THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

Ideal and Practice: Aspects of Noble Life in Late Elizabethan and Jacobean England

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the University of Hull

by

Anna Vladimira Danushevskaya, MA (The Lenin Moscow State Pedagogical University)

May 2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

My first debt of gratitude is to the ORS Fund and the University of Hull, who together have provided me with a research scholarship and maintenance grant, and thus made this research possible.

Some of the source material upon which this thesis is based is drawn from private family archives, and I am grateful to the following owners for giving me access to the contents of their archives, and for permission to use material which is deposited on loan elsewhere: the Dukes of Devonshire and Northumberland; the Marquess of Salisbury; and Viscount De L'Isle. I am very grateful to Dr P. Day at Chatsworth and to Dr. R.Harcourt-Williams at Hatfield for their kindness and attention when I was working on the archives in their care.

I am indebted above all to my Supervisor Professor Glenn Burgess. His interesting and valuable observations made on the first drafts of the work enabled me to rethink my approach to the subject and to create a coherent thesis. I would like to thank him for his limitless patience in correcting my mistakes in the use of the English language.

Summary of Thesis submitted for the PhD degree

by

Anna Vladimira Danushevskaya

on

Ideal and Practice: Aspects of Noble Life in Late Elizabethan and Jacobean England

The thesis investigates what sixteenth and seventeenth century humanists thought about the role of the nobility in society; their views about the proper education of the nobility (including its expected cost) and way of life they considered appropriate to a nobleman. It then tries to consider how all these ideals were realised in practice, drawing heavily on household accounts.

The dissertation consists of an introduction, four chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter studies sixteenth and seventeenth century tracts on education, and advice literature on the conduct of noble life and on the behaviour and customs appropriate to noblemen. The second chapter deals with the practical implementation of the educational ideas of English humanists, and presents a detailed examination of the education provided to the nobility and its cost. The third chapter deals with the tradition of reward and alms-giving as a realisation of the noble virtue of liberality. Scales showing the patterns of reward and alms-giving displayed by different groups of the nobility have also been calculated. A final chapter provides a case study of the life of Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland. It shows in detail the formation of a Protestant humanist nobleman and the ways in which he fashioned his own understanding of his place and function as a nobleman.

The dissertation shows that the English nobility took to heart the humanist ideal of true nobility, with its emphasis on the need for education and virtue to complement birth and blood. From the second half of the sixteenth century the nobility began to provide its children with a humanist education, training them intellectually for a life of service to the state and commonwealth. Their cultural tastes also became broader, and noble patronage played an important role in the general development of English culture in the period.

List of Abbreviations

BL	British Library
Chatsworth MSS	Cavendish Manuscripts, preserved at Chatsworth House
DNB	*Dictionary of National Biography*, 22 vols. (Oxford, 1921-22)
Hatfield MSS	Salisbury Manuscripts, preserved at Hatfield house
HMC *Ancaster*	*Historical Manuscript Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Ancaster, Preserved at Grimsthorpe* (Dublin, 1907).
HMC *Downshire*	*Historical Manuscript Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire, Preserved at Easthampstead Park, Berkshire*, 6 vols (London 1924-1995)
HMC *Hastings*	*Historical Manuscript Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings*, 4 vols. (London, 1928-47).
HMC *De L'Isle*	*Historical Manuscript Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley, Preserved at Penshurst Place, Kent*, 6 vols. (London, 1925-66).
HMC *Middleton*	*Historical Manuscript Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton, Preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire* (London,1911).
HMC *Rutland*	*Historical Manuscript Commission, The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, G.C.B., Preserved at Belvoir Castle,* 4 vols. (London, 1888-1905), v.24

HMC *Salisbury*	*Historical Manuscript Commission, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, K.G., Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire,* 24 vols. (London, 1883-1976)
Household Papers of Henry Percy	*The Household Papers of Henry Percy, ninth Ear of Northumberland (1564-1632)*,ed.G.R.Batho (London, 1962).
Leicester Accounts	*Household Accounts and Disbursement Books of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester* 1558-1561, 1584-1586, ed.S. Adams (Cambridge, 1995).
OED	*The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., 20 vols. (Oxford, 1989)
PRO SP	Public Record Office (London), State Papers
Sidney MSS	Sidney Manuscripts, at the Centre for Kentish studies, Maidstone
Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*	*The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed.J.Spedding, 7 vols. (London, 1861-74), v.II.
STC	A.W.Pollard and G.R.Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of* Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (London, 1986).
Stone, *Crisis*	L. Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy,1558-1641* (Oxford, 1965)
Stone, *Family and Fortune*	L. Stone, *Family and Fortune. Studies in Aristocratic Finance in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries* (Oxford, 1973).

Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage*	L.Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (London, 1977).

Corrigenda

Page and line	Now	Must be
p.13, 10th line	possib7le	possible
p.13, 18th line	Stone's *Crisis of the Aristocracy*	Stone's *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*
p. 17, 4th line	Bughley	Burghley
p. 23, 17th line	in their countries	in their counties
p. 89, 5th line	impression of about the education	impression of the education
p. 103, 14th line	Dowager Countess Essex	Dowager Countess of Essex
p. 146, 16th line	into four categories	Into five categories
p. 156, 11th line	Entries in the rewards	Entries of the rewards
p. 177, 6th line	sixteenth and seventeenth accounts	sixteenth and seventeenth century accounts
p. 189, 18th line	the 1st Earl	the 1st Earl of Rutland
p. 189, 20th line	the Dowager Countess	the Dowager Countess of Rutland
p. 189, 19th line	the 5th Earl	the 5th Earl of Rutland
p. 194, 3rd line	their county paramount	their county were paramount
p. 220, 6th line	28th March 1996	28th March 1596
p..227, 12th line	do not for certain	do not know for certain
p. 230, 20th line	was either reported	was reported
p.231, 23rd line	changes of to their	changes of their
p.280, 8th line	*Sad Shepherd*	*The Sad Shepherd*
p. 287, 16th line	alms to poor; gifts to clerics;	alms to poor; tips to servants and entertainers; gifts to clerics;

Table of Contents.

Acknowledgements		ii
Abbreviations		iii
Table of Contents		vi
Introduction		1
Chapter 1	Theories of Nobility: Ideal, Education and Conduct	20
Chapter 2	The Practical Realisation of Humanist Ideals: Education and Upbringing	80
Chapter 3	The Practice of Liberality: Alms and Rewards	144
Chapter 4	Precept Into Practice: The Making and Life of Roger Manners, the 5th Earl of Rutland (1576-1612)	203
Conclusion		283
Appendix 1	Cost of Education and Maintenance	291
Appendix 2	Rewards Given by the Nobility: Summary Scales	292
Bibliography		294

INTRODUCTION

Early modern England witnessed a significant number of political, social and cultural changes. The transformation of the ideal of the nobility was among those changes. The sixteenth century saw the appearance of humanist tracts that tried to redefine the idea of nobility, and its role in society. These works greatly influenced the existing English nobility, which showed a powerful capacity to adapt to change by adopting humanist styles of education and culture. By this means the nobility could retain its ruling position in the commonwealth. The aim of this work is to study the changing ideals of the nobility and the practical implementation of those ideals.

This work will be occupied with the nobility in the sense of that term defined by Sir Thomas Smith and Sir William Segar.[1] Smith's and Segar's sense of the nobility embraced king, princes, dukes, marquises, earls, viscounts and barons (royalty, and the peerage). Both included, as 'minor nobility', knights and gentlemen descended from the collateral branches of ancient families (the landed gentry). Smith used the term 'gentleman' for anyone 'who can live idly and without manuall labour, and will beare the port, charge and countenance of a gentleman' (this group included educated people of various social origins who acquired gentility of mind).[2] A similar understanding and division of the nobility can be found in John Selden's *Titles of Honour*.[3]

The present thesis will mainly deal with the peerage, though some comparative data on the landed gentry will be presented as well. The terms 'nobility' and 'aristocracy' will

---

[1] Sir Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum* (Cambridge, 1982), pp.65-72; Sir William Segar, *The Booke of Honor and Armes* (London, 1590), f.O2r.
[2] Smith, op.cit., pp.65, 69-72.
[3] J.Selden, *Titles of Honour* (London, 1614).

be used interchangeably when speaking of both the peerage and the landed gentry. For some purposes, at least, the nobility will be divided into three categories: 1) the lesser nobility (gentry and barons); 2) the prominent nobility (the titled nobility); 3) the Court nobility (those of the titled nobility who were prominent power-brokers at Court and in central government, such as the Earls of Leicester, Essex and Salisbury). Thus, I hope to suggest that even the peerage should not be seen as a homogeneous group.

In the traditional medieval conception, the nobility, especially the King's barons, was a group who helped the monarch to rule. In the sixteenth century the role of the aristocracy changed, perhaps not to the degree sometimes thought. One recent historian charted the changes with reference to the Lieutenancy. Under the Tudors and Early Stuarts all Lord Lieutenants were peers.[4] Though they were representatives of the monarch and were appointed by him, they were much more committed to their localities than to the enforcement of governmental policy. From the Restoration the peerage lost their complete hold over Lord Lieutenancy. The nobility continued to play important part in the government of the country, but their service became less associated with the monarch and more with the commonwealth as a whole. This change correlates with others, and together they helped to redefine the ideals and role of the nobility.

The aristocracy and its life have received much attention from historians, and in particular from Professor Lawrence Stone. In the late 1940s Stone intervened in the heated debate on the gentry.[5] The debate was based around the belief that the 'real' causes of the

---

[4] V.L.Stater, *Noble Government: The Stuart Lord Lieutenancy and the Transformation of English Politics* (Athens and London, 1994), pp.8-32.

[5] R.H.Tawney, 'The Rise of the Gentry 1558-1640', *Economic History Review (EcHR)*, 1st ser, 11 (1941), pp.1-38; L.Stone, 'The Anatomy of the Elizabethan Aristocracy', *EcHR*, 1st ser., 18 (1948), pp.1-53; H.R.Trevor-Roper, 'The Elizabethan Aristocracy: An Anatomy Anatomized', *EcHR*, 2nd ser., 3 (1950-1), pp.279-298; L.Stone, 'The Elizabethan Aristocracy – A Restatement', *EcHR*, 2nd ser., 4 (1952); H.R.Trevor-Roper, *The Gentry* (Cambridge, 1953).

Civil War lay in the economic and social fortunes of the landed classes. Tawney tried to prove the 'rise' of gentry at the expense of the crown and aristocracy. Stone agreed with Tawney's view and added his own interpretation of the aristocracy's 'decline'. Trevor-Roper then tried to do two things simultaneously: to expose the doubtful statistical methods of Tawney and Stone and to prove that there were two groups of gentry – rising 'court' gentry and declining 'country' gentry. In his first aim Trevor-Roper was very successful. His arguments pressed Stone to make a number of concessions in regard to his methods, though his belief in the economic decline of the Elizabethan aristocracy remained unshaken. This discussion of the gentry was very important. It inspired considerable numbers of books about that social group.[6] Though discussion was mainly about the gentry, Stone's 'anti-aristocratic' position was very prominent in discussion and this contributed to the heat of the argument. It seemed that the debate on gentry might spark a further debate on aristocracy; but oddly, this was not really to be.

In 1965 Stone's most famous book on the aristocracy was published.[7] It was mainly dedicated to rescuing from criticism his claim that the English aristocracy of the late sixteenth century was in deep crisis: it was becoming socially outmoded and was losing its political influence. This fundamental work on the crisis of the aristocracy dealt with almost all aspects of the lives of the nobility. *The Crisis of the Aristocracy* did not produce debate of comparable heat to the 'gentry' controversy. Over the next four years about 20 reviews of

---

[6] M.Finch, *The Wealth of Five Northamptonshire Families, 1540-1640* (London, 1956); A.Simpson, *The Wealth of the Gentry 1540-1640: East Anglian Studies* (Chicago, 1961); J.T.Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (London, 1969); H.A.Lloyd, *The Gentry of South-West Wales, 1540-1640* (Cardiff, 1968); F.Heal and C.Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (London, 1994).

[7] Stone, *Crisis*.

the book were published.[8] All the reviewers acknowledged the tremendous amount of research which Stone had put into his work, and the readability of the final product. Many reviews were largely complimentary, but the book was also severely criticized. The exclusion of the gentry from the aristocracy was noticed. Stone studied only the titular peerage rather than the whole body of the aristocracy. The latter is indeed very difficult to define, as it is evident from Smith's list of members of 'major' and 'minor' nobility. There were doubts that the peerage was a meaningful group for Stone's purposes. The main part of the book on noble finance was the target of the sharpest critics. It was shown that Stone's own statistical tables proved that the nobility was not in the grave economic crisis which Stone ascribed to it. Stone contradicted himself on some other important issues as well. At the beginning of the book the aristocracy was described as lazy; however later in the book it became industrious and explorative. Stone's way of handling the evidence was questioned. Stone himself noted that 'only a continuous run of accounts over a very long period offers any hope of establishing true annual income, and this is unobtainable except for one or two families'.[9] However later on the rental figures for seventeen peerage families over dates ranging from 1566 to 1659 were given. The majority of Stone's generalizations were considered to rest on insufficient data. His way of handling sources and his quantification of

---

[8] M.Ashley, *The Listener* (18.03.1965), p.420; R.Ashton, *EcHR*, 2nd ser., 22 (1969), p.308; G.E.Aylmer, *Past and Present*, 32 (1965), pp.113-125; E.G.Barber, *American Sociological Review*, 31 (Jun., 1966), p.424; M.Capmbell, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 24 (Apr., 1967), pp.302-304; D.C.Coleman, *History*, 51 (1966), pp.165-178; R.L.Colie, *Renaissance News*, 19 (Spring, 1966), pp.48-54; C.M.Gray, *Canadian Historical Review*, 47 (March, 1966), p.73; C.Hill, *New Statesman* (21.05.1965), p.803; H.Hulme, *The American Historical Review*, 71 (Oct., 1965), pp.173-174; J.Hurstfield, *The Listener* (18.03.1965), p.934; W.K.Jordan, *The Journal of Modern History*, 38 (Dec., 1966), pp.428-429; J.Kennyon, *The New York Review of Books (NYRB)* (7.07.1966), p.23; W.T.MacCaffrey, *Political Science Quarterly*, 81 (Jun., 1966), pp.306-307; J.Max Patrick, *Seventeenth Century News*, 24 (Aut, 1966), p.37, *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, 42 (Win., 1966), p.xxvi; E.Miller, *The Historical Journal*, 9 (1966), p.133; D.H.Pennington, *The English Historical Review*, 81 (1966), pp.562-565; J.H.Plumb, *Economist* (01.05.1965), p.535, *Spectator* (30.04.1965), p.570; P.Zagorin, *Journal of Economic History*, 26 (Mar., 1966), pp.135-137.

[9] Stone, *Crisis*, p.325.

data did not seem adequate to his aims. His conclusions on 'minds and manners' were criticized for lack of evidence and context, especially the educational chapter. Aylmer considered that 'the difficulties in connecting the political and religious inclinations, or the literary and artistic tastes of the English peerage with their economic circumstances reveal possibly a little more markedly and more often than he [Stone] allows, the limits of historical knowledge and understanding'.[10] Barber excellently summarized the main feature of the book, 'Professor Stone had in mind clearly formulated questions or hypotheses when he collected his data, and he organized and analyzed these data in such a way that they yield answers'.[11] All critics suggested that Stone should have shown more clearly the character of the methods and evidence that he had used and the way that he had arrived at his economic conclusions and generalizations. Stone did not immediately reply.

Only in 1973 did Stone publish a detailed study of aristocratic finance.[12] This book consisted of studies of the economic history of five great aristocratic families: the Cecils, Earls of Salisbury; the Manners, Earls of Rutland; the Wriothesleys, Earls of Southampton; the Berkleys, Lords Berkeley; and the Howards, Earls of Suffolk. Stone studied the rise and fall in the fortunes of each family. This book received a more modest number of reviews, six that I have found.[13] All reviewers, except Keith Thomas, considered the book a continuation of *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, and it seems logical to see this book as Stone's answer to the demand of his critics that he shows the basis for his previous conclusions. This book showed just how many long runs of household accounts existed for

---

[10] G.E.Aylmer, *Past and Present*, 32 (196), pp.124-125
[11] E.G.Barber, *American Sociological Review*, p.424.
[12] Stone, *Family and Fortune*.
[13] M.W.Beresford, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 27 (Summer, 1974), pp.218-219; H.Buszello, *Erasmus*, 31 (Wisbaden, 1980), p.382; D.C.Coleman, *History*, 59 (1974), pp.458-59; W.T.Maccaffrey, *The American Historical Review*, 79 (Dec., 1974), pp.1547-1549; K.Thomas, *The Listener* (18.08.1973), p.222; D.Underdown, *Journal of Economic History*, 36 (Sep., 1976), pp.794-795.

the early modern aristocracy. Coleman noted that some of the statistics given in *Family and Fortune* differed from the figures of *The Crisis of the Aristocracy* though both sets of figures seemed to relate to the same noblemen at the same time. Thomas was rather critical of the book. He condemned Stone's practice of passing moral judgements on members of the families that he considered. Thomas considered that 'there is perhaps just a hint of anachronism about denouncing all this gambling and extravagance in the tone of voice appropriate for addressing pre-war Christ Church undergraduates frolicking in Peckwater. A more anthropological approach might have revealed this behaviour to have been less the result of personal vice and weakness than the product of the same forgotten values and assumptions which built the stately homes we still admire'.[14] Indeed, Thomas saw the root of the problem: Stone did not tell his reader what was normal for expenditure on food, clothes, rewards, alms, horses, dogs, books, entertainment and so on in the period. If someone is to be considered extravagant it needs first to be determined what was a normal level of spending for someone of his social position. It seems that Stone judged the behaviour of noblemen, their habits of spending and their educational practises from his own, twentieth century, point of view. One of the purposes of the present thesis will be to demonstrate and to begin correcting Stone's anachronistic approach towards the nobility.

In 1977 Stone published *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*.[15] This book covered all social groups, the aristocracy included. It continued to examine issues raised in corresponding chapters of *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*. While *Family and Fortune* had complimentary reviews, save one, *Family, Sex and Marriage* was the complete

---

[14] K.Thomas, *The Listener*, p.222
[15] Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage*.

opposite. Of eleven reviews, all but one was hostile.[16] This book was criticised for its complete lack of manuscript and archival sources. The reliability of Stone's conceptualization was questioned. Stone was accused of ignoring too much of what 'does not 'fit' into his neat genetic schema', and of selecting his evidence with reference to some basic assumptions about motivation and human interaction, class structure, and progressive social evolution. Berkowitz considered that 'a scaffolding of generalization raised on weak foundations cannot command a high degree of confidence in the overall validity of Stone's shaping assumptions'.[17] Thomas thought that the work 'betrays some carelessness about details, a tendency to exaggerate and an eagerness to push recalcitrant facts into unduly schematic categories'.[18] All critics refused to agree with Stone's view of the Tudor family as unaffectionate. It was universally noticed that all Stone's work was based on sources relating to the upper classes, but that this did not stop him from assuming that the same kind of family relations and sexual behaviour existed amongst the lower classes. Later, this assumption was attacked by Keith Wrightson in his work on English social life at the end of sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries.[19] He accused Stone of transferring conclusions that may be valid for the aristocracy to the whole of English society. Stone's opinion that in a period of high infant mortality it was normal to keep emotional distance between parents and children so that parents could better cope with a child's death has been disputed by

---

[16] P.Aries, *The American Historical Review*, 83 (Dec., 1978), pp.1221-1224; D.S.Berkowitz, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 32 (Winter, 1979), pp.396-403; J.Gillis, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 10 (1979), pp.121-28; A.Macfarlane, *History and Theory*, 18 (1979), pp.103-126; R.Mitchinson, *The New Review* (02.1978), p.41; J.H.Plumb, *NYRB* (24.11.1977), p.30; J.Scott, *Social History*, 4 (1979), pp.509-16; H.Thomas, *The Listener* (8.12.1977), p.752; K.Thomas, *Times Literary Supplement (TLS)* (21.10.1977), p.1226; E.P.Thompson, *New Society*, 41 (8.09.1977) pp.499-501; E.William Monter, *The Journal of Modern History*, 50 (Sep., 1978), pp.502-506.

[17] D.S.Berkowitz, *Renaissance Quarterly*, pp.399, 402.

[18] K.Thomas, *TLS*, p.1226.

[19] K.Wrightson, *English Society 1580-1680* (London, 1982).

Ralph Houlbrooke and Linda A. Pollock.[20] On the basis of correspondence and diaries, both of them prove that children's deaths left deep imprints on their parents. In 1998 Wrightson produced an excellent summary of the historiography of the early modern English family.[21] His general conclusion was that, though Stone's conception of the evolution of English family had been proven wrong, no alternative interpretative scheme had replaced it. Wrightson noticed that the history of the family had become too gendered.[22]

In 1984 Stone published, with his wife, a further study of the aristocracy.[23] *An Open Elite?* aimed to measure whether the widespread opinion that there was 'frequent and easy upward mobility of successful men of business into the ranks of the landed elite' was true or false. For his purpose Stone chose three English counties, Hertfordshire, Northumberland and Northamptonshire. Stone regarded as worthy of his attention only those members of the nobility who owned a stately house 'of a certain minimum size, standing in pleasure-grounds of a certain minimum acreage'.[24] The minimum house was defined as having at least fifty units of living quarters. This house had to be attached to an estate large enough to generate the income to support the owner, his family, and their style of consumption (at least 3,000 acres)._The majority of the reviewers of the book considered this definition of

---

[20] R.Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England* (Oxford, 1998); L.A.Pollock, *Forgotten Children. Parent-child Relations from 1500 to 1900.* (Cambridge, 1983).
[21] K.Wrightson, 'The Family in Early Modern England: Continuity and Change' in *Hanoverian Britain and Empire: Essays in Memory of Philip Lawson*, eds. S.Taylor, R.Connors, C.Jones (Woodbridge, 1998).
[22] M.P.Hannay, '"O Daughter Heare": Reconstructing the Lives of Aristocratic Englishwomen', H.Dubrow 'The Message from Marcade: Parental Death in Tudor and Stuart England', R.T.Warnicke, 'Eulogies for Women: Public Testimony of Their Godly Example and Leadership' in *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, eds.B.S.Travitsky; A.F.Seeff (Newark, London, 1994); H.Wilcox, *Women and literature in Britain 1500-1700* (Cambridge, 1996); C.Gittings, 'Expressions of Loss in Early Seventeenth-Century England', S.Collins, ''A Kind of Lawful Adultery': English Attitudes to the Remarriage of Widows, 1550-1800' in *The changing Face of Death: Historical Accounts of Death and Disposal*, eds. P.C.Jupp, G.Howarth (Basingstoke, 1997); J.Eales, *Women in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (London, 1998); B.J.Harris 'Aristocratic Women and the State in Early Tudor England' in *State, Sovereigns & Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of A.J. Slavin*, eds.C.Carlton, R.L.Woods, M.L.Robertson, J.S.Block (Stroud, 1998).
[23] L.Stone, J.C.F.Stone *An Open Elite? England 1540-1880* (New York, 1984).
[24] Ibid., pp.4, 11.

elite as the owners of stately houses and grounds to be arbitrary.[25] They asked how typical the three counties which the Stones studied were, and the basis on which they made their generalizations. The critics doubted that the Stones had shown beyond doubt that the idea of the English ruling class as an open elite was a myth. The only sign that Stone ever noticed any of the many critics of his books is that in 1989 he acknowledged in his autobiographical essay that his works contained some minor mistakes.[26]

Stone's works raised a number of important questions which have never been fully answered. The existence of any 'crisis' amongst the aristocracy in the period 1540-1640 continues to be considered unproven, but it is not clear that it has been decisively refuted. The political role of the nobility remains uncertain: did their political power increase, decline or remain the same in the century before the English Revolution? J.S.A Adamson has written that during the early years of the Long Parliament even men such as Cromwell 'expected power to reside in a reformed Privy Council, and expected that council to be largely composed of the greater nobility and their clients and allies...'.[27] On the other hand, Stone's views of aristocratic family life and their child-rearing habits have been fairly decisively rejected by other historians. Stone's works were prominently marked with an anti-aristocratic bias, which can be noticed even in his autobiographical essay.[28] He was also frequently accused of anachronistic judgements. Thus, one of the aims of the present

---

[25] The reviews consulted are: A.Briggs, *Encounter* (01.1985), p.53; H.Brogen, *The Listener* (6.09.1984), p.22; C.W.Brooks, *The English Historical Review*, 101 (1986), pp.176-79; D.Cannadine, *NYRB* (20.12.1984), p.64; C.Clay, *EcHR*, 2nd ser., 38 (1985), pp. 452-54; C.Hill, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38 (Summer, 1985), pp.337-340; R.Lachmann, *Contemporary Sociology*, 14 (Jul., 1985), pp.439-442; F.McCormick, *The Scriblerian*, 2 (Aut 1985), p.91; F.M.L.Thompson, *TLS* (7.09.1984), p.990; J. A.Thompson, *The American Historical Review*, 93 (Feb., 1988), pp.138-139.

[26] *The First Modern Society. Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone*, eds.A.L.Beier, D.Cannadine, and J.M.Rosenheim (Cambridge, 1989), p.593.

[27] J.S.A.Adamson, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Long Parliament' in *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed.J.Morrill (London & New York, 1990), p.51.

[28] Ibid., pp.575-595.

work is to provide a foundation for the non-anachronistic judgement of the early modern English aristocracy.

Lawrence Stone has not been the only investigator of the early modern nobility. Interestingly, though, other researchers in this field have been less obsessed with the refutation of Stone's views than the family historians have. Michael Bush, for example, has written extensively on the subject.[29] However he does not directly confront Stone's position, and his interests range more widely to the European aristocracy. Bush covers a broad period from the thirteenth to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This approach permits him to study the aristocracy in development. Though Professor Bush does not say this, his works clearly show that the European aristocracy (and the English one as part of the European) reached a 'crisis' only in the nineteenth century (or, even, for the English aristocracy at the beginning of the twentieth century). The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were a period of change and adjustment, not the first and not the last one during the history of the aristocracy as a class. The latest work of Keith Wrightson fully confirms this.[30] Though rich in references to the works of other historians, Wrightson's book does not even mention Stone. Wrightson effectively proves that the aristocracy (landed classes) were not in crisis. If anything, the opposite was true. They adjusted their economic policies to changing economic conditions. Though Habakkuk's book on English landownership and its impact by marriages, debts and estate management is preoccupied with period after 1650, it gives good background on situation at late Tudor and Early Stuart England [31]

Some work has been done on patterns of noble behaviour. Mark Girouard

---

[29] M.L.Bush, *The English Aristocracy: a Comparative Synthesis* (Manchester, 1984); *Noble Privilege* (Manchester, 1983); *Rich Noble, Poor Noble* (Manchester, 1988).

[30] K.Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* (New Haven,2000).

[31] H.J.Habakkuk, *Marriage, Debt, and the Estates System: English Landownership, 1650-1950* (Oxford, 1994).

demonstrated the role of stately houses in displaying noble and gentry position and ambition.[32] The great families built 'power houses', which served as centres of influence and display, and from which they managed their estates. They served as an index of a nobleman's ambitions. Girouard's conclusions have been expanded in later research.[33]

Questions about the interconnections between social, political, and economic credit in society have been raised in different works. Craig Muldrew in *The Economy of Obligation* has shown that at all levels of society the language of credit was used in both economic and social context.[34] He argues that the economic and the social were frequently the same. If one had no social credit he could not obtain a loan. In a period when the nobility frequently took loans, they cannot be excluded from this picture. A nobleman had to be reliable if he wanted to obtain a loan. Noblemen had social obligations towards their patrons and clients, as well. Cynthia Herrup has dramatically shown the consequences for a nobleman of his failure to fulfil his obligations as head of a household.[35] The loss of social credit proved catastrophic for the Earl of Castlehaven. The issue of social credit has been more broadly raised in Richard Cust's work on honour and politics in Early Stuart England.[36] Cust showed that in the early Stuart period matters of honour were easily transformed into matters of political influence. Several concepts of honour existed in society simultaneously: one associated with civic humanism and Protestantism, emphasizing learning and godliness; and another stressing the importance of blood and lineage and legitimizing a code of conduct based on pride. J.S.A.Adamson has demonstrated how Charles I tried to utilize

---

[32] M.Girouard, *Life in the English Country House: a Social and Architectural History* (New Haven, Mass., 1993).
[33] N.Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry, 1480-1680* (New Haven, London, 1999).
[34] C.Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: the Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1998).
[35] C.B.Herrup, *Crimes Most Dishonorable: Sex, Law, and the 2nd Earl of Castlehaven* (New York; Oxford, 1999)
[36] R.Cust, 'Honour and Politics in Early Stuart England: the Case of Beaumont v. Hastings', *Past and Present*, 149 (1995), pp. 57-94.

concepts of honour and chivalry for his political advantage throughout his reign.[37] Chivalric ideas were used by both Royalist and Parliamentarian nobility during the Civil War.

Lately historians have shown particular interest in studying the Italian influence on English culture generally and on the aristocracy in particular.[38] But some aspects of noble life in England remain unexplored. One example of this is revealed by N.Zemon Davies's *The Gift in Sixteenth Century France*.[39] There is a need for a comparable English study. All these works deal with rather narrow subjects and there is now an obvious need for work which examines broadly the patterns of noble behaviour.

A number of works have been written about particular members of the nobility. Some of them pay more attention to the political career of their subjects,[40] others deal with their private lives, as in some work on the Sidneys, on Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and others.[41]

This thesis will use printed treatises and other material to investigate what contemporaries thought about the role of the nobility in society, and about the educational practices and conduct proper to them. It will use household accounts and supporting contextual evidence to consider how these prescriptive ideas on noble education and aristocratic life corresponded with the practices of the Elizabethan and Jacobean nobility.

---

[37] J.S.A.Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England' in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, eds. K.Sharpe and P.Lake (Basingstoke, 1994), pp.161-198.

[38] R.Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge, 1993); R.Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography 3: Jacobean and Caroline* (Woodbridge, 1998); E.Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian Cultural Relations Since the Renaissance* (London, 1998); A.Hadfield, *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545-1625* (New York, 1998).

[39] N.Z.Davies, *The Gift in Sixteenth Century France* (Oxford, 2000).

[40] H.Gatti, *The Renaissance Drama of Knowledge: Giordano Bruno in England* (London; New York, 1989); P.E.J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: the Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597* (Cambridge, 1999); A.Haynes, *Robert Cecil Earl of Salisbury, 1563-1612: Servant of Two Sovereigns* (London, 1989); E.Berry, *The Making of Sir Philip Sidney* (Toronto; London, 1998); A.Stewart, *Philip Sidney: a Double Life* (London, 2000).

[41] P.Sidney, The Sidneys of Penshurst (London, 1901); A.Haynes, The White Bear: Robert Dudley, the Elizabethan Earl of Leicester (London, 1987); R.T.Spence, The Privateering Earl (Gloucestershire, 1995); R.T.Spence, Lady Anne Clifford: Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery (1590-1676) (Stroud, 1997).

The work attempts to find out what sixteenth and seventeen century authors of educational and advice literature considered the education necessary for a noble child; how much this education was supposed to cost parents; what way of life was understood as appropriate for a nobleman; which customs and habits were meant to be an integral part of a nobleman's conduct. Then it is my aim to study how many of these ideas were realized in practice. Thus, I hope to overcome the danger of anachronism. Then, having found what was expected from a nobleman, I shall analyse the life of Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland, one nobleman subject to Stone's anachronistic judgements.

There are several groups of sources used in the work: theoretical tracts on education, advice literature, household accounts and letters of as wide as possib7le a circle of the prominent and local aristocracy and some literary sources. Taken together all these different sources allow research in the chosen topics, and will place the information derived from the others into perspective. It seems particularly necessary to pay more attention to the specifics of household accounts.

Household accounts are not a new source. They have been used in many works on the English aristocracy and the English economy of relevant periods. In many of these works the accounts have usually been used from a purely economic point of view, as in Stone's *Crisis of the Aristocracy*. Historians have been interested in the yearly totals of income and expenditure. Sometimes particular lines of the accounts have been used to illustrate conclusions usually arrived at by other means. However, the household accounts themselves are a very interesting source. There are several types of accounts: accounts drawn by servants as reports of expenses; accounts made by different clerks of the household; accounts made by the managers of the different parts of large estates (estate accounts rather than household accounts); yearly general accounts, drawn up on the basis of

all the previous types. There are also personal disbursement books of individual members of aristocratic families. Each type of account can provide different data. This data is not purely numerical and economic. Using either the simplest methods of statistical analysis or the data in its own way we can derive from the accounts information which can add significantly to our knowledge of the personality, education, influence and life of particular noblemen or gentlemen and their families. During my research visit to Chatsworth House, owned by the Duke of Devonshire, I found information about the first Earl of Devonshire, which was unknown to scholars for 400 years. This information led to a change in the official tourist guide for the house.[42] Williams in *Bess of Hardwick* made some interesting non-economic use of household accounts.[43] Unfortunately, it was not done consistently. Though this book was written forty years ago, Williams's example has been little followed in other biographies. Certainly household accounts do not survive for every nobleman or noblewoman. Nonetheless Durant in his *Bess of Hardwick*, written eighteen years after Williams's, used accounts only for economic data.[44] I am not, of course, advocating household accounts as the only sources for historical research into the lives of noble families, but it is unwise to ignore the information that they can provide historians with.

The present work consists of an introduction, four chapters and a conclusion.

The first chapter studies sixteenth and seventeenth century tracts on education, advice literature on the conduct of noble life and on the behaviour and customs appropriate to noblemen, such as practices of reward and alms-giving. This chapter outlines the pattern

---

[42] In the guide there was a wrong date for the death of the Earl's first wife (the family was unaware of the fact that the Earl married a second time). Cockayne knew about the existence of the second wife, but he was not sure about the year of marriage (G.E.Cockayne, *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom*, IV (London, 1926), p.340). Household accounts (MS 10a, 10b) provided clear dates for the death of the first wife and the marriage to the second one.

[43] E.C.Williams, *Bess of Hardwick* (London 1959).

[44] D.N.Durant, *Bess of Hardwick. Portrait of Elizabethan Dynast* (London, 1977).

for a child's upbringing from birth to the age of 21, and for an adult's life thereafter.

The second chapter deals with the practical implementation of the educational ideas of English humanists. The core of this chapter will be a comparison of the expenses on children and their education of different Tudor and Stuart noblemen. I am going to use the data which the household accounts provide for expenditure on children, the cost of their maintenance and their education. Sometimes accounts provide the historian with information about what was being studied, including lists of books bought for children. Children's expenses vary from household to household, mainly because in different households these expenses were categorized under different headings, or even in different accounts. In the latter case, not all the accounts for each year survive. Household accounts and private letters enable us to see how ideas about noble education were put into practice, and how much was spent on children in reality. Considerable attention is paid to the Grand Tour as part of the education of a young nobleman. The Grand Tour was a relatively new feature in noble education during the second half of the sixteenth century, but it became common by the end of the century. It seems that in the late Tudor period the most popular European countries for Grand Tours were Italy and France. Though Italy continued to be a place of interest, its influence was limited to the arts and entertainment. Household accounts provide plenty of material about the cost of the Grand Tour. However, source material on young travellers' route and activities abroad is rather scarce, though William Cecil, Viscount Cranborne kept two diaries during the time of his travels. They were sent to his father, the 1st Earl of Salisbury, and because of this they survived to reach historians. These diaries and Cranborne's travel route will be studied in detail.

The third chapter deals with the tradition of reward and alms-giving. Stone is inclined to judge a nobleman as a spendthrift on the basis of the value of rewards given by

him. 'Everything he [the 5th Earl of Rutland] did was on the same princely scale. The man who opened the park gates at Rockingham as he passed received a tip of 1s., the equivalent of two days' wages. The impression is one of absurdly conspicuous expenditure, undertaken not from a sense of what was becoming to one of his rank and wealth, but for sheer pleasure of spending'.[45] With the help of the data provided by the household accounts and other sources I am going to examine the question of rewards. I shall investigate the meaning of the word "reward" in the early modern period, the value of rewards for different types of service given to noblemen or gentlemen, and the value of charitable gifts given by noblemen and their officers. The household accounts of the nobility are revealing about the life patterns not only of the household itself, but of its head as well. Examination of the rewards lists in the household books suggests that the word "reward" had different meanings: it covered charity to the poor, rewards to messengers or carriers, payment for transported commodities and so on. Rewards varied greatly from group to group, but within each group they are very similar in amount. Thus, it seems possible to formulate patterns of noble gift and alms-giving and to avoid anachronism in the matter.

The fourth chapter of the present work is dedicated to a study of the life of Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland. I am going to show that the life of Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland, which Professor Stone considered to show a repudiation of the model of noble life advanced in humanist recommendation literature could in fact be considered an exemplar of this model. The 5th Earl of Rutland might be considered a poor choice for a detailed case-study. More appropriate choices might be Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury, or Walter Raleigh, or Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland. Their fathers all wrote

---

[45] Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.181.

advice books which will be studied in the first chapter, and it is known that they paid close attention to their children's education. The 5th Earl of Rutland, however, did not have the benefit of being the son of a father who wrote an advice book. His father, John Manners, 4th Earl of Rutland, died when his son was only eleven years old. However Bughley was Rutland's guardian in 1588-1597, as well as the guardian of his uncle, the 3rd Earl, in 1563-1570. So, to some extent the 5th Earl of Rutland was exposed to Burghley's wisdom, though Professor Stone considers that it had no effect on him. Stone's general opinion of the Earl's personality and interests is highly negative.

Taking all these points into consideration it seems useful and promising to study the life of this particular man. The material provided by the household accounts will be used in a case study of the Earl of Rutland. Careful and attentive use of the accounts, letters and contemporary literature will show that the role and influence of the Earl of Rutland have not received the attention from historians which they really deserve. The letters of the Earl of Rutland, his friends and relatives show the personality of the Earl, which significantly differs from the picture that was drawn by Professor Stone, whose account is based on rapid and anachronistic judgements.

The chapter is heavily based on the published sets of household accounts and letters, preserved in Belvoir castle. I have repeatedly asked the late and present Dukes of Rutland for permission to study in the Belvoir Muniment Rooms. Regrettably permission was never granted, though this was not finally confirmed until research was well advanced. Initially, it had looked likely that access would be possible. The published letters and household accounts enable us to reconstruct the main events in life of the 5th Earl of Rutland. Unfortunately it seems impossible to determine whether the 5th Earl of Rutland was typical of his family due to the fact that the accounts of the 3rd and 4th Earls of Rutland were almost

ignored during the Historical Manuscript Commission publication. Nor were all the accounts of the 1st and 2nd Earls published, either. The published material gives enough material for some important comparisons and allows the present research to be completed.

Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland has attracted considerable attention on the part of non-Stratfordian scholars as a possible solution to the Shakespeare Authorship Problem.[46] My purpose is not to examine whether or not these claims are sound and reasonable. I want to show that Rutland was a highly educated nobleman who followed the patterns of life appropriate to a nobleman in his period. Sykes is the only scholar out of those who have written about Rutland who tried to use household accounts and as much as possible of the other surviving evidence. Unfortunately he frequently misdates the quoted documents and interprets them rather liberally. There is a need for a detailed biography of Rutland which will treat him without any preconceptions, and this thesis will provide some of the material that such a biography will need to consider. Further work will have to await greater willingness on the part of the present Duke of Rutland to allow scholars into the archives at

---

[46] C.Demblon, *Lord Rutland est Shakespeare* (Paris, 1912); C.Demblon, *L'Auteur d'Hamlet et sa Monde* (Paris, 1913); F.Shipulinskyi, *Shakespeare – maska Rutlenda. Trehvekovaya konspirativnaya taina istorii* (Moscow, 1924); C.M.Sykes, *Alias William Shakespeare*? (London, 1947); P.Porohovchikov, *Shakespeare Unmasked* (London, 1955); I.M.Guililov, *Igra ob Williame Shakespeare, ili Taina Velikogo Fenixa* (Moscow, 1997); I.M.Gililov, 'For Whom the Bell Tolled: A New Dating for Shakespeare's "The Phoenix and the Turtle", and the Identification of Its Protagonists' in *Russian Essays on Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, eds.A.Parfenov and J.G.Price (London, 1998), pp.146-84; J.Michel, *Who Wrote Shakespeare?* (London, 1996), pp.211-226. In Russia Rutland was a very popular candidature on Shakespeare's role since Demblon's books were published. Demblon discovered that the 5th Earl of Rutland was a student of Padua University simultaneously with Danish students Rozenkrantz and Hildernstern. In the late 1920s this hypothesis became a basis of the discussion in which Lunacharskiy was for Rutland as Shakespeare. However CPSU Central Committee forbade further discussion. It was proclaimed that Shakespeare from Stratford-upon-Avon was the true Shakespeare, for this was suitable for the political doctrine of the party. Lenin proclaimed that 'the she-cook can govern the state', thus idea of Shakespeare as a nobleman was contrary to the party doctrine, the son of a commoner suited it better. Dr. Guililov worked with the leading Soviet authority on Shakespeare, Professor Anikst. Anikst told Guiliov that he had had his own doubts about Shakespeare's Authorship and had urged for the open discussion. Anikst was invited to the party representative and was reminded that he had come from the family of old Bolsheviks and had been born in Paris. In the Russia of the period this was sufficient to become a subject to Stalin's repression. Anikst understood the hint, and kept his doubts on Shakespeare's Authorship to himself. The discussion was reopened after *perestroika*. Currently the most prominent defenders of the Rutlandian cause are Dr. I.M.Guililov and Professor M.D.Litvinova. The majority of Russian intelligentsia accepted Guililov's theory, and it became almost official.

Belvoir.

I hope that this thesis will help to establish the way towards a more objective and measured study of the life of aristocracy, in general, and of its individual members in particular.

CHAPTER ONE

Theories of Nobility: Ideal, Education and Conduct

This chapter will give an account of theories of noble life in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. In the sixteenth century there emerged a new understanding of the nobility, and this produced new norms about a noblemen's proper way of life and behaviour. In order to avoid anachronism it is very important for the current work to establish what came to be understood as the proper place of the nobility in society, what was considered appropriate noble behaviour, and how a noble child had to be educated and, more broadly, formed into an exemplar of noble ideals.

1.1. The Changing Ideal of Nobility

Until the late fifteenth century nobility was understood to be the product of lineage and blood. These were propagated in two very popular books published in the last quarter of the century.[47] Both Lull and the St. Albans author emphasised the vital importance of proper noble lineage in a person who was to be understood as noble. However they insisted that the nobility which was inherited with the blood should and would be confirmed by practical virtue. This exercise of virtue produced from the potentially honourable and noble someone who was actually noble.[48] A nobleman confirmed his own nobility when he became a knight, thus through his own military service and virtues he proved himself worthy of his noble

---

[47] *The Book of the Ordre of Chyvalry, translated and printed by William Caxton from a French Version of Ramon Lull'a "Le Libre del Orde de Cauayleria"*, ed. A.T.P. Byles (Early English Text Soc., clxviii, London, 1926); J.Berners, *The Boke of Saint Albans ... Containing Treatises on Hawking, Hunting and Cote Armour* (St Albans, 1486).

[48] M.James, *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986), p.310.

line. *The Boke of St. Albans* gave the list of necessary virtues which should be practised by the nobility in order to help 'in his King's battels': fortitude, prudence, wisdom, hope, and steadfastness.[49] Courtliness, justice and liberality towards the poor were also understood as virtues of chivalry.[50] Only these three qualities were necessary in time of peace. All the others were in essence the demands of a military-oriented culture. In these tracts there is no reference to learning as a qualification for nobility. Thus, noblemen were mainly warriors, not always dependent on or obedient to the crown. This independence was rooted in the idea that emperors, kings and princes themselves belonged to the noble order of knighthood, and so as knights they were bound by the laws of honour. If they broke these bonds, their subjects, the knights in their own rights, were free to disobey them. The idea of an independent and military order of knighthood did not blend harmoniously with a Christian culture with its emphasis on prevalent non-violence and total obedience. But in the middle of the twelfth century John of Salisbury in his *Policraticus* pictured knighthood as God's tool to exercise judgement on mankind.[51] In medieval religious categories, a person's social place was related to his towards the glory of God. All members of society were supposed to show their religious concerns through regular personal prayers and through living a pious obedient non-violent life. They were supposed, too, to participate in the sacraments of the church. Knights were seen in particular as the swords of God. But knights delegated strict religious life to the monastic orders or postponed the true understanding of and commitment to religion until their old ages, when they would become unfit for active service. Thus, John of Salisbury tried to find a place for a semi-independent military class in Christian culture. This remained the standard view so long as such a warrior class was necessary to society.

---

[49] Berners, op.cit., ff.A2r-A3v.
[50] Ibid., f.A4v.
[51] M.James, op.cit., p.318.

The military revolution helped to change this.

There is an agreement among historians that at the beginning of the sixteenth century a military revolution occurred in Europe.[52] This military revolution consisted of four main elements: 1) the supplanting of heavily armoured cavalry by infantry; 2) the introduction of gunpowder weapons; 3) an increase in the size of armies; 4) an increase in the length of campaigns.[53] Ayton and Price see the main result of this revolution as an increase in the cost of war to the state. This had different political, fiscal and bureaucratic consequences. In England this revolution coincided in time with the establishment of the Tudor dynasty. Warfare no longer required feudal knights. The new type of warfare removed the position of the nobility as the only or predominant qualified military force. Partly as a result, the place and social function of the nobility in society began to change.

There was a widespread opinion that the Tudors transformed England from being a country of strong powerful barons and dukes to one governed by the king with the help of an effective state apparatus. The early Tudor kings encouraged low-born officials and clerks, whose only virtues were faithfulness to the monarch and a good education. However G.W. Bernard disagrees entirely with this view.[54] He argues that the nobility retained its political influence and power. Perhaps as a result of the military revolution, it lost its place as the most significant military force; but noblemen continued to be military officers. Noblemen were also important councillors. Though they did not necessarily occupy the prominent offices of state, they considered counselling as their noble duty, not the source of gaining their means of living. Bernard argues that routine administration was being carried

---

[52] *The Medieval Military Revolution. State, Society and Military Change in Medieval and Early Modern Europe.*, eds. A. Ayton and J.L.Price. (London, New York, 1995), p.1.
[53] Ibid., p.2.
[54] G.W.Bernard, *The Power of the Early Tudor Nobility. A Study of the Fourth and Fifth Earls of Shrewsbury* (New Jersey, 1985), pp.173-219.

on by professional officials and administrators because noblemen were not eager to involve themselves in these matters preferring to stay and rule their 'country'.

Some counties were like small kingdoms to some noble families: Sir Henry Vernon of Haddon Hall (Derbyshire) was known as king of the Peak. The famous sentence 'the North knew no lord but a Percy' seems to be a considerable exaggeration, though it is very significant in itself. Bernard considers early Tudor England to have been a federation of noble fiefdoms: the Earl of Shrewsbury ruled in the northern Midlands, the Earl of Bedford in the south-west, the Earl of Huntingdon in the south Midlands, the Earl of Derby in the north-west, the Earl of Northumberland in the north-east, the Earl of Pembroke in south Wales and central southern England, the Earl of Arundel in Sussex, the Duke of Norfolk in East Anglia, and the Earl of Rutland in Nottinghamshire.[55] Noblemen were used as *ad hoc* commissioners by the central government. When in the mid-sixteenth century the post of Lord Lieutenant was introduced, many noblemen received appointments as Lieutenants in several counties.

The Lord Lieutenancy developed into a wide-ranging supervisory office. The formalisation of the Lord Lieutenancy in the mid-sixteenth century acknowledged and reinforced the social, political and military power of the nobility in their countries.[56] Bernard argues that administrative changes were not intended to curb noble power.[57] The nobility acquired new functions as local representatives of the crown, ruling without military force, but by the letter of the law or through social influence. Stater in his excellent book on the evolution of the Lord Lieutenancy under the Stuarts showed that 'a Lord Lieutenant in early Stuart England was a figure of special importance. He stood at the head

---

[55] Ibid., pp.79-180.
[56] Ibid., p.180.
[57] Ibid., p.204

of his county, both politically and socially'.[58]

However the need was felt to justify the changed position of the nobility. The Tudor state needed an obedient nobility. Protestant and humanist writers helped the Tudors to create the new ideology. Protestantism aimed to make the nobility more religiously committed. Protestant man had to follow religious imperatives himself and constantly, not delegating this to special religious groups or postponing it till the later years of life.[59] The image of kingship merged with the ideal of the 'godly prince', and thus the monarch became an embodiment of the divine law, and in this capacity total obedience to him/her was demanded. The Protestant idea of a direct relationship between the individual and God provided the basis for a meritocratic attitude towards the nobility. The Prince's role as a 'fountain of honour' was stressed; he could ennoble any man, thus acknowledging his virtues. In the past one could serve a powerful magnate, then be knighted by him and thus acquire a personal ennoblement. As Selden put it 'In these ancient times Earls (which were then the greatest Nobles vnder the King and Prince) had a power of Knighting. But such also as were neither Princes nor Earles (and that without ane Regal autooritie transferd; for if so, it were not worth observation) about the reign of our first three Edwards sometimes made Knights in the Warres'.[60] But eventually the creation of new knights stopped being a corporate prerogative of knighthood, and passed to the monarch or those whom he entrusted with this duty. So the main way of attaining even personal noble status was through faithful service to the monarch.

Humanists saw the nobility in meritocratic terms as well. But what is 'humanism'?

---

[58] V.L.Stater, *Noble Government: The Stuart Lord Lieutenancy and the Transformation of English Politics* (Athens and London, 1994), p.29.
[59] M.James, op.cit., p.321.
[60] J.Selden, *Titles of Honour* (London, 1614), p.316.

Britannica gives the definition of 'humanism' as 'that Renaissance movement which had as its central focus the ideal of *humanitas*.'[61] *Humanitas* meant the development of human virtue in all its forms: understanding, benevolence, compassion, mercy, fortitude, judgement, prudence, eloquence, and love of honour. The possessor of *humanitas* was of necessity a participant in the active life. Humanism aimed to revive as well as reinterpret classical Graeco-Roman history, literature and values, and to apply them to the political problems of the contemporary world.[62]

Professor Skinner has noted that in the works of modern scholars the term 'humanism' has become so vague that several authorities have proposed that, in order to avoid further confusion, the word ought to be excised from any future accounts of early-modern thought.[63] Skinner does not agree. He suggests returning to the original Renaissance meaning of the word, using it simply to refer to the students and protagonists of a particular group of disciplines centred on the study of grammar, rhetoric, history and moral philosophy.[64] In this chapter we shall use this definition of 'humanism'. Basing their ideas on the Ciceronian concept of *virtus*, the humanists made several fundamental assumptions: that it is possible for men to attain the highest kind of excellence; that proper education is essential for the achievement of this goal; that the contents of such an education must centre on the linked study of rhetoric and ancient philosophy.

Humanism had developed far before its arrival in England, where it appeared relatively late, in the first half of the sixteenth century. Initially humanism in England did not differ much from the Northern European humanist ideas of Erasmus. On English soil

---

[61] *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 20., 15th edition, (Chicago, London, 1990), p.665-677.
[62] M.Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640*, (Cambridge, 1995), p.7
[63] Q.Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, vol. 1, (Cambridge, 1978), p.xxiii.
[64] Ibid., p.xxiv.

these ideas were developed by Thomas More in his *Utopia* (1516). More's work represented classical humanism based on the Graeco-Latin authors. Sir Thomas Elyot's *The book named the Governor* (1531) had a rather different character. The first main difference between these two works of learned Englishmen was that *Utopia* was written in Latin, whereas *The Governor* was in English. Another difference was in the political context: More clearly described a republic, Elyot took the princely aspect of later Italian and Erasmian humanism for granted. More saw personal virtue and learning as the only features of a person that could qualify him for a leading position in governing the state, denying completely any relevance of lengthy lineage and wealth as qualities necessary for a ruler. Elyot agreed that the individual's position in society must be determined by his qualities, i.e. virtue and learning. However he insisted that God created hierarchical society. Elyot defended the existence of a traditional aristocracy. He was more practical than More, trying to apply humanist ideas to the reality of the English social order, but less practical in his hope that virtue could help one to actual political advancement.

All humanist theories had a different understanding of true nobility from medieval theories. True nobility was no longer derived from birth and lineage alone (as frequently was the case in reality), but was supposed to be based on man's virtues, and to be expressed in deeds inspired by those virtues and guided by learning. In England through the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries there were published theoretical tracts which dealt with the subject of nobility.[65] The main question they address can already be found in

---

[65] *The Boke of Noblenes: That Sheweth How Many Sortes [and] Kyndes There is* ... translated out of laten into frenche, and now into English by me Iohn Larke [London, [1550]?]; J.Osorio, *The Five Bookes of the Famous, Learned, and Eloquent Man, Hieronimus Osorius, Contayninge a Discourse of Civill, and Christian Nobilitie: A Worke no Lesse Pleasaunt then Profitable for All, but Especiallye the Noble Gentlemen of England, to vievv Their Lives, Their Estates, and Conditions.* Translated out of Latine into Englishe by William Blandie late of the Universitie of Oxeford, and now fellow of the middle Temple in London (London, 1576); J.Ferne, *The Blazon of Gentrie: Deuided into Two Parts. The First Named The Glorie of Generositie. The Second, Lacyes Nobilitie.*

University Library Hull

the works of More and Elyot. More advocated the view that virtue was true nobility, completely ignoring the issue of lineage. Elyot preferred to see a nobility that combined lineage and virtue as the true nobility, saying that 'where vertue is in a gentyll man, it is commenly mixte with more sufferance, more affabilitie, and myldenes, than for the more parte it is in a persone rural, or of a very base linage...'.[66] In the theoretical tracts nobility was divided into three types: nobility of lineage; nobility of virtue; and nobility combining lineage and virtue.[67] All the authors agreed that it was not enough to have a lengthy pedigree in order to be considered truly noble. So, there remained a question: which type of nobility was better, one of virtue or one that combined virtue and lineage? Osorius refused to give any solution to this dilemma.[68] Nenna made his task easier by excluding the combined type of nobility, so giving victory to nobility of virtue over nobility of blood.[69] Cleland simply stated that 'vertue onlie is able to make thee Noble'.[70] The author of the *Boke of Noblenes* and Ferne considered the third type of nobility, combining virtue and lineage, as 'the only perfect gentry'.[71] In the end, English humanists compromised with the older ideal of a nobility of blood, and added to it a concern with virtue and its acquisition through education. But in the humanist ideal, the virtues were mainly moral and intellectual, while medieval tradition was as much concerned with the military virtues of its nobility.[72]

Among contemporary scholars there is no agreement about who was a humanist and

---

Comprehending Discourses of Armes and of Gentry. Wherein is Treated of the Beginning, Parts, and Degrees of Gentlenesse, with Her Lawes: of the Bearing, and Blazon of Cote-Armors: of the Lawes of Armes, and of Combats (London, 1586); G.B.Nenna, *Nennio: or A Treatise of Nobility: Wherein is Discoursed What True Nobilitie Is, with Such Qualities as Are Required in a Perfect Gentleman*, transl. by W.Iones (London, 1595); J. Cleland, *The Instruction of a Young Noble-Man* (London, 1612).

[66] Th.Elyot, *The Boke Named The Governour* (1531), (London, 1907), p.17.

[67] *The Boke of Noblenes*, ff.A2v-A3r.

[68] J.Osorio, op.cit., ff.I1v-I3r.

[69] G.B.Nenna, op.cit., f.Cc4v.

[70] J.Cleland, op.cit., f.A3.

[71] *The Boke of Noblenes*,f.A3r; J.Ferne, op.cit., pp.15, 23.

[72] F.Caspari, *Humanism and the Social Order in Tudor England*, (Chicago, 1954), p.80.

who was not, nor about exactly what varieties of humanist there were.[73] For example Elyot, who is considered a humanist by all scholars, was labelled by Hugh Kearney a 'court humanist'.[74] Kearney's division between 'court' and 'country' humanism has been severely criticised by Margo Todd, who sees his distinction between the two as artificial.[75] It is even more difficult to understand the reasons for this division because Kearney does not make it clear what he understands by the word 'humanism'. Laurence Humphrey was his exemplar of 'country humanism'.[76] John Morgan, on the other hand, gives the educational doctrines of these two writers different labels, preferring to see in Elyot a representative of humanism and in Humphrey an apologist for a puritan ideal of education.[77] Precise categorisation is a problem with just about every individual writer of the period.

It seems better to see Elyot and Humphrey both as representatives of 'English' humanism. They represented two streams within it. Their main difference was not over the term nobility and the role of this social group in society. They differed chiefly in the importance they gave to religion in the life of a nobleman. To some extent, the ideal of Humphrey, dominated by religion, was closer to Erasmian humanism. Erasmus saw the life of any man (noblemen included) as a constant struggle against the devil's temptations. Whatever a man did he was trying to obtain the passage of his soul to Heaven.[78] Erasmus's *Enchiridion* was written in predominantly religious terms. For Elyot religion was important but not predominant. *The Book of the Governor* was written in secular terms. Elyot's idea of

---

[73] *Reassessing the Henrician Age. Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500-1550*, ed.A.Fox and J.Guy (Oxford, 1986), pp.9-34

[74] On 'court' and 'country' humanism H.Kearney, op. cit., pp.34-45.

[75] M.Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, 1987), p.55.

[76] L.Humphrey, *The Nobles* (1563).

[77] J.Morgan, *Godly Learning. Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560-1640* (Cambridge, 1986).

[78] Erasmus, *Enchiridion Militis Christiani. An English Version*, ed.A.M.O'Donnel, Early English Text Society, №282 (Oxford, 1981)

society was predominantly secular, though the necessity of belief in God and the importance of observing religious norms was clearly stated at the beginning. It is worth remembering that Elyot's book was published thirty years earlier than Humphrey's. When Humphrey wrote, Protestantism had become deeply rooted in England. Humphrey, accepted Elyot's educational ideas in general, but he aimed to merge them with Protestant forms of piety, and Protestant ideas of obedience to the monarch.

The publishing history of *The Book of the Governor* shows that it was very popular through the sixteenth century.[79] Elyot was less a follower of Erasmian humanism and more a civic humanist. Alistair Fox has shown that, though being neoStoic and Erasmian in his moral absolutism, Elyot tried to use the wisdom that he acquired in the study of ancient authors in serving as a counsellor to the King.[80] However Elyot's own court career seemed to demonstrate the impossibility of combining high moral standards with the skills needed to cope with the harsh realities of political life.

Elyot's governors were expected to serve the commonwealth, and thus to live an active and not a contemplative life. They were supposed to be chiefly occupied with acquiring and practising civil virtues. He insisted that those who ruled should make every effort to educate themselves and their children in a humanist manner, which would help to fit them for a position as governors of the state and as councillors to the monarch. Elyot's educational plan, which we shall study further, aimed at social groups possessing wealth and leisure. He did not insist on a strictly hereditary principle of aristocracy, but reluctantly admitted into the ranks of the upper class those who were properly qualified by his standards. Fritz Caspari rightly notes that Elyot preferred a well educated nobility of blood

---

[79] According to the STC, it was published eight times between 1531 and 1580.
[80] A.Fox, 'Sir Thomas Elyot and the Humanist Dilemma' in A.Fox and J.Guy, Reassessing *the Henrician Age. Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500-1550* (Oxford, 1986), pp.52-73.

to those groups of lower status who had acquired a great knowledge which could not be balanced by 'manners'.[81] However Elyot underlined that aristocracy did not mean privilege, but responsibility.[82] Among other responsibilities nobleman had to be liberal towards the poor.[83] Reason must lead the nobleman in all his actions, and it must rule over his emotions.[84] Elyot's book was written for English circumstances and contained practical advice on the achievement of its educational aims. For him the figure of the prince dominated society, though he still left to commoners a very limited opportunity to become members of the nobility. Elyot identified the social and political role of the nobility, in humanist language, as serving the 'publike weale', which was understood as the good of the entire community, while the medieval ideal was centred on the service to one's lord (King, magnate, or God).

Though Elyot, Ascham and other English humanists were clearly influenced by Castiglione's *Cortegiano*, Peter Burke points out that there was a considerable cultural difference between Tudor England and Castiglione's Italy. English high culture was more serious, more pragmatic and more pious.[85]

Brendan Bradshaw noticed that *The Governor* was the first appearance in England of a more conservative form of humanism, centred on the monarchical ideal.[86] He pointed out that Protestantism 'substantially modified the liberal stance of the ideology of commonwealth reform'.[87] Humphrey's ideas represented a further shift to conservatism

---

[81] Ibid., p.107.
[82] Elyot, *Governour*, p.118.
[83] Ibid., pp.158-161.
[84] Ibid., pp.201-205.
[85] P.Burke, *The Fortunes of the Courtier: The European Reception of Castiglione's Cortegiano* (Oxford, 1995), p. 96.
[86] B.Bradshaw, 'The Tudor Commonwealth: Reform and Revision', *Historical Journal*, 22, 2 (1979), pp.455-476.
[87] B.Bradshaw, op.cit., p.472.

from the ideals of Sir Thomas More. The long epistle dedicatory to the Queen manifested Humphrey's idea that the nobility acquired its authority only from the monarch. Humphrey's nobility was to form an educated ruling *élite*, faithful and obedient to the enlightened and learned Prince, more rarely a correcting advising force to the unworthy tyrant. Humphrey especially emphasised that there was no situation in which monarch could be killed or taken from power by force.[88] The tyrant was supposed to be corrected or cured by the nobility, though the means of this correction were not stated.

Humphrey in some places contradicted himself. He considered 'inwarde ornamentes and vertue' as 'the true honour of the mind' and the source of nobility; however further on he added that 'vertue, albeit in whateuer home it harboureth, is euer one aye like it selfe: yet (I wot not howe) more shineth and glistereth in a noble man'.[89] He wrote that 'of a shrimpe sprynges not a rose, or marigold, or of a bondwoman a free sonne borne'.[90] For Humphrey 'the hawtiest, worthiest, and honourablest Nobilitye is that, whyche with the renoume and fame of auncestrye, hath coupeled excellent, Chrystyan, and farr spred vertue'.[91] Thus, he saw a good lineage as one of the eminent qualities of a nobleman. He followed the division of the nobility into three sorts: truly and properly noble were those who were noble through their house and ancestors; then those who were noble of themselves were mentioned; the third sort combined ancient name with their own nobility.[92]

It is obvious that Humphrey preferred the third type of nobility. They were Humphrey's true nobility. It seems that Humphrey saw these members as advisors to the nobility in learning and laws. In a rather complicated and unclear second dedication to the

---

[88] L.Humphrey, op.cit., ff.B2r-v.
[89] Ibid., ff.K4r-v.
[90] Ibid., ff.C1-C1v.
[91] Ibid., f.A5r.
[92] Ibid., ff.D5v.

Middle Temple, the members of the Inns were praised greatly. Nevertheless those who obtained nobility themselves through decent and sincere means were included amongst the nobility as well. It is unclear, though, how the nobility of those who themselves achieved this rank was supposed to became evident, either through the Queen's ennoblement or through their obviously noble actions.

Humphrey wanted 'true Nobles' to be 'good, godlye, wise, and learned'. He emphasised that nobles must have some occupation apart from idle consumption and recreation. Members of a true nobility had to fulfil three duties: to God, to their household and neighbours, and to themselves. Humphrey identified as duties to others generosity towards beggars, scholars, and saints.[93] He wanted nobles to use their learning in the service of the commonwealth.[94] Though Humphrey put learning and education in last place, it was nonetheless an integral feature of the character of his ideal nobleman.

However learning was not the virtue that made a person a true nobleman. 'C[h]rist ought be the crest, the fame and type of nobility, without whom nothing is noble in this inferior circle below the moon'.[95] Humphrey stressed that the monarch was appointed by God. God manifested his will through the monarch, and thus the sovereign's orders had God as their origin. Humphrey's ideal was in essence non-military. He envisaged a religious, obedient and learned nobility, who would serve their sovereign without questioning the monarch's orders. Humphrey condemned as an evil Catholic heresy the idea that a 'bad' sovereign could be removed from his office by force.

Humphrey's ideal was another step forward in creating an obedient nobility. However the events of the period following the publication of Humphrey's book, especially

---

[93] Ibid., ff.P2v-Q2v.
[94] J.Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pp.278-279; Humphrey, op.cit., ff.X2.
[95] Humphrey, op.cit., ff.K6.

the Northern Rising of 1569, showed that this ideal still needed to be put into practice. The ideas of chivalry and military knighthood remained extremely popular among the nobility. Books, tales and songs spoke of chivalrous deeds, and these tales might well have inspired emulation in noble youths.[96] The chivalric literature of the sixteenth century described the valiant deeds of different knights who had shown themselves to be great warriors, gallant and faithful lovers, and obedient subjects. So, there was a burning necessity for some synthesis of medieval chivalric ideas, religious ideas of obedience, and humanistic ideas of virtue, learning, education and service to the commonweal. Elyot's ideal combined the first and the third set of ideas; Humphrey, the second and the third sets. Both, like most writers on the subject, were eclectic; but it was left to another to synthesise all three of these

---

[96] Examples of chivalric literature from the sixteenth century include: *The History of the Excellent Knight Generides* (London, 1506?); M.Pfintzing, *The Adventures and a Portion of the Story of the Praiseworthy, Valiant, and High-Renowned Hero and Knight, Lord Tewrdannckh* (Nuremberg, 1517); *The Knyght of the Swanne* (London, ca.1522); *A Mery Playe Bothe Pytthy and Pleasaunt of Albyon, Knighte* (London, 1566?); J.Partridge, *The Worthie Hystorie of the Moste Noble and Valiaunt Knight Plasidas, Otherwise Called Eustas, Who Was Martyred for the Profession of Jesus Christ* (London, 1566); T.Malory, *The History of the Most Noble and Valyant Knight, Arthur of Little Britaine* (London, 1582); P. D'Oliua, *The Mirrour of Nobilitie, Mappe of Honor, Anotamie of Rare Fortunes, Heroycall President of Loue: VVonder for Chiualrie, and Most Accomplished Knight in All Perfections* (London, 1588); H. R, *Pheander, the mayden Knight: Describing His Honourable Trauailes and Hautie Attempts in Armes, with His Successe in Loue: Enterlaced with Many Pleasant Discourses, wherein the Grauer May Take Delight, and the Valiant Youthfull, Be Encouraged by Honourable and Worthie Aduenturing, to Gaine Fame* (London, 1595); R.Parry, *Modratus; or, The Adventures of the Black Knight* (London, 1595); G.Markham, *The Most Honorable Tragedie of Sir Richard Grinuile, Knight* (London, 1595); F.Sabie, *The Fissher-mans Tale: of the Famous Actes, Life and Loue of Cassander a Grecian Knight* (London, 1595); *The Deligtful History of Celestina the Faire. Daughter to the King of Thessalie: Shewing How She Was Inchaunted by the Three Fairies: with the Strange Aduentures, Trauels, Chiualries, Tournies, Combats, Victories, and Loues of Diuers Wandring Princes and Knights Errant, but Especially of Sir Marcomyr of Tharsus, Who Did Conquest Hir by the Sword, and Enioied Her Afterwards in Mariage, with the Thessalian Kingdome for Hir Dowrie, and His Perpetuall Inheritance* (London, 1596); C.Middleton, *The Famous Historie of Chinon of England: with His Strange Aduentures for the Loue of Celestina Daughter to Lewis King of Fraunce. VVith the Worthy Atchiuement of Sir Lancelot du Lake, and Sir Tristram du Lions for Fair Laura, Daughter to Cador Earle of Cornewall, Beeing All Knights of King Arthurs Round Table* (London, 1597); E.Ford, *Parismus, the Renoumed Prince of Bohemia: His Most Famous, Delectable, and Pleasant Historie. Conteining His Noble Battailes Fought Against the Persians. His Loue to Laurana, the Kings Daughter of Thessaly. and His Traunge Aduentures in the Desolate Iland. With the Miseries and Miserable Imprisonment, Laurana Endured in the Iland of Rockes. And a Description of the Chiualrie of the Phrygian Knight, Pollipus: and His Constant Loue to Violetta* (London, 1598); *The Historie of the Two Valiant Knights: Syr Clyomon Knight of the Golden Sheeld, Sonne to the King of Denmarke: And Clamydes the White Knight, Sonne to the King of Suauia* (London, 1599); *The Myrrour of Knighthood: in Which is Prosecuted the Illustrious Deedes of the Knight of the Sunne, and His Brother Rosicleer, Sonnes Vnto the Emperour Trebatio of Greece: with the Valiant Deedes of Armes of Sundry Worthie Knights* (London, 1599); *The Heroicall Aduentures of the Knight of the Sea ...* (London, 1600).

elements, Sir Philip Sidney.

Blair Worden has emphasised that Sidney's *Arcadia* was written as a political allegory.[97] Mervyn James speaks about the immense importance of *Arcadia* in the transformation of the ideal of the nobility.[98] For Sidney virtue meant the possession of special divinely-given gifts and powers. These qualities were to be cultivated by a humanistic education and devoted to the active service of the community. This virtue was in the noble blood of the heroes of Sidney's *Arcadia*, princes Musidorus and Pyrocles. Musidorus's mother provided them with an excellent education aimed at the development of their inborn virtues:

> For almost before they could perfectly speak, they began to receive conceits not unworthy of the best speakers, excellent devices being used, to make even their sports profitable: images of battles and fortifications being then delivered to their memory, which after, their stronger judgement might dispense; the delight of tales being converted to the knowledge of all the stories of worthy princes, both to move them to do nobly and to teach them how to do nobly; the beauty of virtue still being set before their eyes, and that taught them with far more diligent care than grammatical rules; their bodies exercised in all abilities....[99]

They learned 'the sweet mysteries of philosophy' as well.[100] This education helped the princes to become truly virtuous, and their military victories were the result of this virtue and learning. They overcame their misfortunes by total reliance on God and obedience to his will.

---

[97] B.Worden, *The Sound of Virtue. Philip Sidney's* Arcadia *and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven, London, 1996), p.6.
[98] M.James, op.cit., pp.387-391.
[99] Sir P.Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, ed. M.Evans (Penguin, 1977), pp.258-59.
[100] Ibid., p.802.

> The heavens ... course never alters, so is there nothing done by the unreachable ruler of them but hath an everlasting reason for it. And to say the truth of these things, we should deal ungratefully with nature if we should be forgetful receivers of her gifts, and so diligent auditors of the chances we like not. We have lived, and have lived to be good to ourselves and others. Our souls, which are put into stirring earth of our bodies, have achieved the causes of their hither coming. They have known and honoured with knowledge the cause of their creation and to many men ... it hath been behoveful that we should live.[101]

Thus, in his heroes, and in his own life, Sidney managed to combine all three sets of ideas chivalric, humanistic, and Protestant.

Sidney's views corresponded with his position as a devoted follower of the Leicester-Walsingham policy of Protestant activism. This position was inherited by the 2nd Earl of Essex, together with Sidnean chivalric romanticism, and influenced greatly the minds of Essex's friends. This policy included England's active involvement in the European Protestant league. Thus the monarch was expected to send virtuous and learned noblemen to Europe to protect the Protestant cause. However the ideal of obedience demanded obedience to the monarch's orders even if he or she was not interested in the active military protection of God's cause. Sidney himself suffered from his enforced leisure in the early 1580s, but did not disobey. At the beginning of the seventeenth century Sidney's chivalric ideal was alive at the court of Prince Henry of Wales, which embraced a number of who had been Essex's friends and followers. Prince Henry gave an outward show of obedience by not refusing his father's wishes in the question of marriage. Henry was

---

[101] Ibid., p.803.

certainly happy that the first Catholic marriage plans for him fell through, but he was ready to obey the King's orders, and through them God's will if necessary.[102]

All the humanists named liberality as one of the central noble virtues, 'by no ryssen proffe, may you reade a Noble man, then by geuinge wyllingly, often, and bountifully'.[103] I am going to focus on this particular virtue (chapter three, below) and assess how well it was actually practised. Essex considered liberality to be a cardinal virtue, necessary for the development of one's mind.[104] The Earl held that liberality was a princely aspect of one's nature, for bestowing something on someone else was more noble than receiving something. Liberality 'teacheth us that we should not too much prize life which we cannot keep'. Elyot and Cleland dedicated a chapter to liberality in their books, Humphrey understood it as one's duty towards neighbours.[105] James VI also mentioned 'Liberality', though he had in mind the more general issue of rewards to the faithful servants of the King.[106]

Every author proved liberality to be an ancient virtue and cited examples of noble liberality on the part of Greek and Roman heroes. For Elyot classic examples sufficed, but Humphrey extensively used Scriptural and Biblical examples in his detailed discussion of liberality. First of all liberality had to be given without any hope of an earthly return of the favour. Humphrey also criticised liberality given 'for desire of honour and glorye'. Another important point was to bestow one's favours on persons worthy of such gift. Gifts to one's mistresses and favourites did not deserve the name of liberality. They were the signs of

---

[102] Though there is some evidence that suggests that Prince Henry hoped to accompany his sister to the Continent and try to find himself a suitable Protestant bride in Germany. R.Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales, and England's Lost Renaissance* (London, 1986), pp. 83-84.
[103] Humphrey, op.cit., ff.O8v.
[104] Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*, p. 9.
[105] Elyot, *Governor*, Book II, ch.X; J.Cleland, op.cit., pp.201-205; Humphrey, op.cit., ff.O8v-Q2v.
[106] *The Basilicon Doron of King James VI*, ed. J.Craigie (Edinburgh, London, 1944), p.157.

reckless dissipation, not of noble compassion towards the needy and deserving.[107]

According to Humphrey liberality had to be addressed to beggars, the learned, 'saints', and strangers. Liberality to beggars (alms) consisted in sharing with the poor one's food, giving them money, and building charitable institutions. 'Best deserved they of the commonwealth who first founded hospitalles and almes housen, for poore and wretched lasers'. Liberality towards the learned demanded patronage of poor individual scholars and educational establishments. 'Let also a Noble mans chest open to the famous in skyll, or studye of knowledges'. The nobility was advised to provide scholars with stipends and offer them friendly hospitality. Humphrey wished the nobility to propagate learning by establishing new public schools and Universities and enlarging already existing ones. 'Artes are fed by honour, preferments, aydes: and faynte throughe want, contempt, and pouertye'.[108] Saints, in Humphrey's understanding, were those who suffered for their religious beliefs. This was a Protestant understanding of the term.

Cleland gave recommendations about how liberality was to be bestowed, 'willinglie, and with a good heart', 'with a cheereful countenance, without delaying'. Cleland commended especially liberality towards one's friends and honest men in need. He urged the nobility to help them 'priuatlie, neuer speaking one word' about the gift.[109] Cleland considered that it was noble to give rewards to the servants of other noblemen who brought something from their masters.

An unknown sixteenth century author dedicated a page and a half to explaining and proving the nobleness of the tradition that he called "Liberalicie" towards servants.[110] I.M.

---

[107] Humphrey, op.cit., ff.O8v-Q2v.
[108] Ibid., ff.P3r-v, P5r, P4r.
[109] Cleland, op.cit., pp.202, 203.
[110] I.M. *A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Serving-Men* (1598), publ. Shakespeare Association Facsimilies 3, (Oxford 1931).

stated that wages were never a sufficient means of living for the household servant; they were given the additional support they needed from "Liberalicie". He mentioned that the same "Liberalicie" was given to beggars and poor people, though as mercy rather than reward. However, servants received their payment as acknowledgement of their service. A servant "did merite and deserue it before he had it, though it was ouer and aboue his couenant and bargayne". There are interesting examples of "Liberalicie" which are worth quoting at length in order to show all the nuances of the matter. "If the Seruant were sent to his Maisters friende, or familiar, with a present or friendly remembrance, though he were not at that tyme provided to requite his equall with the lyke gyft or present, yet he would shew his thankfulnesse towardes his Seruant, in liberally rewarding him for his paynes". Another type of "Liberalicie" was "If one Gentleman inuited an other to his house, or that of curtesie and kindnes he came to see him, the Seruingmans duetie and diligence, to do this his Maisters neighbour and friende seruice and honour, though that was their Maisters pleasure and commaunde, yet in regarde of their extreordinarie paynes, some pence redounded to their profite".[111]

However nobleman were warned not to give away too much and ruin their estate: 'he is only liberall, whiche distributeth accordyng to his substance, and where it is expedient'.[112] A nobleman was 'to employe on them with a gentilmanly frankness, so muche as they want, and that not be burdennus to him selfe'.[113] 'Every man should consider wel his own abilitie in giving for to be liberal towards another man, & thereby to hurt himselfe, is a token of want of discretion'.[114]

---

[111] Ibid., ff.D2v, D3r-v.
[112] Elyot, *Governor*, p.159.
[113] Humphrey, op.cit., f.P5v.
[114]; J.Cleland, op.cit., p.204.

The topic of the place of the nobility in society continued to be of great interest in the early seventeenth century. In 1612 Francis Bacon published a revised edition of his *Essays* which now included 38 essays, 29 having been added to the edition of 1597. Among these new essays was *Of the nobility*. This essay was enlarged in the edition of 1625.[115] Bacon saw the nobility as a necessary and useful group in a monarchical society, though he did not explain what this nobility was supposed to do. He insisted that the nobility must not be above the law. The nobility had to act as a barrier to tyranny and seditions. Bacon followed the division of the nobility into three types. Like many other authors before him he certainly favoured a mixed nobility which combined noble blood with personal virtues and learning. It is interesting to note what reservations Bacon had about nobility of the first generation. As an experienced politician Bacon acknowledged that those who obtained noble status themselves were usually more clever, but behind every social success lay a mixture of good and evil deeds. Bacon thought that the descendants of the founder of a noble house remembered his good deeds and forgot about the evil ones. Thus virtue became inbred in the mind of later generations, which became cleared of any evil thoughts and intentions. Bacon's ideal of the nobility was an active nobility which occupied itself in service to the state.

Interestingly that neither Elyot, nor Humphrey nor Bacon drew a picture of the ideal way of life of the nobility. Sidney's picture of the lives of the Musidorus and Pyrocles does not give any practical advice for an individual nobleman. Theoretical tracts on the place of the nobility in society and on the appropriate way of educating noble youths gave explicit and detailed advice on education, but their advice on the general way of life of a nobleman

---

[115] *Francis Bacon*, ed.B.Vickers (Oxford, 1996), pp.364-365

was rather vague. The nobility was informed which qualities were good and evil: examples of proper and improper behaviour were provided; but there was a deficit of clear and explicit advice on the ways of dealing with the practicalities of every day life for a nobleman of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This lacuna was filled by the advice literature of the time.

1.2. Advice Literature on the Conduct of Noble Life

Later we shall study in detail the educational ideals of English humanist writers, but it seems logical to look first at what was seen as the proper way of life for nobility and at the patterns of noble conduct that education and training were supposed to produce, before paying closer attention to the education of the nobility.

In his *The Governor* Elyot complained about parental negligence towards children's education. However not all parents were guilty of this fault. Some of them did not limit their concern about children to providing them with a good education. Children were the subject of further general advice. Fathers who were experienced courtiers gave lessons based on the practical wisdom they had gained in private and in public life. The most famous pieces are those written by William Cecil, Lord Burghley, Sir Walter Raleigh and James VI of Scotland and I of England.[116] *The Advice to his Son* of Henry Percy, the 9th Earl of Northumberland, is of some interest, as well.[117] Northumberland told his son that the *Advice* would be valuable in 'directing you to the sound understanding of that you have to wield rather than leave you to work it forth by experience, with much loss and long in

---

[116] *Advice to a Son: Precepts of Lord Burghley, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Francis Osborne*, ed.L.B.Wright (Ithaca, 1962), pp.7-14, 15-32.
[117] *Advice to His Son, by Henry Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland*, ed.G.B.Harrison (London, 1930).

getting'.[118]

The literary genre of *Advice to a Son*, and sometimes *Advice to a Daughter*, enjoyed a considerable popularity in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.[119] However this genre originated in an earlier period. The later types of *Advice* frequently were generalised essays on manners and morals. In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries *Advices* were mostly addressed to particular individuals. Some of the authors of these *Advices* were famous public and political figures, so their precepts found their way into print and became guides to a wider group of readers than may initially have been intended. Guides to conduct are a common thing in any age, but the sixteenth century was an especially didactic age. There were plenty of different handbooks written and translated in this period. L.B.Wright has paid special attention to Elyot's *The Governor* and James VI of Scotland's *Basilicon Doron* as landmarks of the genre.[120] However, from our point of view, to see *The Governor* and *Basilicon Doron* as works of the same genre is to mix two different types of conduct literature, one giving general instructions and drawing an ideal model for the benefit of a general audience, and the other providing more specific and practical instructions aimed at particular individuals. Advice literature appeared because there was a lack of practical advice in works like *The Governor*. Advice literature put a great stress on practical and worldly counsels and on ways to succeed in a world which was far from ideal. A practical father who wanted his son to prosper in life took pains to warn him of the perils of real life. Other works gave detailed and exact plans for a child's education, so the authors of advice literature paid little attention to the educational process. Providing an education was never a goal in itself. As today, education had to improve the

---

[118] Ibid., p.49.
[119] *Advice to a Son*, p.ix.
[120] Ibid., p.x.

chances of a child in its future life. In any case, these *Advices* were addressed to young men who had already received a proper education as a result of the concern of their fathers.

Burghley wrote his *Certain Precepts for the Well Ordering of a Man's Life* in about 1584. It was written for his favourite younger son Robert Cecil (b. 1563), who had already proved himself a true son of his scholarly parents, as we shall see. Burghley's advice was the result of his own experience and covered all aspects of life. Sir Walter Raleigh's *Instructions to His Son and to Posterity* were very similar to Burghley's *Precepts* in size and contents.[121] The ideas of Northumberland's *Advice to his Son* were very similar to those of Burghley and Raleigh. Like the others, Northumberland wrote a practical guide, not a philosophical tract, so it was not his 'intent to open the very original grounds' of life.[122] He saw only two ways to procure his son 'a happy state in general'. The first was through scholarly or 'mindly' pleasures; the second through 'bodily advantages', which were understood as honours and wealth. Northumberland strongly advocated the first way. His recommendation probably gained greater weight from his own participation in several military actions. In his youth Northumberland had been very eager to participate in war, dreaming of winning glory, but the reality of modern warfare made this difficult, and so the Earl was disappointed in his expectations. Part of his advice warned against the danger of being too attracted by military service, revealing the Earl's disillusionment with such service.[123] King James VI was in a rather different position. He was certain about the future place of his son in society, so, in fact, he gave Prince Henry recommendations about how to be a good King.

All the authors emphasized the necessity of serving God in the advice they gave.

---

[121] Ibid., pp.15-32.
[122] *Advice to His Son*, p.50
[123] Ibid., pp.113-114.

Their children were advised to say their prayers regularly, and to obey God's word. However, in general advice literature, this subject did not occupy much space. Fathers stressed the importance of religion and its profession if their children wanted to reach Heaven. However this concern was obvious and did not need further elaboration on their part.

Much more attention was given to the subject of matrimony. For James VI this problem was closely connected with religion. James certainly had the Princess of some prominent Royal house in mind as a proper bride for his heir, though he foresaw some difficulties in finding such a Princess in the Protestant camp.[124] However fathers less elevated in rank were concerned about their future daughters-in-law too. Burghley advised Cecil to be extremely cautious in choosing a wife. The young man was advised to marry a gentle born woman but one with some money: 'a man can buy nothing in the market with gentility'. However he strongly objected to any match in which money was the crucial object. Sir Walter Raleigh took great care in giving his son instructions on marriage, as well. He explained what part of the estate a wife should enjoy, and how much she should receive as a dowry. Raleigh advised his son to marry at about thirty. He considered that before thirty a man was 'unfit either to choose or to govern a wife and family'. However if you married after thirty you would have little chance to 'see the education of thy children'. A wife was likely to survive the husband and marry a second time, and so Raleigh stressed that the vast bulk of an estate should pass to the heir and not to the widow.[125] Northumberland agreed with Raleigh that widows were greatest gainers from their husbands' death. Northumberland did his best to prove the uselessness of entrusting

---

[124] *Basilicon Doron*, pp.129-30.
[125] *Advice to a Son*, pp. 20-23.

management of the estate and household to a wife. He tried to prove the inferiority of women's education, and therefore their inability to be effective.[126] James VI in contrast recommended that Prince Henry keep his future wife from 'meddling' with politics, and instead occupy her with 'the Oeconomick rule of the house'.[127]

Having had successes and failures himself, Burghley advised his son about the upbringing of future children. They were to be brought up in learning and obedience. It was recommended that they should have convenient maintenance according to their father's ability. This would prevent children from expecting their father's death. Cecil was advised about his daughter's future: 'Marry thy daughters in time, lest they marry themselves'. Burghley did not want his grandsons to 'pass the Alps, for they shall learn nothing but pride, blasphemy, and atheism'. This particular advice seems very interesting. By 1584 several of Burghley's wards had already travelled abroad and visited Italy. Probably the results were far from being very comforting.

Northumberland had an unusual point of view on the issue of having children. He considered having too many children a source of great unhappiness. Those who had no children were called happy by misfortune, those who had a few children were understood as less unhappy than those who had many. The main distinctive feature of Northumberland's *Advice* is that a considerable part of the writing was dedicated to the management of estates, the theme being of special practical interest for the Earl. His attitude to children was closely connected with this theme: the more children one had, the more money one had to spend on them.[128]

Robert Cecil received some detailed advise on how to keep his own household.

---

[126] *Advice to His Son*, pp.54-55, 90-106.
[127] *Basilicon Doron*, p.135
[128] Ibid., pp.55-56.

Burghley recommended spending not more then three quarters of his income. He advised keeping demesne lands in order to have one's own cattle and corn. Burghley wanted Robert to be very cautious in the matter of borrowing and lending money to friends. Cecil was warned not to trust any man too much. Burghley insisted that his son should not be 'attended or be served by kinsmen, friends, ... for they will expect much and do little'. Very interesting recommendations on noble expenditure could also be found in Francis Bacon's essay *Of Expense*.[129] Bacon advised noblemen to spend not more than a half of their receipts on their ordinary expenses if they wanted to 'keep ... [an] even hand'. If a nobleman wanted to become richer, he was advised to spend not more than one third on his ordinary expenses. Bacon had a rather original point of view on debts. He considered it useful to have some debts, for these were supposed to teach 'a habit of frugality', which would stay for life even when the original debts were be cleared. It is unclear whether debts were supposed to accompany a nobleman through his entire life or not, but it is obvious that Bacon considered debts as unavoidable and to some extent a useful feature of a young nobleman's life.

All authors of advice literature gave their children some practical recommendations about how to live and behave at Court. It was considered necessary to 'keep some great man thy friend, ... compliment him often, present with many yet small gifts and of little charge, and if thou have cause to bestow any great gratuity let it then be some such thing as may be daily in sight'.[130] Later it will be shown that this advice put in words the common practice among the nobility of England.

Advice literature provided detailed recommendations on the appropriate behaviour

---

[129] *Francis Bacon*, pp.396-97.
[130] *Advice to a Son*, p.13.

towards people of different social standing: 'towards thy superiors be humble yet generous; with thy equals familiar yet respective; towards inferiors show much humility and some familiarity'. The aim of this behaviour was to be advanced by superiors, considered well-bred by equals and to be popular amongst the inferior. Sir Walter Raleigh wanted his son to have friends rather among 'thy betters than thy inferiors'.[131]

Generally moderation in behaviour was highly desired, and it was recommended neither to crave for popularity nor to despise it. Much of the advice given seems either trivial or common place. Young people had to be neither rude in conversation nor too arrogant in his jests. Rudeness would make a man unwelcome in all company. Burghley especially warned against constant and persistent displays of one's wit; this could lose friends.[132] Walter Raleigh, the younger, was advised 'to avoid public disputations at feasts or at tables amongst choleric or quarrelsome persons'.[133] Prince Henry was reminded that 'a King is as one set on a stage, whose smallest actions and gestures, all the people gazinglie doe beholde'.[134] Consequently, the Prince received advice on proper kingly behaviour at the table and in his private chamber. All these recommendations were well applied to the life of the great noblemen, whose lives were public as well.

Young noblemen were warned against listening to flatterers, 'the worst kind of traitors' because they strengthened the imperfections of the flattered person and encourage them in their vicious actions.[135] Northumberland particularly warned his son against the danger of flatterers and those well wishers who came disguised as a soldier or a statesman, and might try to persuade him to enter their own profession in the hope for advancement for

---

[131] *Advice to a Son*, p.19.
[132] Ibid., p.13.
[133] Ibid., p.24.
[134] *Basilicon Doron*, p.163.
[135] Ibid., p.115; *Advice to a Son*, p.23.

themselves.[136]

While giving their advice on behaviour all the authors considered dicing, horse racing, card games and so on as occupations inappropriate to a gentleman. James VI, however, thought, all these occupations worthy of a King's attention.[137] He disagreed with other authorities who insisted on 'forbidding carts, dice and other suche like games of hazard'. The King considered that, occasionally, when the Prince had nothing else to do, he could occupy himself in these games, though dice was less recommended as James considered it more appropriate for 'deboshed souldiers'. The King wanted his son to follow three rules in play: 1) to play for a recreation and be ready to loose; 2) to spend in play no more that he would be ready to give to his Pages; and 3) to obey the rules of game and not to use any tricks. He paid considerable attention to hunting and hawking as important recreations in the life of a Prince.[138] He recommended exercises 'on horse-back' and especially promoted 'hunting, namelie with running houndes; which is the most honourable and noblest sorte thereof; for it is a theeuishe forme of hunting to shoote with gunnes and bowes'. This particular type of hunting was understood as a way of keeping a Prince ready for war in time of peace. Later on we shall see that Elyot recommended this kind of hunting as a physical exercise for identical reasons._

Burghley's *Precepts* and James VI's *Basilicon Doron* were well known to their contemporaries.[139] In addition to the fact that the *Precepts* survive in various manuscript copies, they were published five times between 1611 and 1637. There were eleven different editions of *Basilicon Doron* between 1599 and 1632, and up to 16,000 copies were printed

---

[136] *Advice to His Son*, pp.113-118.
[137] Ibid., pp.191-95.
[138] Ibid., p.189.
[139] *Advice to a Son*, pp.xvii-xviii. Cecil's *Precepts* survive in various manuscript versions: a manuscript in the British Library (Stowe MS, 143) and in the Folger Shakespeare Library (V.a.321; V.a.381; V.a.402; X.d.212).

by April 1603. The book went through eight English editions in the spring of 1603.[140] Raleigh's *Instructions* were published eight times between 1632 and 1636.[141] I shall try to consider later the ways in which some of the advice was actually implemented.

So, what was the sort of proper noble conduct that all these advice-giving fathers wanted their sons to follow in their lives? A practical nobleman had to be religious and learned. He was supposed to marry a gentlewoman with sufficient marriage portion. He had a free choice of career either military or civil, but he was supposed to choose one, so that his virtues could be practised in the world for the benefit of the commonwealth. A young nobleman was supposed to seek a powerful patron at court, to whom he had to present gifts. His company was restricted to his equals and betters. His behaviour towards others was expected to reflect their social status as well as his. Thus, the personal merits and virtues of individuals became irrelevant in comparison to their social status. A nobleman had to hide his thoughts from his companions. Thus a real English nobleman was meant to be more cautious, industrious, and reserved than more open nobleman of early Italian humanism.

1.3. Changes in Educational Ideals

As we have seen, recommendations on education and upbringing did not represent an integral part of advice literature, though some authors gave some attention to the question. There was a separate literature concerned with education, the formation of the ideal nobleman. In the sixteenth century, changes to the ideal of nobility naturally led to changes in educational doctrine, the purpose of which was often to delineate the means by which true nobility could be formed.

---

[140] J.Doelman, '"A King of Thine Own Heart": The English Reception of King James VI and I's *Basilicon Doron*' in *The Seventeenth Century*, IX, 1 (Spring 1994), p.1.
[141] STC 20641.5, 20642, 20642.5, 20643, 20643.5,20644, 20645, 20646.

1.3.1. The medieval Ideal of Education.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century the main educational ideal of nobility was medieval in its essence. The main aim of the medieval educational ideal was to create a chivalrous knight. This required a long and difficult training. Until a boy was seven he spent his time with his mother on the female side of the house. There he was supposed to receive a basic moral and religious training. At the age of seven a boy was sent away from home to the household of another member of the nobility, where he served seven years as a page. As a page, the boy had to undertake and be taught the menial tasks of household service, and particularly of attending his lord at table. At the end of his training as a page he would begin to pay more serious attention to his physical training, which consisted of running, leaping, wrestling, and riding. At the age of fourteen a boy became a squire. From this period his serious technical training as a knight began. Until twenty-one he was trained in the use of various weapons, in the management of horses, especially the heavy war-horse, and in the maintenance of armour. He would hunt and hawk, and continue to perform personal services for his lord. The ideal of courtly love demanded the development of the domestic arts of music and poetry. At the age of twenty one the squire was ready for knighthood and went through a complicated ceremony of investiture. Such was the training of the knight as described in the chivalric literature of the period.[142] This education of noble youths seems to have been unbookish, though this does not mean that medieval knights were illiterate. Rather the intellectual part of their training was much less significant than the martial, religious and moral elements. Lull in his *The Order of Chivalry* mentioned that he wanted future knights to start their preparations for knighthood by reading the books 'in such maner

---

[142] A.T.Byles, 'Medieval Courtesy Books and Prose Romances of Chivalry' in *Chivalry: A Series of Studies to Illustrate Its Historical Significance and Civilizing Influence*, ed.E.Prestage (London, 1928), pp.183-206; A.B.Ferguson, *The Chivalric Tradition in Renaissance England* (Washington, 1986), p.40.

as other scyences ben redde'.[143] Orme states that the literary descriptions of medieval heroes, with their knowledge and accomplishments, were more than romantic ideals; he thinks that they mirrored the reality.[144] According to Orme, a young nobleman was taught the proper codes of behaviour, he spoke either French or English, but knew something of both and could speak at least a little of either when required. He was a religious man and gave charity to the poor. He could read and understand Latin, if it was not very difficult. He could write in either French or English and oversee the letters and household accounts. He could dance, sing and sometimes play a musical instrument. He received an appropriate military and physical training, as well.[145] This education pointed in more than one direction. On the one hand, it prepared a nobleman for domestic life; on the other hand, it trained him for active public and military life. Such an education served well the needs of medieval society. However the military revolution, among other things, changed the situation. In this changed world another type of education was needed, for warfare was no longer centred on the knight and the education of the nobility no longer need to ensure the training of knights. Even as future military officers they would need a different type of education.

1.3.2. Changes in Attitudes to Learning.

Different historians give different accounts of the pattern and motor of social, political and military change found in Tudor England, but most of these accounts would support Stone's view that administrative and military changes encouraged the nobility to

---

[143] R.Lull, *The Book of the Ordre of Chyualry*, translated to English and printed in 1484. Quoted by A.T.Byles, p.197.
[144] N.Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry. The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530* (London & New York, 1984), p.211.
[145] Ibid., pp.211-12.

change their attitude to education.[146] Previously, Universities provided education mainly for clerics, including people of humble birth who intended to make a career in church.

Stone suggested that in the middle of the sixteenth century there was an educational boom in English society, in which many social groups participated.[147] For the nobility he suggested an educational boom linked to the desire of the aristocracy to prepare itself for better service to the monarch under new conditions.[148] Stone, Hexter, and Curtis share the view that the flow of noble students entering the Universities between 1560 and 1580 increased suddenly and dramatically, that noble students became a majority among those studying in the University, and that the English ruling class started to exploit and expand its educational opportunities.[149]

However the views of Hexter, Curtis, and Stone have been doubted by other scholars, including Hugh Kearney, Kenneth Charlton, and Rosemary O'Day.[150] Professor Kearney successfully proves that receiving higher education did not give the gentry and aristocracy better opportunities to obtain offices and posts. He suggests that the educational boom among non-gentle groups was the result of the desire of the yeomanry and rich merchants to become gentlemen. The easiest and least expensive way of doing this was to send a son to University. Charlton is more interested in the details of the teaching process and the teaching profession, but he too disagrees with Hexter, Curtis, and Stone on the question of the noble educational boom. He sees it not as a cultural revolution but as a

---

[146] L.Stone, 'The Educational Revolution in England 1560-1640', *Past and Present*, 28 (1964), p.61.
[147] *The University in Society*, ed.L.Stone (Princeton, 1984).
[148] L.Stone, 'The Educational Revolution', pp.41-80.
[149] J.H.Hexter, 'The Education of the Aristocracy During the Renaissance' in J.H.Hexter, *Reappraisals in History* (London, 1961); M.Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition* (Oxford, 1959).
[150] H.Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen. Universities and Society in Pre-industrial Britain 1500-1700.* (London, Faber and Faber, 1970); K.Charlton, *Education in Renaissance England*, (London, Toronto, 1965); 'The Teaching Profession in Sixteenth-and-Seventeenth-Century England' in *History and Education: the Educational Uses of the Past*, ed.P.Nash (New York, 1970); R.O'Day, *Education and Society 1500-1800: the Social Foundations of Education in Early Modern Britain* (London, 1982).

political and social change, which did not have a large impact on the nobility.[151] O'Day also disputes Hexter's and Stone's view that sons of the nobility (gentry and peerage) dominated the Universities. She agrees with the latter about the halt in the increase of noble students at the beginning of the seventeenth century, but she is less persuaded by Stone's explanation for this halt. O'Day sees the increase in University students from the nobility as a gradual and constant movement between 1450 and 1650, rather than as a sudden boom.[152]

Jewell writes that 'between 1575 and 1639 50% of Oxford's entry came from sons of the gentry'.[153] James McConica suggests a slighter lower figure of 46% for the sons of gentlemen or men of higher rank who matriculated at Oxford in the same period.[154] He admits that not all undergraduates matriculated, he also points out the lacunae of data available. McConica makes it clear that from the 1580s the University had insisted on official registration of all students, thus the informal arrangements between college tutors and well-born students which had existed before began then be formally registered.[155] McConica demonstrates that well-born students existed in Oxford long before the so-called boom of the 1560s. While it is possible to find how many of them were officially supposed to study in each college, in accordance with the College's charter of foundation, the number of those who had informal arrangements is impossible to calculate. Thus, it is difficult to determine whether Stone's theory of a sudden and substantial noble influx into the Universities was anything more than the result of changed University practices of record keeping. McConica also proves that Corpus Christi (and probably other Oxford colleges) did not suffer a substantial drop in noble students in the 1590s, as Stone suggested.

---

[151] Charlton, *Education*, pp.167-68.
[152] O'Day, op.cit., p.97.
[153] H.M.Jewell, *Education in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1998), p.112.
[154] *The History of the University of Oxford*, III, ed.J.McConica (Oxford, 1986), pp.722-23.
[155] Ibid., pp.688-692.

Whatever their differences all historians agree that the University became an integral part of the education of the nobility in the second half of the sixteenth century.

The present work will be less concerned with fluctuations in the composition of the student body than with educational theories and ideas that led to any increase there may have been in the numbers of noble students at the Universities. Stone's ideas about the boom in education within the aristocracy leave the impression that from the second half of the sixteenth century, under the influence of humanism, the gentry and nobility suddenly realised the necessity of giving their children (sons, at least) a good higher education. In general this is true. However, in the second half of the century there were still some members of the country gentry that doubted the necessity of giving boys an education which was considered clerkish, as in previous centuries. Educated contemporaries described the education of the medieval and early Tudor nobility as consisting mainly of noble sports: military training, hunting, riding, dancing and like disciplines. Sometimes it was even mentioned that boys were not taught how to read or write.[156] The same points were noted throughout the sixteenth century by various scholars and writers.[157] Even at the beginning of the seventeenth century it is said that some gentlemen preferred that their sons 'should hang, than study letters',[158] though Nicholas Orme suggests that this was an attitude that had in practice disappeared by the beginning of the sixteenth century.[159] Let us look more closely at the pedagogical ideas and ideals of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We shall begin with accounts of the ideal education for noble boys.

---

[156] *Poetical Works of John Skelton*, ed.A.Dyce (London, 1843), v.I, p.134; F.Caspari, *Humanism and the Social Order*, pp.196, 126.
[157] E.Dudley, *The Tree of the Commonwealth*, ed.D.M.Brodie (Cambridge, 1948), p.45; W.B.Devereux, *The Lives and Letters of Devereux, the Earls of Essex*, I, (London, 1855), p.328; Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*, pp.6-20.
[158] F.J.Furnival, 'Manners and Meals in olden Times', *Early English Text Soc.*, 1st ser., xxxxii, 1868, p.xiii.
[159] Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry.*

1.3.3. Humanism and the Emergence of New Ideal.

All historians agree that change in attitudes to education was at least partly the product of new humanist ideas. Humanists succeeded in creating the doctrine that a classical education not only constituted the only possible form of schooling for a gentleman, but also the best possible preparation for an entry into public life. This doctrine led to a rise in concern for the precise details of a young man's education - what exactly he should be made to learn, and in what order. This question started to be treated as a matter of the highest importance. A number of humanists wrote advice-books on education.[160]

Even among the humanists, there was no uniformity of opinion on the particularities of educational ideals. Elyot's ideal of education was more lay, Humphrey's one more godly and religiously-oriented. Both Elyot and Humphrey obviously agreed on the idea that a gentleman must be educated The particular details and content of this education were different. However, gentleman educated on either model would know Latin, Greek, logic, rhetoric, ethics, manners, philosophy, geography, and history; and have read the classics and the Bible.

Elyot and Humphrey (and their followers) differed not about general educational ideas, but about methods and supplementary materials. Both of these branches of 'English' humanism needed the new approach that early Italian humanists offered for understanding the real meaning of texts, rather than the meanings they had acquired in scholastic disputation. Elyot intended noblemen to use this approach to classical texts, from which they could learn things of use to public life.[161] Humphrey wanted this approach used towards both classical and religious texts so that examples of proper noble behaviour from

---

[160] Q.Skinner, op.cit., pp.88-90, 214.
[161] Elyot, *Governour*, pp.36-41, 69-71.

the early history of Christianity could become the perfect models for noblemen to follow.[162]

Elyot's ideas were later more practically expanded and detailed by Roger Ascham in his *The Schoolmaster*, John Cleland in *The Instruction of a Young Noble-Man* and Henry Peacham in *The Complete Gentlemen.*[163] Northumberland explained in detail how a noble child had to be brought up and educated. His advice was close to that of Elyot and Humphrey. In 1616, Humphrey's ideas were embellished by an anonymous author.[164] These books provided new idealised patterns of education for aristocratic youths from the moment of their birth till the end of their formal education. Some educational ideas were expressed in the tracts *Cyuile and Vncyuile Life* and *The Court and the Country.*[165] The first one dealt with a wide range of humanistic ideas. The main part of the dialogue was dedicated to the theme of the superiority of the active live to the contemplative. Vincent (the champion of the country-based, contemplative life) and Vallentine (the defender of an active court and city life) discussed the changes in contemporary English society. Vallentine underlined 'that men are not only borne to themselves', they have also to serve their country and their Prince.[166] So, the education, that Vincent gave to his children had to have this aim as its central one. Finally, Vallentine managed to persuade Vincent to part with his old country style of life. Though *The Court and the Country* was written in 1618, the 'courtier' still had difficulty in persuading his 'country' cousin of the necessity for higher and bookish education. At the end of this dialogue, the participants retained the same views with which

---

[162] Humphey, op.cit., ff.K8r, M6r.
[163] R.Ascham, *The Schoolmaster* (1570), ed.L.V.Ryan (Ithaca, New York, 1967); H.Peacham, *The Complete Gentleman, The Truth of Our Times, The Art of Living in London* (1622), ed.V.B.Heltzel (Ithaca, New York, 1962).
[164] *Office of Christian Parents* (1616).
[165] *Inedited Tracts Illustrating the Manners, Opinions, and Occupations of Englishmen During the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* ..., ed.W.C.Hazlitt {New York, 1968).
[166] Ibid., p.16.

they had begun the discussion. It is easy to believe that there was some opposition to the new methods and styles of education among the country and conservative nobility. Even if this opposition was a literary invention, the necessity of such a literary tool is indicative. Let us now look at the details of medieval and early modern educational ideas.

1.4. The Stages of the Humanistic Education of a Nobleman

Elyot, Humphrey and Peacham gave advice on the process of educating the nobility. Professor Kearney emphasised that Elyot's ideal of education was less influential in practice than Humphrey's, though Elyot's book was much more popular. Humphrey was an active and popular Oxford don. Kearney argues that the personality of Humphrey and his educational ideas initiated and contributed to the strength of Oxford Puritanism. Professor McConica tends to agree with the fact that Humphrey had a great influence on the religious life of the University of his time.[167] *The Governor* was less concerned with religion. It was a complete guide to educating noble sons from the moment of their birth till the moment they entered royal service.

1.4.1. From birth to the age of fourteen.

It is very clear from the general spirit of Elyot's and Humphrey's tracts that the main supervisor of a boy's education was supposed to be his father. After the birth of a child, regardless of sex, Elyot recommended finding a good wet-nurse of sanguine character, between 20 and 30 years old; and another woman to oversee the behaviour of those who were in contact with the child. Until he was seven a boy had to live in the women's part of

---

[167] *The History of the University of Oxford*, pp.295-335.

the house. However, this did not mean that he learned nothing until he was seven years old.

While living with the women he was supposed to start learning Latin as a spoken language (probably with his father's help), though it was noted that this early start on a foreign language ran counter to the Greek and Roman example, in which this sort of education did not commence until the child was seven. Elyot objected to this that the native language of Roman children already was Latin. In the sixteenth century teaching continued to be in Latin, but this language was not native for English children. So, for successful further learning, children were to learn Latin as a spoken language before the age of seven. In spite of Elyot's desire for such an early start, he did not want to force a child into learning by violence; he wanted boys to learn writing almost as a form of play. He recommended teaching noble boys alongside some children of humble birth in order to inspire competition.

At seven a boy had to be taken from the company of women, only one old matron then being permitted thereafter to look after his needs. From seven, a tutor, 'an ancient and worshipful man, gentle and with gravity' had to be provided for a boy. A tutor was not necessarily an educated man, though if he was it was a commendable quality. The main aim of the tutor was to study the nature of his pupil, to commend his virtues and to correct the negative sides of the character. The tutor had to organize his charge's daily life. The boy's diet was regulated; he was not supposed to sleep more than eight hours a day. This tutor should teach the boy the parts of speech in English. When he had learned them, his father has to provide 'such a maister as is excellently lerned both in Greke and Latine'.[168] A child had to learn Greek and Latin grammar, either simultaneously or beginning with Greek. He

---

[168] Elyot, *Governour*, ch.9.

was supposed to learn Greek for three years, during which time he had to speak only Latin to the people around him. Those people were to be specially selected for the elegant style of their Latin. Then a child would be taught Latin grammar, not in depth, but as much as was necessary for understanding ancient authors. A child had to be taught music as a rest from other studies. Elyot especially underlined the inappropriateness for a noble child of singing or playing simply for the sake of showing his abilities in public. Humphrey seconded this idea thirty years later. Elyot recommended teaching a boy painting and carving. These two abilities he considered necessary for a military commander. After all these studies, at about fourteen years, a boy should start the second stage of his education.

The purpose of this early stage of education was to give a noble student a taste for learning, thus Elyot constantly insisted that studies should be as pleasant as possible. By the age of fourteen, children were to master Latin and, perhaps, Greek and would thus be prepared for studying different aspects of the classical curriculum.

1.4.2. From the age of fourteen to University.

From the age of fourteen, a boy was taught rhetoric and history; and he started the study of Roman Law. A master had to teach a boy logic, rhetoric, and the speeches of ancient orators. At the same time, a boy was taught geography and ethnography in order to facilitate his future reading of historical chronicles. Elyot made a detailed list of necessary and useful reading. Most of it was of secular, political or historical content. From the age of seventeen Elyot recommended starting the study of moral philosophy. Once again the majority of recommended philosophical treatises were secular. After mastering philosophy,

at the age of 21, young noblemen were advised to study English common law.[169] Elyot did not specify the place where they were supposed to study, though he recommended involvement in disputations about particular cases as a method of studying the law.

This choice of literature was one of the more obvious differences between Humphrey and Elyot. They overlapped to some extent in recommending the classical historians, Livy, Caesar, and the historical books of the Bible, but in general they differed significantly. Humphrey included far more sacred history than Elyot. He mentioned Josephus and recommended John Calvin.[170] Humphrey insisted on the reading of mainly religious texts while studying history and philosophy, making it more Biblical and Christian history than civil.[171] Elyot turned to the classics for his models, with occasional mention of Biblical heroes. Humphrey put the Bible first and the classics correspondingly second. According to Humphrey the best model for a gentleman was Christ.[172]

In addition to subjects common with Elyot, Humphrey included in his ideal course for noblemen some practical subjects like mathematics, arithmetic, and geometry. As a puritan, interested in religious texts, he wanted his students to know Hebrew as well. He saw the Bible as the best historical book in this language. Humphrey disapprovingly commented on the marked interest in astrology among the nobility; he saw that they needed 'not spurr to it, but rather a brydle from it'.[173] Elyot focused more on the prominent nobility. He prescribed many exercises such as lifting and throwing heavy stones, playing tennis, wrestling, running, swimming, handling weapons like swords and battle axes, shooting the

---

[169] Ibid., ch.14.
[170] Humphrey, op.cit., f.Y7.
[171] H.Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen*, pp.38–40; Elyot, *Governour*, book 1, chs.XX-XXII; Humphrye, ff.X7v-Y3.
[172] Humphrey, op.cit., f.L2
[173] Ibid., f.Y6v.

long bow, riding, hunting, hawking and dancing. Elyot and Humphrey had different attitudes to dancing, as well. Elyot saw dancing as to some extent an introduction to the virtue of prudence.[174] He described in detail the dancing steps that he wanted his nobleman to use, and each of the steps contributed something to the various aspects of the virtue of prudence. Humphrey, on the other hand, merely tolerated dancing as an exercise for the sake of health.

Elyot paid considerable attention to the physical exercises of his scholars. He mentioned that there were some exercises that were useful merely for the sake of health, and sent his reader to Galen for the particularities of these exercises.[175] Elyot recommended wrestling, swimming, and running as exercises very suitable for a nobleman that could help to prepare him for military service. Elyot illustrated the usefulness of these exercises by the examples of famous Greek and Roman warriors who made use of their proficiency in these exercises during various battles. He insisted that his pupils must 'lerne to handle sondrye waipons, specially the sworde and the batayle axe'. Elyot considered that 'to ryde suerly and clene on a great horse' was 'the most honorable exercise'.[176] He advised noblemen to practice hunting red deer with hounds, as this was 'an imitacion of batayle' from his point of view.[177] Elyot considered shooting with the long bow useful pastime for a nobleman, as it too was supposed to prepare him for military service.[178] Elyot's exercises were in some way analogous to the military training of the past. To an extent, Elyot managed to combine the old medieval and new Renaissance ideal of education. His pupils were to become not only scholars, but soldiers as well. It has already been mentioned that humanists aimed to create

---

[174] Elyot, *Governour*, pp.85-107.
[175] Ibid., p.73.
[176] Ibid., pp.74-78.
[177] Ibid., pp.79, 82-83.
[178] Ibid., pp.111-115.

councillors to the monarch. However, as Conrad writes, Elyot modelled his councillor on the imperial Roman exemplars. 'The amici did not participate in a formal institution with fixed membership and meeting times. Much like pre-1540 Henrician Councillors and Privy Chamber personnel, these men were not only counsellors, but also soldiers and local governors who spent much of their lives away from Rome on government service'.[179]

Elyot, as well as all other humanists, was highly worried about the moral upbringing of noble children. He praised such moral virtues as prudence, justice, mercy, and humanity. He valued liberality, fidelity, fortitude, continence, patience, abstinence, and modesty. Elyot, and Humphrey as well, recommended sobriety in diet and moderation in apparel. Besides these personal and behavioural virtues, Elyot paid considerable attention to qualities which can be called 'social': he recommended having appropriate friends and company, a readiness to consult one's elders and other more experienced people. Experience itself was a positive quality, which a child had to gain together with knowledge.

Every humanist, whether Catholic or Protestant, writing on educational matters mentioned the religion of his pupils. A proper religious upbringing was a concern for all of them. Only after this need was proclaimed did they move to other necessary aspects of education. However if Elyot and Ascham only mentioned the importance of the issue, Humphrey dedicated about thirty pages to the question of religion.[180] He insisted on the observance of established religious ceremonies. He wanted his noblemen to display 'true unstayned worship of God and sincere relygyon'. He stressed that noblemen must 'worshipp Christ not stockes, stones or saints'; they 'ought [to] ... race oute all the roots and sutes of superstition: and suffer not delusion of Idolatry creepe into the Church'. He criticised those

---

[179] F.W.Conrad, 'The Problem of Counsel Reconsidered: the Case of Sir Thomas Elyot' in *Political Thought and the Tudor Commonwealth*, eds.P.A.Fideler and T.F.Mayer (London, New York, 1992), p.78.
[180] Humphrey, op.cit., ff.L3v-N2.

who 'aduance Supersticion (not builde Religion) [and who] eyther renew reized Monasteries or found new'.[181] Humphrey's religious views expressed the strong anti-Catholic attitudes of Puritanism._

Elyot clearly saw that the education of the English nobility was far from his ideal. In his work he pointed out four reasons for this situation. Three of these reasons related to the attitude of noble parents; the fourth reason was a result of the educational situation in England in general. Parents were guilty of pride, avarice, and negligence. By 'pride' Elyot meant the opinion that 'to a great gentilman it is a notable reproche to be well lerned'.[182] The charge of avarice consisted of two things: the lack of any test of the abilities and character of tutors or masters, and the fact that the salary demanded was the main thing which influenced the parents' decision to employ a teacher. This parental avarice continued to be critisized by Humphrey, Ascham, and Peacham. Elyot saw the negligence of parents in the way they sent their children away from home to other households and therefore could not control their further education and development after they turned fourteen and had already learned Latin and Greek. The fourth reason for failure to educate children adequately was the shortage of sufficient masters and tutors. This fault could be corrected only by time. Some parents were well aware of this problem. Sir Robert Sidney promised to find his children a good Frenchman because 'our Oxford men have seen nothing but the schools and need for most things themselves to be taught'.[183]

Another difference between Elyot and Humphrey is that Elyot did not see the grammar school or University as the appropriate place for educating the nobility, while Humphrey as a University don obviously had another opinion.

---

[181] Ibid., ff.L6r, M7v, P6r.
[182] Elyot, *Governour*, p.49.
[183] HMC *De L'Isle*, II, pp.269- 270.

It is possible that Elyot's omission of both grammar schools and Universities from his discussion of education reflected his disapproval of the character of these institutions, both of which still retained connections with their ecclesiastical roots.[184] Helen Jewell and Foster Watson think that English grammar school acquired a more secular and humanistic character only by the early 1540s, and Elyot wrote his *Governor* in 1531, when English Grammar schools were still rather scholastic.[185] There are no references to grammar schools either in *The Governour* or in *The Nobles*. Ascham's *The Schoolmaster* mentioned the existence of schools, though he did not see them as involved in the upbringing of gentle and noble boys. Though Ascham's recommendations on education were very similar to those of Elyot, there were some minor differences between their approach to the early stages of education.

Elyot wanted a boy to learn the elements of Latin as a spoken language from as early an age as possible. Ascham agreed with the idea that excellency in spoken Latin was one of the aims of education. However he pointed out that 'now commonly, in the best schools in England, for words, right choice is smally regarded, true propriety wholly neglected ...'.[186] Ascham insisted that the child had first to obtain a formal understanding of the language, skill in its oral and written usage; only when these requirements were fulfilled was the child permitted to speak Latin constantly.

The basis of all learning, the Seven Liberal Arts, were divided between the grammar school and the University: the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and dialectic) formed the syllabus of the grammar schools, while the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music) was the subject of University studies. Studies in the schools and Universities were in Latin.

---

[184] Jewell, op.cit., p.81.
[185] Ibid., pp.99-102; F.Watson, *The English Grammar School to 1660* (London, 1968), pp.532-536.
[186] Ascham, op.cit., p.17.

In 1582 Richard Mulcaster complained that too much time was spent in learning Latin and Greek. Though he critisized Ascham for encouraging the study of these languages he considered it right that the ancient languages must be first learned, thus compromising with the existed practice.[187] William Kempe in his model school curriculum of 1588 assigned only one term at the end of the final year to mathematics and the other sciences.[188] All other time was given to Grammar, Logic and Rhetoric. The basics of Grammar were supposed to be learned by studying Latin. Quentin Skinner has observed that, despite the wider desires of the humanists, the practice of the grammar schools was to concentrate on the teaching of Latin, and other subjects rarely appeared in the curricula.[189] Studying Latin was never the aim in itself. Students learned Latin in order to be able to read classical Latin authors, to study moral philosophy, rhetoric and history from their works. Thus, Latin was means of obtaining a wider body of knowledge.

Kempe identified two main steps in the teaching in schools. The first step was to teach how to read Latin. This was supposed to be done as early as possible. Kempe assigned three years for learning to read Latin with any fluency. Children were supposed to learn by heart the parts of speech, the declension of nouns and the conjugation of verbs. They had 'to practise the precepts of Grammar in expounding and unfolding the works of Latin Authors'.[190] At the age of nine children were expected to read some moderately difficult Latin texts. From about ten years old children started the second major step of their school education. They had to learn speaking and writing Latin on their own account. At the end of

---

[187] R.Mulcaster, *The First Part of the Elementarie VVhich Entreateth Chefelie of the Right Writing of Our English Tung*. (London, 1582)
[188] W.Kempe, *The Education of Children in Learning: Declared by the Dignitie, Vtilitie, and Method thereof. Meete to Be Knowne, and Practised aswell of Parents as Schoolmaisters* (London, 1588), f.H1r in *Four Tudor tracts on Education*, ed.H.B.Warfel (Florida, 1966), p.237.
[189] Q.Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge, 1996), p.26.
[190] Ibid., f.F4r..

this stage, in three years, children ought to be able to compose Latin essays of their own. At the same time children could start learning either Greek or Hebrew. Kempe considered it necessary to give pupils some idea of mathematics and science. Literature consisted of the works of the classical Latin and Greek writers.

Kempe did not pay as much attention to the study of Greek as he did to the study of Latin, which was a point of emphasis for Elyot, Humphrey, and Ascham. Maybe this attitude reflected contemporary practice. It seems that Sir Philip Sidney in his school years did not receive the opportunity to study Greek in depth, though he later spent some time in Greek studies during his Grand Tour. Learned Henry Percy, the 9th Earl of Northumberland, wrote in his *Advice to his Son* that 'the attaining to the Latin is most of use, the Greek but loss of time'.[191] The 'wizard' Earl gave his own impressive list of the subjects which he wanted his son to master: 'Arithmetic, Geometry, Logic, Grammar Universal, Metaphysics, the Doctrine of Motion of Optics, Astronomy, the Doctrine of Generation and Corruption, Cosmography, the Doctrine *de Anima*, Moral, Politics, Economics, the Art Nautical and Military'.[192] Northumberland's list of subjects, which included Mathematics and Navigation, seems more practical than that of Elyot and Ascham. It is closer to Humphrey's ideal, which was in its turn closer to the real curriculum and life of the University than those of Elyot and Ascham.

1.4.3. University and the Inns of Court.

By the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries the majority of noble boys attended University for some period of time. Though there were only

---

[191] *Advice to His Son*, p.67.
[192] Ibid., p.67.

two Universities, Oxford and Cambridge, there was another institution that provided higher education, the Inns of Court. Humphrey's book was dedicated to the Inner Temple. Sometimes young noblemen attended one of the Universities and later one of the Inns. Though Stone agrees that in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries the Inns of Courts were attended by both the gentry and the peers, he sees the Inns as more attractive to the former than to the latter.[193] Professor Prest's figures, however, give a different impression.[194] According to his data, in the period between 1590 and 1610 the numbers of peers, esquires and gentry attending one of the Inns were approximately equal, while in the period 1610-1639 there were more students from the peerage and squirearchy than from the gentry. Prest estimates that out of the total number of entrants to the Inns of Court on the turn of the centuries about 85-91% were students of noble or gentry status.

These figures suggest a contrast between the social composition of the Inns and the Universities. The latter had a more complicated and diverse social structure. As mentioned earlier, not more than 50% of University students were well-born. Neither Elyot, nor Humphrey nor Ascham paid much attention to University studies. Henry Peacham was more worried about the behaviour and friendships of gentleman at University than about the essence of their studies. He mentioned that students must not forget to study. The simple fact of living four or five years in the University would not give them any knowledge, so they had to concentrate on their studies.[195] He thought that parents gave too much money to their sons, so 'instead of studying the seven liberal sciences, they study seven couple of hounds'.[196] With this scornful sentence Peacham demanded that University students should

---

[193] Stone, *Crisis*, pp.690-691.
[194] W.R.Prest, *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts 1590-1640* (London, 1972), pp.30-32
[195] Peacham, *The Complete Gentleman*, p.44.
[196] Peacham, *The Truth of Our Times*, p.208.

study more diligently.

1.4.4. The Grand Tour.

By the end of the sixteenth century the education of noble boys clearly also included the so-called Grand Tour, involving travel around Europe, mainly France, Italy, and Germany; but it was a relatively recent innovation. It is difficult to determine whether Humphrey was aware of this development, though he did mention that the English nobility was 'delyghted rather wyth foreyne wittes, and traffyke, then their owne countreyes, where notwithstanding they have both plentye of excellent wittes and aboundance of all necessaryes'.[197] Ascham condemned with all possible force travel abroad. He wrote that English students became addicted to vices and Catholicism after their stay in Italy. He argued against the need for travel to provide practical experience of the world. He stated that 'learning teacheth more in one year than experience in twenty, and learning teacheth safely, when experience maketh more miserable than wise'.[198] In spite of this opinion there were enough young gentlemen who, like Jacque in *As You Like It*, were ready to risk their health and fortune in order to gain experience.[199] Ascham was clearly aware of this, so he recommended, 'if wise men will needs send their sons into Italy, let them do it wisely, under the keep and guard of him, who by his wisdom and honesty, by his example and authority, may be able to keep them safe and sound in fear of God, in Christ's true religion, in good order and honesty of living'.[200]

None of the major early writers on education (Elyot, Ascham, and Humphrey)

---

[197] Humphrey, op.cit., f.Q1r.
[198] Ascham, op.cit., p.50.
[199] W.Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. by M.Hattaway (Cambridge, 2000), Scene 1, ln.20, p.161
[200] Ascham, op.cit., p.63.

dedicated any part of his book to a description of foreign travel and its part in the education of noble boys. Among the authors who wrote general tracts on the education of the nobility, only Cleland and Peacham, who wrote their books when the Grand Tour was already an established feature of noble education, dedicated chapters to foreign travel as the last stage of a formal education.[201] Peacham mentioned the generally negative attitude towards these travels sometimes coming from people who travelled themselves. Peacham thought 'they are as one who hath filled his own belly and denieth the dish to his fellow'. He saw travel as the means of gaining some practical knowledge of foreign affairs, and as likely to produce a deeper love of one's own country. Peacham divided the reasons for travel into private and public categories. Under 'private' ones he saw 'the recovery of ... health, or gaining as a merchant, by traffic, or some profession wherein you excel others'. Under 'public', 'the general good of ... country' was understood.[202] It seems interesting that these 'private' reasons suggest that Peacham's book was initially addressed to a wider circle of the readers than those of his predecessors. Neither Elyot, nor Humphrey, nor Ascham saw trade and desire to obtain a profession as gentlemanly concerns.

In 1606, about fifteen years prior to Peacham's chapter on travels, T. Palmer had written an essay on travel.[203] This book to some extent repeated advice given in several widely known letters of advice. The most characteristic letters are those written by Sir William Cecil for his son Thomas (1561), and for the benefit of his ward Edward Manners, the 3rd Earl of Rutland (1571), the letters written by Sir Philip Sidney for his brother Robert (1580); and three letters written by the 2nd Earl of Essex to his 6th cousin and friend Roger

---

[201] Peacham, *The Complete Gentleman*, chap.XVIII; Cleland, op.cit., pp.251-271.
[202] Peacham, *The Complete Gentleman*, p.161.
[203] T. Palmer, *Essay of the Means How to Make Our Travailes into Forraine Countries the More Profitable and Honourable* (London, 1606).

Manners, the 5th Earl of Rutland.[204] Even the existence of books on travel did not stop Henry Percy, the 9th Earl of Northumberland from writing a letter on the subject to his son Algernon in 1618.[205]

The Essex letters were the most famous. Copies of these letters can be found in the papers of several noble families.[206] The main difference between Palmer's book and these letters is the age at which it was considered suitable for a boy to go abroad, Peacham did not pay special attention to this question. The letters were written to young noble boys of known age. Algernon Percy went abroad at sixteen, Robert and Philip Sidney started their travels at seventeen, Thomas Cecil and the 5th Earl of Rutland at nineteen, the 3rd Earl of Rutland at 22. However Palmer recommended 25 as the best age for starting travel.[207] He considered that by 25 young men would have acquired the knowledge necessary to benefit from travel. The pupil would have perfected himself in all his studies. This advice seems to have been ignored; the majority of students going abroad were under twenty.

Foreign travel had several aims. The first aim was educational: in Italy and Greece noble youths were supposed to be influenced by the remains of ancient Greek and Roman culture. A second aim was dictated by their social position as noblemen: they could study

---

[204] Among historians there is no uniformity of opinion about the authorship of these three letters. In the end of the nineteenth century James Spedding doubted Essex's authorship of the letters (Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*, pp.7-20). He suggested Francis Bacon, Essex's secretary at this period as the real author of these letters, demonstrating a close similarity between some passages in the letters and other parts of Bacon's works. In the 1990s the discussion was reopened. Paul E. Hammer insisted that the letters were written by Essex. He argues this in his article 'Letters of Travel Advice from the Earl of Essex to the Earl of Rutland: Some Comments', *Philological Quarterly* 74 (1995), pp.317-25. Professor Brian Vickers in his *Francis Bacon* ((Oxford, 1996), p.540) and other writings continues to support Bacon's claims to authorship. On the details of the discussion see P.E.J.Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics. The political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597* (Cambridge, 1999), p.149 (note 200). I shall treat and refer to letters as Essex's for they were signed by Essex and sent to Rutland from Essex. Thus Essex was their author as far as Rutland was concerned.

[205] *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney and Hubert Languet*, ed.S.A.Pears (London, 1845), pp.195-202; *Advice to a Son*, pp.3-6; HMC *Rutland*, I, p.91; Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*, pp.7-20; 'Instructions on Travel to His Son, by Henry Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland', ed.F.Grose, in *The Antiquarian Repertory*, iv (1809), pp.374-380.

[206] BL, Add. MSS 12511, 37232, 38137; Harley MSS. 813, 4888, 6265.

[207] Palmer, op.cit., p.18.

riding, fencing, dancing, and music. The perfection of these gentlemanly arts could be achieved only in Paris and Florence. Thirdly, as future statesmen young noblemen had to learn and practice foreign languages: French, Italian, and German. Peacham even mentioned particular areas, which he considered the best for different European languages: 'for the French, Orleans; Florence for the Italian; Leipzig for the High Dutch; and Valladolid for the Spanish'.[208] Noblemen also needed to study different political institutions in Europe. The fourth aim was to gain military experience during the long periods of peace under Elizabeth and early Stuarts. The art of fortification and the technical aspects of siege warfare could be learned only in Europe. So, here we can see some continuity with the medieval functions of the nobility and its education. It is characteristic that Elizabethan favourites served abroad: the Earl of Leicester in the Netherlands, the 2nd Earl of Essex in France, in the Cadiz expedition and in Ireland. Sir Philip Sidney, Leicester's nephew, was mortally wounded and died in the Netherlands; the 5th Earl of Rutland, Essex's stepson-in-law (he married the only daughter of Sir Philip Sidney) and friend, served in the Netherlands and Ireland. Sir Philip Sidney and the 5th Earl of Rutland had Grand Tours as part of their education.

The authors of the advice letters, like Ascham, were very worried that young students might be influenced by Catholicism. Boys were advised to continue their daily prayers. All of the authors advised keeping a diary in which to set down different information. The range of this information was very wide, from the political systems of different countries to the names of the governors of towns; from the state of the finances and the monetary system to the main geographical features of the land; from Roman antiquities to the characters of the leading courtiers. It is worth mentioning that only

---

[208] Peacham, *The Complete Gentleman*, p.162.

Essex's advice suggested noting the beauty of the places where his friend was supposed to travel.

Though the letters of travel advice had a lot in common, they had some differences as well. The letter to Thomas Cecil, whose intellectual limitations were well known to his father, stressed especially the necessity of prayers and of keeping a journal. William Cecil wanted his son to be 'civilly trained, and to have either the French or Italian tongue'.[209] The demands made of the 5th Earl of Rutland were much higher. He had to make himself an 'expert man' and to attain knowledge for his private study. He had to study the liberal arts and read 'Histories for they will best instruct you in moral, military, and politie'.[210]

Philip Sidney gave his brother special recommendations about the route he should follow. The countries most useful for travel he considered to be France, Germany, the Low Countries, and Italy. France and Spain had to be observed to see how they could hinder the development of England, though in these counties some useful things could be borrowed. Germany was looked at as a model of excellent laws and justice. Flanders 'hath divers things to be learned, especially their governing, their merchants and other trades'.[211] Italy was recommended by Sidney from a purely cultural point view.

Northumberland was worried about the dangers to his son's health that could occur from too much exercise, from drinking in hot countries and from contacts with women. It is well known that Northumberland was highly interested in estate management and considerably improved his income. It is not surprising to find in his letter the advice to pay close attention to the commodities and the customs of different countries. Peacham managed to be even more practical than Northumberland. Apart from the rather common

---

[209] *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign series of the Reign of Elizabeth 1561-1562* (London, 1866), pp.104-05.
[210] Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*, pp.10-13.
[211] *Correspondence*, pp.198-99.

advice to keep silent while travelling, his readers received some valuable practical advice. They were informed that 'apparel abroad is much dearer than ... in England. Stuffs are cheap ... in the Netherlands, so are velvets and silks about Naples... Boots and shoes are very dear everywhere...'.[212] Peacham even mentioned that if he had the monopoly of carrying old English leather shoes to France, he would be a very rich man. Peacham recommended that you 'know the price of meat before you eat it', pointing out that this was not the custom of young English noblemen abroad. There is no need to study Francis Bacon's essay *Of Travel* for his recommendations were very close to mentioned above.[213] One piece of advice unique to Bacon was the recommendation that the traveller, after returning home, should 'maintain a correspondence by letters with those of his acquaintance [those that he met abroad] which are of most worth'.

All writers emphasized that travellers should widen the knowledge that they possessed. They should study and observe foreign customs and manners so that they could use the practical experience and instruction thus received in the service of their own commonwealth. The Grand Tour was not a pleasure travel, its aim was to finish the creation of a humanistically-educated nobleman, ready to use his virtue in his monarch's service for the good of the commonwealth.

1.5. The Education of Noble Women

It is well known that women's education received much less attention than men's during our period. A patriarchal society allowed only very limited public roles to women and relegated them to predominantly private ones. Women were considered weak creatures,

---

[212] Peacham, *The Truth of Our Times*, p.219-20.
[213] *Francis Bacon*, pp.374-76.

lacking fidelity and marked intellectual ability.

In 1523 Juan Luis Vives wrote a manual on *The Education of a Christian Woman.*[214] It was written in Latin for the benefit of Princess Mary. The first translation into English appeared in 1529.[215] Vives granted women equal intellectual abilities with men. However he considered that women's education must be centred around the requirements of chastity and their future role as mistresses of the household. A girl was supposed to be taught how to read, though it was more important to learn how to manage a household. Vives thought that a girl's early reading should be restricted to the Scriptures and the writings of philosophers that pertain to good morals.[216] Teaching at a school was denied to her because it would detract from her modesty and decorum. Vives's book enjoyed enormous popularity in England, but it did little to change the familiar idea of women as inferior to men.

This opinion was so widespread that Sir Thomas Elyot decided that it was necessary to refute it in a small book, *The Defence of Good Women*. During the course of the dialogue, Caninius, originally hostile to women, became convinced 'that women beinge well and vertuously brought up, do not onely with men participate in reason but som also in fidelitie and constauncie be equall unto them'.[217] Elyot's invented model of the 'good woman', Zenobia, studied moral philosophy between the age of 16 and 20. At 20 she was married to her husband, a prince of Palmira. She considered her learning the main thing that helped her to understand the true place of a woman, which was to be an obedient and dutiful assistant to her husband. Hilda Smith rightly comments that, for humanist authors, women were primarily to be trained as wives. This proved the most important limitation on what they

---

[214] J.L.Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman: a Sixteenth Century Manual*, ed.C.Fantazzi (Chicago & London 2000).
[215] Ibid., p.32.
[216] Ibid., p.78.
[217] T.Elyot, *The Defence of Good Women* (London, 1540), ff.D6r-D7v.

were expected and able to learn and on how they could use this learning.[218] Puritan authors had even less interest in developing a girl's intellectual interests: she was to be brought up for domestic life, for the position of the virtuous lady of the house.[219] It is significant that Humphrey in his lengthy dedication of *The Nobles* to the Queen, made it clear that the Queen's rulership of the state was as good as her father's and brother's had been.[220] However, though good rule was considered a personal virtue of male monarchs, in the case of Elizabeth it was seen as the will and power of God manifesting itself through a weak woman. It is perhaps surprising that, with such an attitude to women's learning, England did have several learned and educated women. Princesses Mary and Elizabeth Tudor and Lady Jane Grey were all accomplished linguists. The daughters of Sir Thomas More and of Sir Anthony Cooke; Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke; her nieces Mary Sidney-Wroth and Elizabeth Sidney, Countess of Rutland; and their second cousin, Lucy Harrington, Countess of Bedford were among the most educated women of their time. In general there was a much smaller number of well-educated women then of educated men.

So how were these women educated? Henry VIII started the tradition of giving proper education to his daughters. The example of Sir Thomas More who educated his daughters in the same way that men were educated helped considerably to strengthen the idea that women were able to apply themselves to learning. Henry VIII's Queens helped to create the idea of the Court as a place where education and knowledge were demanded, not only of men, but of women as well. So, the Court became the natural place in which to provide education for noble girls while they served as ladies-in-waiting. At the age of

---

[218] H.L.Smith, 'Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Women' in *Women and Literature in Britain 1500-1700*, ed. H.Wilcox (Cambridge, 1996), p.13.
[219] J. Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p.280.
[220] Humphrey, op.cit., Dedication.

thirteen or fourteen noble girls could be accepted at Court under the patronage of some lady-in-waiting of high influence, large retinue and good reputation. However not all parents could afford to send a girl to Court, which was a rather costly affair. And, in any case, girls had to receive some education (i.e. learn to read religious books and to sew) and manners before entering the higher academy of the Court for final polishing. An initial education could be achieved at home under the supervision of mothers and the instruction of a private tutor. Some girls were sent to the houses of other families known for the quality of their education. This education would fit them for their vocation - to be married and become mistresses of their own households. Lady Jane Grey herself was in the household of Catherine Parr from the age of nine. Whether girls received an education at home or at some other household, it consisted of elements of English and Latin, music and dancing. Girls were taught some arithmetic, necessary for keeping accounts, and studied how to write letters properly. Much attention was paid to their religious and moral education. An integral part of women's education was needlework, which was understood as a religious virtue as well, because needlework prevented women from idleness, the worst possible sin.[221]

While boys, in practice, though not in Elyot's theory, received part of their education in the Universities and abroad, girls were educated at home. The main figure in women's education was therefore the private tutor. Sometimes girls studied together with their brothers, like Mary and Robert Sidney, or William and Frances Cavendish. In general the level of noble girls' education depended solely on their parents' opinion about the importance for a girl of receiving any education. Confirmation of this can be found in Northumberland's *Advice to his Son*.[222] Northumberland considered that women's minds

---

[221] Charlton, *Education*, pp.203-213.
[222] *Advice to His Son*, pp.91-92.

were not inferior to men's, but he did think them deficient in education. Northumberland described very colourfully the common education that girls received at home. For some years they were taught to read and write, until they have acquired enough 'to keep them from idleness, the wind and weathers'. This education was a game for girls, which is why the majority of them did not learn proper orthography. Parents were held guilty for this. They did not sufficiently exercise their daughters in learning. Northumberland continued his criticism of women's education by discussing their knowledge of foreign languages. He thought this very limited, extending no further than the capability to read some fashionable novels, like *Amadis* in French, *Ariosto* in Italian, *Diana de Monte Major* in Spanish, *Arcadia* in English. Parents took great care to produce daughters who were modest, neat, graceful, and obedient. These qualities enabled them to find suitable husbands while they were young. Northumberland condemned the practice of giving so little education to girls, but it was nonetheless a common practice of the time.

1.6. The cost of education.

Now that we have examined theoretical ideas of noble education, let us try to evaluate how much parents were supposed to spend on the education of their children. Though Elyot in his book blamed avarice as the reason for the decay of education, he did not name any specific amounts for a tutor's salary.[223] He did say that a more or less normal salary for a teacher or a private tutor would be equal to the salary of two servants. However, the servants in the example were a cook and a falconer. These servants were among the most qualified and highly paid ones. In the household of a prominent nobleman they

---

[223] Elyot, *Governour*, book 1, chap XIII, p.53.

received between £4 and £8 per year, plus different gifts. That would make the appropriate salary for a tutor between £8 and £16 per year. The tutor had to live with his charge, and was free of expenses for food and maybe clothes. Ascham, however, named an entirely different sum.[224] Sir Richard Saville, at whose request *The Schoolmaster* was written, promised to pay for the education of Ascham's son and his own grandson under the supervision of a good schoolmaster appointed by Ascham. Sir Richard mentioned that 'they three do cost me a couple of hundred pounds by year'. These two sums may not be so different as they seem at first glance. Sir Richard in his £200 included the cost of maintenance for his noble grandson, his companion, and the tutor. However Sir Richard was an exception. In the body of his book Ascham, like Elyot, blamed the avarice of parents, who were 'loth to offer the other [the tutor] 200 shillings'.[225] So, Ascham gives £10 as the bare minimum for a teacher. We shall later see how much was actually spent on the maintenance of boys and how much was paid to tutors.

If the parents considered it necessary to send a son abroad they had to be ready for further expenses. Robert Dallington thought £125 (500 crowns) per year as the necessary sum for a nobleman, accompanied by one man: 'ten gold crownes a moneth for his own dyet, eight for his man (at the most), two crownes a moneth for his fencing, as much dancing, no lesse his reading, & fifteene crownes monethly his riding'.[226] Cleland considered that a nobleman must be accompanied by three men, a tutor, a pursebearer and a page, and saw £200 per year as necessary to cover the expense.[227] In 1595-1597 Dallington

---

[224] Ascham, op.cit., p.8.
[225] Ibid., p.26-27.
[226] R.Dallington, *A Method for Trauell. Shewed by Taking the View of France. As it Stoode in the Yeare of our Lord 1598* (London 1605?), p.ix. One gold crown was equal to 5s. (*A Dictionary of British history*, ed.J.P.Kenyon (London, 1986), p.84.).
[227] Cleland, op.cit., p.254.

accompanied his friend, the 5th Earl of Rutland, in the latter's Grand Tour, and later, in 1604, the Earl's younger brother; so his book was first-hand evidence. Unfortunately none of the sources mention even approximate sums for expenses in connection with girls' education.

1.7. Conclusion.

The sixteenth century witnessed considerable social change. New educational doctrines and modes of life were adopted by a nobility that wanted to retain its social prominence. Humanist ideas were imported to England, adapted and applied. English humanists provided the nobility, and all those interested in the subject, with a detailed and practical educational programme. As time passed, the process of education came to include a new component, the Grand Tour. This stage lacked a theoretical base in the classical tracts of English humanists, which was supplied instead by letters on travel and chapters in new books. Though travel might seem likely to produce the development of a more cosmopolitan elite, all authors who recommended travel abroad wrote extensively about the necessity of being acquainted with one's native country before going abroad, and were concerned with the profit that the travellers would bring back from their travels.

Some members of the aristocracy were worried that their children would want knowledge about the realities and practicalities of life, so they provided their sons with necessary advice literature. Theoretical tracts and advice literature demonstrate that in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries there was a relatively clear idea of the nobleman. A person had to be educated in a proper way for public service and behave himself in an appropriate way (i.e. practice virtue), and follow certain customs in order to be considered a really noble person from the humanist point of view. Even giving alms and

reward, theoretically a voluntarily action, was expected from a true nobleman. The question that next arises is whether this image had any discernible impact on the conduct and behaviour of the nobility.

CHAPTER TWO

The Practical Realisation of Humanist Ideals:

Education and Upbringing

Having studied the educational theories of the sixteenth century we are left with the question of how closely and thoroughly ideas about noble education were put into practice, and how much such education and upbringing actually cost parents. In this chapter we are going to study the implementation of humanist educational doctrines in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The realization of educational ideas within noble families will be assessed on the basis of the letters and household accounts of the Sidney, Cecil, Manners, Percy, Devereux, and Cavendish families, and some others. The choice of these particular families is determined by the survival of sources relevant to the present research. Though all these families had entered the peerage by the end of Jacobean reign, the Sidneys, Cecils and Cavendishes were gentry families under Elizabeth.

There is some difficulty in assessing the first stage of children's education. Generally, while children were small they were not among the primary concerns of their parents. Indeed some have argued that in this period of high infant mortality distance between children and parents was normal, and helped parents to cope with a child's death, though this view has been largely discredited by Ralph Houlbrooke and Linda A. Pollock.[228] They have demonstrated that children's deaths had considerable impact on their parents. However, Houlbrooke indicates that the reaction to a child's death varied with the child's age and the strength of the previous relations between parent and

---

[228] R.Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England* (Oxford, 1998); L.A.Pollock, *Forgotten Children. Parent-Child Relations from 1500 to 1900.* (Cambridge, 1983).

child.[229] It seems that the death of new-born babies was not taken as badly by parents as the death of an older child, though if a child survived a few days its death certainly caused sadness. Nonetheless small children, under the age of about five, were rarely mentioned in their parents' letters while they were healthy. Children started to appear in the letters of their parents either when they were sick or when they were already capable of some correspondence. So, we do not know how closely Elyot's recommendations about the character of wet-nurses and the steps to be taken in the first stages of education were observed in our chosen families, and there is no way of filling the gap.

2.1. Stages in the Upbringing and Education of Noble Children

In this part of the work I shall examine the evidence provided by the personal correspondence and household accounts of the nobility, which throw some light on the education of children. A good place to begin is with the early education of Sir Robert Sidney's children.[230] The quantity of correspondence that survives from Sir Robert enables us to look inside the nursery of his children and then to follow his boys' paths out of it. The richness of the material makes this an incomparable case study. The evidence gives us the opportunity to compare the early stages of the education of Sir Robert's children, especially his eldest son William, with the recommendations of Elyot, Humphrey, and other humanists. Subsequently we shall compare with this the evidence available for other noble families about the education and upbringing of their children. It is worth making it clear from the very beginning that our evidence never fully covers for any one family all the stages in child's education. After drawing these comparisons we shall study the cost to parents of bringing up their children until they came of age.

---

[229] Ibid., p. 234.
[230] Sir Robert Sidney (1563-1626), younger brother of Sir Philip Sidney, future Viscount Lisle and 2nd Earl of Leicester.

Elyot divided the life and education of a child into four stages: from birth to seven they were supposed to be in the nursery; from seven to fourteen a boy should be occupied in study with a private teacher or schoolmaster; from fourteen to 21 he undertook further studies with his schoolmaster, and from 21 studied English Law. By the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, the fourth stage of a noble education usually consisted of the Grand Tour; the second stage sometimes included attendance at grammar school, and during the third stage children attended University and sometimes the Inns of Court. There was some flexibility about this, and certainly some noblemen studied at the Inns at a later time, including the 5th earl of Rutland, who did so after his return from the Grand Tour.

2.1.1. The Early Education of Sir Robert Sidney's Children.

Sir Robert Sidney was greatly interested in the upbringing of all of his children, boys or girls. The relations between the parents and the children in the Sidney family were very warm, and it is difficult to see it as unaffectionate. When in 1597 Lady Sidney was going to visit her husband in Flushing, Sir Robert recommended that she 'leave here the 3 greater [children] behynd her'.[231] This recommendation led to an outburst of feeling on the part of the eldest child of the family, Mary, then eleven years old. The girl wanted to see her father, moreover she considered herself too young to be parted from her mother. Surprisingly, the girl won. She received a personal letter from her father, and all three eldest children were permitted to visit him.

Such affectionate relationships help us to understand why the family agent, Rowland Whyte, constantly informed Sir Robert, when he was serving as a governor at Flushing, about the educational successes of his children. Sir Robert was informed not

---

[231] HMC *De L'Isle*, II, p.261.

only about the births, christenings, illnesses, and deaths of his children, but about any events in their lives. Though Sir Robert considered the education of boys his responsibility and the education of girls that of their mother, Lady Barbara Sidney, he was nonetheless interested in the girls' achievements.[232] One of the first detailed reports which we can find in the letters of Rowland Whyte to Sir Robert Sidney is dated 1595.[233] By this year Sir Robert had five children: Mary, Catherine, William, Elizabeth, and Philip (a girl). The letter mentioned all of them: 'Mrs. Mary and Kat. do much profitt in their booke. Mr. William daunces a galliard in his doublett and hose. Mrs. Bes cannot yet speake, and litle Mrs. Philip can goe alone'. Two months later the opinion of the Lord Admiral about his eldest daughter was passed to Sir Robert: 'Mrs Mary was already a fitt mayd for the Queen'.[234] In February 1597 Sir Robert was informed of the Queen's opinion of his second daughter Catherine: 'she [the Queen] never saw any child come towards her with a better or bolder grace, then Mrs. Kat. did'.[235]

Naturally Sir Robert paid the closest attention towards the upbringing of his eldest son and heir, William. After his first appearance in the letters, William's education became a matter of great concern to his father. In November 1596 Sir Robert was 'glad to hear that Wil begins to read' (he was six at this time).[236] Sir Robert considered that it was time for William to start proper learning and in the same letter he promised himself to find a tutor for his son in order to be sure of the quality of education that his heir would receive. Sir Robert stated that it was long past the time when his son had to be taken out of the nursery. He considered that at the age of seven a boy should be able to read English. In a later letter Sir Robert clearly wrote that seven-year-old William Sid-

---

[232] Ibid., p.269.
[233] Ibid., p.164.
[234] Ibid., p.191. This Mistress Mary Sidney was the future poetess Lady Mary Wroth, the author of *Urania*.
[235] Ibid., p.236.
[236] Ibid., p.227.

ney continued to live with his maids and did not learn anything.[237] This he considered a most inappropriate way of bringing up the heir of a nobleman.

Lady Sidney probably consulted her husband about the salary for a tutor whom she wanted to take for the eldest son. In his reply Sir Robert made it clear that he was ready to pay £20 per year to a tutor if he considered his knowledge sufficient. However, he continued, if any schoolmaster would be taken to the boy, William would be entirely in the charge of this schoolmaster. No women should interfere with his education. Sir Robert prayed his beloved wife to realize that the boy would be entirely in his father's charge from that time.[238] This lecture was the result of Lady Sidney's desire to take the boy with her while visiting her husband, contrary to his wish that the boy should be left at the house of Sir Charles Morison, by whom he would be brought up. Future correspondence suggests that a tutor was taken for the boy in England. Rowland Whyte mentioned a Mr. Bird, reputedly honest, religious, learned and of good behaviour. It seems interesting that the tutor's level of education was mentioned third. English noble parents preferred to be sure that the future tutor was of sound religion, so that their children would be brought up in the religion to which the family belonged. The moral and religious qualities of the tutor were no less important than his knowledge. Whether Protestant or Catholic, parents were equally eager to provide their children with tutors of sound religion.

Sir Robert did not immediately get his way. The question of a visit to Flushing became more complicated when William fell sick of the measles and his mother stayed with him till he recovered. The illness of the heir resulted in his being given permission to accompany Lady Sidney to Flushing. However, a rather unpleasant surprise waited the boy in Holland. Sir Robert found a schoolmaster for him. 'Hee [the schoolmaster] spea-

---

[237] Ibid., p.270.
[238] Ibid., pp.268-269.

keth both High Dutch and Low Dutch, French and some English, besides Lattin and Greeke'.[239] Thus, William was to be educated at home by a teacher who mastered Latin and Greek and would be able to teach classics to his charge. Sir Robert was looking to the future: he expected the schoolmaster to accompany William later in his travels abroad. This clearly shows that the Grand Tour was already intended for the seven-year-old boy, who had just started his proper book learning. Sir Robert wanted Lady Barbara to bring William with her, so that he could place the boy with his new tutor. In view of Lady Sidney's desire to control the life of her children, it is not surprising that she tried to leave her three elder children in England and avoid the necessity of parting with William. As a pretence she used the reason which Sir Robert himself had used in trying originally to dissuade her: 'the vild aire of Flushing'. The next day Sir Robert was informed that Lady Sidney liked very much the tutor, Mr. Bird, who was found for William in England.[240] It seems that Lady Sidney won. In January 1600 it is clear from Whyte's letters that the tutor of the Sidney children was Mr. Bird.

Contrary to Elyot's recommendations, Lady Sidney retained the position of general supervisor over the education of her children: 'she sees them well taught, and brought up in learning and qualities fit for their birth and condition'.[241] The humanist advice to limit a women's influence over a noble boy was soon given some justification by the behaviour of this particular mother. In February 1600 Lady Sidney's relations with Mr Bird were rather bad, probably as a result of a dispute. Mr. Bird accused Lady Sidney of lacking education herself, so he considered her an inappropriate judge of the education that he gave to her children. Sir Robert was supposed to make a decision about continuing to employ Mr. Bird or firing him.[242] In April Mr. Bird was again men-

---

[239] Ibid., pp.276-277.
[240] Ibid., pp.279.
[241] Ibid., p.424.
[242] Ibid., p.434.

tioned in Whyte's letter, so we can assume that Sir Robert had realized his intention of giving the tutor sole power over the upbringing of his children.[243]

Later, Rowland Whyte reported that all the children 'are kept at their books, they dance, they sing, they play on the lute, and are carefully kept unto yt'.[244] At this period Sir Robert's family consisted already of eight children. At the age of five, his second son, and eventual heir, suddenly appears in the letters. Robert was praised for his wit and speech. Three weeks later little Robert participated in the Court celebrations together with his two eldest sisters and a brother. Robert 'plaied Wagg soe pretily and boldly, that all tooke Pleasure in him', especially the Lord Admiral. The boy 'prated with his Honor beyond Measure'.[245]

The last time William and his achievements were mentioned was in May 1600. He and Mr. Bird briefly reappeared in the survived correspondence of his parents in July 1604 when he was already fourteen years old. However it is worth mentioning here that Lady Sidney never stopped interfering in the education of her sons. When the boys were already studying at University she invented pretexts in order to recall them from Oxford. According to her husband this was the reason that they had so little time for study.[246]

So what can we conclude from the example of early upbringing and education of Sir Robert Sidney's children? Humanist patterns were alive and influential. William Sidney studied with a tutor from the age of seven, though the first efforts to teach him reading were made when he was six. He continued to be educated by his tutor, at least, until the age of 14 There was no particular praise for his achievements, and it seems that Robert Sidney was cleverer then his elder brother. The particularities of the boys' education

---

[243] Ibid., p.452.
[244] Ibid., p.437.
[245] A.Collins, *Letters and Memorials of State, in the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, Part of the Reign of King Charles the Second, and Oliver's Usurpation*, II (London, 1746), p.190.
[246] HMC *De L'Isle*, III, p.421.

are unknown to us, but it is obvious that Sir Robert demanded knowledge of Latin and Greek as a minimum requirement for his children's tutor. So, it would be safe to assume that Mr. Bird provided a humanist education rooted in the learning of Latin (and possibly Greek).

The elder girls' received some bookish education too, though their education ceased figuring prominently in the correspondence of their parents after 1600, when they were fourteen and thirteen years old. Probably by this time the girls had become very accomplished young ladies. In 1600 they appeared first time in the parental letters in connection with marriage proposals. After their weddings they became equal *in status to* their parents, and so were mentioned in their parents' letters in an 'adult' context.

Let us now try to compare the scarce evidence which we have from other noble families, whose letters are not as informative about their children's education as the correspondence of Sir Robert and Lady Barbara Sidney.

2.1.2. From birth till 14.

As was mentioned before, we have virtually no information about the first and second periods in children's lives. It seems pointless to separate these periods, so we are going to examine them together. The information that is available mainly tells us whether a noble boy went to school or whether he had a private tutor. Occasionally, if detailed household accounts of a noble family survived, it is possible to find out a little about what some boys had studied and how much money had been spent on their education.

The Willoughby family accounts give some limited data about the earliest stage of education of Sir Francis Willoughby (b.1546). His parents died in 1548, and he and his elder brother and sister lived with their uncle, their guardian.[247] His elder eight-year-

---

[247] HMC *Middleton*, p.519.

old brother was sent to school, nothing more is known about him. However Francis Willoughby was too small to be sent to school. His schooling started when he was about 4 years old. In 1550 two ABC books were bought for him and 'a pounde of sugerer plate and greate comfettes' were made 'to make hym larne his booke'.[248] His elder sister, Margaret simultaneously started to learn counting. In 1551 'an Englysshe dyaloge' was bought for Francis.[249] In 1552 Francis received a bow and arrows, and in 1554 a Latin book was bought for him. In 1555 he was taught music and dancing.[250] In 1555 he went to school at Walden where he studied at least until 1557.[251]

In school the boy was taught to write and sing. Another set of books was bought for him: 'Ciceroes epystelles with divers commentariez', 'a dixionarie in Englysshe', '*Colloquia* Vivis', '*Colopine cum onomastico*', '*Copia Erasmi*', '*Epitome Adagiorum Erasmi*', 'the Actes of the Appostelles in meter to sing', 'Corderius *De corrupti Sermonis emendacione*', '*Compendium Eligantiarum* Valle', 'Terence phrasez' and 'a book of Sherez fugeres in Englyshe'.[252] In 1557 Francis was taught arithmetic and writing 'the Italian hand'. In 1558 he went to Cambridge and here all information about his education ends. However the impressive list of books bought for him witness that the boy was already well educated in classical literature at his grammar school.

The education of Sir Robert Sidney, himself (unlike that of his children), and

---

[248] Ibid., p. 400.
[249] Ibid., p.403. Christopher St German, *The Dialogues in Englysshe, bytwene a Doctour of Dyuynyte [and] a Stude[n]t in the Lawes of Engla[n]de, Newly Corrected and Imprinted with Newe Addycyons* (London, 1543).
[250] Ibid., pp. 405-08. Evaldus Gallus, *Pueriles Confabulatiunculae* (Weert, 1548).
[251] Ibid., pp.411-13.
[252] Thomas Elyot, *The Dictionary of Sir T.Eliot, Knight* (London, 1538); J. Vives, *Exercitatio Linguae Latinae Jo. Lud. Vivis* (Lyon, 1543); Ambrose Calepin, *Onomasticon Latinogrecum* (Strassburg, 1537); Desiderius Erasmus, *D.Erasmi de Duplici Copia Rerum ac Verborum Commentarii duo* (Basileae, 1542); Desiderius Erasmus, *Adagiorum Epitome Post Novissimam D. Erasmi Roterdami Exquisitam recognitionem/ per Eberhardum Tappium, ad Numerum Adagiorum Magni Operis nunc Primum Aucta* (Antverpiae, 1553); Christopher Tye, *The Actes of the Apostles, Translated into Englyshe Metre ... by Christofer Tye ... wyth Notes to Eche Chapter, to Synge and also to Play vpon the Lute* (London, 1553); Mathurin Cordier, *M. Corderii de Corrupti Sermonis Emendatione, & Latine Loquendi Ratione Liber Unus, ...* (Lugduni, 1547); Lorenzo Valla, *Laurentii Vallae de Latinae Linguae Elegantia* (Parisiis, 1541); Terence, *Floures for Latine Spekyng Selected and Gathered out of Terence, and the Same Translated in to Englyshe ... by Nicolas Udall* (London, 1538); Richard Sherry, *A Treatise of the Figures of Grammer and Rhetorike* (London, 1555).

that of his famous older brother and sister, Sir Philip Sidney and Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, is difficult to study. Any correspondence between the children's parents and between the tutors and the parents has not survived. So, we can operate only with evidence provided by the household accounts, and a few scarce references by contemporaries. This evidence gives only some very general impression of about the education of the Sidney children in their early childhood.

All the Sidney children lived during their early childhood under the care of Mr and Mrs. Robert Mantel.[253] Most probably Mrs Mantel was some kind of nurse to the Sidney children. Philip Sidney stayed with Mrs Mantel in 1561; Mary and Robert lived in Ludlow Castle under Mr and Mrs Mantel's supervision from 1571 till 1574 while their parents were away. In 1561, £12 was paid for Philip Sidney's board, while Mary and Robert's expenses between 1571 and 1574 amounted to £43 10s. 2s. There were no books mentioned in the account for 1571, though bows and arrows were bought for the children. At this time Mary was about ten years old, Robert was two years younger. The next year Mantel paid for two books of prayers for Robert and for lute strings for Mary Sidney. So, it can be assumed that at the age of nine the boy was able to read. This probably was true of Philip Sidney as well. Both boys started their formal schooling in the age of ten. We have already mentioned that, in reality, at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, some of the noble boys attended grammar schools for some period of time. The Sidney boys were among those who went to school.

Owing to Sir Henry Sidney's appointment as Lord President of the Council in the Welsh Marches, Philip Sidney attended school far from his native Kent. Sir Henry's jurisdiction included Shrewsbury. He sent Philip to the grammar school of this town on

---

[253] Sidney MSS, A5/1; A56/1-3, A59/1.

October 17th, 1564. We do not know the curriculum of the Shrewsbury school, however Helen Jewell has recently described the curriculum of the Free Grammar School at Leicester in 1571.[254] It is safe to assume that this curriculum was similar to those of other grammar schools in England.

Leicester Grammar School curriculum included Calvin's or Nowell's Catechism in English, English reading and parts of speech, and writing, for the first form; English concords and elementary Latin for the second; more Latin, including a Latin Catechism and Cato or Aesop for the third form; more Catechism and Latin with Castellion's Latin dialogues or Cicero's epistles for the fourth; Cicero, Erasmus, Terence, Ovid or Horace, and the introduction of Greek for the fifth and sixth forms. In their seventh year pupils studied mainly Cicero and either the Greek New Testament or Calvin's Catechism in Greek. It is evident that the curriculum followed the humanists' recommendations on the authors to be read so the pupils would acquire a proper education in virtue. Those educated in grammar schools would likely know Latin, and some Greek, and would be acquainted with the major works of Roman classical authors, especially Cicero. Their religious development was also well looked after. The majority of the entrants to the grammar schools in the sixteenth century were boys who had already learned to read.[255]

We know nothing about Philip Sidney's studies before he began at the grammar school, though his zeal for knowledge was evident. Thomas Moffet who later lived in the household of Mary Sidney, the Countess of Pembroke, left some information which he probably received from the lady of the household: 'He [Philip] so held letters in his affection and care that he could scarce ever sleep, still less go forth, without a book. Nor did he direct his eyes so much to the colored and gilded cover of the book as to the let-

---

[254] H.M.Jewell, *Education in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1998), p.27.
[255] Ibid., p.17.

ters and meaning of it'.[256]

The headmaster of Shrewsbury school was Thomas Asham, a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Under his leadership the school gained a high reputation. Philip spent three years there. From February till November he was supposed to be at school from 6 am till 4:30 p.m.; during the three other months from 7 am. till 5:30 p.m. The education was almost entirely in Latin, and it combined humanist and Puritan elements: in the account of expenses on behalf of Philip Sidney, kept by Thomas Marshall from December 1565 till September 1566 we can find 'a Virgile' and a 'Cato' near 'Calvines chatachisme'.[257] As we have seen these books were prescribed for the students of Leicester Grammar school, probably other elements of its curriculum was similar to those of Shrewsbury. The only evidence about the knowledge actually acquired by Philip in the Shrewsbury school is Moffet's. He praised Philip's ability in mathematics, as well as his knowledge of Latin, French and some Greek.[258] So, we can see that when the boy left grammar school at fourteen years he begun to acquire the linguistic proficiency and some knowledge of mathematics expected by humanist authorities.

The only letter preserved from Philip's school days is from his father, with a postscript from Lady Sidney, written in 1566. The letter mentioned two letters written by the boy to his father: one in Latin and another in French. Sir Henry made it clear that his letter was the first which had ever been written by him to his son.[259] The father wanted his son to be a religious man. However, the next passage is rather unusual in a letter to a schoolboy. Philip was ordered to study only for the hours assigned to him by his master, and not to exceed them. This may suggest that young Philip Sidney was certainly very keen on learning, and this corresponds with the evidence from Moffet. The boy was or-

---

[256] Th.Moffet, *Nobilis, or a View of the Life and Death of a Sidney*. Eds. V.B.Heltzel and H.H.Hudson (San Marino, 1940), pp.71-72
[257] Sidney MSS, AU 1704
[258] Moffet, op.cit., p.75.
[259] Quoted by M.Wallace, *Sir Philip Sidney* (Cambridge, 1915), pp.68-69

dered to be humble and obedient to his masters, courteous and affable to all men. Sir Henry recommended moderation in diet. However he wanted the boy to be happy. Philip was instructed in the usefulness of acquiring the habit of doing good, and being truthful and cautious in speech. In her postscript Lady Sidney asked the son 'to have always before the eyes of your mind these excellent counsels of my lord, your dear father, ... and once in four or five days to read them over'. This letter shows that the religious and moral qualities of a child was considered as important as his intellectual development. Knowing that Philip Sidney was a keen scholar, we might expect that a considerable part of the money spent by Thomas Marshall on Philip's behalf would be connected with it. However only 2.34% (12s. 4d.) of the total expenditure accounted for was spent on the boy's education, buying books, paper, ink, and other necessaries. All other money was spent on his apparel and board.

Robert Sidney attended school, as well. The household accounts include the entries like: 'paper book to write in Latin at School', 'to Usher that taught Mr. R. to write', 'for pen and ink horn', 'for a sachell for his books', 'Latin book for him', 'for a table for him to write in school', 'to his master for 3 books'.[260] Thus Robert had started his schooling and certainly studied Latin. So, it is safe to assume that he also mastered the grammar school curriculum. He had his own master, though we do not know his name. Maybe it was the same Mr. Bust who appeared in the later accounts. Mary Sidney was not left without education either. The expenses for lute strings for her continued, and in the account for 1572 - 1573 a sum of £10 was paid for her teacher of Italian.[261] These accounts would suggest, though, that the education of girls was of considerably less concern than that of boys.

The Sidney brothers were not the only noble boys who attended grammar

---

[260] Sidney MSS, A56/2, A56/3.
[261] Ibid., A4/4.

schools. Henry Percy, the younger son of the 9th Earl of Northumberland was sent to a school kept by a man called Willis at Isleworth.[262] Robert Devereux, 3rd Earl of Essex, spent about six years at Eton from 1598 to 1604.[263] According to Cockayne, William Cecil, Viscount Cranborne, was educated initially at Westminster School, and then in 1600 at Sherborne School.[264] In March 1600 Sir Walter Raleigh wrote Sir Robert Cecil from his estate near Sherborne, that the latter's son 'is also better kept to his book than anywhere else'.[265] Later in the year, this learned father received a letter in Latin from his son. So, at nine years he knew at least enough Latin to write several lines in the language. However, nothing is known about the level of knowledge which Essex and Cranborne received before entering University.

However it seems the aristocracy continued to give an initial education to their children mainly at home. Sir Robert Sidney's desire to send his son to the household of Sir Charles Morison for his initial education shows that the tradition of sending children to another household was still alive in the end of the sixteenth century. The household of William Cecil, Lord Burghley attracted a considerable number of young boys. It served as a kind of school for many young fatherless noblemen under the age of 21, who lived in Burghley's house for different periods of time.[266] In 1563 the 3rd Earl of Rutland lived here. In 1576 the 2nd Earl of Essex at the age of nine also spent several months in this household. (Before the death of his father, Essex had a schoolmaster, Robert Wright, a French tutor, Piliard; and another tutor, Edward Wrightington.[267]) The curriculum, which

---

[262] E.B.De Fonblanque, *Annals of the House of Percy*, II (London, 1887), p.368.
[263] *The Eton College Register 1441-1698*, ed. Sir W.Sterry (Eton, 1943), p.102.
[264] G.E.Cockayne, *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom*, XI (London, 1926), pp.404-405. The histories of Westminster school make no mention of William Cecil as its pupil (J.D.Carleton, *Westminster School: A History* (Hart-Davis, 1965); L.E.Tanner, *Westminster School* (1951)).
[265] HMC *Salisbury*, X, p.84.
[266] Burghley was the Master of the Court of Wards. So, he was in a position to exercise considerable influence on the upbringing of young aristocrats.
[267] BL, Lansd. MSS. 25, f.45. It is worth commenting that these accounts were published in W.B.Devereux, *The Lives and Letters of Devereux, the Earls of Essex*, II, (London, 1855), as appendixes, however with some important omissions, changes and misplacements.

Burghley created for one of these wards, Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford is well known, so it is worth quoting:[268]

A.M.	7-7.30	Dancing	P.M.	1-2	Cosmography
	7.30-8	Breakfast		2-3	Latin
	8-9	French		3-4	French
	9-10	Latin		4-4.30	Writing
	10-10.30	Writing and Drawing		4.30	Prayers and Supper
	10.30	Prayers and Dinner			

On holidays a boy had to read extra prayers. For the rest of the holiday he was permitted to ride, shoot, dance and so on. From the list Burghley made in 1578 of advisable reading for John Harrington, which included Cicero, Livy, Caesar, Aristotle, and Plato, we can gain some idea of what kind of books were used in the education of Burghley's charges.[269] It seems that Greek was excluded from Burghley's curriculum. But the humanist requirements for a proper curriculum were largely followed, though it looks as if boys were engaged in physical exercise only on holidays. It is perhaps likely that they played games during the daybreak, after dinner, and after the supper, at the end of the day. The physical training of those young noblemen who lived in the care of their parents was better catered for, as they generally received fencing lessons in addition to dancing lessons.

The Manners family (Earls of Rutland) showed marked care for educating well all its male members. The 2nd Earl of Rutland paid for the education of his youngest brother Oliver, who was only six years older then the Earl's own eldest son. We know that by the age of ten Oliver had certainly started his formal studies. Later, when he was 15, he was taken by his brother to France.[270] Edward, the future 3rd Earl, and his younger brother John, the future 4th Earl, started their schooling at nine and seven years re-

---

[268] Quoted by Stone, *Crisis*, p.680.
[269] J.Harrington, *Nugae Antiquae*, ed. H.Harington (1779), II, (Hildesheim, 1968), pp.282-286.
[270] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.373, 375, 382.

spectively. The household accounts tell us that Edward, styled Lord Roos, already had his schoolmaster, Mr. Thorpe, who in March 1558 left his young charge for Cambridge.[271] However the heir was not left without a tutor. Among the people who received rewards in May of the same year we can find 'Mr. Conyers, my Lorde Roos scolemaster'. He received a rather large reward of £3 3s. 4d.[272] It was not enough for the proper education of the heir that he had a teacher. Lord Roos and his brother together had their lessons with 'the master of fence', and a man called Frythe taught the children to dance. It is worth mentioning that he was separately paid for teaching the heir and the other two children.[273] Unlike the tutor, these specialists were probably not the members of the Earl's household. Unfortunately we cannot say a lot about Lord Roos's school years during his father's lifetime. The published household accounts jump suddenly from 1558 to 1585, so we are left with information only for a year. In this year the education and upbringing of all of the three children cost about £20, 85% of which was spent on the eldest son.[274] After the death of the 2nd Earl of Rutland in 1563 their further education became the concern of Burghley, though actually only the young Earl's education was under his supervision. The *trivium* was probably covered during these early stages of the 3rd Earl of Rutland's education under his father's care.

Rutland's younger brother, John was sent to Cambridge in 1563. This suggests that he had sufficient knowledge of Latin in order to enter this institution. Thirty two years later his younger sons, three younger brothers of the 5th Earl were sufficiently educated to move in to Cambridge, after the death of their mother in 1595. On 9th of March 1594 Thomas Cooper's dictionary and 'two or thre more little bookes' were bought for boys. On 3rd May these books were supplemented by three psalm books.[275] At this time

---

[271] Ibid., p.380. He was given £1 to help him to move to the University.
[272] Ibid., IV, p.381.
[273] Ibid., p.382.
[274] Ibid., pp.380-387.
[275] Ibid., p.408. Th. Cooper, *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannieae* (London, 1565).

Francis Manners was sixteen; George Manners, fourteen; and Oliver, seven years old. However a separate copy of a psalms was bought for Oliver, which suggests that he was already able to read. As mentioned, Universities dealt with students who had already studied the *trivium* prior to entering the institution. Knowledge of basic Latin was the minimum requirement even from a noble student.[276]

Sir William Cavendish, son of Sir William Cavendish by his 3rd wife Elizabeth Hardwicke,[277] paid no less care to the education of his children than the members of the Sidney and Manners families did. It is not uncommon to find that we can know almost nothing in detail about the education of some families. Sir William had two children by his first wife, a son, William (born. 1590) and a daughter, Francis. Both of them constantly appear in the Cavendish household accounts.[278] From 1599 year onward sums were given and spent on the children and their education. So we know that from 1599 till 1605 Thomas Banes taught William and his sister to sing. For this work he received £4 annually. In 1604 Francis started to learn playing the viol. She continued her studies till 1606, and was given £2 yearly in order to pay for her studies. However it was not enough for a boy to study only singing. Young William had his own teacher. From 1603 till 1604 he was taught by Mr. Cales, later replaced by Mr. Bruyne. Both of the teachers had the same salary of £20. We know nothing about the actual education they provided, though probably it was humanist in nature. This education included singing, recommended by Ellyot. It seems on the basis of the available evidence that this was a rather untypical feature in the noble boy's education.

We find ourselves in a slightly better situation with data on the early education of Lord Algernon Percy, the heir to Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland.

---

[276] Scholars who write on history of English education (including Jewell, McConica, Curtis and Costello) consider *de facto* that all entrants to the Oxford and Cambridge knew Latin well enough.
[277] Elizabeth (Bess) of Hardwicke married forth time to the 6th Earl of Shrewsbury. In 1618 her son, William, was created Earl of Devonshire.
[278] Chatsworth MSS, 10a, 10b.

Northumberland wrote three pieces of advice for his son.[279] It is difficult to ascertain how closely he followed his own advice in the upbringing of Lord Algernon (b. 1602), his third son, but the eldest to survive infancy. When the boy was four years old his father was imprisoned in the Tower, being suspected of participation in the Gunpowder plot. Northumberland's system of accounting provides a historian with valuable information on the education of Lord Algernon.[280] The accounts of February 1608 - February 1609 informs us how much money was spent for Lord Percy to learn to write, dance, draw and fence and gives us the name of the teacher of writing, Mr Newsome, and of dancing, Mr. Jermyne, who taught Percy for 22 weeks and a month respectively. At this period Lord Percy was barely six years old, but his highly learned father began his formal schooling in accordance with humanist recommendations. The small boy had already four subjects to learn. Next year Lord Percy's studies were more concentrated on writing and dancing. In 1610 singing was added to the list of his occupations. Next year the nine-year-old boy learned to fence for nine months and two days. However physical and military training went along with intellectual studies. The following books were bought for Lord Algernon, 'a Grammar/ Erasmus Epitome/ Ovide Metamorphosis in English and Latin and a booke with Sabines notes, Ordelius Epitome, Stowe his chronicle'.[281] This choice of books clearly suggests the humanist orientation of the education; at the age of eight the boy either already knew some Latin or had just started to learn it.

---

[279] *Advice to His Son*, op. cit.; *Instructions by Henry Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland Touching the Management of His Estates, Officers, &c.*, ed. J.H. Markland (London, 1838); 'Instructions for the Lord Percy in His Travells; Given by Henry, Earl of Northumberland' op.cit.

[280] Each of the officers of the household who dealt with money had to lay out his account of expenses at the end of the year. Then all these accounts were compiled in one, general account, of annual receipts and expenses. In the general account we can usually find either a sum of total disbursements for the benefit of the children, or sums which were spent for the benefit of each of the children, with a few details. However the initial accounts sometimes provide us with valuable information on the nature of the disbursements.

[281] Desiderius Erasmus, *Epitome Colloquiorum Erasmi: Continens in se Communiores Quotidiani Sermonis Formulas* (London, 1602); Abraham Ortelius, *A. Ortelius His Epitome of the Theater of the Worlde* (London, 1603); John Stow, *The Abridgement of the English Chronicle* (London, 1611). It seems impossible to determine which *Grammar* was bought for Lord Percy. The identification of the exact edition of the Ovid's *Methamorphosis* is difficult, as well.

Percy's education shows that humanist advice on the simultaneous development of body and mind of a child was closely followed. Unlike his younger brother, Henry, Lord Algernon Percy did not attend any school.

It is difficult to decide whether there were any reasons why some noble boys attended public schools and others did not. Professor Stone simply mentions the fact that from 1560 onwards more noble pupils attended different types of schools, including private boarding schools and public grammar schools.[282] He states that later it became the fashion to send children to boarding schools. However it is difficult to find a reason for the initial turn from private tutor towards public schools among the aristocracy. Among the cases that we have studied, schools were attended only by the children of Sir Henry Sidney, Sir Robert Cecil, the eldest son and heir of the 2nd Earl of Essex, and the younger son of the 9th Earl of Northumberland. The first three were noblemen frequently occupied constantly on state business, the fourth one was imprisoned. It is possible that these parents preferred to send their children to approved schools in the hope that they would benefit from more constant supervision of their studies than at the parental home, from which their fathers were likely to be absent. Lady Barbara Sidney prevented her eldest son William from being sent to the house of Sir Charles Morison, as William's father (who was absent from England) had wanted. Probably Sir Robert was sure that in Sir Charles's house the boy would receive the necessary education under the strict supervision of the master of the household. Absent fathers, it seems, tried to provide their sons with an appropriate education by sending them to schools or to the houses of trusted friends.

For a brief time there was another place in which noble children could receive an education. This was the court of Henry Prince of Wales. The Prince's household was

---

[282] Stone, *Crisis*, p.688.

itself considered an Academy. Cleland advised the nobility to send their children to the 'Academy of our Noble Prince Henry: to learne the first elements to be a Privie Counsellor, a Generale of an Armie, to rule in place and top commande in warre'. He wrote that at the Prince's court could be found 'the most rare persons in Vertue and Learning'.[283] William Sidney, Robert Devereux, 3rd Earl of Essex, John Harrington, heir to the 1st Baron Harrington of Exton, and William Cecil, Viscount Cranborne, waited upon the Prince in different times and lived in his household.[284] It should be noted that while attending the Court and serving the Prince, William Sidney was accompanied by his tutor Mr. Bird. In October the Prince of Wales' household was partly discharged, probably because of Prince's move to the University.

2.1.3. At University or the Inns of Court.

We have seen that all noble boys were exposed to a humanist early education. However, the level of their achievements differed widely. This education enabled them to move to the third stage of their lives, study at University.

None of early English humanists considered Universities as appropriate places for noble youths. They recommended private study with tutors. However from the middle of the sixteenth century young noblemen started to attend Universities in large numbers. Curtis considered that the reason for this was that Oxford and Cambridge had become important centres of humanist learning.[285] The medieval Universities mainly concentrated on the study of logic and metaphysics, while grammar, rhetoric and the quadrivium were much less prominent. The arts course at Oxford and Cambridge in the Elizabethan period moved away from this pattern. According to Elizabethan regulations

---

[283] J. Cleland, *The Instruction of a Young Noble-Man* (London, 1612), p.35.
[284] HMC *De L'Isle*, III, p.128-129.
[285] Curtis, op.cit., p.71.

students had to be in residence at the University for four years, attend certain specified lectures and perform the prescribed exercises in order to obtain a B.A. degree. The lectures usually covered five or six of the seven liberal arts and three philosophies. Occasionally, Greek was included in the course. Required lectured were on grammar, rhetoric, dialectics or logic, arithmetic, and music.[286] Logic still retained its central position in the curriculum, but the period for its study was considerably shortened. Oxford students had to study Linacre's *Rudiments*, Virgil, Horace, or Cicero's *Epistles* for grammar; Aristotle's *Rhetoric* or Cicero's *Praeceptiones* or *Orations* for rhetoric; Porphyry's *Institutions* or Aristotle's *Dialectics* for logic; Boethius or Gemma Frisius for arithmetic and music. Cambridge students studied the works of Quintilian, Hermogenes or Cicero's *Orations* for rhetoric; Aristotle's Dialectic and Cicero's Topics for logic, and Aristotle, Pliny, or Plato for training in philosophy.

In practice the changes were not so marked as statutes prescribed. The most evident reform of the curriculum was the increased place for the study of grammar and rhetoric.[287] Fletcher, in his analysis of the arts' programme in Oxford, emphasises that the changes to the curriculum were not particularly marked, but noted that the Cambridge programme was more humanist than that of Oxford.[288] Curtis paid considerable attention to the role of tutors in the education of University students, including noble students. The scholars had to obey their tutors as they would their parents. The tutors were responsible for all payments due to the colleges from the students, as they had to 'teach their pupils diligently' and not to 'allow them to wander idly in the town'.[289] At the end of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century it was still common for noble students not to take a degree if they were not going to take holy orders.[290]

---

[286] Ibid., p.86.
[287] Ibid., pp.96-96.
[288] *The History of the University of Oxford*, v.III, ed. J.McConica (Oxford, 1986), p.173.
[289] Curtis, op.cit., pp.78-79.
[290] Stone, *Crisis*, p.792.

Noble families tended to have a favourite University: the Sidneys attended Oxford, the Cecils, the Percys, the Devereux and the Manners, Cambridge. This choice is obvious in the case of the Sidneys - their relative, the Earl of Leicester, was the Chancellor of Oxford. Burghley was the Chancellor of Cambridge, so it is not surprising that his children and wards studied in Cambridge. However even those members of the Manners family who were not Burghley's wards preferred to follow family tradition.

We shall begin our survey of University education with those noblemen who were educated at Oxford. All members of the Sidney family spent some period of time in Oxford. In February 1568 Philip Sidney was sent to Christ Church. Sidney's tutors at Oxford were considerable scholars, Thomas Thornton, future Vice-Chancellor of the University, and Thomas Cooper, Dean of Christ Church, who was an eminent lexicographer. According to Moffet, Philip Sidney became interested while at Oxford in 'chemistry, that starry science, rival to nature'.[291] Certainly, Philip studied grammar, rhetoric and logic. However from a letter to Hubert Languet it is known that Philip was highly interested in Aristotle and was eager to study as much Greek 'as shall suffice for the perfect understanding of Aristotle'.[292] During his studies Philip participated in the disputes which were a part of University study. Moreover, he was considered 'matchless' in this activity.[293] There is no official record of Philip Sidney's matriculation, nor an exact date for his leaving Oxford.[294]

---

[291] Moffet, op.cit., p.75.

[292] *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney and Hubert Languet*, ed. S.A.Pears (London, 1845), p.208.

[293] Richard Carew, *Survey of Cornwall* (London, 1602), f.102v.

[294] Some scholars suggest that in 1571 he migrated to Cambridge for a term or two. Professor Osborn suggests that in 1571 Sidney left Oxford as a result of illness. J.M.Osborn, *Young Philip Sidney 1572-1577* (London, 1972), pp.23-24. According to this opinion, illness prevented him from continuing his studies. As evidence Professor Osborn uses the entry in Sir Henry Sidney's household account for the year beginning May 31, 1571, compiled by general-receiver William Blount. Blount entered 'expenses of Mr. Philip Sydney, being sick at Reading, and other £38 11s. 6d.' (Sidney MSS, A4/3). Clearly Professor Osborn is correct that this entry proves that Philip was sick at Reading and required a large sum of money. However Osborn makes too much of this. He interprets the sum of £60, which he found in the account as being given to Philip this year as a proof of the seriousness of the malady. Professor Osborn failed to mention that the £60 was entered by Blount under the heading of 'annuities'. Moreover, the previous account of Blount for the period from March 1, 1570 till May 31, 1571 contains the same sum of £60, where it is entered as three-quarters of Mr Philip Sidney's annuity

Robert Sidney was sent to Oxford in the summer of 1575. Household accounts inform us that he was accompanied by 'his reader', Mr Bust, and Griffin Whitfield.[295] The latter was Robert's fellow-student. They matriculated together.[296] The Sidney accounts included the payment of 5s. to a teacher of writing, and of 6s. 8d. to a teacher of singing, thus the University scholarly curriculum was complemented by education in these socially important arts. By February 1579 Robert Sidney had already left England for a Continental Tour. Most probably, then, he stayed three years at the University. It is interesting that out of the total sum spent during Robert Sidney's stay in Oxford, 64% of the expenses were spent on items directly connected with education: payments to teachers, books, ink, and paper. There are no details in the accounts of what he studied. However, Philip Sidney's two letters of instruction to his younger brother going abroad suggest that by this time Robert knew Latin and read some Roman authors.[297] The letters suggest that he had studied Aristotle's *Ethics*, Homer, some classical Greek historians and contemporary histories and chronicles. Study of the latter was supposed to be continued abroad.

Sir Robert Sidney's eldest son came to University somewhere at the end of 1604, when Sidney wrote to his wife that 'Wil shall goe to Oxforde, as soon as I can provide for him'.[298] In 1607 he continued to study at the University, where he was now accompanied by his younger, twelve-year-old brother Robert. We know nothing about the quality of the boys' education in Oxford. In 1608 William Sidney left Oxford and was preparing

---

(Sidney MSS, A4/2).

[295] Sidney MSS., A7, A5/7.

[296] It is interesting that at the same period, in 1577, the 2nd Earl of Essex was accompanied to Cambridge by Gabriel Montgomery, who also studied together with the Earl and was 'to be maintained as a gentleman' (Devereux, I, p.168.). Probably this became a tradition.

[297] *Correspondence*, pp.195-202.

[298] HMC *De L'Isle*, III, p.138.

to go to France, while Robert Sidney stayed in Oxford at least until 1610.[299]

The 3rd Earl of Essex began his University studies at Oxford in 1604. His father had been educated in Cambridge, so it seems that the young Earl broke with tradition by entering Oxford and not Cambridge. However, after Leicester's death, Essex had been a candidate for the post of Chancellor of Oxford. In spite of the University's desire to see him as Leicester's successor, the Queen insisted on the candidature of Lord Buckhurst. It seems that Essex continued to have some influence inside Oxford.[300] Thus, whatever University was chosen for the 3rd Earl, his father had close connection with both of them. Essex lived at the Warden's lodging in Merton College under the care of Sir Henry Savile, a man of severe morals, and strict religious principles, but also a distinguished classical scholar and humanist. Savile, for the sake of the late Earl's memory, was eager to give his son a good religious education.[301] After James I's accession, Essex was restored in blood and honours. He was about two years older than Henry, Prince of Wales, and the King promised the dowager Countess Essex that her son would be educated together with the Prince. Essex was therefore among a number of young noblemen who waited upon the Prince. It is known that Henry and Essex were very close in these years. They graduated simultaneously in August 1605: the Prince at Magdalene College and Essex at Merton College (Oxford). Essex occupied his time at Oxford with 'riding great horse, running at the ring, and the exercise of arms. His other hours were occupied in the perusal of books that afforded most profit not most delight'.[302]

The students who went to Cambridge included, as we have seen, the 2nd Earl of

---

[299] Ibid., p.464. This letter bears no year. The HMC report suggests 1606, but it seems more logical to assume that this letter was written later, either in 1607, or even 1608. The letters dated 20 and 22 October 1607 clearly suggested that both William and Robert Sidney were supposed to be in Oxford. It seems impossible that on 7th of October 1607 Sir Robert considered sending William to France, and on the 20th already expected him to depart for Oxford. So, it seems that the most probable date of the letter is 7th October 1608. This date will be used in the current work. HMC *De L'Isle*, IV, p.229.

[300] *The History of the University of Oxford*, v.III, ed.J.McConica (Oxford, 1986), pp.433, 436-437.

[301] Devereux, op.cit., II, p.220.

[302] Ibid., p.223.

Essex, who was sent to Trinity College, in early May 1577. From the letter about the young Earl written by Edward Waterhouse to Lord Burghley, after the death of the 1st Earl of Essex, it is known that 'he can express his mind in Latin & French as well as in Englishe'.[303] At University, he was accompanied by his tutor, Mr. Robert Wright, who made constant reports about the young Earl's scholarly achievements to Burghley.[304] The sums spent by the Earl's tutor are usually about 40% of the total sum of his annual expenses. Included in this 40% was the cost of Essex's diet in Cambridge. However, items, directly connected with education constantly featured in the accounts and took up approximately 7% of the tutor's bill.

The accounts give us a list of books which were bought for the young Earl's studies in Cambridge in 1577: 'Ramus' logic with a commentary, Ramus on Tully's orations, Sturmius de elocutione, Questiones Bezae theologicae, Grimalius de optimo senatore, Isocrates in Greek, the Chronicles of Holinshed, the boks of Johan Boden de politica, books of the funeral sermons of the Erles father'.[305] This list shows that Essex knew Latin and Greek, and read Latin and Greek authors. Books named in the 1581 account show that Essex continued to study the classics. The works of Cicero, four volumes of Plutarch, the complete works of Beza were bought for the Earl. In this account we can find a book of especial interest for us: Richard Mulcaster's manual on education,

---

[303] BL, Lansd. MS 23, f.190 recto.
[304] Devereux, I, pp.167-169; HMC *Salisbury*, XIII, p.156.
[305] BL, Lansd. MSS. 25, ff.50, 82. Some of these books most probably were: Petrus Ramus, *The Logike of the Moste Excellent Philosopher P. Ramus Martyr, Newly Translated, and in Diuers Places Corrected, After the Mynde of the Author* (London, 1574); Petrus Ramus, *Petri Rami Praelectiones in Ciceronis Orationes Octo Consulares* (Basileae, 1575); Théodore de Bèze, *Quaestionum et Responsionum Christianarum libellus. Pars altera Quaestionum et Responsionum Christianarum pars altera, quae est de Sacramentis* (London, 1577); Isocrates, *Isokratous pros Demonikon Logos Parainetikos = Isocratis Exhortatio ad Demonicum: Tou Autou Peri Basileias Logos pros Nikoklea. Ejusdem de Regno ad Nicoclem* (Paris, 1569); Raphael Holinshed, *The Firste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande* (London, 1577); Jean Bodin, *Les Six Livres de la Republique* (Paris, 1576); Joannes Sturmis, *In Partitiones Oratorias Ciceronis, Dialogi Quatuor, ab ipso Authore Emendati, & Aucti. Nunc Vero Capitibus Distincti, & Castigatiores Editi, Additis ... Adiunximus Praeterea, Propter Studiosos Eloquentiae, Eiusdem Authoris Libros Duos, de Amissa Dicendi Ratione, & quomodo ea Recuperanda sit* (Argentorati, [c.1576]); Nicholas Grimald, *Oratio ad pPontifices* (London, 1553).

Positions wherin those primitive circumstances be examined necessarie for the training up of children, which was published in the same year, 1581.[306] Some of the books bought were standard textbooks, however the choice of Ramus, Sturm, Bodin and Beza suggests a humanist approach to classical studies. Curtis indicates that in the early 1570s official studies were normally supplemented with the reading of such contemporary political thinkers and logicians as Ramus, Sturm, Osorius, Beza and Bodin.[307]

Essex's education included the study of French as well. His first teacher of French, Piliard, was probably discharged when Essex went to Cambridge. However, the young Earl needed someone with whom he could practice his language skills, so in 1579 another Frenchman was hired for this purpose, while some other man was employed as a reader for the Earl.[308] Essex studied at Trinity College until November 1581. Cambridge helped to develop further Essex's taste for learning. He himself performed the prescribed public exercises in logic and ethics and took an MA degree in 1581.[309] As early as in September 1578 Essex in his letter to Burghley referred to Cambridge as 'Ithacam meam'.[310] He regularly sent letters in Latin to his chief guardian. Professor Hammer sees these letters as striking for their earnest tone and for the strong appreciation they show of the responsibilities attendant upon high rank. Essex was known as one of the best educated noblemen of his time. It is well-known that when on 23 July 1597 Elizabeth spontaneously responded with a Latin speech to the harsh words of the Polish ambassador, she was very proud of herself. The Queen later told Burghley that she 'was sorry' Essex 'had not heard his and her Latin' to appreciate the elegant style of her unprepared speech[311]

---

[306] Devereux MS5, ff.53, 54b.
[307] Curtis, op.cit., pp.118-19, 134, 162.
[308] Devereux MS5, ff.47, 53b, 54b.
[309] P.E.J.Hammer, *Polarisation*, p.25.
[310] HMC *Salisbury*, II, p.206.
[311] PRO SP 12/264/57.

Another of Burghley's wards, the 5th Earl of Rutland had a very good University education as well. He was sent to Cambridge in November 1587 by his father, who died less than a year later. Unlike many other aristocratic children, Rutland spent a long time at the University, continuing to stay in Cambridge till February 20, 1595. It seems that Royal wards had a better chance of staying longer at University. However it certainly depended on the inclination of each particular boy. The 2nd Earl of Essex, the 3rd Earl of Southampton and the 5th Earl of Rutland proved themselves willing students, benefiting greatly from their studies in the University. So, Burghley preferred to keep them there, where they were well occupied, so long as they caused him no problems. In his letter to Rutland Burghley stressed that 'lerning will increase if it be cherished, and cannot be lost but by negligence, and besyde that, lerning will serve you in all ages, in all places and fortunes'.[312]

The Earl probably agreed with the opinion of his guardian. According to his tutor's letter, dated December 1590, the 'young Lord is very well set on work, cheerfully following what he takes in hand, and proves thereby the best of his time and companions'.[313] In autumn 1591 the Earl wrote to his mother: 'I do assure your Ladyship that the cariage of myselfe both towardes God and my booke, my comelinesse in diet and gesture, shall be such as your Ladyship shall hear and like well of''.[314] Rutland put first in a list of desired achievements, godliness and book learning, and it seems he invested much time in acquiring this book knowledge. In 1593 he was admitted to the Inner Temple. This most probably happened when he was at Court. After that the boy returned to Cambridge and continued his studies for another two years till his mother's death and his going abroad. Rutland's three younger brothers also attended Cambridge,

---

[312] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.274-275.
[313] Ibid., pp.284-5.
[314] Ibid., p.297

after the death of their mother in 1595.[315]

Another Cambridge student, William Cecil, Viscount Cranborne, was the only surviving son of Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury. His father and grandfather were highly educated and learned men, and it might be assumed that William would follow in the same vein. Such an assumption would be false. He studied at Cambridge from 1601 to 1607. Though in February 1605 he was admitted to Gray's Inn, it seems that Cranborne continued his study at Cambridge at least until December 15, 1607. Cranborne's long stay in Cambridge suggests that he was a good student and received an extensive education, befitting the son of such a learned father. This was not so. Two books of accounts, kept by Mr. John Spier, of Cranborne's household expenses between June 1605 and August 1607 show that only between 0.44% and 0.53% of total expenses were spent on any kind of education. On horses, dogs and hunting not less then 30% of total expenses was disbursed. Sometimes 30% of monthly expenses were spent only on horses.[316]

Cranborne's University education was a great concern to his father through all these years. His University tutor, Roger Morrell, had to write to Salisbury each fortnight, judging from the dates of his surviving letters, though in one of them Morrell mentioned Salisbury's desire that the tutor 'should write daily'.[317] Taking into consideration the fact that Cranborne himself was ordered to write to his father regularly, it seems that Salisbury received letters either from the tutor or from the pupil weekly. The very first of Morrell's letters, of September 29, 1602, pointed out the problem which would be a constant hindrance to Cranborne's education. The boy was 'too often sent for home or too long kept from hence [Cambridge]'. Morrell made it clear that if the boy's studies were so

---

[315] Francis Manners stayed in the University until 1597. In 1598 he went abroad at the age of twenty. George Manners stayed in Cambridge until 1598, then he accompanied his brother to Ireland. Oliver Manners left Cambridge in 1599 at the age of twelve and became a student at the Inner Temple. (HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.414-15)

[316] Hatfield MSS, Box G/2, Box G/4.

[317] HMC *Salisbury*, XII, p.440.

frequently interrupted, the tutor would not 'be able, considering his rawness, to do that good upon him that I heartily desire and you certainly expect'. Morrell laid down the methods which he was going to use in teaching his pupil: daily private instructions and participation in public lectures and disputations.[318] Thus, Morrel intended to follow the practice prescribed by the Elizabethan statutes. During all Cranborne's University years, Morrell constantly complained of his frequent and lengthy periods of absence from the University and of the boy's apparent lack of delight in learning.[319] From correspondence it is known that Cranborne began to learn 'the first book of Caesar's Commentaries', 'learned a whole oration of Tullie, besides all his ordinary exercises' and exercised 'himself in Seton's *Logic*, and some parts of Tully, with daily translations out of English into Latin'.[320] This set of achievements seems more suitable to an education in a grammar school than to a University, but, as McConica notes, 'the universities in Elizabethan England were prized by the gentry often as places of what we should regard as advanced schooling rather than university study'.[321]

Cranborne's most lengthy absence from the University was between the end of April 1603 and November 1604. He left University after James I's accession and returned to his tutor only after the discharge of Prince Henry's household, a member of which Cranborne had become. No doubt the boy learned something from his time in the household of Prince Henry, 'the true Pantheon of Great Britaine, where Vertue her selfe dwelleth by patterne, by practise, by encouragement, admonitions, and precepts...'.[322] Each time that he returned to Cambridge, Cranborne would assure his father of his 'going to my booke, which being the thing which Your Honour doth cheefest desire'. [323]

---

[318] Ibid., p.406.
[319] HMC *Salisbury*, XVI, pp.346, 358, 374; XVII, pp.81-82.
[320] Hatfield MSS, v.228, ff.1, 7a; v.190, f. 61; HMC *Salisbury*, XVII, pp.81-82.
[321] *The History of the University of Oxford*, III, p.695.
[322] Cleland, op.cit., p.35.
[323] Hatfield MSS, v.228, f.6.

Once, in July 1605, Morrell supported Cranborne's desire to visit some of his friends, taking into consideration the fact that in July there were no public lectures or other exercises.[324] On 31 July, 1605 Cranborne received an honarary MA. The nature of the degree did not escape Salisbury's attention. Salisbury wanted his son to be 'worthy of your degrees, given you'.[325] In spite of receiving the degree Cranborne, continued his studies at the University.

There is no lack of letters on Salisbury's part about the faults which he saw in his son's learning.[326] Salisbury mentioned that fifteen-year-old Cranborne 'cannot speak six words in Latin', 'in any part of storie [he is] ... not able to show memory of 4 lines'. Cranborne's logic was very poor as well; he did not study mathematics, languages or music. The only positive thing about Cranborne was his good handwriting. As a consolation Salisbury mentioned that if Morrell 'had not been a watch over him, it would have been much worse with him'.[327] Salisbury conveyed very directly to his son his disappointment in his progress and the faults which he found in him:

> I fynd ill Orthographie which agreeth not well with an Universitie, neyther will I lett passe the absurditie of your making the parenticise... To which I will add this one thing (worse then the rest) that your letters are without date from any place, or tyme, which makes me doubt whether you be at Roystone at some horse race or at Cambridge. Your name is not well written and therefore I have written it underneathe as I would have it. I have also sent you a peece of paper fowlded as

---

[324] HMC *Salisbury*, XVII, 314-315.
[325] Hatfield MSS, v.228, f.23.
[326] These letters rarely bear date. Sometimes it is difficult to accept the dating of the *HMC Report*, which attributed all these letters to 1607. In April 1606, Morrell wrote Salisbury a letter that was clearly the answer to some very precise and exact accusations. But what were the accusations? There is a draft of a letter to Roger Morrell, which contains very severe criticism of the results of Cranborne's long studies in Cambridge. Salisbury's criticisms perfectly match Morrell's excuses. Unfortunately this draft was not dated. It is reasonable to presume that it was written in 1606, and not in 1607. Some of these letters were summarised too briefly in the HMC Calendar.
[327] Hatfield MSS, v.228, f.14.

gentlemen used to write their letters, where yours are lyke those that come out of a grammar school.[328]

Morrell acknowledged Salisbury's criticism of him and wrote that till this period he had taught Cranborne Latin and logic. In both of these disciplines the boy had the knowledge necessary for 'true congruity in speech and orderly reasoning in disputation'. He expressed his desire to start the study of any 'story' writer that Salisbury might commend, or to teach Cranborne any language that Salisbury might choose.[329] So, Cranborne had problems with orthography, grammar, style and the appearance of his writings, but not with his handwriting.

Salisbury was clearly aware that his son's real passions were: horses and dogs. That is why he wrote to him: 'I plainly tell you, (especially for keeping running horses I will no more allow) ... And therefore take it from me that for a while, (till you appear to profit better in your learning) I will allow you to keep no hounds, only you may keep your horse to take the air; for it is not only imputed to me as a folly to suffer to you to live at such liberty as you do'. It seems that Salisbury's demands and advice were taken into account and Cranborne continued his studies in Cambridge with more diligence.[330] After Salisbury's reprimand, the purchase of four books appeared in the accounts: 'a book called Valerius Maximus', 'book to my Lo:', 'a book called Quintus Curtius', 'a book Blundevile'.[331] Now Salisbury was more satisfied with his son's letters, though he was not sure that they were written entirely by Cranborne. Salisbury clearly expressed

---

[328] HMC *Salisbury*, XIX, p.131; Hatfield MSS, v.228, f.19.
[329] HMC *Salisbury*, p.104.
[330] Ibid., XVIII, p.318; Hatfield MSS, v.228. ff.13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21.
[331] These books most probably were, Valerius Maximus, *Valerii Maximi Dictorum Factorumque Memorabilium Libri IX: Infinitis Mendis ex Veterum Exemplarium Fide Repurgati, atq[ue] in Meliorem Ordinem Restituti / per Stephanum Pighium... accedunt in fine eiusdem annotationes; et breves notae Iusti Lipsii* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1594); Quintus Curtius Rufus, *The Hisorie [sic] of Quintus Curtius, Conteining the Actes of the Great Alexander. Translated out of Latine into English, by Iohn Brende* (London, 1602); Thomas Blundeville, *M. Blundeuile His Exercises, Containing Eight Treatises, ... as well in Cosmographie, Astronomie, and Geographie, as Also in the Arte of Nauigation....* (London, 1606).

his views on learning shortly before Cranborne's departure abroad, in December 1608.[332] Salisbury called learning the riches, 'which you will sell for no gold when you have it'. He wanted his son to spend some time in learning and promised then to permit Cranborne to occupy himself with 'other exercises worthy of a gentleman towards which you shall want nothing'. It is hardly surprising that Cranborne did not follow the path of his grandfather and father, in pursuit of learning, power and wealth. He was of very limited ability

Lord Algernon Percy, was the son of another very learned father. He attended St. John's College (Cambridge), like Cranborne, though ten years later. He spent approximately two years in Cambridge, accompanied by six servants. Unfortunately nothing is known about his achievements.

The table below summarises the University attendance of the nobility examined here.

[332] Hatfield MSS, v.228, f.23.

Table 2.1. Years of University Attendance and Degrees Obtained.

Name of the student	Period	Number of years	Degree
Edward Manners, 3rd Earl of Rutland			MA 1564
John Manners, 4th Earl of Rutland	1564-1566	2 years	
Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland[333]	21.11.1587 20.02.1595	7 years 3 months	MA 20.02.15-95
Francis Manners, 6th Earl of Rutland	1594-1597	3 years	cr. MA 1612
George Manners, 7th Earl of Rutland	1594-1598	4 years	cr. MA 1612
Oliver Manners	1594-1598	4 years	
William Cecil, Viscount Cranborne[334]	29.09.1602 13.12.1607	5 years 2.5 months	cr. MA July 1605
Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex	1579-1581	3 years	MA 1581
William Cavendish			cr. MA 1608
Philip Sidney	February 1568 after May 1571	3 years 2 months	
Robert Sidney	Summer 1575 December 1578	2,5 years	cr. MA 1588
William Sidney	End 1604 7.10.1608	4 years	
Robert Sidney	October 1607 1610	3 years	
Robert Devereux, 3rd Earl of Essex	1604		MA Aug. 1605
Algernon Percy	Easter 1615	2 years	MA 1616

The examples of Oxford and Cambridge students mentioned here show that they followed the University curriculum to very different degrees. They attended lectures, participated in disputations, and fulfilled the prescribed exercises. Their education was under the close control of tutors, and through studies with their tutors they complemented the university programme by reading the writings of contemporary humanists and intellectuals. If they were not especially opposed to learning, as Cranborne was, young noblemen would have left the University educated in accordance with the recommendations of humanists. The table shows that noble students were usually associated with a University for not less than two years, and on average that they spent three or four years at University. The 5th Earl of Rutland and Viscount Cranborne stayed an unusually long time in Cambridge, though it seems that this time was not particularly beneficial for the

---

[333] There is a relatively complete data about Rutland's whereabouts between 21 November 1587 and July 1593 four years one month of these five years, eight months and one week were spent in Cambridge.

[334] There is a relatively complete data about Cranborne's whereabouts. Between 29 September 1602 and 13 December 1607 (five years two months and two weeks) he spent two years one month and two weeks in Cambridge. However his attendance was not spread equally through the period. Between 29 September 1602 and 10 July 1605 he spent in University 7 months, while between 10 July and 13 Dec 1607 – 18,5 months.

latter. It is interesting that by the end of the century it became normal for noblemen to receive a degree. A minority fulfilled the prescribed exams; the majority was created MA on one or other occasion.

We are left with the Inns of Court to consider. In the household accounts and family papers used for this research there is not much material about the educational and economic details of studies at the Inns of Court. The only detailed material which we have is provided by the papers of the Manners and Percy families. It seems that the majority of the male members of the Manners family had spent some time at the Inns of Court as a part of their education. John Manners, future 4th Earl of Rutland, after time at Cambridge studied at Gray's Inn from 1566 to 1568. Three of his sons, Roger, Francis and Oliver, studied in the Inns as well: Roger and Francis attended Gray's Inn and Oliver, the Inner Temple. It has already been mentioned that all of them studied for several years in Cambridge.

From correspondence we gather that in 1586 another representative of the Manners family, George Manners, studied at the Inner Temple.[335] Roger Manners of Uffington informed his brother that 'your son George doth well and behaveth him self lyke an honest man'.[336] It seems that among George's problems was either bad handwriting or poor style. He was advised to 'lerne to write better'.

George himself decided to inform his father about his progress in study. He mentioned advice which he had received from his father when departing from Haddon to the 'newly entered world'.[337] Probably this advice consisted of many different points. In his letter the young man mentioned only the 'chefest' points: 'to applie my booke, to use good company and flie the contrary, to wright, and to give myselfe to honest and

---

[335] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.195-196, 198. He was the son of Sir John Manners of Haddon hall and a cousin of the 3rd and 4th Earls of Rutland. It happened that Earldom fell on his son John, after the death of his 2nd cousins, the 5th, 6th and 7th Earls of Rutland, without male heirs.
[336] Ibid., p.195.
[337] Ibid., pp.195-196.

lawfull exercise for my boodie'. George considered it necessary to report his successes on these points. It would be immodest if he praised his knowledge, so he preferred to 'hope yt shall be found when as occasion shall be ministered'. He assured his father that his company consisted of 'Barristers, those of 7 or 8 years standing'. He mentioned that the sons of Lord Buckhurst and Mr. Rose were among his company. He denied acquaintance with any bad company. Perhaps he had had a friend of whom his father did not approve, for he made a point of proving that he 'cleane abandoned him from mee'. His papers in his study room he considered good enough evidence of his diligence in writing. George did not forget physical exercise either: he claimed to 'use the dancing scole, tennise, runing, and leapinge and such like in the felds'. According to a postscript of his uncle Roger, in the next letter to his brother he 'now beginneth to studie'. His studies at the Inner Temple and with his tutor were considered as some type of trial. 'He hath bin at his owne lybertie; he hath caryed himselfe free from any vice, and willing to take advice and warnynge of his frendes'.[338] Only the question of George's learning was still not clear. His uncle hoped that 'in tyme he will proffite in study sufficiently'. It is very difficult to understand what George was supposed to study. Constant references to writing suggest that he had to study classic authors in order to improve his style of writing.

We know nothing about the details of the education of the brothers Allan and George Percy. They were sent together to the Middle Temple by their brother, the 9th Earl of Northumberland in 1596.[339] The boys were nineteen and sixteen years old, respectively. Neither of the brothers was yet entitled to an annuity, as their four elder brothers were, so they went to study.

If we try to supplement our material with the conclusions of Professor Prest we get a good general idea of the type of learning which noble boys could obtain in the Inns

---

[338] Ibid., p.198.
[339] BL, Northumberland MSS, microfilm 361.

of Court.[340] When and how students learnt was entirely their own responsibility. They had no supervision as in Oxford and Cambridge. The main subject in the Inns of Courts was the common law, which was considered a very difficult subject. In fact, only in this subject was any instruction provided. However if some students wanted to learn the 'courtly' *trivium* (fencing, dancing and music) they could study either in the specialist academies, or by hiring a private tutor. Some wealthy students could afford even to have a tutor, who could help them with their legal studies. As we have seen, that was the case with George Manners. Prest is sure that the students in the Inns had the opportunity to study the classics, and receive more or less the same amount of knowledge as in the Universities. During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries a stay at the Inns was part of the conventional gentlemanly education.[341] Elyot considered the study of English law a necessary part of a noble boys' education.[342] However Elyot considered that this study should begin only after boys had turned seventeen, because English law was a difficult and dull subject, and it was considered necessary to prepare boys' wits for it. Elyot, of course, had not recommended that students attend the Inns, just as he had not recommended them to go to University. It has been mentioned that the grammar schools of Elyot's days differed significantly from those of the later half of the century. Jewell rightly points out that change came to schools after a new generation of teachers had been produced by the Universities in the 1540s and 1550s.[343] For Elyot, a University continued to be a place for educating the clergy, and thus it was omitted in Elyot's ideal model of noble education. However when some aspects of the humanist curriculum reached the Universities, they became more appropriate places for aristocratic youths, as did the Inns. It was thought useful for a gentleman to acquire some knowledge of law,

---

[340] W.R.Prest, op.cit., pp.115-174.
[341] Ibid., p.23.
[342] T.Elyot, *The Boke Named The Governour* (1531), (London, 1907), pp.62-69.
[343] Jewell, op.cit., pp.81-82.

which could help him in his own future law cases or enable him to advise his neighbours in case of necessity. Gentlemen needed some knowledge of the law in order to serve better as justices of peace or sheriffs, as well.

2.1.4. The Grand Tour.

We now move to the final stage of noble education, the Grand Tour. All Grand Tours differed from one other with regard to length and route.

On May 25th, 1572, the Queen granted Sir Philip Sidney a licence to leave England for two years. Philip's uncle, Leicester, wrote a letter to his friend the ambassador in France, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sidney's future father-in-law. The young man became very popular at the French Court, and he enjoyed its vivacity. However this life was soon interrupted by the St. Bartholomew's eve massacre. After that, at the beginning of September, Sidney left for Germany. He visited Frankfurt, where he met Hubert Languet and became his intimate friend. Languet assumed the position of Sidney's mentor and advised him during his travels around Europe for the next two years. To the special relations between Languet and Sidney we owe the extensive correspondence which allows us to reconstruct Sidney's life and occupation during these years.

Philip Sidney visited Heidelberg, Strasbourg, Vienna, Venice, Padua, Florence, Genoa, Poland, and Prague. On the way back, he revisited Heidelberg, Strasbourg, Frankfurt, and then from Antwerp he left for England, which he reached at June 1575, having extended his leave for travel by a year. Sidney occupied his time abroad with constant study. On 19th December 1573 he wrote 'I am learning astronomy, and getting a notion of music'.[344] In his letters Languet gave Sidney recommendations about how to improve his style of writing by reading Cicero's letters. However, Languet did not ap-

---

[344] *Correspondence*, p.204

prove of his friend's enthusiasm in learning astronomy and geometry. He considered these sciences of less importance to a nobleman than proper Latin, though both of them were the part of a liberal arts course. Languet would have preferred Sidney to study Greek literature rather then waste time on geometry. By this time Sidney knew Latin, Italian, French and some Greek. In Vienna he learnt the art of horsemanship under John Peter Pugliano. About this man Sidney wrote in *The Defence of Poesie* that 'if I had not been a piece of a logician before I came to him, I think he would persuaded me to have wished myself a horse'.[345] As a result of these lessons Sidney was considered one of the best horsemen in England. During his Grand Tour Philip Sidney was also a student of Padua University, and studied there philosophy, rhetoric and some other disciplines. It could be said that at 21 when he returned to England he was well educated in the humanist fashion.

Sidney's travels found their way into his *Arcadia*.[346] One of the shepherds in Arcadia sang a song that he had learned a long time ago. Half of this song was dedicated to 'old' Languet and his careful guidance of his young pupil's mental development. Sir Philip himself said of his foreign travels, four years after his return, 'I know the only experience which I have gotten, is to find how much I might have learned, and how much indeed I have missed, for want of directing my course to the right end, and by the right means'.[347] Based on his own experience Philip Sidney wrote two letters of instruction to his younger brother when Robert went abroad. It is difficult to be sure about the knowledge and education which Robert received abroad. If he followed the advice of his brother he would have had to consider 'which are most notable in those places which you come unto'.[348]

---

[345] Sir Ph.Sidney, *The Defence of Poesie* (Cambridge, 1923), A2 (p.3).
[346] Sir Ph.Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (Penguin, 1977), p.705.
[347] *Correspondence*, p.195.
[348] Ibid., pp.195-202.

The majority of aristocratic travellers did not leave a significant amount of information about their travels. Only very few letters survived from the travels of members of the Manners family (the 3rd and the 5th Earls of Rutland, and Frances and Oliver Manners). These letters are barely enough to reconstruct the route of their Tour. Each of these four Tours included France and Italy. The 5th Earl of Rutland during his Tour visited the majority of places that Sidney had visited twenty three years before him. We know equally little about the 3rd Earl of Essex's Continental tour. Robert Devereux, the 3rd Earl of Essex left for his Continental Tour in the spring 1608. He started his travels in France, where he was well received by Henry IV, who always liked the late Earl of Essex. Most probably he visited Germany as well. A small number of letters remain from his absence of three or four years. These letters are mainly to the Prince of Wales and their common tutor. However it is difficult to find out where the Earl was and how he spent his time. Taking into consideration what we know about the Court of the Prince of Wales, it could be assumed that he spent these years productively, studying and observing foreign countries.[349] The same kind of assumptions has to be made about the travels of Lord Algernon Percy. He left for the Continent in 1619; being at the Hague in May 1619, three years later he was mentioned as being at Venice. In September 1624 he returned from France and greeted his father newly released from the Tower.[350]

Much more information has survived from Cranborne's Grand Tour. Two of his diaries are preserved in Hatfield house. The first diary covered the period from August to the end of October 1609, the second from September 1610 to the end of March 1611.[351] These diaries were subsequently sent to Salisbury as evidence of Cranborne's diligence and progress in his studies. We shall see shortly that Cranborne's Tour

---

[349] R.C.Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales, and England's Lost Renaissance* (London, 1986).
[350] PRO SP 14/109/17, 14/172/2, 99/17/442; BL, Add. MS 27962A, f.189v.
[351] HMC *Salisbury*, XXI, pp.104-113, 237-249.

resulted in his receiving sufficient education, something his father demanded of him. It seems that this final positive achievement was a product of the constant efforts of Salisbury, who closely oversaw his son's education and did not lessen his pressure until his heir obtained the knowledge required of him. We shall study Cranborne's Tour in detail because it shows the ways in which the Grand Tour could serve as an alternative to a University education for a nobleman.

Cranborne went abroad with a large retinue. According to Sir William Godolphin, Cranborne had 'some 30 gentlemen and servants in his train'.[352] The expenses of such an entourage had to be tremendous. In his *Instructions on Travel* the 9th Earl of Northumberland recommended his son to be moderate in his expenses and 'cast a syde the coat yow are borne unto for a tyme'.[353] It is interesting that Salisbury gave his son the opposite advice 'he is of a base mind that thinks money to serve for anything but for use'.[354] This sentence was meant to encourage Cranborne spending on his retinue and on entertaining the French nobility. Salisbury made many criticisms of his only son's scholarly failings, but Cranborne was never reprimanded for his expenses.[355]

Cranborne was accompanied on his travels by two tutor-guides, Mr. Fynett and Dr. Lister. Salisbury made it clear that either Mr Fynett or Dr. Lister had to be constantly with Cranborne. Salisbury considered it the common practice of English travellers abroad. He mentioned that when he himself was 24 years old and went abroad, he was accompanied by Mr. Richard Spencer, who 'never parted from me'. The same behaviour

---

[352] Ibid., p.146.
[353] 'Instructions on travel...', p.379.
[354] HMC *Salisbury*, XXI, p.157.
[355] This obvious difference between the attitude of Northumberland and Salisbury to the expenses of their children abroad demands explanation. Salisbury is almost the only aristocrat whom we have studied who gave such strange advice to his son, in effect encouraging him to be a spendthrift. Perhaps the Cecil family, being an upstart family, wanted to compensate for their lack of pedigree with the prodigality which they were ready to show towards their *entourage*. Members of the Percy and other old noble families certainly did not have such a burning need of display to justify their position.

was commended in Essex and his tutor Mr. Wingfield.[356] So, Cranborne was supposed to be under constant supervision. Cranborne's University years did not enrich him with a proper education, but the European Tour certainly compensated for this.

Cranborne spent the two winters of 1608-1609 and of 1609-1610 in Paris. He participated actively in Court amusements, but he studied as well.[357] He was learning a new style of handwriting, and took riding lessons with officers of the royal stables.[358] He assured Salisbury that he was in good health and followed profitably his studies. Salisbury was not particularly satisfied with all these assurances, so he sent Mr Fynett a set of instructions ordering that he and Lister (the tutors) took extra care of Cranborne and demanding a letter every ten days from his son. He wanted the young man 'to have regard to his exercises'.[359] In France Cranborne continued the studies that he had left unfinished in England. He made translations from the Latin, particularly Seneca, and Cicero's *Orations and Epistles*, and he exercised himself in French and in logic. Salisbury was satisfied with his son's successes, but he wanted him to speak while abroad, mostly French and not English. So, the father welcomed his son's intention to leave Paris, where too many Englishmen stayed, and to go to other parts of the country. In August 1609 Cranborne left Paris and started his tour around France. Before the tour he was advised by his father 'not to hasten his course'.[360]

The first of Cranborne's diaries received considerable attention from John Stoye in his *English Travellers Abroad*.[361] He sees this diary as 'probably the earliest surviving record of the tour - which, with few variations, became the route normally followed - written by an English traveller'. Cranborne dutifully put down all the cities that he vis-

---

[356] HMC *Salisbury*, XXI, p.157.
[357] Ibid., pp.19, 35.
[358] J.Stoye, *English Travellers Abroad 1604-1667: Their Influence in English Society and Politics* (New Haven, London, 1989), p.30.
[359] HMC *Salisbury*, XXI , p.33.
[360] Ibid., p.123.
[361] J.Stoye, op.cit., pp.27-30.

ited. He stayed two or three days in a few towns. He filled the pages of his journals with the names of one city after another, making a short note about each. He noticed chateaux and bridges, ports and fortifications, thus following the advice of the authors of advice letters. Cranborne named the places where he crossed the Loire, the Garonne, the Durance and the Rhône. Thus, Cranborne followed humanist advice to make geographical observations and to commit them to a diary.

Some things struck him as worth special comment: he admired the chateau Chambourg, liked the alleys and trees in the garden of the chateau at Blois, appreciated the grand stairway of Amboise, noticed new fortifications at Tours. At Saumur he visited the governor, the famous Protestant leader Duplessis-Mornay. However, the latter was in Poitou, but his lieutenant let Cranborne into the castle, where he took notice of a beautiful library, galleries and an armoury. The fine fortifications and artillery of the town were not missed either. Cranborne was pressed to spend ten days in La Rochelle, because he suffered a mild attack of smallpox. In Bordeaux Cranborne admired the ruins of Roman buildings, especially those of the palace of the Emperor Galien. On the way from Bordeaux the young traveller visited Cadillac, Langon, Agen, Moissac, and Montauban before he arrived to Toulouse. At Moissac Cranborne had a clear view of the distant Pyrénées. Sometimes he made political or religious comments about the cities that he saw: Montaubun was a strongly fortified Protestant town; Toulouse, on the other hand, was Catholic with a large number of relics of apostles and saints. Passing through Carcassone, Narbonne, Bezuers, and Pezenas, Cranborne put down the names of the governors of these cities and the number of the soldiers in the garrisons. In Montpellier he noticed the Medical School and Herbal gardens, and in Nimes another set of Roman ruins was highly appreciated. At Marseille Cranborne enjoyed the remarkable hospitality of the Duc de Guise. Cranborne summarized his travels between Toulouse and Marseille

in a letter to his father of October 13, 1609. He 'passed through Languedoc and Provence, countries much differing from the other parts of France, wherein [there are]... many fair towns and monuments of great antiquity'.[362] From Marseille he came to Lyon, where he found some letters from his father. Salisbury wanted his son to go to Geneva. As a dutiful son, Cranborne followed this direction until the autumn weather pressed him to return to Paris. This first tour covered 416 leagues, an estimate with which Cranborne ended his diary.[363]

The diary was immediately sent to England. Salisbury liked it. He decided to keep it with him and advised his son to buy another paper-book and start the second diary. Salisbury was so satisfied with his son that he offered to send him 'many fair dogs and some pretty strange parrots', so that he could present them to 'any ladies or others to whom you are beholding'. Salisbury promised his son that when he returned home he would 'lack nothing you can desire that is within my power'.[364] After the assassination of Henry IV on May 14, 1610 Cranborne, and many other Englishmen, decided to return to England immediately and wait.

On September 13, 1610 Cranborne resumed his travels, accompanied by the same Dr. Lister and Mr. Fynett. He went to Italy, as was planned before.[365] It took Cranborne about a month to pass to Italy, through the French cities which he had already visited. He passed several Savoy cities, Chambery, Susa, Turin, and Versel. Cranborne made notes about each of them. Versel was especially noticed as a well fortified border city of the Duke of Savoy. Ten miles further lay the first city of the Duke of Milan, Novara. From it Cranborne passed to Milan itself. A description of the Milanese fortress, its architectural beauties and features found their way into Cranborne's diary.[366] Nothing

---

[362] HMC *Salisbury*, XXI, p.138.
[363] Ibid., pp.104-113.
[364] Ibid., pp.156-57
[365] Ibid., p.215.
[366] Ibid., pp.237-241.

else was entered. However Venetian sources mentioned that one of Cranborne's company was arrested in Milan where the Viceroy appeared to treat Salisbury's son and heir with offensive neglect.[367] From Milan, passing Lodi, the last city under the Duke of Milan's jurisdiction, Cranborne started towards Venice. He greatly admired the Venetian fortresses Cremona, Orsynovy and Brescia, describing them in some detail and mentioning the number of soldiers guarding them. At Brescia, Cranborne was permitted inside one palace, where he admired the beautiful architecture and rare paintings. Then he moved on, passed Pescara, and showed his knowledge of ancient history by mentioning that near this city Roman consuls defeated the Cimbres. Five miles later Cranborne entered the 'beautiful and great city' of Verona. He admired its ancient Roman sites, like the Arena, the beautiful palaces of the citizens and nobility, and its marvellous churches, including the Cathedral of the Benedictine Fathers or the Church of Our Lady. The next city, Vicenza, impressed the young traveller much less, though he noticed many nice houses, the Academy, and the theatre built by the architect Palladius.[368] The next city *en route* was Padua, famous for its educational opportunities. Cranborne did not fail to admire and notice its most remarkable features and sites. He noticed the University and public schools; and mentioned beautiful houses, with roofs unsupported by pillars, and different churches with their coloured marble floors and walls. The monastery of the Benedictine Fathers was described in great detail, being the masterpiece of the same architect Palladius, much admired by Cranborne. In November Cranborne arrived in Venice, staying in the house of Sir Henry Wotton. He was warmly received there, and was introduced to the Doge and Senate. He liked the architectural beauties of the city, but considered its air not suitable for his health.

---

[367] J.Stoye, op.cit., p.85.
[368] HMC *Salisbury*, XXI, pp.241-242.

So, on November 29 he moved back to Padua, where he fell ill. During his illness Cranborne showed a strong desire to terminate his Italian travels and return home. Salisbury gave his a permission after much deliberation.[369] Cranborne began the return route by travelling through Germany, and then on to the Low Countries. In Insbrück Cranborne admired 28 bronze statues of the ancient Great princes, like Clovis, first Christian King of France; Godfrey de Buillon, King of Jerusalem; Louis XI of France and of some other Emperors of the Austrian Royal House. In Augsburg Cranborne greatly appreciated a number of Lutheran churches. From hence he moved towards Nuremberg passing through a number of small towns. The beauty of Nuremberg and its Lutheran faith were commended by the traveller, who was constantly on the move. Through another row of small cities Cranborne arrived in Frankfurt, which he did not like very much. Augsburg and Nuremberg he admired more. The strength of the Catholic faith was noted in Cologne. In Dusseldorf, Cranborne was well received by the brother of the Elector of Brandenburg. After passing through some other German cities, Cranborne entered the Low Countries at Utrecht, whose fortress was especially noticed. Amsterdam he described as the most commercial city in Europe, and mentioned a large number of the nations that traded with it. Leaving Amsterdam, Cranborne quickly passed through Harlem, Leiden, Delft, Rotterdam, Dorst, Middelburg, Vlissingen, and Anthwerpen. The commercial role and importance of Anthwerpen was noted in the diary. The last week of his journey was spent passing through cities which were garrisoned by Spanish soldiers, Brussels, Ghent, Bruges, Oostende, Nieuwpoort and Dunkerque.[370] At the beginning of April 1611, Cranborne reached Calais and safely returned to England.

---

[369] PRO SP 99/11/727, 99/12/88, 99/12/90, 99/12/113, 99/12/116, 99/12/122, 99/12/125, 99/12/164.
[370] HMC *Salisbury*, XXI, pp.242-249.

What we can say about the education that Cranborne received abroad? From his long studies in Cambridge, Cranborne had not learnt a lot. From abroad he returned with a good knowledge of French (he was even used by Henry IV as an interpreter). He certainly had now some knowledge of the Greek and Roman historians. He had studied Latin and logic, and taken lessons in horsemanship. He was even intending to visit some battlefields, until Henry IV's assassination interrupted his plans. Cranborne's diaries witness that he took to heart the advice to observe the political, religious, and commercial life of the countries he travelled through. His comments showed that he judged religious practices which he saw from the position of an unshakeable Protestant, the attitude characteristic of Prince Henry's circle. Cranborne lacked military experience, but this was not his fault. Circumstances prevented him from obtaining such experience, though he was able to experience something of foreign political and religious affairs. According to letters, Salisbury was mostly satisfied with his son's achievements in his studies. It seems that Cranborne learned abroad more than he ever did in England, not least because he was constantly attended by two tutors. In England, Morrell (his University tutor) was able to exercise his educational influence only occasionally. It could be said that Cranborne followed most of his grandfather's advice and fulfilled all the purposes expected of foreign travel, save obtaining military experience.

Now, that we have studied several cases, we can draw some conclusions about how closely educational ideals were followed. We have seen that the ideas of Elyot, Ascham and Humphrey about the content of noble education were by the late sixteenth century followed very closely, though the means by which this education was delivered differed from that envisaged earlier in the century. Boys received a humanist education, but they studied in the Universities. An additional innovation was the Grand Tour, which became almost obligatory for the nobility. Jewell dedicated only two and a half

pages of her book on early modern education to the Grand Tour.[371] She sees the Grand Tour more as a sign of status and wealth and way of pass pleasantly years while waiting for the inheritance than as a really useful educational tool. However on the Cranborne's example we have seen that foreign travel became an integral part of the educational process by the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, and should be understood primarily in an educational context.

2.2. The Cost of the Education and Upbringing of Noble Children.

2.2.1. Birth to Fourteen.

It seems that when small children lived in the nursery, their expenses were not significant. While Robert, Mary, Ambrosia and Thomas Sidney lived under care of Mr. and Mrs Mantel, the total expenses for all four of them from 1570 to 1575 did not exceed £100 (£17 per year), including the wages of people attending them.[372] From 1590 to 1595 the Dowager Countess of Rutland spent on her five younger children living with her the modest sum of £30 11s. 7d. (£5 per year), including £1 12s. on books.[373] The rest was spent on clothes. In five years between 1598 and 1602 Sir William Cavendish spent £77 13s. 11d. (£15 10s. 9d. per year) for the benefit of his son William and daughter Frances.[374] It is generally known that William Cavendish was educated by the celebrated Thomas Hobbes.[375] However Hobbes became William's tutor, or rather companion and friend, in 1608, when William Cavendish was already 18 years old. It seems that the words 'educated by' would be better changed to 'finished by'. William Cavendish, in fact, had a teacher who was paid £20 yearly. In general, between 23% and 41.5% (about £22 per year) of the total sum of expenses on William was spent for the benefit of his

---

[371] Jewell, op.cit., pp.123-126.
[372] Sidney MSS, A5/1; A56/1-3, A59/1.
[373] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.395-96, 400-01, 403, 407-08.
[374] Cavendish MSS, 10b.
[375] G.E.Cockayne, IV, p.340.

education each year. From the beginning of William's serious schooling (1603) he started to received an annuity of £20 from his father. His sister two years later (1605) began to receive £8 per year.[376]

We know very little about the expenses on his children's education incurred by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. However this case is very special one. Leicester paid for the education of his illegitimate son, Robert Dudley.[377] In Leicester's household accounts of October 1584 there are two entries related to the boy: his schoolmaster, Mr. Canellae, received £3 in reward for teaching Robert Dudley; the boy himself received 10s. in reward.[378] It is difficult to decide whether this sum was a gratuity or a necessary payment for the work. In November 1585 Mr. Canellae 'that teach the yonge Mr Dudley' received £5 as a reward for his services.[379] It is difficult to find out how much Mr. Canellae was paid per year, since Leicester's household accounts are fragmentary. Robert Dudley, who was ten years old in 1584, lived quietly at Whitney and then at Offingt-on during his father's lifetime. Leicester provided for him, but the cost of his maintenance was very small. He was not a legitimate heir to the title, and he was brought up in accordance with standards different than those applying to the legitimate offspring of the nobility. However it was considered necessary to give the boy an education and to provide him with a schoolmaster, or rather tutor. Some other entries suggest that Mr Canellae lived together with his charge and took care of all aspects of his life.[380]

In June 1560, when Leicester had no children of his own, he gave a reward of £3 14s. to the schoolmaster of Sir John York's children.[381] Leicester was not the only person

---

[376] Chatsworth MSS, 10a, 10b.
[377] (Sir) Robert Dudley (1574-1649), illegitimate son by Douglas Sheffield.
[378] *Leicester Accounts*, pp.188, 189.
[379] Ibid., p.329.
[380] Ibid., p.337.
[381] Ibid., p.158. Sir John York (d. 1569) was close to Northumberland and his family, he lent money to Dowager Duchess of Northumberland, Lord Ambrose Dudley and Leicester. It is worth mentioning that his children later served under Leicester in the Netherlands (*Leicester Accounts*, p.352).

who rewarded the teachers or tutors of other people's children. In 1610 the Earl of Huntingdon gave £1 10s. to 'Mr. Bewley to pay for his son's learning syferr'.[382] Very likely Mr Bewley had difficulty finding the money to pay for his son's studies. When Robert Sidney, whose parents Sir Henry and Lady Sidney undoubtedly occupied the higher social standing than Mr. Bewley, was taught to write, an usher of the school was paid £2.[383] This suggests that there was some difference even in the expenditure on very basic learning between the noble and the common child.

One year of Philip Sidney's maintenance when he lived apart from his parents, who were in Ireland, and attended grammar school cost £26 6s. 3d. This sum includes the cost of the apparel bought for Philip when he attended his uncle Leicester and participated in the entertainment of the Queen in Cambridge. When Robert Sidney went to school, between 7s. and 10s. were spent annually on his education.[384]

Thus, pre-University education was relatively inexpensive, especially if noblemen were ready to use public schools and not employ a private tutor and other teachers for his children.

2.2.2. University and the Inns of Court.

After boys began their studies in the Universities their expenses became more significant. Philip Sidney's expenses during his first University year amounted to £240 6s. 10d. and to £232 19s. 3d. in his second. When, in 1575, Robert Sidney began attending University, £236 3s. 8d. was disbursed for his benefit. The following year a sum of £268 was spent on him.[385] Lord Percy spent £237 12s. 6d. in 1615, in his first year at

---

[382] HMC *Hastings*, p.373
[383] Sidney MSS, A56/2.
[384] Sidney MSS, AU 1704; A5/1; A56/1-3, A59/1.
[385] Ibid., A7, A5/7.

Cambridge, and £190 6s 7d. in his second year.[386] Usually between 25% and 40% of total annual expenses for the benefit of Lord Algernon was disbursed on his education. Obviously some young noblemen like the 2nd Earl of Essex managed to spend even more. The Earl was allowed £140 from the Court of Wards and £70 of the fees of his hereditary offices. Even this sum was not enough for Essex. Only in his first year were Essex's expenses lower than his total allowance of £210, when they amounted to £197 12s. 8d. There were years when expenses were between about £240 and £272, and there were years when he spent between £339 and £380. However the really bad year was 1580-1581, when Essex spent £634 5s. 6d., three times more then he was permitted. This huge expense led his guardians to reconsider the proper educational path for the young Earl. He took his M.A. in July 1581, being then under fifteen. He was then moved to the house of his grandfather, Sir Francis Knollys, and then to the house of his cousin, the Earl of Huntingdon. These noblemen received £200 per year for the maintenance of their relative. This step did help to lessen the Earl's expenses. They continued to be more than the sum allowed to him, but they were mainly under £250.

The disbursement books of the Manners family, especially of Dowager Countess Elizabeth, give details of the educational expenses at Cambridge of the 5th earl of Rutland, and the cost of training Bridget, the Earl's sister, at Court. In 1588 Roger received £4 as a present from his mother, another £91 was sent to his tutor Dr. Jegon. Presents worth £10 9s 7d were made to the University. This year, the Earl's first, all was organized by the boy's father, the 4th Earl. The cost of the young man's journey to the University was £40. So, Rutland's first year at Cambridge cost his parents £145 9s. 7d. The same year, after their father's death, Bridget was sent to Court. During her first half year at Court she received £106 16s. 4d. from her widowed mother. The personal disburse-

---

[386] BL, microfilms 362-363 (Northumberland MSS U.I.3 (2-3)).

ment book of the Dowager Countess Elizabeth is full of entries for sums sent to Earl Roger and Lady Bridget.[387]

Table 2.2. Expenses on Education of Roger and Bridget Manners.

Year	Bridget			Roger		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1588	106	16	4	145	9	7
1589	289	3	10	181		
1590	80			367	4	4
1591	10			196	10	10
1592	245			358	11	4
1593	280			73		
Total	1001	0	2	1321	16	1

So, the education of the Earl at University until 1593 and his elder sister at Court cost their parents and himself about £2,322 16s. 3d. Probably another £300-£400 was spent for the Earl's last two years in the University, but the accounts are not accessible.

After the death of the Dowager Countess in 1595, Rutland had to provide an education for his younger brothers and sisters. In his mother's lifetime the younger children rarely appeared in the accounts separately. In 1599 the expenses for the five younger brothers' and sisters' education amounted to £578 6s. 5d.[388] He paid for the education of his motherless nephews: Rutland, William, and Robert Thyrwit.[389] In 1611 he paid £19 2s. 9d. for the board and teaching of Rutland Thyrwit, probably the eldest son.[390] During his life Earl Roger gave various sums to the teachers of his nephews. In his will he bequeathed a further £50 per year to each of his three nephews, stressing that

---

[387] The accounts exist only for the half of 1593.
[388] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.393-415. Apart from this, Earl Roger paid annuities to his brothers. Before 1610 the Earl's favourite brother, George, received £200 yearly, then it was raised to £240. The youngest brother, Oliver, had an annuity of £120 per year, raised to £160. In 1602 Earl Roger paid 18s for the marriage licence of his sister Francis. (HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.414-15, 431-32, 453, 442). Until his brothers turned 21 and sisters were married it was his responsibility to provide for them.
[389] They were children of the marriage of his sister Bridget and Robert Thyrwit. Mr Thyrwit was not a wealthy man, so the Earl of Rutland helped to provide for their nephews and a niece. The latter received from the 5th Earl £500 as a marriage portion.
[390] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.470.

he wanted them properly brought up and educated.[391] Neither his uncle, nor father, nor his younger brothers made such provisions in the interests of poorer relatives.[392]

It is uncertain how much the Earl of Salisbury paid for the University education of his son and heir. The period of Cranborne's stay at University between June 1605 and August 1607 cost the Lord Treasurer £1,368 7s. 8d.[393] Every penny spent on Cranborne's behalf was meticulously entered into the account. Of this sum, only £1 4s. was spent on books and £5 11s. on some cultural events.[394] For comparison, the 2nd Earl of Essex spent on books in 1579-1580, £1 16s. 10d. and in 1580-1581, £9 7s. 2d.[395]

Unfortunately we have very little data on the cost of educating gentry sons. The account book of Augustine Steward of Glastonbury place gives details of the allowance of his stepsons, Thomas Sisley and Thomas Campion, in Cambridge in 1583.[396] The total annual cost of their education was supposed to be £20 for two of them. The cost of tuition was £2 each, the cost of diet £6 10s each, the rent of their chamber was £1. The guardian of the boys meticulously entered every possible expense in his list, including washing, candles, paper, and the mending of clothes and shoes. 21.54% of the £20 was to be spent on their education (tuition fee, candles, paper). The guardian put down a list of clothes which each of the boys was to be sent during the year: 'a gowne, a cap, a hat, 2 doublets, 2 pairs of hose; 4 pairs of wheatherstock, 6 pairs of shoes, 2 shirts and 3 bands'. It is unknown whether their guardian managed to keep the expenses that low, but this estimate shows the bare minimum that could be spent on a child's education in Cambridge.

---

[391] PROB 11/120.
[392] PROB 11/71, 11/72, 11/122,
[393] Hatfield MSS, Box G/2, Box G/4.
[394] Ibid.
[395] Devereux MS5, ff.47b-48, 53-55.
[396] BL, Egerton, 2599, f.233v.

The cost of University education definitely varied with the social position of the student, being the lowest for children of the lesser nobility and the highest for children of the prominent nobility. The high cost of University study for the children of prominent aristocrats was mainly due to the cost of maintaining the necessary entourage of servants, with horses and other related expenditure.

Let us now see how much an education at the Inns of Court would cost parents. According to Professor Prest the accepted minimum cost of maintaining a student at the Inns was about £40 a year.[397] £80 was considered a very generous sum for a student. We have no data in the surviving correspondence about the cost of George Manners' stay at the Inner Temple. However we have some figures about the cost of admittance to Gray's Inn. In 1599 Oliver Manners began his studies there.[398] His brother paid £10 for his admittance to the Inn, another 10s. was paid to the butlers, and the treasurer received £5 for admittance for two years. The chamber for Oliver in the Inn cost Rutland £9. In all the cost of Oliver's admittance to Gray's Inn was £24 10s.[399] It can be assumed that Oliver had no financial difficulties while studying in the Inn. His yearly allowance was £120, three times more than the necessary minimum. However, later the Earl raised this sum to £160. Unfortunately our data for the cost of education at the University and the Inns is not comparable. It suggests that an education in the Inns was considerably cheaper for a noble gentleman than one at the Universities. Obviously there was a difference in the cost of living in London and in University cities, but we do not have the means of making the necessary adjustments.

The 9th Earl of Northumberland sent two of his brothers to the Inner Temple in 1596. This cost him £18 4s. 4d, including the apparel of the youngest brother, George.

---

[397] W.R.Prest, op.cit., p.27.
[398] He was the youngest brother of Roger Manners, the 5th Earl of Rutland, and the 2nd cousin to George Manners.
[399] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.432.

Probably this sum was an admission fee and not the actual cost of maintenance of two gentlemen in the Inn. In the same year another accountant mentioned payments of Mr. George Percy's debts totalling £72 6s. 9d.[400]

2.2.3. The Grand Tour.

We are left now with only the cost of the Grand Tour to consider. John Stoye arrived at the conclusion that the eldest son of a prominent nobleman, studying in Paris needed about £1,000 yearly. Some tutors considered that even this was not enough, and that £1,150 was the bare minimum for a young nobleman with a large retinue attending the Academy of horsemanship.[401] On the other hand, Sir Robert Dallington and John Cleland considered £125 and £200 per year respectively as necessary for a young nobleman travelling abroad.[402]

According to the household accounts of Sir Henry Sidney, during the period between May 1572 and May 1574 Mr. Philip Sidney, who was abroad, was given £716 3s. 2d.[403] In the account for children of 1574-1575 expenditure totalled £233 5s. 6d.[404] The household accounts of Sir Henry Sidney suggest that this year was the last one in which the overwhelming portion of money spent on children was spent on the eldest son. It might be guessed that about £150 of the total sum spent on children was spent on Philip Sidney. This makes the cost of his Continental trip about £870. That means that Philip Sidney spent about £290 per year on his travels. If we take into consideration the rate of inflation, £290 in 1572 is equal to about £388 in 1598, the year of publication of

---

[400] BL, Northumberland MSS, microfilm 361.
[401] J.Stoye, op.cit., pp.33, 34.
[402] R.Dallington, *A Method for Trauell*, p.ix; Cleland, p.254..
[403] Sidney MSS, A4/4, A4/5
[404] Ibid., A33/3.

Dallington's book.[405] This sum seems large in comparison with Dallington's recommended £125 and Cleland's £200; but Philip Sidney was accompanied by a tutor, a companion who studied together with him, and two servants. Before Philip's younger brother, Robert Sidney, began his Continental Tour he received in advance a stipend of £240 for two-and-a-half years. Another £28 was given to those who accompanied him. A letter of Philip Sidney to Robert is a very valuable source for evaluating the cost of foreign travel. Philip made it clear that Robert would receive £200 annually. Moreover, he informed Robert that their uncle Leicester sent him £40, which would be an annual payment as well. The letter suggests that an extra sum of £30 would be sent annually by Philip himself as a token of his brotherly love and affection. So, we arrive at a sum of £240-£270 per year. Like his elder brother, Robert had a travel companion, Harry Whyte, and probably Mr. Bust, his tutor, went with them as well. So we can say that the sum assigned to Robert was approximately the same that was spent by his elder brother. It seems that these sums of £250-£300 per year were rather moderate in comparison with Stoye's figures.

The travels of Oliver Manners cost his brother, the 5th Earl of Rutland, £231 10s. in 1610, very close to the sum suggested by Cleland. Single year of Francis Manners' Tour cost his brother the larger sum of £643 5s. 9d. The 5th Earl of Rutland himself received from his estates £1,037 14s. 10d. while he was in Europe between December 1596 and June 1597. The total cost of his two year Tour was probably about £2,500 - £3,000 (which is equal to about £3,000 - £3,500 in 1610). This sum sounds enormous, though we know that Rutland was accompanied by Robert Dallington and several other persons. However Lord Percy's travels in 1622 alone cost the Earl of Northumberland

---

[405] The inflation rate is calculated on the basis of the prices and wages rates in H.Phelps Brown, S.V.Hopkins, *A Perspective of Wages and Prices* (London; New York, 1981).

£1,538, besides his yearly allowance of £1,000.[406] But it seems that the champion among the noble spendthrifts in Europe was Cranborne, encouraged in this course by his father, who was very ready to pay handsomely for his heir's foreign travel. The total cost of Cranborne's two year Continental Tour was about £10,503 15s. 6., though this sum included the salaries of his two tutors, who were paid yearly £100 each. If Cranborne really was constantly accompanied by 30 people of various status, it is not that difficult to understand how he managed to spend such a sum.

It appears that there were two scales of expenses abroad, the members of the peerage and their heirs spent £1,000 - £5,000 per year, gentry and barons had to satisfy their children with more modest annual sums of £150 - £300. The only figure whose expenses fits neither of these patterns was Francis Manners (his Tour cost £643). He was Rutland's heir apparent, but seemed likely to loose this place to future children of the Earl.

2.2.4. salaries of Teacher.

Elyot considered that the barest minimum yearly salary of a tutor was between £8 and £16, Ascham's minimum salary for a teacher was £10. Ascham considered £200 an appropriate sum for two students and a teacher. £8-£16 in 1531 was equal to £14-£28 in 1570, and £29-£40 in 1600. It seems, in fact, that the usual salary paid was £20 per year. This sum was paid by Sir Robert Sidney to a tutor of his son in the beginning of the seventeenth century. Robert Wright, the tutor of the 2nd Earl of Essex, received the same sum in 1577, as did the tutors of William Cavendish in 1603-1608 and of Lord Percy in 1608-1610.[407] That means that teachers' salaries rose insignificantly from 1531,

---

[406] Quoted by *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.lv.
[407] HMC *De L'Isle*, II, p., pp.268-269; BL, Lansd. MSS. 25, ff.45, 50, 82; Cavendish MSS, 10b; BL, Northumberland MSS, microfilm 363.

and were certainly behind the rates of inflation by 1610. Teachers of languages could expect to be paid £10 per year, like Essex's Frenchman Piliard or Mary Sidney's teacher of Italian in the 1570s.[408] A teacher of dancing was universally paid £2 per month per pupil throughout our period. A teacher of fencing could receive between £1 and £2 per month.[409] Among Northumberland's accounts we can also find payments to a teacher of writing of 10s. per week, probably an occasional expense. In the accounts for the same year it is noted that Lord Percy's teachers received their salaries of £40.[410] These salaries were entered among the wages of the servants and officers. Probably all specialist teachers (teachers of writing, dancing, drawing, languages and fencing) were not members of noble households but were additionally employed._

2.2.4. The total cost of education and the upbringing of children.

It is difficult, for several reasons, to determine exactly the cost of children's education and upbringing. Firstly, it is very difficult to decide when to stop in our calculations. The question is relatively easy in the case of girls; before their marriage all money spent on them was for their education and maintenance. After this marriage the sums paid were, mainly, the marriage portion which was given to a husband. This marriage settlement can be understood as a last payment, similar in nature to lands given to younger sons in order that they could maintain themselves as gentlemen. We do not include either marriage portions or these land or money settlements for sons. However it seems that in spite of the fact that sons often had their own income they frequently received some allowance from their parents and eldest brothers. This allowance will be included in the cost of these education and maintenance._

---

[408] BL, Lansd. MSS. 25, ff.45, 50, 82; Sidney MSS, A4/4.
[409] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.380-82; Cavendish MSS, 10b; BL, Northumberland MSS, microfilm 363; HMC *Hastings*, p.368.
[410] BL, Northumberland MSS, microfilm 363

Secondly, lack of clarity in the accounts is a major problem in determining the total costs of education. For example, it is difficult to assess how much was spent during the 2nd Earl of Essex's minority. We have two different sets of household accounts with slightly different sums. One set of yearly accounts of expenses incurred for the Earl's benefit is preserved in the archive of the Marquise of Bath, in Longleat house.[411] Some other accounts are preserved in the British Library.[412] The Longleat house accounts seem to be the final yearly accounts which were created for the guardians of the Earl. The other accounts probably were drawn up in the course of the year, immediately after the expenses were made. However, sometimes the sums of total yearly expenses in these two collections are different. These differences might be due to the dates of the accounts: The Longleat house accounts were drawn for a year from St Michael's day till the next St Michael day. The British Library accounts were kept from January to January. In any case it seems that during the minority of the Earl, which lasted nine years, a sum of £2,904 11s. 9.5d. was spent (about £323 per year), thus exceeding his allowance by £1,014 11s. 9.5d.

Sir William Cavendish's household accounts prior to 1599 have not survived.

Table. 2.3. Sir William Cavendish's Expenses on His Children.

Year	Purpose	William	Francis
1599-1608[413]	Education and upbringing until marriages	£477 2d.	
1608	Marriage portion		4000
1609	Allowance	240	
1610	Allowance	700	
1610	Debts	1000	

The sum of £477 2d. was spent by Sir William Cavendish on the education and upbringing of his two children between 1599 and 1608, making about £53 per year. Between

---

[411] Devereux MS5, ff.34b, 35b, 38b-39, 43b, 47b-48, 53-55, 64-64b.
[412] BL, Lansd. MSS 25.
[413] 10 April 1608 William Cavendish married to Christian Bruce (aged 12), sister of Thomas, 1st Earl of Elgin.

1599 and 1608 about 15% or 40% of total sums spent on children were disbursed for their education. However we do not know what kind of education they received, though probably William Cavendish received the appropriate education, expected for a noble boy at that period.

The total cost of educating all seven children of the 4th Earl of Rutland would be something around £6,600 in 9 years, though the lion's share of this sum, about £4,500, was spent on the education of the 5th Earl.[414] The cost per year is about £723. Another £130 was spent annually for paying off the marriage portions of Ladies Elizabeth and Francis Manners.[415] £400 annually was paid in annuities to two unmarried brothers, George and Oliver, in addition to lands that they enjoyed in accordance with their father's will.

Between St. Michael's Day, 1608, and St. Michael's Day, 1612, Salisbury disbursed £18,500 7s. for the benefit of his daughter, son and daughter-in-law. While Cranborne travelled, his wife received £400 annually from his father.[416] Once again the largest part of this sum was spent on the heir, with £13,863 17s. 6d. going to Cranborne's benefit. The education and maintenance of the three of them cost Salisbury about £4,625 per year. This sum is between 8% and 11% of Salisbury's total annual expenses during these four years.

Northumberland spent about £4,668 18s. 4d. on upbringing of his 4 children between 1601 and 1618. This sum does not include the cost of Lord Percy's Grand Tour, which could be any sum between £6,000 and 12,500. Approximately 10% of the sum spent on Lord Percy was disbursed on his education._

---

[414] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.393-415.
[415] Ibid., p.465.
[416] Hatfield MSS, Accounts 160/1.

It seems that Ascham's £200 per year for maintenance of a schoolmaster and his two noble charges was very close to reality. Almost all noble boys were accompanied at University by others of good birth, who were their companions. Their studies were supervised by their personal tutors. The cost of the maintenance and education of such a group could vary between £181 and £697 15s. 5d. A sum around £210-250 was normal. The 2nd Earl of Essex was allowed £210 from his guardians. In 1615 the senior servant of Lord Percy received £242 10s. 6d. to be disbursed for the benefit of his young master while in Cambridge. Next year he was allowed £175, but spent £190 6s. 7d. So once again we have two scales: £200-£300 for the prominent nobility and £300-£700 for the Court nobility. Probably for education of the children of the lesser nobility £50-£100 was enough.

The question of the cost of a Continental Tour has been already studied. Robert Dallington assigned yearly £125 for a nobleman, accompanied by one man and Cleland £200 for a nobleman, accompanied by three men. Usually noblemen were accompanied by a larger retinue, so this sum was not enough. It seems that the lesser nobility disbursed between £150 and £300 per year on travel, while the Court and prominent nobility operated with yearly sums of between £1,000 and £3,000.

The total cost of the upbringing and education of the children of noble families, regardless of sex and number of children, was high.[417]

---

[417] See Appendix 1 on the details of the expenses.

Table 2.4. The Cost of Maintenance and Education of Noble Children.

Nobleman-payer	NN of children	NN of years	Sum total	Per year	Per year per child
Sir William Cavendish	2	9	£477 2d.	£53	£26 10s.
Sir Henry Sidney	4	17	£3,648 14s. 1d.	£214	£53 10s.
The 9th Earl of Northumberland	4	18	£4668 18s. 4d.	£260	£65
The 2nd Earl of Essex	1	9	£2,904 11s. 9.5d.	£323	£323
The 5th Earl of Rutland[418]	7	9	£6,600	£723	£104 15s.
The 1st Earl of Salisbury	2	4	£16,775 13s. 2d.	£4,194	£2,097

The last column shows the cost per child a range of sums between £30 and £2,097. It seems that the upbringing of a child of the lesser nobility cost between £10 and £50, the prominent nobility spent between £100 and £200 on a child, the Court nobility disbursed between £323 and £2,188 per child per year. These figures seem to say a lot about the average. The 5th Earl of Rutland left £50 annually for the education and upbringing of each of his nephews. They belonged to the lesser nobility, so £50 was considered a sufficient sum for them.

In any individual case, it is worth noting whether a child was the eldest son or daughter, or one of the other children. The eldest sons and daughters received a much more expensive education. Usually about 80% of the sums spent on the children's upbringing in the family were spent for the benefit of the heir. It seems that the education of the heirs of the prominent and Court nobility could cost between £140 and £300 per year, excluding the costs of a Continental Tour. The education of the younger children, brothers and sisters, depended solely on the attitude of the parents and the elder brother. In the case of the Sidney family we have seen that there was really no great difference in spending on the education of Sir Philip and Sir Robert Sidney. However Northumberland followed another pattern in the upbringing of his two sons. Henry Percy was brought up as a younger son, and expenses for his benefit were between £10 and

---

[418] The 5th Earl paid for his own education as well as for education of his three sisters and three brothers.

£60 per year, usually about £22, later rising to a maximum of £120. In the Manners family we can see a similar picture. There was a difference in the cost of the education of the brothers Edward and John Manners. In the case of the children of the 4th Earl of Rutland, this difference was even more evident. The basis of it could be found in the will of the 4th Earl of Rutland.[419] The Earl bequeathed to each of his three younger sons some lands, which they were supposed to enjoy from the age of 21. Each of three daughters had to receive £1,000 'for preferement and advance in marriage', either at the time of marriage or at the age of 21 if they were not married off by this time. However the boys and girls had to be educated and maintained until 21. The 4th Earl considered that £30 per year per son would be enough for their maintenance. The question of the girls' maintenance cost was more complicated. 100 marks per year had to be spent for the benefit of the eldest, Bridget, who was sixteen years old. Two younger daughters had to satisfy themselves with 40 marks each per year until they were twelve. From the age of twelve the girls were entitled to £50 per year. A mark was worth 160d.[420] So, Bridget was entitled to £66 13s. 4d. per year, Elizabeth and Francis to £26 13s. 4d. Rutland's eldest son was supposed to spend £210 annually on the education and maintenance of his younger brothers and sisters. In the case of Bridget, the sums spent were certainly much higher than those that had been bequeathed. The younger sisters were married off young, at the ages of fourteen or fifteen, and spent no time at Court, so the sums disbursed for their benefit were low in comparison with those spent on Bridget. It seems that in reality the cost of educating the three younger sons of the 4th Earl was much higher than their father had expected. The 5th Earl had to give appropriate and costly education to his younger brother and heir Francis. On the next and favourite brother,

---

[419] PROB 11/72. In the will daughters Bridget, Elizabeth and Mary were mentioned. However later the Dowager Countess Rutland gave birth to a girl who was called Francis, her elder sister Mary dies in early childhood.

[420] *A Dictionary of British history*, ed.J.P.Kenyon, (London, 1986), p.84.

George, eventually the 7th Earl of Rutland, he spent not much less than on Francis. Oliver, the youngest brother, was certainly a loser in this game. His education was the cheapest of all four of the brothers, though he was sent to the Continent. Even he received an education appropriate to the youngest son of an Earl. Professor Stone's statement that the 5th Earl 'never showed any very marked interest in scholarship'[421] looks strange when applied to a person who studied in Cambridge for seven years, spent two years abroad, studying in University in Padua,[422] studied at the Inner Temple and at Gray's Inn, and was incorporated MA in Oxford, after his return from abroad. Moreover this person provided the best possible education to all the members of his family. It is worth mentioning that the 5th Earl provided his younger brothers and sisters with an education of better quality then did his uncle, the 3rd Earl, so praised by Professor Stone.

In *As You Like It* we can see the conflict between what an elder brother was expected to give to the younger one by way of education, and what he could actually manage to do.[423] From the first line of the play we find ourselves in the middle of the conflict between Oliver and Orlando de Boys, the eldest and the youngest sons of Sir Rowland de Boys. We know from the very beginning that their father bequeathed Orlando 'poor thousand crowns' and 'charged my brother [Oliver] on his blessing to breed me [Orlando] well'. Orlando blamed Oliver for not giving him any education, and keeping him in the countryside. He mentioned their other brother Jaques, probably a middle son, who was kept at school and was reported as being a good student. Orlando was kept at home without any education and learning, receiving only food and clothes from his eldest brother. Orlando is the best illustration of the case of a younger brother entirely dependent on the good will of his elder brother, the heir. 1000 crowns was equal to £250.

---

[421] Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.178.
[422] He registered as a student of the University of Padua in the 1595.
[423] W.Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. by M.Hattaway (Cambridge, 2000), Act I, Scene 1, lns.1-69, pp.73-76.

Even if the author meant £1000, the sum still was not very large for the proper education of a noble-born boy, as we have seen.

2.3. Conclusion

We have seen that a humanist education was normal for an aristocracy by the late sixteenth century. The extent and quality of children's education depended solely on the willingness of their parents and guardians to provide for and finance their education. Sir Philip Sidney gave a final judgement on his educational experience in *Arcadia* when he described himself as being 'brought up from my cradle age with such care as parents wont to bestow upon their children whom they mean to make the maintainers of their name'.[424] Parental care was the main moving force in providing children with an appropriate humanist education. The cost of the education differed with the social position of the student, being the least for a child of a lesser nobleman and the greatest for a child of a powerful courtier. Birth order was also crucial. The eldest son of the family was entitled to a larger share of expenditure on his education and upbringing, for he would transmit name and title to future generations. Thus, if we want to know whether the sum spent on a child's education was normal or extraordinarily large we have to consider the matter against a scale appropriate to his/her social position and birth order.

---

[424] Sidney, *Arcadia*, p.334.

CHAPTER THREE

The Practice of Liberality: Alms and Rewards

Liberality was considered an essential virtue for a nobleman, but it is easy – too easy – for historians to misread liberality as prodigality. A proper historical yardstick needs to be determined, so that non-anachronistic judgements can be made. Therefore, this chapter will determine using the data of the household accounts, whether distinct patterns of noble liberality can be found in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and whether there were standard amounts for rewards and alms in the period. We shall discover whether the rewards and alms given by an individual can help us to judge whether he was guilty of prodigality or simply displayed proper liberality. As far as the data permits, the question of change in the level of liberality over time will also be addressed. It will be shown that liberality occupied a very important place in noble culture throughout the period.

It has already been shown that humanists and the authors of advice literature paid considerable attention to liberality. Liberality was manifested in various forms: alms to the poor, financial assistance to writers and scholars, the foundation of the colleges and libraries, financial support for ministers, discrete help to the friends, and benevolence towards servants.

Household accounts give us an excellent opportunity to see what forms noble liberality took and whether these forms could be related to the different aspects of liberality that are found in the humanist literature. Conclusions will be based on the household accounts of a variety of noblemen, rich and poor, in which there is significant mention of either rewards or alms.[425] Different sorts of accounts compiled by different per

---

[425] *Household Papers of Henry Percy*; *Leicester Accounts*; HMC *Rutland*, IV; HMC *Ancaster*, pp.459-476; HMC *Middleton*, p.327-456; HMC De *L'Isle*, I; HMC *Hastings*, I, pp. 361-386; Hatfield MSS, Accounts

sons will be used: from the steward of the household to the clerk of the kitchen, from the master of the household himself to the tutor of noble children, all of whom I shall refer to in this context as 'accountants'. There is one peculiarity related to the way of entering the sums into the accounts: if the sum was between 1d. and 23d. it was entered in pence, if the sum was between 2s. and 100s. it was entered in shillings, and only sums above £6 appeared in the accounts in pounds. It should be noted that household accounts do not contain a section headed 'liberality', but almost every account contains a section headed 'rewards'. Sometimes rewards were put in one section with either alms or annuities and gifts to relatives. In the most structured and well organized accounts, like those of Salisbury, alms, rewards, annuities and gifts were grouped in separate sections. All aspects of the liberality could be found in these sections of the accounts.

Different people used the word 'reward' differently. Anyone who glances at the 1584-1586 Disbursement Book of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester would conclude that a good half of the entries, if not more, included the word 'reward'. However, a closer look enables us to see a number of distinctions in the use of this word. The most frequent entries are of the form: 'Gyven in reward the same day by your lordship's commandment to a poore woman that sueth for her sonnes pardon', 'Gyven in reward ... to musicions who came from London to Wansted', 'Gyven in reward ... to one Lane a keper at Wansted', 'To Mr. Richard Knowls the same day which he gave in reward by your lordship's commandment to Mr. Davyson's men presenting a caste of fawkons to your lordship', 'Gyven in reward ... to Mr. Gifford's footeman', 'Gyven in reward ... to

---

160/1, Box G/2, Box G/4, Estate Papers and Accounts 6/31; Chatsworth MSS, MS 3, 7, 8, 10a, 10b, 23, 24, 29, 42; Sidney MSS; W.A.Carrington, ed.,'Stewards' Accounts Preserved at Haddon Hall', *Journal of Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 16 (1894), pp.61-85; D.Gurney, ed., 'Extracts from the Household and Privy Purse Accounts of the Lestranges of Hunstanton from A.D. 1519 to A.D. 1578', *Archaeologia*, 25 (1834), pp.411-566; G.Ornsby, ed., *Selections from the Household Books of the Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle*, Surtees Society 68, 1878; W.Stevenson, ed., 'Extracts from *The Booke of the Household Charges and Other Paiments Laid out by the Lord North*', *Archaeologia*, 19 (1821), pp.283-301.

the servants of the house at Sir Harry Leis'.[426] It should be stressed that these examples of entries containing the word 'reward' are of a sort that can be found more than a dozen times per year, sometimes more than 60 times per year! They are easily found in any detailed noble household accounts, even in the accounts of Viscount Cranborne while he was a Cambridge student.

At first glance, it seems very difficult to generalise about the actual values of rewards. But in fact the value of individual rewards given by noblemen fell within the same range in the accounts of noblemen of the same social status. It looks as if there were, at least, two different scales of rewards given. One, from 2s. 6d. to £2, was paid by prominent and Court nobility; the other one, from 1d. to 2s., by the lesser nobility. (These scales are attached as Appendix II).

Before we start to examine the practices of giving reward, it will be useful to examine the meaning of the word itself. *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines the word as 'a return, remittance, or recompense made to, or received by, a person for some favour, service or merit, or for hardship endured'.[427] It seems sensible to divide entries in the rewards section of the household accounts into four categories in accordance with the different aspects of liberality that they represent:

1. rewards to the poor (alms)

2. rewards to servants and other tips;

3. rewards to clergy, writers and scholars;

4. rewards to entertainers;

5. rewards to friends and relatives.

We shall examine closely the different categories of rewards, and the actual recipients of noble generosity. Having examined these categories we shall pay some atten-

---

[426] *Leicester Accounts*, pp.177-180, 186
[427] *OED*, XIII, pp.845-46.

tion to liberality as a social and political practice in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, trying to make a connection between Humphrey's criticism of liberality given for the sake of honour and the actual practice of giving rewards.

3.1. Alms.

Alms to the poor were considered the main sphere of noble liberality. Entries of rewards and gifts to the poor were frequently but not always united in the same part of the household accounts. The meaning of the word 'alms' is very clear: 'charitable relief of the poor; a charitable donation, a gift of charity, a benefaction'.[428] The use of the word 'charity' in this definition makes it advisable to consider that term, too. The word 'charity' had a more complicated set of meanings. Charity is 'a) benevolence to one's neighbours, especially to the poor; the practical benefits in which this manifests itself; b) manifested action, especially alms-giving, applied also to the public provisions for the relief of the poor, which has largely taken the place of the almsgiving of individuals; c) acts or works of charity to the poor'.[429]

Felicity Heal in her *Hospitality in Early Modern England* examines alms to the poor as part of the hospitality offered by the noble household to strangers.[430] During her work Heal deals with all three different senses of the word 'charity'. She observes that from the fifteenth to the second half of the sixteenth century the connections between the noble households and the poor, especially of the same parish, were very close. These households traditionally fed the poor at their gates with 'broken meats and fragments'. This feeding did not exclude the giving of money. Food alms were mainly given to the local poor and depended on the personal generosity of the master of the household.

---

[428] *OED*, I, pp.354-55.
[429] *OED*, III, pp.42-43.
[430] F.Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990), pp.96-98, 130-135.

However from 1536 began the process of putting poor relief under public and state control. The first legislative initiatives of 1536 and 1547 were not very successful, though they showed the general tendency of the process - to make poor relief compulsory and monetary. These ideas were further developed in the poor acts of 1572 and 1576. The compulsory poor-rate and some other measures affirmed the public nature of poor relief and led to a separation between the poor and the noble household. The acts of 1598 and 1601 completed the complex web of poor laws. After 1598 begging was forbidden without licence, which could be obtained from a JP or some local authority. The poor were prohibited to beg themselves. They were supposed to stay at home, while special collectors were gathering money from parishioners and delivering something to the worthy poor. The late sixteenth century was struggling with efforts to reconcile hostility to begging with enthusiasm for aiding the poor. Poor relief was understood as a Christian duty. This contradiction was the impetus behind the process of clarifying who was worth giving alms to, and who had to be condemned as a vagrant.

The statutes of 1598 and 1601 did not include any rates of taxation for poor relief. They stated that churchwardens, and pastors of each parish had to elect a collector for poor of their parish. Each parish had to collect weekly between 0.5d. and 6d. from its members for the relief of their poor. Statutes specified that average rate per parish in each county must not exceed 2d. per week. Parishioners were supposed to contribute in accordance with their means towards relief of the poor.[431]

In his study of philanthropy in England between 1460 and 1660 Jordan noted that the nobility, unlike merchants, clergymen, and professionals, preferred to give alms for the direct relief of poor throughout the period.[432] The general tone of the book gives an

---

[431] *The Statutes of the Realm*, IV (London, 1963), pp.896-99, 962-965.
[432] W.K.Jordan, *Philanthropy in England 1480-1660. A Study of the Changing Pattern of English Social Aspirations* (London, 1959), pp.343-44, 384-85.

impression of being hostile towards the nobility, and rather better disposed towards merchants and their participation in poor relief. Jordan's book is based on wills. He considered that 'the casual gift for alms, the spontaneous gift of a coin for a beggar, the modestly cloaked aid given to a worthy but needy householder ... are elusive and are probably wholly unrecorded'.[433] In this, he was wrong. Household accounts of the nobility recorded every penny given to the poor. Jordan has been criticised for his failure to adjust his figures to the rate of inflation and for an over enthusiastic approach to the problem; as well as for his failure to understand the difference in the nature of the merchant and gentry capital, which produced considerable differences in the patterns of charity characteristic of these groups.[434] Thus it is probable, that the nobility participated on much larger scale in poor relief than Jordan suggested, but that its participation was of a more direct and personal nature.

My research does not deal with the general tendencies of the process, but rather with the particular details of alms giving. Household accounts do not mention food alms. It seems likely, from the moment that the accountant put down the quantity and types of different products consumed per day or per week, that there was no reason to give particular mention to those remnants of the meals that were given to the poor at the gates. However household accounts have a large number of entries relating to money alms to the poor.

Entries for sums given to the poor are usually very detailed. Accountants frequently described the conditions of the persons who received alms: 'poor leper boy', 'poor woman that have her house burnt', 'poor man that had been in bedlam'. Alms

---

[433] Ibid., p.24. Jordan chose ten counties for his research. It seems interesting that almost all noble families which are studied in the present research lived in counties excluded from Jordan's research. It would be interesting to know, how Jordan accounted for Sir John Manners of Helmsley disappearance from those paying alms for poor relief after 1587, when he had become the 4th Earl or Rutland and moved from Yorkshire (the county in Jordan's sample) to Leicestershire (excluded county).

[434] C.Wilson, Review of Jordan *Philanthropy in England*, *English Historical Review*, 75 (1960), pp.685-687; G.R.Elton, Review of Jordan *Philanthropy in England*, *Historical Journal*, 3 (1960), pp.89-92.

were frequently given to owners of burnt houses and to prisoners. Owners of burnt houses received about 4d from the lesser nobility and about 1s. from prominent aristocrats. One exceptionally high payment of 18d. carried the explanation that in the house property worth £300 was lost and a son of the owner was burnt.

Statutes required prisoners to be cared for by public means as well. Each county was expected to send various sums to each of its prisons, hospitals, and alms-, 'so as there to be sente owte of every County yearely Twenty Shillings at the leaste' 'for the Releife of the Poore Prisoners of the King's Benche and Marshalsey'.[435] In addition to contributing to the official payments, the nobility gave sums to prisoners when they passed through places where prisons were situated. Prisoners in various places could receive about 4d.-8d. from the gentry and about 12d.-20d. from prominent aristocrats. It seems that Salisbury's 15s.-45s. was exceptional due to his Court position.[436]

Another type of entry names the poor and the place where the alms were given. The public care for the poor is represented in the accounts by the entries for money given to different boxes for the poor and given to collectors for the poor. Entries, like 'for poor for last whole year' appear in the accounts regularly. These types of entry enable us to see that the system of public collection for the poor was firmly introduced by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Though the nobility paid regularly to these collectors, they frequently liked to give charity independently from the state system, as their Christian duty. Some noblemen felt this necessity; some did not.

Unfortunately not all accounts mention the amounts given to collectors (some of these accounts, like the Lestranges, were compiled before the introduction of the system of public care for the poor). Alms-giving followed the general rules of reward-giving:

---

[435] *The Statutes of the Realm*, IV, p.898.

[436] HMC *Ancaster*, pp.465, 467; Cavendish MSS, 10a; HMC *Middleton*, p.423, 430, 426, 441; HMC *Hastings*, pp.367; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.155, 229, 321; Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, ff. 59r; Boxes G/2, G/4.

the lesser nobility gave smaller amounts, the prominent and Court aristocrats larger. It seems that there were three types of payments: gifts to individual paupers and weekly payments for the parish or neighbourhood poor, mentioned by Cooper; and payments to the collectors. The last of these was more or less obligatory; the first two were completely voluntary.

Table 3.1. Alms Given by Noble Families.[437]

Name	Dates	Individual alms		Payments to the collector	Per year	On occasions
		Range	Average			
Lestranges	1519-1548	1d.-2s.	1d-4d.	1s.		
Berties	1560-1562	5d.-20d.		5s.		6s. 8d. Easter
Cavendishes	1598-1609	2d.-6d.		1s. 8d. – 7s.		£4 18s. 8d. at funeral
Sir Fra. Willoughby	1566-1574	4d.-2s.	6d.-12d.	4s.		
Huntingdon	1607-1611	6d.-5s.		£2 13s. 4d.		
Howards	1612	2d.-8s. 6d.	6d.-2s. 6d.		£30	
Leicester	1558-1586	2d.-£1	6d.-2s		£54 8s. 1d.	
Rutland	1595-1612	2s. 6d.-5s.		£2-£5		£30 at funeral
Dowager Countess Shrewsbury	1591-1592	6d.-£2	£1-£2	£1	£48 17s. 6d. £72 11s. 8d.	13s. at Christmas
Sidneys	1566-1598	3s. 4d.-£1		2s. – £1 6s. 8d.	£4 4s. 8d. £6 19s. 4d	
Northumberland	1588				£14 6s. 6d.	
Cranborne	1605-1606	6d.-2s. 6d			£2 11s. 5d.	
Salisbury	1608-1612			10s.-£3	£40 16s. 8d. £57 4s. 8d.	

All these payments were frequently complemented with other sums. After a survey of his estates, Sir Richard Bertie gave £3 5s. 8d. to poor tenants. The 'poor visited people of Leicester' received from Rutland £1, and the 'poor distressed people of Leicester' £4. Salisbury paid £2 5s. 4d. monthly to the visitors house. Salisbury gave approximately

---

[437] Le Strange, pp.432, 496, 497, 524, 539, 555, 566; Haddon, p.71; HMC *Ancaster*, pp.463-467; Cavendish MSS, 10a, 7, 8; HMC *Middleton*, p.423-4, 426, 441; HMC *Hastings*, pp.365-68, 375, 378, 380; *Howard Household Books*, pp.29, 32,54-55; *Leicester Accounts*, pp. 40, 48,59, 65, 68, 80, 134, 153-58, 161-62, 177-181, 185-87, 189-201, 203-04, 207-08, 212-19, 221, 224-25, 228-30, 232, 234, 236-39, 242-43, 245-48, 250-51, 253-55, 258-59, 262-63, 265-68, 270-71, 276-80, 282, 284, 286-96, 297-99, 301-04, 306-09, 312-18, 320-22, 324-25, 327, 329-30, 332, 335, 338, 341-42, 345-47, 350-51, 353-54, 357-58, 367; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.449, 450, 454, 463, 471, 476, 477; Sidney MSS, A4/5, A5/5-7, A33/3; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, pp.77-80; Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, ff.7v, 34r, 59r; Boxes G/2, G/4.

£13 each year in individual alms, though the sums which he gave to individual paupers are unknown. We know the approximate value of sums given to prisoners (who were always mentioned among the poor receiving the alms: between 15s. and 45s. When there was shortage of wheat and oats at the end of 1608 and beginning of 1609; Salisbury bought at this period 'corn for poor at Hatfield', which cost him £846 7s. 9d. At the same period £40 was given to almshouse at Chasten.

In 1615 Thomas Cooper published *The Art of Giving*.[438] The aim of the book was to persuade a wider circle of people to give alms. If even servants were supposed to give small alms out of their salaries, it comes as no surprise that Cooper understood alms-giving as the duty of all noblemen and gentlemen too. He mentioned alms-giving to individuals, weekly payments, and feeding at the gates.[439] His opinion of feeding at the gates was not very high. He understood it as an old custom, but not as a sincere fulfilment of God's will. Weekly payments were condemned as done in vain. Only individual alms were worth Heaven, and the book pointed in this direction as the best way to achieve the salvation of one's soul.

It is interesting that Cooper criticized the old custom of feeding at the gates as vehemently as the new requirement to give weekly payments to the collectors for the poor. Unfortunately, scarce data does not enable us to analyze the change in alms-giving amongst the nobility over time. The Rutland household accounts provide us with some very limited opportunities. In 1524-1542 the 1st Earl of Rutland typically gave 4d. to an individual pauper, which was the equivalent of 1s. in 1610. In 1595-1612 the 5th Earl of Rutland gave not less than 2s. 6d. to single paupers. The 5th Earl spent more than his great-grandfather in personal alms. However Leicester continued to give occasionally 2d. to single pauper in 1585 as he had done in 1558. This sum was untypical for him in

---

[438] Thomas Cooper, *The Art of Giving* (London, 1615).
[439] Ibid., ff.C2v-r, D4v; Fv-r.

both periods. Jordan's data shows a steep rise in the collective sum of alms given by the nobility (only peers for Jordan) from £1,750 19s. for the period between 1541 and 1560 (equal to £3,501 18s. in 1611-1640) to £55,077 12s. for the period between 1611 and 1640. The same increase is evident for Jordan's upper gentry (barons and knights), from £5,766 18s. (equal to £11,533 16s. in 1611-1640) to £88,743 11s.[440] It might be suggested that the nobility gave collectively more alms from the 1560s, though the average amount given to a single pauper only slightly increased over the period.

Thus, we have seen that the lesser nobility usually gave in individual alms between 1d. and 1s., collectors for the poor could receive from 1s to 5s., though we do not always know what period the payment covered. The weekly payments could be between 4s. and £1. The prominent and Court nobility paid in individual alms between 2d. and 5s., between 10s. and £2 to collectors, and between 10s. and £5 in weekly payments. It is observable that private weekly donations and individual alms were larger than the sums paid to the collectors for the poor. Private alms were mainly distributed on the local level.

3.2. Rewards to Servants and Other Tips

Rewards given to servants is the second largest group of rewards in the household accounts. All household servants were in some way or other paid by their masters. Servants who brought letters and gifts had also been paid by their own masters. Nevertheless, I.M. insisted that servants were entitled to liberality from their masters' friends. Other categories of those who were 'rewarded', like midwives and door keepers and keepers of parks were tipped too. Here we shall study each of these categories in turn.

---

[440] Jordan, op.cit., p.385.

3.2.1. Rewards to the Servants in Households Visited.

Royal and noble households had essentially the same structure, though the Royal household consisted of a larger number of servants. Each house owned by the nobility had a resident household which was made up of a Kitchen with Larders, a Buttery and Pantry, a Cellar, a Brewery, a Bakery, a Laundry, a Wardrobe, Storehouses and Stables, and each household was intended to be self-sufficient. The Kitchen might be subdivided into more departments, including sauceries, confectionaries, sculleries, and poultries. Each department had several servants, though this number varied from household to household. and was headed by an officer, who was often assisted by grooms. There were special departments that looked after the hall, chambers, and the master's treasure. Each household had a number of footmen. The household was headed by group of three or four men, the steward, comptroller, chamberlain or master, whose function varied from household to household. In addition to these household officials there were also a secretary and chaplain. Some households also included resident musicians, players, fools or celebrities as their members.[441] All of these servants were on occasions rewarded additionally to their wages.

We now pass to the rewards given by noblemen at the monarch's household. Court servants received 'rewards' on a regular basis from the court nobility as New Year presents or, during their visits to Court: 'To the cookes in the Qwenes previe kychen at Westminster, passing throughe the kychen'.[442] The servants of the monarch's household were in fact the best rewarded of all servants. The majority of the rewards were given to the officers of the monarch's household as New Year gifts. Rutland's accountant made a detailed list of the queen's servants who received New Year gifts from his master in

---

[441] C.M.Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (London, 1999), pp.19-45; *Rivals in Power. Lives and Letters of the Great Tudor Dynasties*, ed.D.Starkey, (London, 1990), pp.239, 259.
[442] HMC *Ancaster*, p.466.

1600: 'her Majestie's garde, then to the porters and their men; to the pantry; to the buttery; to the seller; to the spicery and to Mr. Becke; to the pages; to the groomes ordinary; extraordinary; the pryvy kitcheners; the others; the blackgard; the keper of the counsell chamber doore; to the harbingers'.[443] This list indicates roughly the circle of the servants that were rewarded. The following table gives the range of sums which noblemen gave in rewards to servants of the Royal household at different times.

Table 3.2. Rewards to the Monarch's Household.[444]

Nobleman	Sum	Year
Leicester	£59 4s. 10d.	New Year 1560
Leicester	£64 14s. 8d.	New Year 1561
Sir Richard Bertie	£9 16s. 4d	June 1562
Lord North	£48	1577
Sir Henry Sidney	£23	New Year 1579
Rutland	£12 15s. 6d.	New Year 1600
Salisbury	£76 15s.	New Year 1604
Rutland	£13 17s	New Year 1606

The presents given to the monarch's household servants were not necessarily in monetary form. Salisbury gave seven doublets to officers of the Court as New Year's gifts in 1604 and in 1608. These doublets cost him £17 3s. 6d. in 1608.

Apart from giving New Year rewards to Royal servants, noblemen occasionally gave them rewards at other times. Leicester paid the Queen's cooks 50s. (in comparison with 3s. 4d. given by the Dowager Duchess of Suffolk), officers of the Court £5 5s., and two footmen £4.[445] So, we can see that for almost every household the sum given to the monarch's household was the maximum.

Before addressing the issue of rewards to household servants it is worth considering what their wages were in the period. 31 of Leicester's 39 servants were paid £2 per year in the period 1559-1561; three servants received £4, one £6 13s. 4d., one £9 6s. 8d.

---

[443] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.431.
[444] *Leicester Accounts*, pp. 149-50, 162-63; HMC *Ancaster*, p.467; North, p.288; Sidney MSS, A33/3; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.430-1, 459; p.289; Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, f.7r; EPA 6/30.
[445] *Leicester Accounts*, pp.158, 211, 270; HMC *Ancaster*, p.466.

and one £30.[446] Scrappy evidence for the Earl of Leicester makes it difficult to find out how many servants he had in total, which of them was salaried, and which served only for board and livery.[447] 28 of Howard's 45 servants received a salary between £1 and £2, and nine between £2 13s. 4d and £4; four servants were paid £5, £6, £8 and £20 respectively in 1612. The last sum was due to the accountant himself and his wife. [448] In 1606 36 of Huntingdon's 41 servants were paid between £1 6s 8d and £2, two gentlewomen and the clerk of the kitchen received £10 each. In 1610 22 of his 34 servants received wages between £1 and £2. So, the average household servants could expect between £1 and £2 as their wages in the period, and this figure does not appear to have changed much over time. Thus rewards from their master's guests would be very welcome.[449]

Entries in the rewards to servants are numerous. The nobility of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was largely itinerant. No small contribution to the abundance of these entries was the annual progress of the monarch and her or his Court. The court nobility then stayed in the houses of their fellow aristocrats who had been 'honoured' by the monarch's wish to stay with them.[450] Regardless of the actual duration of the visit - a week, one day or one meal - the noblemen were expected to reward the servants of the household. Salisbury paid £17 12s. 6d. in rewards to the servants of four noble houses during a month and a half of Royal progress in July-September 1603. Viscount Cranborne rewarded servants on a similar occasion 9 times in August 1606, and 11 times in September 1606, spending £26 5s. 11d. in total.[451] Leicester paid in rewards

---

[446] *Leicester Accounts*, pp.399-418.
[447] There are only two surviving household books of Leicester 1558-1560 and 1584-1586. However these books are not full (especially 1584-1586, of which only copies of two fragments exist, because on 11 January 1879 the original was destroyed by a fire in the Free Reference Library of Birmingham Corporation). The first book covers the first two years of the Elizabethan reign, when Leicester's household structure was not settled.
[448] *Howard Household Books*, pp.17-20.
[449] HMC *Hastings*, pp.371, 373.
[450] This honour was rather expensive one. In July 1612 the Kings two days visit to Belvoir castle cost Rutland - £613 6s.
[451] Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, Box G/2.

£58 10s. 10d. to the servants of 48 houses between April 1584 and April 1585.[452] It is not surprising that in the Leicester and Salisbury accounts this type of reward was paid very often: they were high ranking courtiers. It is more interesting that Viscount Cranborne's accounts are full of such entries taking into consideration the fact that he was supposed to be studying at St. John's (Cambridge), but instead of studying occupied himself in hunting.

There was no difference between the rewards given by guests who were relatives or friends of the master of the house and those given by others. The 5th Earl of Rutland left gifts to servants after staying at the house of his granduncle, Sir John Manners of Haddon, who received from the Earl £3 1s. The Dowager Countess of Rutland left £3 5s. to servants of her uncle-in-law, Roger Manners of Uffington.[453] Sir Henry Sidney gave £2 in reward to the kitchen of his brother-in-law Leicester; and £2 18s. 6d. to the officers of his son-in-law, the Earl of Pembroke.[454]

The names of the recipients of rewards were never mentioned; instead their offices were recorded. Usually the cooks and the keepers of wardrobe were entered individually, the servants working in the pantry, buttery, and cellar were rewarded as a whole department. Sometimes the ushers of the hall or of the cellar were mentioned separately.

---

[452] *Leicester Accounts*, pp.187-360.
[453] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.477, 401.
[454] Sidney MSS, A33/3, A5/7.

Table 3.3. Sums Given in Rewards to Household Servants.[455]

Noblemen	Dates	Individual servants	Individual officers	Depart-ments	Cook	Per house
Lestranges	1519-1548	1d.-1s. 8d.		2s.		1d.- 10s.
Berties	1560-1562	1s.-3s.4d.	3s 4d.			1s.-£2
Willoughbys	1566-1574	1s.	2s.	2s.	2s.	3s.-18s. 4d.
Lord Howard	1612	6d-1s.		1s.		6s. 6d.-£2 15s.
Huntingdon	1607-1611	1s.-6s.	6s-10s.	1s.-10s.	6s.	4s.- £2 11s.
Rutland	1595-1612	1s.-8s.	6s.-10s.	4s.- 12s.	3s.	3s.-£3 5s.
Salisbury	1608-1612	2s 6d.-5s.	5s.-£2	10s.-£1	10s.-£1	£1-£10
Leicester	1558-1586	2s.–6s. 8d.	10s.-£2	10s. -£1	5s.-£3	5s.-£4
Lord North	1578-1580				£1-£4	6s.- £3 6s. 8d.
Sir Henry Sidney	1566-1586	2s.6.-5s.	3s.4d.–6s.8d.	3s.4d.- 5s.	5s.	£1-£2 18s. 6d.
Cranborne	1605-1606				5s.	12s.-£4 12s.

Thus, the lesser nobility gave between 1d. and 3s. 4d. to individual servants and officers, between 1s. and 2d. to departments, and between 1d. and £2 15s. per house. The prominent and Court nobility rewarded individual servants with sums between 1s. and 6s. 8d.; individual officers, between 3s.4d. and £2; departments between 1s. and £1. They left between 4s. and £4 12s. to household servants. It is obvious that even the lesser nobility felt an obligation to reward household servants. This tradition continued to exist and flourish.

It is interesting to compare the sums that noblemen spent on the wages to their own household servants and in reward to the servants of others. The available evidence is very fragmentary, so it is almost impossible to base on it anything except indicative statements about how important in reality rewards were for household servants. In the period between December 1558 and March 1561 Leicester paid about £300 in servants' wages. During the same period he gave £139 1s. 4d. in rewards to various household servants, including those who brought him gifts. In 1612 Lord Howard paid £123 19s. 8d. in servants' wages; another £63 15s. 4d. was given in rewards. The same year Mr

---

[455] *Le Strange*, pp. 432, 446, 447, 469, 496, 539; HMC *Middleton*, pp. 426, 441, 446; HMC *Ancaster*, pp. 463, 466, 467; *Howard Household Books*, pp. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 147, 246; HMC *Hastings*, pp. 362, 366-368; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp. 414, 436, 449, 450, 453, 471, 477; Hatfield MSS , EAP 6/31, Box G2, ff. 20r, 21v, 23r-25r; *Leicester Accounts*, pp. 68, 76, 80, 154-55, 158, 186-87, 189, 194, 208, 212-14, 216-17, 224, 251, 273-74, 277, 287, 289-90, 293, 295, 298-300, 302-03, 312, 321, 344, 346, 355, 357, 359-60;. Sidney MSS, A33/3; A4/1; North, pp.297, 300.

Skelton's servant was rewarded 20 times for bringing gifts, 18 times with 1s., once with 2s. and once with 5s. Thus, Howard paid to Mr. Skelton's servant (or different servants) £1 5s, more than he paid in wages to some of his servants. It seems that noblemen gave in rewards up to half of the sum they paid in wages to their own servants. These rewards could amount to as much as the salary that servants would have received from their masters.

3.2.2. Other Rewards to the Servants of Other Households.

In all household accounts this category occurs frequently. Unfortunately, not all these entries are very detailed: sometimes simply naming the particular servant's position (footman, coachman) was enough for the accountant.

This was especially true of footmen. The representatives of this occupation fill the Leicester household accounts, though very often nothing is said about what they have done in order to be rewarded 'Gyven in reward viiith of October by your lordship's commandment to my Lady Huntington's footeman'. It is possible that this involved footmen opening the door of the coach, which was their direct responsibility, or some other service, for example bringing letters from their masters.

Noblemen received and sent a lot of letters, the chief means of communicating information over long distances. Payments to the carriers of letters were made both by their senders and their receivers. The geography of this communication was very wide: letters were sent to and received from the nearest neighbour and from people living in other countries: 'Given in reward the vij of October by your lordship's commandment to Walter your lordship's servant carring letters to Kenelworth', 'Gyven in reward the xix of October by your lordship's commandment to a merchant's servant for bringing letters oute of Flaunders', 'geven to Mr. Conysbie's man that brought letters from Padoua', 'To

my L. Edward Seamer his man for bringing letters frome the cowert'.[456]

Sometimes letters were brought by people, who were neither members of the noblemen's own household nor the servant of any one else: they were referred to as 'fellow', 'one', 'carrier', or even 'bearer'. Fascinatingly, the payments to those delivering letters varied as well. Rutland paid 3s. and 5s. for the letters brought from the 'Lordes of Councell', but a messenger with letters from Padua received 10s. At first glance, it looks as if the difference depended on the distance. However, the situation was the opposite in the Leicester accounts: a servant who brought letters from the Netherlands received 2s. 6d., while one that brought a letter from Portsmouth was given 6s. 8d., and the Earl of Derby's servant with letters received a pound.

Rutland's accountants distinguished two different types of payments (for sending and for receiving). Money for those who brought letters was *given*; servants sent with letters were *paid*: 'Gyven, the xxvjth of March, 1610, to a messenger sent by the Lords of Councell, with letters to his Lordshipp', 'payd to an other to carry my L. letter to Beverley'.[457] In the Leicester accounts both types of payments were described as rewards; but the word could appear to have a rather different meaning in the two cases. A servant sent with a letter, was receiving compensation for his expenses on the way. A man who brought a letter was receiving a tip - he would already have received payment from his own master, and the sum given by the receiver of the letter was an additional gift.

Many other servants were rewarded for services of various kinds. Coachmen were another frequently rewarded group.[458] Other services for which rewards were given

---

[456] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.419, 424, 449, 459, 471; Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31; Box G/2, Box G/4; HMC *Ancaster*, p.463; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.185 186, 187, 190, 191, 209, 214, 216, 233, 240, 241; *Howard Household Books*, pp.27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33; Le Strange, pp.496, 497, 523, 538; Cavendish MSS, 10a, f.32; Haddon, p.68; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.57.
[457] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.471, 449.
[458] *Leicester Accounts*, p.186; HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.461.

included displaying hawks, attending at the coach during the Royal progress, bringing tents on request and helping to set them up (against the King's visit), and so on. Not uncommonly there was mention of rewarding a servant without any explanation of the service done 'Gyvyn in rewarde to my Ladye Moryson's man by my Ladye', 'giuen to Litten, Mr. Manners man'.[459] It can be concluded that this category, though it is easily detectable as a category, is less clear in meaning. It seems that servants were mostly being paid for an actual service, though it is possible that there were some servants who received not a remittance, but a token of favour or gratuity.

In any case, the unexplained payments to servants of other noblemen or the payments for bringing letters were very frequent and varied from 1s. to £1. The most typical were sums between 1s. and 5s. The servants of other noblemen received from 5s. to £1, sometimes even £2. However, sums of about 6s. were more normal.[460] The lesser nobility in the similar situations paid from 4d. to 7s. 6d.[461] These sums could be a very substantial addition to a servant's salary of £1-£2.

3.2.3. Rewards to Servants Bringing Gifts.

This category of recipients is the largest and it indicates the prevalence of gift-giving in the cultural and social practices of the period. Linda Levy Peck has argued that gift-giving extended throughout the social structure.[462] Each year, members of the aristocracy sent New Year gifts to one other, the most important of which were sent from the Queen or King. The monarch was also the recipient of the most expensive New Year gifts which were registered in the household accounts of the aristocracy. Members

---

[459] Hatfield MSS, EPA 6/31; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.440, 481; Cavendish MSS, MS 10a.
[460] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.419, 424, 440, 449, 454, 459, 461, 463, 471; Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31; Box G/2, Box G/4; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.177, 185-187, 190-91, 197, 204, 209, 214, 216, 219; 233, 240, 241; HMC *Ancaster*, p.463; *Howard Household Books*, pp.27-32; Sidney MSS, A4/1, A50/15, A56/3; North, pp.284-285.
[461] Le Strange, pp.458, 495-498, 523-24, 538-540, 566, 569; Cavendish MSS, 10a, f.32; Haddon, p.68
[462] L.L.Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London, 1991), p.16.

of the nobility with Court connections also sent New Year gifts to the main officers of State, like the Lord Treasurer, the Lord Keeper, and others.[463] They also sent gifts to members of their own families, though these gifts were mainly in money rather than jewellery or precious objects.

Usually gifts were brought and presented by the servants of the sender. Sometimes gifts were brought by people who had no direct connection with their sender. In that case the accountant simply mentioned that the reward was given to 'one that brought ... from', and the name of the actual sender was given, making it plain that the bearer of the gift was not a servant of the person who sent it. However, such cases were rare.[464] Sometimes one servant was sent to take presents to several different noblemen: 'Spent by Wlodin in goinge with redd deare pyes and roe pyes that my La: sent to Judges'.[465] In 1580 the Earl of Shrewsbury instructed his London agent about which of his London friends should receive red deer pies.[466]

The vast majority of the gifts and presents sent and received consisted of foodstuffs. Sometimes food was sent as a present for some special occasion. In July 1612 the 6th Earl of Rutland was awaiting the visit of King James I and Henry, Prince of Wales. His neighbours sent the new Earl presents 'against the King's entertainment'.[467] The presents consisted of 5 stags, 25 bucks, 16 sheep, 15 lambs, 5 fowls, 2 salmon, 2 capons, pears, and plums. £24 6s. was paid in rewards to the bearers of these presents.

The value of rewards received by the bearer of a gift varied in accordance with the nature of the present. It can easily be shown that the amount of the reward was different in the case of edible and non-edible presents. Gifts and presents received and sent by noblemen can be divided into several groups: edible (fruits, vegetables and cheeses;

---

[463] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.430, 463.
[464] Ibid., pp.477, 464,467, 470; Hatfield MSS, EPA 6/31; Accounts 160/1, f.7r.
[465] Cavendish MSS, MS 10a.
[466] Lambeth Palace Library, MSS 699, f.31.
[467] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.489.

meats; poultry; fish) and non-edible (dogs and hunting birds; books). We shall look at each in turn.

a) Rewards to Servants Bringing Edible Presents.

The reward received by the bearer of a gift varied even for different sorts of edible gifts. In the previous parts of the work we have already seen several examples of two scales of reward being in operation. However, the situation with rewards to those bringing edible presents is even more complex. It seems that there were three scales of rewards for this type of present: rewards given by the lesser nobility, by the prominent nobility and by the Court nobility. Complex and diverse though things initially seem, a close look at the evidence suggests the existence of a coherent set of scales of rewards. It is worth noticing that a difference in the scale and value of rewards between the prominent nobility and the Court nobility can be observed mostly among rewards to servants who brought foodstuffs.

Table 3.4. Rewards to Servants Bringing Edible Presents.[468]

	Lesser nobility		Prominent nobility		Court Nobility	
	range	**typical**	**range**	**typical**	**range**	**typical**
Fruits, cheeses	4d.-1s.		6d. - 3s.		2s. 6d. - £1	
Meats	8d.-6s. 8d.	3s.	5s.-£1 10s.	10-15s	5s.-£1 10s.	10-15s.
Poultry	1d.-1s.	6d.	1s. - £1	1s.-2s. 6d.	2s. - £1	5s.
Fish	2d.- 8d.		1s.-6s. 8d.	1s.-2s. 6d.	2s. 6d. -£1	
Other Foods	1d.-1s.		2s. 6d. - £2			

Among the fruits sent were grapes, apricots, cherries, plums, peaches, apples, pears, strawberries, raspberries, oranges, melons and others. Vegetables were represented by

---

[468] Le Strange, pp. 421-22, 447, 450, 457, 495, 497-98, 523-4, 537-40; Cavendish MSS, 10a, ff.32-34; Haddon, pp.62-3, 71, 73; 83;. HMC *Middleton*, pp.418, 420, 421, 431-34, 436-38, 440-42, 445; HMC *Ancaster*, pp. 463-65, 467; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.436, 452, 454, 455, 461-64, 467, 468, 471, 476, 477; *Howard Household Books*, pp.27-32; Sidney MSS, A56/2; Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31, Acc.160/1, f.7r; *Leicester Accounts*, pp. 41-42, 44-45, 48-49, 51-53, 55, 59, 60-66, 69, 74, 79, 81, 103-04, 150-62, 182-86, 190, 192, 195, 197-201, 204-07, 212, 214-15, 219-20, 223-26, 232, 235-36, 240-42, 245, 247-48, 252, 254-55, 257-58, 261, 264, 267, 270-71, 276, 278-80, 285, 288, 291, 295, 297, 299, 301, 303, 305-10, 329, 338, 343, 357, 359, 363.

cucumbers and artichokes (others did not appear in the accounts). Cheeses were usually not specified, though once Leicester's accountant mentioned cheeses from Holland. Dried peaches were a gift worthy of sending to the Queen. Mr. Palavicino's man, who brought them to Elizabeth, was rewarded by Leicester, and not by the Queen herself.[469] Sometimes foods were brought as gifts, including 'strawberyez and creame' and many others.[470] A servant who brought fruits and cheeses would receive a sum from 4d. to £1, depending on the status of the gift's recipient.[471]

One of the two main kinds of meat sent was venison. Naturally this meat was in abundance during the hunting season; so, hunters, especially those living in forest areas, were able to send a small, inexpensive gift. The sender probably took into consideration whether or not the recipient of the gift had on or near his own estates the opportunity to hunt venison himself. The almost entire absence of such gifts to the Earls of Rutland might serve as evidence of this. The Rutlands were hereditary Wardens of Sherwood Forest, so sending them venison seemed unnecessary, though such gifts did appear occasionally in the accounts. In contrast, Leicester's and Cecils' accounts are filled with deer, stags, bucks, does, and hinds. One of the most common gifts directly connected with venison were 'redd deer' pies. Venison was not the only kind of meat given to noblemen: mutton, veal, pork, brawn and bacon were also common gifts.

It is worth pointing out that there were different values of reward for presents of meat ready for consumption and for presents of actual animals. When venison as meat appears in the accounts, the reward to the bearer does not differ from the reward given to those bringing a piece of beef or mutton.. But when live oxen or wethers appear in the accounts, the bearer was rewarded on the same scale as servant who brought bucks and

---

[469] It is also worth mentioning that Mr. Palavicino's man received reward from Earl of Leicester twice in one day: first, for the dried peaches brought for the Earl himself, second, for the same fruits brought for the Queen to Hampton Court (*Leicester Accounts*, pp.184-185.).
[470] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.382.
[471] Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.183, 184, 185, 205, 219.

deer, up to £1 in Leicester's accounts. This can be seen in venison rewards in Lord Howard's household.[472] Rewards here were between 1s. and £1 (the latter for an entire buck and the former for venison ready for consumption). Salisbury paid 1s. for receiving a shoulder of venison; the Rutlands paid from 1s. to 2s. for venison.

Presents of poultry and game birds appear as frequently as venison. Partridges were the most common victims of sixteenth and seventeenth century appetites, though pheasants, swans, fowls, capons, pullets, snipes, quails, pigeons, woodcocks, plovers and turkeys also served as gifts. The amount of the reward given to servants was influenced by the number and type of the birds given, though this was probably not the only reason for variation. Rutland paid 2s. to the servant of Mr. Wood for bringing eight quails and two turkeys; John Gamble received the same sum for twelve quails; Mr Dupport's man received 2s. 6d. when he brought two turkeys; and Sir William Armyn's man received the same reward for presenting two turkeys and a peacock. Widow Grame's servant received from Lord Howard a reward of 12d. for a present of geese, Mrs. Harrison's servant received 2s. for the same present. Leicester paid to 'Grey's man' and 'John Hutten's man' 3s. 4d. and 6s. 8d. respectively for fowls. The Salisbury household usually paid 10s. as a reward for bringing fowl, but there was no uniformity for other poultry. Sir Oliver Cromwell's man always received 5s. for partridge, but Mr. Maynes' man was rewarded with only 2s. for bringing the same kind of bird.[473]

Fish were sent as gifts in much lesser quantities. Nevertheless there are plenty of different kinds of fish: lobster, salmon, 'herinshawes' (young herrings), oyster, 'crenixes' (crayfish), trout, carps, pikes, tenches and breams, though sometimes accountants provided few details of the present received, naming it simply 'fresh fish'. Some-

---

[472] *Howard Household Books*, pp.28-31.
[473] Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31

times fish was received together with poultry 'fish and fowle'.[474] As in the case of meat, some noblemen were presented with prepared dishes, for example 'x lampry pies'.[475] Court aristocrats received fish as a present less frequently than noblemen who lived constantly or periodically in the country. This possibly was connected with the special difficulty of preserving the fish in edible condition. Accounts contain no references to salted and dried fish as a present.

Other foodstuffs can also be found among gifts: hops, wine, cakes, puddings, eggs, sugar loafs and pepper; perhaps oats, too, though they were often used as a food for horses as well as people.[476] In all these there is an interesting tendency. In the accounts of country aristocrats we can meet such things as hops, cakes, puddings, eggs, native wine and some similar things. However, in the accounts of prominent titled and Court nobility we see other occasional gifts, like foreign wine, sugar and pepper. The former were homemade products, especially country-made ones; the latter were foreign commodities - they were mostly presented by foreigners and merchants, though some cheap wine was sometimes presented by countryfolk to children of the local nobleman together with cakes.[477] However, all these products were comparatively infrequently presented to noblemen, possibly because of their nature - cakes and eggs were too simple; sugar and pepper too rare.

b) Rewards to Servants Bringing Other Gifts.

Edible gifts were not the only type of presents which were sent to noblemen. Other gifts, like horses, dogs, hunting birds, books and other things, appear frequently in

---

[474] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.464.
[475] *Leicester Accounts*, p.220.
[476] It is interesting that in the accounts of prominent and Court aristocrats we can meet such presents as oats and wheat. Salisbury twice received 40 quarters of oats as presents, from Sir Michael Stanhope and from Sir Marmaduke Dorres.
[477] HMC *Ancaster*, p.464.

the accounts. Only the accounts of the prominent and Court aristocrats have entries for horses, dogs, hunting birds and books. There is almost no difference between the rewards offered by these two groups of nobility in these categories.

Table 3.5. Rewards to Servants Bringing Other Gifts.[478]

	Prominent and Court Nobility
Horses	£1 - £5
Dogs	6s. - £1.
Hunting birds	£1 - £3 5s.
Books	5s. - £1
Books by author	£1 - £10

Horses, dogs and hunting birds were seldom given, probably because they were too expensive. Sometimes accountants named the kind of horse: 'gray mare', 'nag', 'pyde nag', 'pyde horse', '2 geldings'; in some cases the name of the horse was given: 'geven in reward by your Lordship's commaundment to the Lord Admyrall's man that brought your Lordship a horse called Bay Musgrave'; sometimes they just mentioned that the present was a horse.[479] Entries, relating to dogs, leave no room for doubt: the dogs presented were hunting dogs - spaniels and hounds. Hunting birds, like falcons and hawks, were also among the presents.

The collection of Salisbury's manuscripts contains more than 150 letters that had accompanied presents sent to him.[480] About 100 of the 150 senders of the gifts were gentlemen or peers. About 70 of them consisted of foodstuffs, mainly of local origin. It is worth maintaining that out of 28 does and stags sent, 19 were sent by gentlemen; 3 by

---

[478] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.467, 471, 419, 453, 477, 490; *Leicester Accounts*, pp. 41-42, 45, 47, 53-61, 65-68, 72, 78-79, 83, 85, 104, 151, 153-59, 161-62, 179, 184-85, 188, 191, 192, 195, 201-02, 205, 207-08, 216, 220-21, 224-25, 230, 233, 235, 241-42, 244, 247, 249-51, 256-57, 259, 262, 266, 268-70, 277, 281, 294-96, 299-300, 302, 305-06, 310, 316-18, 320, 322, 326-28, 331, 333, 336-37, 340, 371; Hatfield MSS, EPA 6/31; Acc.160/1, ff.7r, 33v; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.63; HMC, *Ancaster*, p.465.

[479] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.471, 419, 453; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.201, 220, 225, 235; Hatfield MSS, EPA 6/31; Acc.160/1, f.7r; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.63

[480] HMC *Salisbury*, vols.IV, VII, VIII, IX, XI, XII, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI. The Index section of these volumes contains pages of particular letters sent together with presents under Cecil, Robert - presents sent to him.

Earls; 3 by the King; a Bishop, a Baron and a Commoner sent a stag each. Noble and gentleborn senders dominate as senders of fowls. Fish were never sent by well born senders. Other categories of gift were predominantly sent by commoners, with occasional nobleman appearing among the givers of fruits, cheeses or similar gifts. Mostly, these were from noblemen's widows or impoverished nobles. Gifts of horses, hunting birds and dogs (39) were the next largest category among the presents sent to Salisbury. The same picture is found among the presents of gamebirds and horses. 15 birds and 4 horses were given by squires; seven birds and one horse, by the Earls; one gamebird and eight horses by Lords; and one bird and one horse by Commoners.

Hunting birds could be sent as gifts even by the monarch. Rutland received hawks as a present from the King of Denmark, and the King's messenger was given 65s. [481] In his will the 5th Earl of Rutland bequeathed six horses, two hawks (the best to the Earl of Southampton) [482] and his dogs to his friends. Salisbury rewarded those bringing hunting birds with 20s.; the only exception (£3) was when the hawks were brought from Ireland. Rewards to the bearers of dogs varied in accordance with the kind of animal: for bringing spaniels, the reward was from 6s. to 15s.; for hounds, from 10s. to 20s.

Almost every prominent or Court nobleman's accounts contain at least one entry recording the gift of a book. Most of these entries simply state that the present was a book: there is no information about it contents or language.[483] Sometimes it is possible to draw conclusions, at least, about the book's country of origin or language: it seems that the book, presented to Leicester by 'one Mr. John Case of Oxford', was composed

---

[481] 5th Earl of Rutland was sent to Denmark by James I to present him with the Order of Garter.
[482] The Earl of Rutland and the Earl of Southampton were the closest friend in the 1590ies, they participated together in the Essex Revolt.
[483] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.471, 490; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.230, 370; HMC *Ancaster*, p.465; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.63; Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, f.33v.

in England;[484] and 'Monsieur Le Forge' presented to Richard Bertie a book in French, as well as one that 'a ffrenchman ... dedicated ... to' the Earl of Salisbury. However entries give more details about the nature of the book: 'geven to Mr Cotgrave that presented his French Dictionary to my Lady'.[485] Books were an expensive item, so it is not surprising that they appear rarely in the accounts. They were mostly presented by their authors, who with such a present were seeking the patronage of the noblemen. There was no difference between rewards to native and foreign authors: they received approximately the same sum of money. Sir Richard Bertie gave £1 to Monsieur Le Forge for the book presented by him, while Mr. Cotgrave received £3 for presenting his French Dictionary to the Countess of Rutland. Salisbury rewarded a Frenchman that dedicated his book to him with £2; Leicester in similar circumstances gave £5 to Mr John Case and to Mr Robert Greene, each of whom dedicated their books to him.

Some other gifts can be found in the accounts of the nobility: violets, seeds, parrots, a 'carnary bird', 'fyne carved pictures of Marble', portraits, jewels, glasses, a clock, gown of cloth, live sables, 'a Quushion of cloth of silver', chess sets and other things.[486] It is difficult to determine whether there was any special meaning in such gifts. It seems natural for Sir Jerome Bowse to have presented to Leicester live sables, considering that he had just returned from Russia in 1584, where he was an ambassador during the last months of Ivan IV the Terrible's reign.[487] It might be assumed that some of the senders wanted to present something that could be really appreciated by the recipient.

---

[484] Adams suggests that this book was either STC 4762 *Summa Veterum Interpretum in Universam Dialecticam Aristotelis* (1584), or STC 4759 *Speculum Moralium Questionum in Universam Ethicen Aristotelis* (1585). Both books were dedicated to Leicester (Leicester Accounts, p. 230, n.488).

[485] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.490.

[486] Cavendish MSS, MS 10a, f.26v; HMC *Ancaster*, pp.466, 467; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.74; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.221, 224, 199, 227, 235, 264; HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.382; Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, ff.33v, 58r.

[487] The Earl received them on the December 6th, 1584 (*Leicester Accounts*, 199). In January 1585 Elizabeth I received as a New Year gift from Leicester 'a Sable Skin the head and four feet of gold fully garnished with Diamonds and Rubies of sundry sort' (BL., Harl. 4,698.). So, at least one of Bowes's sables found its way to the Queen after appropriate embellishment and garnishing.

The rewards for presenting miscellaneous gifts depended on the social position of the recipient of the gift. If the presents were given to a member of the lesser nobility, the reward was from 6d. to 18d.; if the recipients were prominent or Court noblemen the scale was between 2s. 6d. and 40s. Unfortunately it is difficult to understand the logic of these rewards. Leicester gave 2s. 6d. as a reward to the bearer of a chess set, and 10s. to Lord Lumley's man who brought seeds for his garden. Salisbury paid 40s. to both the merchant's man and Lord Lumley's man, who brought 'fine carved pictures of Marble' and 'a picture of the Queen Mother of Scotland' respectively; but for bringing 'pictures-allegories' Lord Lumley's man received £4.

It is interesting that there was no great change in the value of rewards over a 20-30 years period. In spite of inflation, the money given remained the same. In 1612 Lord Howard twice paid Mr. Skelton's servant 12d. for the gift of rabbits; in 1633 Mr Skelton's servant again received the same sum for bringing rabbits. In 1612 Lord Howard paid 5s. to servants of Mr. Lampough, of Mr. Thowlson and of Mr. Bartram, each of whom brought presents of wheat from their masters, in 1633 the servant of Mr Barwick received 5s. for bringing wheat.[488] In a period of inflation, therefore, the actual value of rewards fell.

3.2.4. Servants Leaving Service.

Among the entries in the accounts there are payments relating to servants who were leaving the service of their master. Accountants entered these payments as rewards. This group is comparatively easy to understand, though it also can be divided into two parts: people who were employed on a temporary basis to perform a very specific service, and salaried servants who were departing for various reasons. In the first

---

[488] *Howard Household Books*, pp.28, 29, 32, 314, 319.

case, the payments were almost certainly a fee for the duty performed. It is likely assumed that Lucas, 'the wagoner', carried some goods of Sir Henry Sidney's from Ireland. When the service was done he received his money (£6 13s. 4d.) and departed; when the wife of Sir Francis Willoughby had no future need for 'norce Mounte', 'norce Gune' and Mrs Anne Pate (they probably were midwife and nurses) they were dismissed. Sir Francis Willoughby paid between 5s., 10s. 6d. and £1 respectively to these women.[489] The second situation is, certainly, different. On a similar occasion, Salisbury paid £20 to a gentlewoman who was leaving her place in Lady Francis Cecil's service. He gave a gift of £5, as a gratuity to the huntsman of his son 'at going away'. Cranborne's huntsmen received their wages from the Viscount on a constant basis, so when one of them left he received a present, a reward from his master's father. It is possible that his departure was a result of Lord Cranborne's tour to Europe, so that for two years he had no need for a huntsman. It is difficult to guess what reasons moved two of Lady Francis Cecil's maids to depart, but both of them received their parting gifts from their mistress's father.[490] When Cheryl left the service of Dowager Countess of Shrewsbury, she received £5 from her former mistress.[491] When Mr. Lodge left Northumberland he received £3. Though the data about these payments is very sketchy, it can be assumed that the lesser nobility paid between 5s. and 20s. to a departing servant, and prominent noblemen between £3 and £20.

3.2.5. Midwives and Nurses at Christenings.

In almost all household account we can find entries relating to 'rewards' given at christenings to midwives and nurses. It is not altogether clear whether these payments

---

[489] Sidney MSS, A4/1; HMC *Middleton*, pp.441, 425
[490] Hafted MSS, Acc.160/1 f.7r; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.63.
[491] Cavendish MSS, 8.

were fees for their work or tips, but it seems very probable that midwives and nurses received their fees from the father. For example, in the Sidney and the Willoughby accounts there are payments of between 5s. and £1 15s. to midwives and nurses who assisted the mistress of the household in childbirth.[492] Thus, the godfather's reward was an additional payment.

Table 3.6. Rewards to Midwives and Nurses at Christenings.[493]

Nobleman	Year	Sum
Sir Richard Bertie	1560-1562	6d. - 3s.
The Manners family	1528-1590	10s. - £1
The 5th Earl of Rutland	1600-1610	10s - £3, typical £1
Lord Howard	1612	£1 - £3
Leicester	1558-61, 1584-6	10s - £3, typical £2
Huntingdon	1610	£2

It seems that the amount of reward that a midwife or nurse received from the godparent of a child differed with the social position of the godparent. This raises questions about the social meaning of liberality which will be addressed later. .

3.2.6. Doorkeepers and Keepers of Parks.

In the household accounts there are a large number for entries of rewards given to keepers of different places, like parks, doors, and gates, 'Gyven in reward by your lordship's commandment to the keper of the door at the Parlyment House'; 'Gyven in reward by your lordship's commandment to the keper of St. James's park for opening the

---

[492] Sidney MSS, A5/6; HMC *Middleton*, pp.441, 425.

[493] HMC *Ancaster*, pp.463, 465, 468; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.382, 395, 396, 401, 403, 424, 431, 446, 459; *Howard Household Books*, p.264; *Leicester Accounts*, pp. 47, 50, 58, 59, 197, 206, 217, 243, 311-12, 315, 331; HMC *Hastings*, p.369.

gate for your lordship'.[494] The sums varied from 6d. to 5s. These payments to keepers was almost always unexplained. When details are provided they referred to the opening of doors and gates, letting someone pass through or showing someone a house.

The keeper of St. James's park received 2s. for opening a gate for Leicester. However, the next day the keeper of Hampton Court park received 5s. for the same work. It is difficult to find a reason for this difference in payment. The value of payments varied in accordance with the social position and age of the recipient: a poor man received 6d. from Viscount Cranborne; a 'fellow' 2s. Leicester paid 6d. to a 'boy at Milend Greene' and 12d. to 'one that let your lordship at frier's gate', both for the same work. Salisbury paid 5s. for opening a gate. Rutland paid 1s. to the 'opener of park gates'.[495] The Bertie accounts give us a sum of 3d. paid to somebody who opened the gates for mistress of the household.

These payments raise a question: were keepers rewarded because they did some extra work, or were they rewarded for doing the work expected of them? Presumably they received wages as keepers, so it seems likely that these other payments to keepers were, actually, gratuities.

The entries to the keepers of hunting parks appears in almost every account.[496] Every hunting park had its owner, even if it was the monarch. Either the owner or his deputy appointed a keeper to the park, and it is likely that these keepers were paid. But I.M.'s view that wages were never a sufficient means of living for a servant applied to keepers as well as to household servants._

---

[494] *Leicester Accounts*, pp.80, 153, 158, 161, 178, 193-94, 201-02, 247-48, 277, 286, 291, 335; Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31; Box G/2, ff.21v, 24v; HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.419.
[495] *Leicester Accounts*, p.185, 203, 230, 284, 330; Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31; Box G/2, ff.21v, 24v; HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.419.
[496] HMC *Hastings*, pp.366, 377; North, pp.289, 291, 292; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.419, 434; Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31; Box G/2, Box G/4; HMC *Ancaster*, p.467; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.68, 133, 162, 179, 186, 193, 214, 217, 234, 240, 246, 250, 262-63, 268, 271, 274, 276-77, 288, 291, 293, 296, 298, 300, 357; *Howard Household Books*, pp.27, 28; Sidney MSS, A4/1.

The numerous entries in the accounts of the Earl of Leicester differ only in the names of the parks and places. The accounts of Viscount Cranborne give us more information about the nature of payment: 'Given to Sir Arther Capelles keeper for his fee my Lo: killinge of a brace of buckes there'.[497] In the Rutland accounts there is also one detailed entry - 'to Nicholus Swinkeborne, keyper at Croxton, in rewarde for kyllinge one ollde dodge fox there'.[498] However, it is interesting to note the fact that this type of payment to keepers was variously positioned in the accounts: what for Leicester's and Rutland's accountants was a 'reward', became for Cranborne's accountant a 'fee'. Some other accountants used simply 'given' without any further details. It seems that payments to keepers were more like payments for actual services, help in hunting. The majority of payments of 10s. appear during hunting season from June to September, but lesser payments to keepers can be found at other times.

The 'fee[s] for a buck', or doe, or stag were not all the same. The fee for a buck almost universally was not less than 10s., with one or two exceptions of 12s. and 15s.; the fee for a stag was about £1; the fee for a doe is the most variable, it varies from 6s. 8d. to 10s., perhaps depending on the size of the animal.[499] The sum of 10s. was given by the court nobility; however, less prominent gentlemen paid a third of this sum - 3s. 4d. (for a doe) or a half - 5s. (for a stag).[500]

We can, therefore, conclude that payments to keepers of hunting parks were more or less fixed: if a peer was hunting somewhere, he knew that he would pay not less than 10s. for killing an animal. Gentlemen recognized the necessity of payment, as well,

---

[497] Hatfield MSS, Box G/2, ff.21r, 20r.
[498] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.455
[499] HMC *Hastings*, pp.366,377; North, pp.289, 291, 292; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.419, 434; Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31; Box G/2, Box G/4; HMC *Ancaster*, p.467; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.179, 193, 240; *Howard Household Books*, pp.27, 28; Sidney MSS, A4/1. It is worth mentioning that there are very few entries with 10s. payments in the Rutland accounts. As Wardens of Sherwood Forest the Rutlands were the persons who appointed the keepers of the forest. So, if they wanted to hunt they could do this near their own castle without any additional expense.
[500] Le Strange, p.539; Haddon, p.71.

but simply paid less. Presumably, keepers received wages from their masters, but it was understood that they would complement them with fees received from noblemen hunting in the park. A parallel can be drawn with those who occupied offices of state. The salaries of the officers were never enough to cover the burden of the office; thus officials accepted presents of different kinds from suitors. Society was struggling in coming to terms with a universal monetary system that should encompass all spheres of life, even those that were previously regulated by the code of honour._

Household accounts demonstrate that the nobility gave liberal rewards towards other men's servants, even though they had already received wages. Thus, this recommendation of the humanist literature, to reward servants additionally to their wages was followed very close. These payments helped to tie noblemen into an economy of reward and credit that connected them to a broader population.

3.3. Liberality to Clergy, Scholars and Doctors.

Humanists considered liberality towards the learned and clerics to be a manifestation of nobleness. In the accounts there are many entries for sums given to doctors, clergymen, writers and schoolmasters. All these people were 'rewarded'. We have seen that the 'rewards' to poor were alms, 'rewards' to servants were tips. So what were 'rewards' to the educated?

3.3.1. Doctors and Carers.

Several representatives of the medical profession can be found in household accounts, including nurses, surgeons, doctors, and physicians.

The word 'nurse' was rarely used in the accounts in the meaning of 'a person,

generally woman, who attends or waits upon the sick'.[501] The most common way of describing the woman who was providing medical services for a sick person is the following: 'Margeret Semers in reward for keeping Mr. Philip', 'paid by the same accountant as money given in reward by your Lordship's commandment viz. ... to a woman of Shawford, where Phillip, footeman, lay hurte'.[502] According to the household accounts, it was a common practice to send an ill person away from all other members of the household, and perhaps only the master and mistress of the household were not subject to this approach.

In the Lestrange accounts there is a payment of 25s. to a 'woman of Lyn for healing Ann Winter's leg'; Northumberland paid £8 10s. in total to heal a footman. Of this money 30s. was given to a woman who kept the wounded servant. These sums were comparatively small. When Sir Philip Sidney was ill, his father paid £19 to a woman who kept him.[503] Payments to nurses appear to have depended on the social rank of the patient, for servants about 25-30s., for nobleman a larger sum.

It seems true that nurses caring for the sick were paid for their services. This analysis is applicable to this category as a whole. It seems more than probable that payments to doctors and others involved in tending the sick were salaries or fees. However, the matter is not quite so straightforward. The majority of these payments had to be fees in our meaning of the word, but almost all accountants entered this category of payment in the part of the accounts headed 'gifts and rewards'. In general three different members of the medical profession are mentioned: the surgeon, the physician, and the doctor. The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives us a clear descriptions of the physician and the surgeon: a physician is 'one who practises the healing art including medicine and sur-

---

[501] *OED*, X, p.603.
[502] Sidney MSS , A4/4; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.74.
[503] Le Strange, p.538; Sidney MSS, A4/4; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.63.

gery, especially as distinguished from one qualified as a surgeon only'; surgeon appears to be 'one who practises the art of healing by manual operation; a practitioner who treats wounds, fractures, deformities, or disorders by surgical means'. More vague was the word 'doctor'. *The Oxford English Dictionary* is of little help in this question: a doctor is 'one who mends or repairs, especially with a qualifying word'.[504] It seems that sixteenth and seventeenth accounts used the terms 'doctor' and 'physician' interchangeably. In the list of Leicester's servants two surgeons (Mr. Goodwse and John Isard) and two Physicians (Dr. James and Dr. Hipocrites) were mentioned.[505] Margaret Pelling doubts that the tripartite division of medicine into physicians, surgeons and apothecaries, characteristic for the Continent, was developed in England to the same extent.[506] Apothecaries rarely appear in the accounts. If they were mentioned, the money, given to them was paid, not rewarded. But in the accounts surgeons and physicians/doctors were clearly 'rewarded'.

The social differences between the surgeon and the physician/doctor are clearly seen in the sums paid to them. Surgeons were usually paid the smallest sums, between 5s. and 30s.[507] In general, the most detailed entries in accounts referred to surgeons. These entries are clear - 'to the surgeon that healed Phillip, footeman', 'Gyvyn in rewarde to Hollande, the surgeon, for dressyng of Mr. John Manner's hedde', 'Gyvyn more to him for helpyng of my Lorde's legge beyng hurte in the shippe'.[508] On the same page of the Rutland account we can find 'Gyvyn in rewarde to Doctor Hyll', which does not explain at all what the reason for the reward was. The same type of entry can be found in Leicester's accounts 'in reward by your lordship's commandment to Mr.

---

[504] *OED*,.XI, p.746; XVII, p.293; IV, p.913.
[505] *Leicester Accounts*, p.431.
[506] M.Pelling, 'Medical Practice in Early Modern England: Trade or Profession?' in *The Professions in Early Modern England*, ed. W.Prest (New York, 1987), p.91.
[507] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.381, 382, 409, 417-18, 424, 431, 444, 454, 461,477, 478; Sidney MSS, A5/7, A56/2.
[508] *Household Papers of Henry Percy,* p.74; HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.381.

Marwood my Lord of Bedford's surgion'.[509] This entry, at least, provides us with the information that the Earl of Bedford had his own surgeon and Leicester, most possibly, consulted him. However, in that case the reward to the permanent household surgeon, receiving his salaries, could be understood as either partly a gratuity from Leicester, or as a fee for services outside the household. Surgeons were frequently called for the servants; doctors generally attending the master and his family. As a result of this, physicians/doctors can be found in the household accounts in larger numbers than surgeons.

Leicester had two physicians and two surgeons in his own household, according to the list of servants. However surgeons were never mentioned in the body of the accounts. On the other hand, the name of Dr. James, the physician, appears frequently in the accounts. He is mentioned as receiving quarter wages of £10, but that really makes payment of £3 ('gyven in reward the same day by your lordship's commandment to Mr. Doctor James') look like a token of favour.[510] It is worth mentioning that Dr. James performed functions additional to his medical duties. He gave rewards at Leicester's command, and bought some silver pots for the Earl, as well. Leicester's two physicians were among the mourners at his funeral. They were entered in the list immediately following Leicester's chaplains and before knights of his household. Surgeons were absent from the list.[511]

Sir Francis Willoughby's accounts contain no surgeons and distinguish two types of payments to Dr. Smith, who was summoned occasionally: 'to Doctor Smythe in rewards ... for comming frome London to Wollaton with my Mrs' and 'for the charges of ij horses of my Mrs. that Doctor Smyth and his man ryd to London'.[512] The amount of money paid in these cases was different: the 'reward' was stable £13 6s. 8d. (suggesting

---

[509] *Leicester Accounts*, p.179.
[510] Ibid., pp.431, 316, 218; 301, 303, 346, 353-4, 368-9, 372; 328.
[511] Ibid., pp.450-51.
[512] HMC *Middleton*, pp.431, 450.

that it was, actually, a fee); but the 'charges' were different, and the sum depended upon the distance of the journey.

A more complex situation can be found with doctors in the 5th Earl of Rutland's household. Both doctors and surgeons were certainly 'rewarded'. The word is constantly repeated in entries. Moreover the stress was given to the word 'reward': 'to Mr. Doctor Hunton in rewarde for commyng to my Lady', 'to Mr.Doctoure Hunton as in rewarde, for attending of his Lordship', 'to Mr. Alton, of Nott, phisision, as in rewarde, for attending of my La: and mris at Belvoer'.[513]

Rutland's accountants mostly recorded the name of the person to whom the doctor was summoned, though sometimes they made more detailed entries like £10 'in rewarde to Doctour Marbeck for certen waters and other thinges which he bought and provided for my Lordes use in his L. jorney into Holland, and for his paynes'. Here the doctor was reimbursed for his expenses and received a gratuity for his efforts. However, one small thing spoils this picture. Dr. Marbeck received an annuity from Rutland. Other entries relating to him, suggest that he was a rather narrow specialist: he always provided Rutland with waters for his journeys abroad and to Ireland. Margaret Pelling indicates that more than half of sixteenth-century medical graduates of Cambridge settled in the provinces. She considers it possible that many such graduates may have practised only sporadically.[514] Thus, Dr. Marbeck could belong to this category. If we suppose that this was the situation, it makes more understandable the summons of Dr. Hunton and of the physician Alton.

The Cavendish accounts provide us with some variation in the pattern of reward: the payments to doctors appear here in a part of the disbursement book entitled 'foreign expenses'. Foreign expenses were understood in a hundred different ways, but fortu-

---

[513] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.454, 461;431; 424; 417-418, 444; 454, 461, 477, 478.
[514] M.Pelling, op.cit., p.99.

nately one entry makes the nature of the payment clear 'to doctors for their allowance here omitted before'. The payment here was an allowance. Usually there were two types of payments to doctors, one sum given to the doctor himself and one paid for the cost of his horses. The 'allowance' (fee) paid was £1 per day of visit.[515]

Fortunately, there are some more straightforward entries in other accounts: 'paid for 4 peeces of white plate given to your Ho: to the doctors of phissick' which cost about £27 for four doctors, a little more than £6 each.[516] There is a letter, written by Sir Francis Willoughby, in which he ordered a buck be sent to Dr. Smith and 'a pretty nagg to be found for him to give to Dr. Smith, which should have its running at grass at Sherfield within thirty miles of London, from whence he might use him at his pleasure'.[517] These entries represent plain gifts to doctors. The same letter of Sir Francis Willoughby makes it clear that doctors were needed by noblemen periodically, but they preferred to use a physician on a regular basis: his wife 'needs a phisitian, and will use him if he will be contented to come to her'.

Household accounts show that there was a social difference between two types of medical professionals. Surgeons occupied the lowest position. They were frequently called to the servants and paid between 5s. and 30s. Physicians were the master's doctors and received between 10s. and £15. Probably they never involved themselves in manual healing. London doctors were specialists and were generally paid above £10. It should be underlined that this system mirrored the social system as a whole: those who performed manual service received less, those who were not involved in the process of

---

[515] Cavendish MSS, 10a. The Cavendishes also had a regular doctor in Dr. Hunton, though he did not live in the house. He came from nearby Newark. This makes it very probable that he was the same Dr. Hunton who attended the Rutlands. Entries of the Cavendish MSS accountant were made in 1598, while the Rutlands were attended by this doctor from 1604 till 1612. It is probable that Dr. Mumford, who in 1604 was summoned from London to the Countess of Rutland, and Dr. Munnford, who in 1610 received £1 'for his comfort' from the Earl of Huntingdon, were the same person as well (HMC *Hastings*, p.369; HMC *Rutland*, IV,p.454).
[516] Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, ff.7r, 58v.
[517] Ibid., Acc.160/1, f.7r; HMC *Middleton*, pp.574; 575.

doing something with their own hands and worked with their brains were paid more.[518]

So, after examining all these different examples we are faced with the general question of what was meant by the word 'reward' when applied to the medical profession. The answer is not simple. Women, who performed duties similar to contemporary nurses, received reimbursement of their expenses and a fee for their services. The same is true for doctors from outside the household, surgeons and physicians, who performed services for a nobleman. However, in the case of household doctors 'reward' this word could cover other things: a) reimbursement for money spent; b) a gratuity; or c) a present.

It was mentioned that in the middle of the sixteenth century it was possible to attain status of a gentleman through receiving education. This was especially true for those who specialised professionally in medicine and law. However a traditional view that a gentleman serves another gentleman/nobleman for the sake of honour might have continued to exist in society. Thus, probably, when the payments to the medics were entered as 'rewards', accountants tried to cover monetary relations with the traditional language of honour. Possibly the same applies towards 'rewards' to clerics and schoolmasters.

3.3.2. Clergy and schoolmasters.

Rewards paid to preachers and ministers were mostly entered as rewards by the accountants. It looks reasonable to include in this group people who received reward for making a speech. Clergy were often graduates from the Universities. They were supposed to have some other means of living than rewards. The money given to preachers

---

[518] H.Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen. Universities and Society in Pre-industrial Britain 1500-1700.* (London, Faber and Faber, 1970). Professor Kearney suggests that at this period the easiest and least expensive way to become a gentleman. was to receive a University education.

was a sign of pleasure, a gratuity for their eloquence. Though this money was earned by the receiver, it was understood as a present, a contribution, a godly deed, but not as a salary or fee due from the giver. A minister of the Italian church received 6s. from Lady Sidney, and a chaplain was rewarded with 13s. 6d. for a service. Lord Howard paid quarterly to his parish vicar 10s. in addition to the tithe which he returned to him. Sir Richard Bertie paid a minister 10s., as well. Sir Richard Bertie paid Mr Salle, a French preacher, £2. It is not surprising that the Court nobility gave higher sums on similar occasion. Leicester regularly gave between £2 10s. and £5 to ministers, and rewarded Mathew, a Scottish preacher with £20. We have no data about Salisbury's payments to preachers and ministers. However he paid £2 to a boy, who made a speech; certainly a reward to a preacher would be greater.[519] All of them made speeches which were heard and thought worth reward, but this reward was a gift on the nobleman's part. Mostly these preachers and speakers were outsiders, who delivered a special sermon or speech for their patron. Such clerics could receive between 1s. and £20 from noblemen.[520]

In the household accounts money was frequently paid in 'rewards' to teachers and schoolmasters. Though it is obvious that this money was earned by the receivers, it was most often called a reward. Schoolmasters usually were 'rewarded' with sums of between 30s. and £10, the most common sum being 30s.- £2.[521] Sometimes nobleman helped their clients to pay for their children's education. The 5th Earl of Rutland gave £2 to the schoolmaster of his nephew; Huntingdon paid 30s. to Mr Bewley to pay for his son's learning to 'syferr'. So, prominent Court noblemen 'rewarded' teachers and

---

[519] HMC *Ancaster*, p.466; *Leicester Accounts*, pp 200, 204; Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, f.33v; Sidney MSS, A4/4.
[520] Sidney MSS, A4/4-5, A56/2; HMC *Ancaster*, p.466; *Howard Household Books*, p.28-9, 31-32; Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, f.33v; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.200, 204, 210, 234.
[521] Le Strange, pp.495, 497, 539; HMC *Ancaster*, p.463; North, pp.284, 285; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.48; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.181,188, 189, 238; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.382, 455; Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, f.58v.

schoolmasters with sums between £1 and £5.[522]

It may be, therefore, that payments to various schoolmasters was to provide them with means for their charges, but certainly some of this money was paid as wages to the schoolmaster himself. However, some of these 'rewards' might be a gratuity. It is possible that Rutland gave a reward to the schoolmaster of his nephews and nieces because he was satisfied with their successes in learning. Once Rutland gave a reward of £1 to a poor scholar and he made bequests of £20 each to Queens' and Bennett Colleges (Corpus Cristi). The bequest to colleges surely was in vain with Humphrey's advice to nobility to be liberal towards educational institutions, mentioned in the first chapter of the present work.

3.4. Rewards to Entertainers.

Singers, musicians, players, dancers, waits, jugglers, keepers of various beasts, and fools can all be found in household accounts of the nobility. Wolgar sees the term 'minstrel' as encompassing all entertainers: acrobats, actors, harpers, gitterners, drummers, jugglers, jesters and fools. He proves that the profession of minstrelsy was an honoured one in Late Medieval England.[523] The members of this profession were universally 'rewarded' in the household accounts, thus, they were recipients of noble liberality.[524]

---

[522] *Leicester Accounts*, pp.188, 329; Sidney MSS, A4/1, A5/7; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.380, 382, 426, 455, 470; HMC *Hastings*, pp.368, 373, 390; *Howard Household Books*, p.30.
[523] Woolgar, op.cit., p.28.
[524] There remain important questions to answer about the nature of aristocratic pastimes and their relationship with popular culture in early modern England. Peter Burke's *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1994) mentions all sorts of entertainers that can be found in the household accounts as performing for the lower classes, as well (pp.92-95). However he suggests that popular culture and elite culture became separated from each other. This process started after 1500 and was completed by 1800 throughout Europe. Burke maintains that the English elites started their withdrawal from public culture relatively early, and the process was already far underway in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries (pp.270-80). One aspect of this growing division is shown in Robert Malcolmson's *Popular Recreations in English Society 1700-1850* (Cambridge, 1973), in which he shows that post-Reformation England found itself in the midst of a debate on entertainment. Puritans aspired to ban traditional forms of entertainment including May games, minstrels, dances and public feasts. However Puritan attitudes were not shared by the Stuart kings (pp.5-14). The same subject has been examined in detail by David Underdown (D.Underdown, *Revel, Riot & Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford, 1985), pp.45-68).

In the early modern period, though the public theatre was in an early stage of development, the provision of entertainment was a private rather than a public concern. So, it depended entirely on the noblemen what they would receive as entertainment. It is most unlikely that the shows or plays which noblemen attended at Court or at some other house would have been recorded in the accounts, unless they rewarded the musicians of their host. Accountants recorded only money deliberately spent by their master on his cultural pleasures.

If we do not find entries for entertainment in the Salisbury accounts, it does not mean that he did not attended Court entertainment and theatre. It simply means that musicians were not invited specially to his house. In any case, living at Court, he had no need to secure for himself any special entertainment: he had enough of it through his Court connections. He did organized for the King and his Court performances of some of Ben Jonson's masques at Salisbury house, with machinery and decorations by Inigo Jones. Moreover, he paid 14s in rewards to people who were called 'Virginians', most probably Indians from North America.[525] These people 'rowed with the cannow'; in addition to this, he gave £10 to 'men that played upon the ropes'; so, even Salisbury paid for some entertainment.[526]

The same pattern can be seen in the Leicester accounts: musicians and players appear in them when Leicester travelled and was not at Court. Yet, the case of Leicester is not so plain. On the one hand, Leicester had little reason to seek entertainment outside his own household. His own list of servants names seven musicians in 1587, and in the accounts for 1559-1561, at least one musician was mentioned.[527] He was an owner of a players' company as well. On the other hand, it is worth remembering that in 1559

---

[525] Hatfield MSS, EPA 6/31.
[526] Ibid., Acc.160/1, f.33v.
[527] *Leicester Accounts*, pp.433, 131, 401, 420, 426.

Leicester asked the President of the North to allow his men to play in Yorkshire.[528]

In Leicester's case it is seems necessary to distinguish Leicester's players and Leicester's musicians. The latter were members of his household and received wages. Sometimes Leicester's household musicians received rewards for services not connected with their profession: for carrying goods, for example. Leicester's players were in another position.[529]

For players and performers 'reward' was a salary or fee paid for an actual performance. Richard Bertie's accounts included one odd entry: 'To my Lorde Robart Dudleyes players at Grimsthorpe, which offered themselves to play but dyd not'.[530] This is unusual for household accounts, though in small towns some officials certainly preferred to give players a reward to depart without playing, because they were afraid of the possible disorder resulting from a large gathering of people.[531] The fear of infection during an epidemic was often another reason for banning the actors from towns and cities.

The majority of noblemen, spending much time in the countryside, paid rewards to musicians, singers, players, waits and others constantly. Keepers of various animals, such as lions, bears, fighting bulls and dogs, appear in the household accounts, as well.[532] We shall consider waits, singers, musicians, minstrels, and instrumentalists all of whom I shall call 'musicians' under the same category. When we investigate the value

---

[528] M.C.Bradbrook, *The Rise of the Common Player. A Study of Actor and Society in Shakespeare's England* (London, 1962), p.52. Though Leicester had his own players already in 1559, it is known that this 'ownership' was more a matter of protection for the players in order not to be arrested as vagabonds and beggars. Leicester's own players travelled around the country and earned their means of living, so Leicester possibly needed some outside players. When he needed his own troupe, for example for entertaining the Queen at Kenilworth from 9 to 27 July 1575, he would summon them from their wanderings and they would appear with his badge on their sleeves.

[529] In late sixteenth century there were four major Companies of players: Leicester's Men (from 1559, and who in 1576 built the first stationary theatre in London), the Queen's men, the Lord Admiral's men (organised in 1572-4), and the Lord Chamberlain's men (organised in 1572-4). It worth mentioning here that the Queen's men was an artificial creation: 12 of the best actors from other troupes were chosen and sworn as the Queen's servants in 1584. They were not formally incorporated, but remained in their old troupes.

[530] HMC *Ancaster*, p.465.

[531] Bradbrook, op.cit., p.49.

[532] HMC *Ancaster*, pp.463-468 (24 entries); HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.431, 437, 439, 446, 449, 452,450, 461, 462, 464, 467, 468, 471, 476 (30 entries); HMC *Middleton*,pp.422, 424- 426, 430, 433, 440- 442, 446, 447, 450, 451 (24 entries).

of payments to musicians and players we face one difficulty, which is not easy to overcome. We simply don't know how many players participated in the performance and how many performances they gave. Rarely an accountant entered the number of players or musicians who received money from him, but generally the only hint is the use of plural or singular terms.

Table 3.7. Expenses on entertainers.[533]

Nobleman	Dates	Musicians		Players		Beasts
		Range	Typical	Range	Typical	
Vernons	1564	4d.-£1 10s.	8d. –1s.	2s.-13s. 4d.		
Lestranges	1519-1548	4d.-3s.4d.	8d.-20d.	8d.-5s.		
Berties	1560-1562	1s 8d.-10s.		3s. 4d.-£3 15s.	6s.-13s.	3s.4d.-6s.
Willoughbys	1566-1574	6d.-10s.	2s.	3s.4d.-£1 10s.		
Lord North	1575-1580	5s.-£3	5s	5s-£2		
Lord Howard	1612	1s.-£1	2s.-2s.6d.			
Cranborne	1605-1606	2s.6d.-10s.				
Huntingdon	1607-1611	1s.-£1 10s.	2s.6d.-6s.	2s.-£2		
Rutland	1595-1612	4s.-£5	15s.	10s.-£10	£1 10s.	1s.-£2
Leicester	1558-1586	1s. – £10	6s.-£2	5s. - £10	10s.-£5	3s. 4d.

Expenses on entertainers can provide the historian with information about the individual cultural tastes of different noblemen. The accounts show us that the Lestranges and Sir George Vernon preferred musicians, though they occasionally saw some plays. Sir Francis Willoughby's and Sir Richard Bertie's sympathies were equally divided between musicians and players. Rutland and Huntingdon were great admirers of the performing arts. In their accounts we can find respectively 32 and 26 entries relating to them. In the Rutland accounts there is also an entry for the first known payment to Inigo Jones.

Bradbrook says that players established a tacit scale for their private perfor-

---

[533] Haddon, pp.63, 64, 72, 84; Le Strange, pp.422, 423, 432, 458, 495-98, 524, 538-40; HMC *Ancaster*, pp.463-467; HMC *Middleton*, pp.424, 426, 430, 432-33, 440-42, 447, 450, 451; North, pp.284, 285, 291, 292, 295, 298, 300; *Howard Household Books*, pp.27-29, 31; Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31, Acc.160/1, f.33v; Box G2, ff.23r-24r; HMC *Hastings*, pp.362, 365-72; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.381, 431, 437, 439, 449-50, 452, 461-62, 464, 467-68, 471, 476-77; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.183, 186, 189, 206, 209, 211-14, 216-17,220, 231, 291; Sidney MSS, A5/6.

mances.[534] She sees £10 as the price for a Court performance, £2 as the top price for plays performed in the country, and 10s. as the more common price. The reality is a bit more complex. It seems that there were two scales of payments to entertainers. One between 4d. and £1 per performance for the lesser nobility, and another between 5s. and £10 per performance for the prominent and Court nobility. Prof. Bradbrook's figures correspond to the scale for the lesser nobility: their top price was 30s.-40s., and the common one 10s.

The sum varied with the social status of the players and musicians. Independent or occasional ones received lesser sums; professionals associated with the higher nobility or the monarch were paid more. The only players named in the Leicester accounts were the Queen's players, who performed in Leicester house in 1584 and received £10 from the Earl, the equivalent of a payment for a Court performance. Rewards to performers were mainly fees for their services though there are some exceptions applying to musicians, especially if the payment was made by a guest in the house of the musicians' master. In that case the payment became a gratuity.

3.5. Rewards to Friends and Relatives.

Cleland recommended being liberal towards one's friends. This liberality was supposed to be very discreet and wholehearted. The Leicester household accounts have a number of rewards given to various men.[535] These sums varied from £1 to £40, but it is difficult to find out whether these people were Leicester's friends in need, or whether they were given money in order to reimburse their expenses in Leicester's service, or whether they were given simple gifts. The Dowager Countess of Shrewsbury (Bess of

---

[534] Bradbrook, op.cit., pp.43-44.
[535] Leicester Accounts, pp.188, 204, 207, 210, 212, 213, 222, 233, 236, 239, 292, 316, 338, 341, 343, 347, 356-57.

Hardwick) gave sums between 3s. 4d. and £10 to various men and women, mainly the latter.[536] The Countess gave sums between £1 and £60 to various brides at their marriages.

Relatives as well as others were the recipients of sums that accountants entered as rewards. Wives were never rewarded, but children and dependant relatives were: Susan and Peregrine Bertie, Robert Dudley and Lady Dorothy Devereux, Mr Oliver and Mr Roger Manners, Lady Francis Cecil and Lady Cranborne, all of them were mentioned in the accounts of their relatives as receiving 'gifts and rewards'.[537] For some the money was entered as a New Year gift, but for others it was entered as a 'reward'. The real meaning of the 'reward' becomes clear from the accountants' comments: the Manners brothers received their money when they went abroad. It seems that this was either their pocket money or allowance. Lady Devereux received a present from her stepfather.

In Sir Thomas Lestrange's household accounts there are several entries for payments to his nephews. Regardless of the number of nephews, one or two, they always received 10s. between them. The same sum Sir Richard Bertie gave to each of his children as New Year's present. It seems that 10s. was a common sum given to a relative by the lesser nobility. On the other hand, Lord North gave his brother sums of £1 and £5; Northumberland gave £5 to his sister; the Dowager Countess of Shrewsbury gave her relatives presents of value between £2 and £366 5s., all these payments were entered among rewards. If Sir Richard Bertie gave 10s. as a New Year gift to his children, Salisbury gave his daughter first £10 as a present, and then another £30 as 'free gift'. This

---

[536] Cavendish MSS, 7, 8.

[537] Robert Dudley was natural son of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester by lady Sheffield; Lady Dorothy Devereux was daughter of William Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex and sister of 2nd Earl of Essex, and stepdaughter of Earl of Leicester. Mr. Oliver and Mr Roger Manners were brothers of Henry Manners, 2nd Earl of Rutland. Lady Francis Cecil and Lady Cranborne were daughter and daughter-in-law of Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury.
Le Strange, pp.495, 497, 539; HMC *Ancaster*, p.463; North, pp.284, 285; *Household Papers of Henry Percy*, p.48; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.181,188, 189, 238; HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.382; Hatfield MSS, Acc.160/1, f.58v; Cavendish MSS, 7, 8.

expression suggests that the first payment was more or less expected, while the second one showed her father's special affection. The wife of Salisbury's son, Lady Cranborne, received only £4. This sum probably was the last payment of her quarter allowance. The Rutlands' accounts give us the sums of £20 and £13 6s. 8d., paid by the 2nd Earl of Rutland to his brothers when they were preparing to travel to France. Leicester showed his affection to his stepdaughter, giving her 'in reward' £20. Leicester's natural sun received only 10s., possibly underlining the distance between the bastard, whose social status was uncertain, and the lawfully born Lady Devereux.

Accounts do not contain large number of entries for sums given to friends, but it is likely that such payments would have been given in person out of the sums which were registered in the accounts 'to his Lordship private purse'.

Generally, the simple sum of the reward or alms can be very deceptive. The actual sum of the reward must be considered in relation to the social position of the noblemen. It is worth mentioning that however large the sums of annual rewards might seem, they were usually only between 0.15% and 6% of the total spent by noblemen; most commonly between 0.5% and 2%. There is insufficient data to make any general conclusion regarding the dynamics of change over time in the amount of rewards and alms given. The 1st Earl spent £2 4s. 10d. in alms between 1524 and 1543 (£2 13s. 9.5d. at 1587-1612); his son, the 2nd Earl, spent £1 13s. 8d. between 1549 and 1558 (£2 4.5d. at 1587-1612); the Dowager Countess disbursed £39 12s. 10d. between 1587 and 1595, the 5th Earl spent £100 3s.10d. between 1597 and 1612. However it is possible that the personal liberality of the 5th Earl was responsible for this sharp rise in the sum given in alms.

3.6. Liberality as Social and Political Practice.

In his book Humphrey insisted that liberality should be given without any expectation of return. He condemned liberality given 'for desire of honour and glorye'.[538] But this desire may well amount to the desire to widen and strengthen one's social and political influence, and in various ways giving alms and rewards could help to construct noblemen's social standing and political aspiration.

Even alms-giving was not only the fulfilment of Christian duty, but a way of showing one's social position. Weekly alms were paid by families with considerable income and high social standing. It is not incidental that Thomas Cooper in 1615 attributed weekly alms-giving to a desire to show one's generosity, not to any real Christian mercy to the poor. However, this may not be altogether correct. It is possible that weekly alms became fashionable among richer social groups, but the sums were variable, 5-7s. for the Cavendishes, 10s. for Salisbury, £1 for the Dowager Countess Shrewsbury and £5 for Rutland. It may be that the value of payments measured in relation to the social status of the giver could help to distinguish between sincere and fashionable almsgiving. For example, if someone gave weekly alms of an amount greater than was common for nobility of the same social status, it is probably indicative of a real philanthropic impulse.

3.6.1. Rewards to Household Servants as a Means of Status Display.

It seems that a social pattern is discernible in the rewarding of household servants. If the guest who enjoyed the hospitality of a household was inferior in social and economic position to the master of the household, he was, nonetheless, supposed to reward the servants in accordance with the social position of his host. If he was of equal or

---

[538] L.Humphrey, *The Nobles* (London, 1563), ff.O8v.

superior position there was no problem; servants were rewarded in accordance with the rank of the guest. This means that the Court nobility tended to give more or less equal rewards to servants of any household, regardless of the social position of its master. Prominent aristocrats gave lesser sums than the Court nobility while in the country, but when they attended Court or stopped in the houses of their superior in rank, they seemed to give the same amount in reward as the Court nobility. When the lesser nobility visited prominent aristocrats they rewarded servants as if they were their master's equals in rank.

A kind of an illustration of this pattern can be found in the household accounts of the Lestranges. When Sir Thomas Lestrange visited his equals around the county, he rewarded servants with sums from 1d. to 20d.; however, the chamberlain of Lady Bell received 2s., Lord Surrey's servants received 4s. 8d. and 'cousin Southwells officers' 10s.[539] Even this sum, large for the Lestrange household, was only at the lowest level of rewards given by the prominent and Court nobility. Nonetheless, Lestrange seems to have attempted to match the largesse of the higher nobility.

A similar situation can be observed in the Willoughby household. When Sir Francis visited Mr. Stainforth he left the servants of the household 3s. as reward, at Shelford 9s., and the servants at the Earl of Rutland's house received 18s. 4d. from Lady Francis Willoughby. The dowager duchess of Suffolk, wife of Sir Richard Bertie, gave 12d. at a house where the Duchess 'dried her hair in the way'; but a yeoman of wardrobe at the house of Sir Walter Mildmay received from her 3s. 4d., and servants in 'Mistress Sissells house' 6s. 4d.[540] Servants at Lord Cromwell's house were rewarded with 20s. and in the Earl of Rutland's with 40s.[541] In general, the Bertie accounts show some am-

---

[539] Sir Richard Southwell of Wood Rysing was a favourite of Henry VIII, one of the Commissioners at the suppression of Monasteries and one of the executives of King's will (*Archaelogia*,XXV (1834), p.536).
[540] Le Strange, pp.432, 446, 447, 469, 496, 539; HMC *Middleton*, pp.426, 441, 446; HMC *Ancaster*, pp.463, 466, 467; *Howard Household Books*, pp.27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 147, 246.
[541] Henry Manners, 2nd Earl of Rutland (1526-1563).

biguity. The Bertie household tended to give rewards on the level of the lesser nobility, but marriage to the Duchess of Suffolk sometimes encouraged them to step out of this frame.

The Rutlands, who certainly occupied a higher position than Sir Richard Bertie, gave rewards that varied from 3s. to £3 5s. per house. Approximately the same amount in reward was given by the Earls of Huntingdon.[542] The value of payments given by Leicester and Salisbury varied between 5s. and £4 per house.[543] 3s. and 5s. were given by Rutland and Leicester respectively when they dined in a house, but did not stay in it. Cooks and the wardrobe keepers of Court noblemen were usually rewarded with 20s., a sum between 10s. and 20s. was given to the departments and about 5s. to the ushers. Rutland, Leicester and Salisbury paid these sums to the servants of prominent nobleman. Cranborne's accountants paid to the servants of prominent noblemen between 20s. and 92s., while servants of the lesser nobility were paid between 12s. and 20s.[544]

Sir Henry Sidney's position was ambiguous: there was a considerable gap between his status as the Lord President of Ireland and his rank as a knight.[545] Sir Henry was expected to reward servants on a generous scale, which he did. When he or his wife, Leicester's sister, visited Leicester in Kenilworth, the servants of the house were rewarded with £2 6s. When Sir Henry stayed in the house of his son-in-law, the 2nd Earl of Pembroke, the Earl's officers received £2 18s. 6d. Sir Henry can certainly be called a champion among the givers of rewards to the officers of other private households. In 1578 he gave to the Earl of Pembroke's officers £26 9s. 2d. However, it is worth remembering that this was the year of the Earl's marriage to Sir Henry's only surviving daugh-

---

[542] HMC *Hastings*, pp.362, 366-368.
[543] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.414, 436, 449, 450, 453, 471, 477; Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.186,187, 189, 194, 208, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 224.
[544] Hatfield MSS, Box G2, ff.20r, 21v, 23r-25r.
[545] It is known that Elizabeth I offered Sidney peerage instead of money for his service in Ireland, however, on his own Sir Henry did not have sufficient means for accepting such costly honour.

ter, and this probably was the first visit of Sir Henry in his new status as father-in-law to the master of the household. Together with these really large sums we can find in the Sidney accounts a more modest sum of 18s. 6d., given to the servants of Mr. Sheldon. The social position of Mr. Sheldon was lower than that of the Earls of Leicester and Pembroke, so his servants received less; but like Leicester, Salisbury, Cranborne, and Rutland, Sir Henry Sidney remained at levels normal for prominent and Court noble-man.

Our assumption about the necessity of rewarding servants of the host's house in accordance with the host's position might be doubted. We do not insist that our explanation is the only right one. It could be argued that the larger household had more servants thus the larger rewards given there reflected this fact. However, some additional proof on this matter can be derived from the accounts. The servants of a house at Royston received only 4s. per department from Rutland, who gave to two cooks and two butlers at Walsingham house in London 10s. each and to two chambermaids 8s. each.

In different years Richard Bertie and his wife, Mrs. Francis Willoughby and Viscount Cranborne visited the Earls of Rutland and left £2 in 1561 (equal to £2 8s. at 1606), 18s. 4d. in 1570 (equal to £2 2s. at 1606) and £3 10s. in 1606 respectively in rewards to their servants.[546] The position of Sir Francis Willoughby was certainly among the lesser nobility; the ambiguity of the Bertie situation has already been mentioned; Cranborne belonged to the upper Court nobility. All guests left the servants a considerable variety of sums, though all three sums were above 10s. which was the maximum reward ever given by Lestrange to the servants of a noble household.

It seems that the value of the rewards given to servants of other households was a means of displaying one's social position as well as one's gratitude towards servants.

---

[546] HMC *Middleton*, pp.446; HMC *Ancaster*, p.467; Hatfield MSS,Box G2, ff.24v, 25r. They visited 2nd, 3rd and 5th Earls of Rutland.

The lesser nobility gave comparatively small amounts to the household servants, but enough to confirm their noble status. Prominent aristocrats while living in their county paramount in their neighbourhood. This status was confirmed by their considerable rewards. But when those lords and ladies attended Court or visited their equals and superiors in rank they became one of a number of people of similar status. The higher value of their rewards at Court was an effort to strengthen their place among other prominent noblemen. Perhaps the only unquestioned Court aristocrats were Salisbury and Leicester. They were manifesting their distinguished position with their high rewards. The value of rewards to household servants of other noblemen might acts a useful barometer of the position which aristocrats claimed for themselves among their fellow noblemen.

3.6.2. Participation in the Process of Gift-Giving.

Gift-giving played a significant part in the political life of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As an experienced politician, Burghley recommended that a nobleman to 'keep some great man thy friend, ... compliment him often, present with many yet small gifts and of little charge, and if thou have cause to bestow any great gratuity let it then be some such thing as may be daily in sight'.[547] This advice put in words the common practice of the nobility of early modern England. The degree of aspiration of an aristocrat might be worked out on the basis of his level of participation in the process of gift-giving. The value and nature of these gifts can show much about the real position of a nobleman in society.

In the accounts of the Rutlands, Leicester or the Cecils there are few rewards or payments to servant sent out with gifts. They were mostly the recipients of such gifts,

---

[547] *Advice to a Son*, ed.L.B.Wright (Ithaca, 1962), p.12.

not the senders of them. The Cavendish accountant did pay money as a reward to members of the household as compensation for their expenses while being sent with gifts, as well as to noblemen's servants who brought presents from their masters. Some of the gifts involved particular social obligations, like a New Year gift to a monarch, others did not. It can be observed that the higher the position of the nobleman, the fewer gifts he sent. Leicester and Salisbury sent New Year gifts to the monarch and four or five top officials: these gifts were customary requirements. Gifts freely given were bestowed mainly on their close friends and members of their family. The Rutlands sent gifts to the monarch, a circle of Court officials and to some of the Queen's ladies-in-waiting.

'Free' gifts themselves may be understood as a kind of reminder about help that had been promised, reward in advance. It is very difficult to distinguish gifts from bribes. State officials were asked for their assistance in various matters, ranging from appointment to vacant posts to monopoly grants, from leases of Crown properties to law suits. Peck argues that the extent and scale of corruption increased especially from the 1590s.[548] We can find in the correspondence between Sir Robert Sidney and his servant Rowland Whyte an illustration of the relationship between gift-giving and political influence.. At the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Sir Robert served in Netherlands. He and his family sought his return, but the Queen was not in a hurry to make the decision. Sir Robert's wife constantly sent presents to the highest Court officials trying to obtain their help and good will. Rowland Whyte's letters leave no room for doubt about the aim of these presents. 'My Lady has sent 600 [the Earl of Nottingham] two boar pigs for a present to put him in mind of your return', 'I moved Mr. Secretary [Robert Cecil] about your leave ... My Lady sent him a boar pie; he returned many thanks but not one word of your leave'[549]. Cecil received some fine Holland

---

[548] Peck, op.cit., p.5.
[549] HMC *De L'Isle*, II, pp.423, 429, 470, 471 (2).

from Lady Sidney, as well.

The value of the reward that servants who brought gifts received depended on the social position of the recipient of the gift. It can be assumed that the lesser nobility, living constantly in the country had their own food supplies at hand. Presents from neighbours were signs either of respect and friendship or of the pursuit of support (in itself a show of respect). The respect of neighbours was appreciated, and acknowledged in a modest tip to the servant that brought the gift. The prominent nobility received such presents when they lived in the country. At these periods they were provided with provision from their own gardens and fields, if they had demesne lands. This situation was very similar to that of the lesser nobility; but the titled nobleman was ready to give more generously than country gentlemen. Generous tips displayed a prominent nobleman's status, making clear their difference in fortune and influence from the lesser local nobility. However, the sum given was less than for Court aristocrats. It seems that the latter gave rewards according to other principles: to bearers of small and unimportant things (like fruits and cheeses) about 2s. 6d. - 4s., to those who brought something more important about 6-10s.

However, it seems significant that both for the prominent Court nobility and for the country nobility the difference in the value of reward sometimes showed the awareness of the recipient of the gifts of the difference in the social status of those who sent them. Salisbury paid to the servant of Sir Robert Wroth (an immensely rich but not high-ranking gentlemen) £1 for bringing a brace of bucks as a present from his master; the servant of Sir Arthur Cappel (a gentlemen of ancient blood with considerable Court connections) for the same number of does received 30s. Leicester rewarded Gramer of Kenilworth with 10s. for a brace of does; for bringing another brace of does Sir Thomas Tressam's man received 13s. 4d., though in the Leicester household reward for bringing

a deer was usually 10s.[550] The social status of Sir Thomas Tressam was obviously higher than that of Gramer of Kenilworth. However, the most telling evidence in this regard can be found in the list of rewards given by Francis Manners, 6th Earl of Rutland, for presents of food, which he received before the King's visit. We can here clearly observe variation in the value of reward in relation to the social position of the sender. The messengers of the Earls of Lincoln and Huntingdon received £1 each for a stag, while King of Burly was paid only 6s. The same pattern we can see in the accounts of the lesser nobility. The Lestranges, generally, paid as a reward for does, stags and bucks between 8d. and 2s. 8d.[551] However, the servants of his son-in-law and of cousin Sir Thomas Fresham received 3s. 4d. and 6s. 8d. respectively; another cousin's servant received 5s.; and cousin Fresham's servant, when sent the second time, received 3s. 4d. All these sums were more then customary for this household.

Another telling fact: Leicester rewarded messengers with presents on the same scale in 1558 and in 1588, suggesting that from the very first year of the Elizabethan reign he arrogated to himself the status of the most prominent Court noblemen.

3.6.3. Participation in Baptism.

As David Cressy has shown, the ceremony of baptism had a very strong social role in strengthening the relations of friends, kin and patrons.[552] The majority of noble families chose godparents for their children in accordance with their social rank.

According to the household accounts money was paid to the child, the parents, the midwife and the nurse. The 'reward' to the parents of the child (actually a present from godfather to godchild) could consist of money, though some noblemen preferred to

---

[550] Hatfield MSS, EAP 6/31; *Leicester Accounts*, pp.195, 199, 214; HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.489.
[551] Le Strange, pp.497, 498, 524, 539.
[552] D.Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford 1997), p.149.

give real presents to their godchildren.

Sir Richard Bertie's household paid between 2s. 6d. and 30s. per christening.[553] The social status of the parents of the children was not very high. Their fathers were probably tenants or neighbours of the Bertie family. It can be assumed that with these gifts at christenings the local nobility strengthened connections with their tenants, confirming their position among the surrounding population.

However, the situation of the prominent and Court nobility was different. It is possible that they participated in local christenings, but rarely and mostly not in person. Francis and Elizabeth, two of the eight children of Elizabeth, Dowager Countess of Rutland (1588-1595) frequently played the role of godparents to children of their neighbours. It is worth noticing that both of them during the years of their involvement in christenings were well below the age of 16, which was the minimum demanded by the church for godparents.[554] They gave sums which were never less then a pound, between 22s. 6d. and £4 10s. Their grandfather, the 2nd Earl of Rutland, gave 39s. 2d. at the christening of Sir Anthony Strelly's child. Sir Anthony was a local gentleman. However, all these sums differed greatly from the christening gifts of their elder brother, the 5th Earl of Rutland.[555]

Rutland participated in a large number of christenings. He usually gave silver cups and bowls with covers as gifts to his godchildren. The value of Rutland's presents was between £4 10s. 10d. and £19 16s. 8d. The sum of £40 13s. 4d. exceptionally large even for the Rutland household, appears in the accounts in relation to the baptism of his niece, a daughter of his younger brother, Francis.[556] The parents of the Rutland godchildren were usually knights or peers, though once the chambermaid of the Count-

---

[553] HMC *Ancaster*, pp.463, 465, 468.
[554] D.Cressy, op.cit., p.154.
[555] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.382, 395, 396, 401, 403, 424, 431, 446, 459.
[556] Katharine Manners (1603-1649), she married George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham (1593-1628) in 1620.

ess of Derby appears as a parent. Her nurse and midwife received the lowest reward of 10s. However the nurse and the midwife of Lord Thomas Howard's child received £3 each.

It is worth noting that Leicester's accounts for 1584-1586 never mention any presents given to the parents of a child, but Leicester constantly paid £2 to nurses and midwives at christenings.[557] The same pattern is noticeable in the account for 1558-1559.[558] However, according to the accounts for 1559-1561 Leicester was godfather of ten children and gave them presents of between £1 6s. 8d. and £30. The lowest sum was given at the christening of a gardener's child, the largest at the christening of Lord Hunsdone's son. At two of the other christenings Leicester gave his godchildren presents of silver bowls. However in this account there is no separate entry for rewards to nurses and midwives. Leicester's sister, Lady Mary Sidney, gave at one christening a silver salt bowl, which cost £5 1s. 4s. Unfortunately the accountant did not enter the name of the child's parents. The Earl of Huntingdon gave £10 as a present to his godchild, a child of Sir James Winkenfield.

The most interesting picture of relations with godchildren can be observed in Lord North's accounts. North twice gave the sums of 30s. and 53s. 4d. to some of his tenants at the christening of their children. However in his accounts there are sums given to his godsons, which were certainly paid not to children, but to adults. In the case of Lord North we can see the true fulfilment of the idea of a godparent, someone who would help his godchild throughout life.[559]

In general, it can be concluded that the value of the rewards and gifts given at baptism depended on the social rank of the parents of the child and their political and

---

[557] *Leicester Accounts*, pp.197, 206, 217, 243, 311-12, 315, 331.
[558] Ibid., pp.47, 50, 58, 59.
[559] Sidney MSS, A4/5; North, pp.291, 292, 300.

personal closeness to the godparent. The more a nobleman gave. the stronger the ties that connected him to the family, or the stronger the ties that he wanted to create. The lesser nobility gave smaller sums than prominent and Court aristocrats. It seems that the honour of involvement in baptism was mutual: to parents it was a sign of their connection with their landlord; to a nobleman it was the visible expression of his influence. The idea of godparentage was under constant criticism from Puritan writers; but tradition continued to involve godparents in both private and public christenings.[560] It can be assumed that for the nobility participation in baptism was a means of strengthening the system of noble patronage and their network of clients.

3.7. Conclusion.

I.M. understood the tradition of liberality to have been dead in 1598. However, the reward and alms sections of the household accounts, studied in the course of the present chapter, show another picture. All three types of liberality mentioned by I.M. (to the poor; to household servants; and to those who brought presents) continued to flourish, as did liberality towards clergymen, scholars and friends.

It could be argued that Sir Richard Bertie's and Leicester accounts are not the best proof of this tendency (they were compiled in 1559-1588), but the Rutland, the Salisbury and the Percy accounts show the same pattern: all types of 'Liberalicie' are present in them. One must be careful generalising from these examples, and fewer accounts survive from the first half of the seventeenth century. But in spite of limited sources, it can be assumed from his own words that I.M grieved more over the loss of the entire style of life of the old nobility of which 'Liberalicie' was but a part. It is difficult to assess the actual decay of the tradition. The household accounts witness the op-

---

[560] D.Cressy, pp.150-51.

posite. It seems tradition tried even to deny the new realities perpetuate older traditions. It might be thought that the almost universal description of the payments to the doctors, schoolmasters and clerics as 'reward' was an attempt to apply the old way of thinking to the new situation: learned people were gentlemen; gentlemen served for honour, not for money: they were rewarded, not paid.

The reward section of household accounts can be used by historians in order to judge the degree of influence of noblemen. Analysis can show whether the nobleman was the recipient of gifts from local figures or from other noblemen from another parts of the country. The amount and nature of these gifts can show the potential influence of the nobleman in local and wider society. This material will be used in the fourth chapter of the present thesis, in the case study of the 5th Earl of Rutland.

Liberality in the shape of rewards and alms was a very important social institution. The giving of rewards was understood as an obligation on nobleman through sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Separate scales of rewards applied to noblemen of different social positions. Different types of rewards had different monetary values. If a nobleman wanted to proclaim his status, he had to give rewards of a value appropriate to his status. This was his or her social duty. The actual value of the particular rewards can tell historians a lot about relations between members of the nobility, about their relations, connections, local and Court influence.

It might be thought that all these differences are of very little significance and unimportant. The opposite is the case. Stone's comment that 'Everything he [the 5th Earl of Rutland] did was on the same princely scale. The man who opened the park gates at Rockingham as he passed received a tip of 1s., the equivalent of two days' wages. The impression is one of absurdly conspicuous expenditure, undertaken not from a sense of what was becoming to one of his rank and wealth, but for sheer pleasure of spending'

has been already mentioned.[561] The statement is grossly anachronistic and misleading. First, a small correction is that according to the Phelps Brown index of prices, in 1598 the date of the entry, 1s. was the equivalent of one days' wages.[562] Secondly, we have already seen that normally those who opened the gates were rewarded between 6d. and 5s. by prominent titled and Court nobility. We have observed that 6d. was paid to persons of very low rank, like 'boys' and the poor. The 5th Earl of Rutland was undoubtedly a member of the prominent titled nobility. This payment of 1s. was quite normal, and moreover vitally necessary 'from a sense of what was becoming to one of his rank and wealth'. Professor Stone decided himself what became an English Earl in the sixteenth century, but it would have been wiser if the proper sources for rewards, and the scales of reward that can be derived from them, had been consulted. Otherwise, the judgement cannot appear anything but arbitrary.

---

[561] Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.181.
[562] H.Phelps Brown & S.V. Hopkins, *A Perspective of Wages and Prices* (London and New York, 1981), p.11.

CHAPTER FOUR

Precept Into Practice: The Making and Life of Roger Manners, the 5th Earl of Rutland (1576-1612)

This chapter will examine the life of Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland. It will examine the ways in which the Earl might be considered a typical Renaissance nobleman, a product of the new humanist educational ideals, who followed many of the recommendations of the advice literature in his attempt to fashion himself as a true nobleman. The chapter starts with a study of the Earl's education and upbringing, moving then to consider his military and political career. The Earl's cultural patronage will complete our study of his life. Thus it will be possible to see the development of the Earl's character and to judge whether or not his education and upbringing equipped him with the knowledge and qualities necessary for his future life and activity. This analysis of the formation and life of the Earl of Rutland will be grounded on conclusions which have been reached in the previous chapters about the place of the nobility in society, about the proper education and conduct of the nobility, about the usual cost of noble upbringing, and about customary practices of reward and alms-giving.

The 5th Earl of Rutland was for Lawrence Stone an example of a reckless and spendthrift nobleman, who was indifferent to any cultural influences, and who did not generally value education or use his own to any good. I want to show that if a properly historical rather than an anachronistic approach is used, conclusions contrary to those of Stone can be reached. In so doing I will demonstrate that, even in the smallest details, anachronism of judgement needs to be guarded against with great care.

4.1. The Formation of a Nobleman - Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland

This section examines the education received by the Earl, and the attention and care that people around Rutland paid to his proper upbringing and education. A central concern will be to demonstrate that Rutland was given a good humanist education, and to show how this helped form his own understanding of what it meant to be a nobleman.

4.1.1. Birth to Inheritance.

Roger Manners, second but first surviving son of John Manners of Helmsley and his wife Elizabeth Charlton of Appley Castle, was born on 6 October 1576, probably in North Yorkshire, either in Kirk Dighton or in Helmsley.[563] Nothing can be said about the infancy and early childhood of the boy, as is often the case with noble children.

We can assume that he received a good initial education from the earliest reference to him in the papers which are kept in Belvoir can be found in the letter written to John Manners on 7 May 1586 by one John Pullein who was probably a teacher in York. Pullein indicated that Roger was 'an excellent brave child, and hath that virtue grafted in him which will bring forth fruit to the common wealth'.[564] The boy was nine years and seven months old at this time. Pullein said that he had 'tried him in many ways and find him a singular fine child'. The teacher claimed that his 'diligence shall not be wanting

---

[563] Sykes, Porohovchikov, Guililov and Michel consider that he was born in Belvoir Castle (C.M.Sykes, *Alias William Shakespeare?* (London, 1947), p.151; P.Porohovchikov, *Shakespeare Unmasked* (London, 1955), p.59; I.M.Guililov, *Igra ob Williame Shakespeare, ili Taina Velikogo Fenixa* (Moscow, 1997), p.234; J.Michel, *Who Wrote Shakespeare?* (London, 1996), p.212). The reasons for their assumption are unknown. I have asked I.M. Guililov about the facts which led to this assumption. The reply was rather unscholarly: it seemed an axiom for him, and he never doubted the fact. John Manners constantly lived in Helmsley. His letters to his brother were mostly sent either from Helmsley, or from York. Roger Manners was baptised on 19 November 1586 at Kirk Dighton, county York (G.E.Cockayne, *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom*, 2nd ed., v.XI (London, 1949), p.259). This place of baptism looks strange if Belvoir Castle was the place of birth. It is difficult to imagine a young mother in the sixteenth century, whose firstborn had lived only seven weeks, travelling with her second son 80 miles from the place of his birth in order to baptize him. However Kirk Dighton is only 23 miles from Helmsley. Moreover, in the Belvoir archive there are two letters which make it clear that in November 1579 and June 1581 John Manners lived in Dighton (HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.118, 126).

[564] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.193.

in performing what I have already begun'.

We get another glimpse of the young Roger Manners, Lord Roos[565] as he was styled in household accounts, a year and a half later, when the boy left Belvoir Castle, where his father was then the master, for Cambridge.[566] On 4 September 1587 the 4th Earl of Rutland gave £20 to Mr. John Jegon, the Master of Queens' College, in order 'to maike provisions at Cambridge for my Lorde Roose'. Queens' College received from the 4th Earl a gilt bowl with a cover which cost £7 2s. 11d. Probably it took some time for Mr. Jegon to make everything ready for Roger Manners, the boy having left Belvoir only on 24 November 1587.[567] This trip of the young Lord and his retinue cost the Earl another £40. Immediately after arriving at the University a 'poticarye of Cambridge' received £3 6s. 8d. So, before Roger started his studies at Cambridge £70 9s. 7d. were spent on him. On 9 December 1587 Jegon informed the Earl that his 'son is in very good health'. The masters and the fellows of the college were satisfied with the Earl's gift of plate.[568]

At Cambridge Manners had at least two attendants, a man and a boy. The Earl of Rutland 'set down £20 to his tutor for his tuition, £10 for the diet of his man, and £5 for his boy', but did not have time to set allowance for his son's own diet, and other necessities.[569]

According to Lord Roos's own letter of 4 February, he concentrated for first three months of his time at University on correcting his 'ill-inditing and ... worse writ-

---

[565] The barony of Roos came to the Manners family though the female line (Eleanor Roos), from until the 3rd Earl of Rutland direct male line never was never interrupted. However Earl Edward had only child, a daughter. So, it was questionable whether the Barony of Ross passed to the heir general or heir male. Both sides consider themselves the only rightful owners of the title. While the legal dispute continued both sides called themselves 'Lord Roos', in 1616 it was decided that the old Barony of Roos should be confirmed on the offspring of Earl Edward's daughter, William Cecil.

[566] *HMC Rutland*, IV, pp.392-93.

[567] Unfortunately Rutland's official matriculation date is unknown, J.Venn gives only dates for Rutland's admittance as Fellow Commoner at Corpus Christi and at Queens' (J.Venn *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A Biographical List* (Cambridge, 1922), v.III, p.135).

[568] Ibid., I, p.233.

[569] Ibid., p.248.

ing'.[570] Even after this the boy was not satisfied with the results, but he did not want to show himself forgetful of his mother and wrote her a letter in spite of the remaining faults in his writing.

From 24 February 1588 Roos became the 5th Earl of Rutland. On 4 March 1588 he wrote a letter to his widowed mother trying to comfort her.[571] Naturally, his presence was necessary at the funeral of the late Earl. Sir John Manners of Haddon Hall, Roger Manners of Uffington and Sir George Chaworth were appointed to bring the boy from Cambridge to Belvoir 'there to tarry till the funeral be done'.[572]

4.1.2. From Inheritance to Grand Tour.

The young Earl of Rutland did not return to Cambridge immediately after the funeral. He stayed with his mother until the middle of May 1588. While Rutland was staying at Belvoir, the Dowager Countess received a letter from Lord Burghley which made it clear that he would shape the boy's life for the near future.[573] Burghley insisted that the Earl should return to Cambridge, to his 'honest and discreet tutor', and he was ordered to remain there until further directions from the Queen.[574] Burghley promised to pay all reasonable charges for his tutor, diet and attendants, but as his guardian Burghley expected the boy 'to learn and follow his book or any other good qualities'.[575]

By 27 May Burghley's order was obeyed, and the Earl had returned to Cambridge.[576] In August Rutland thanked his mother for sending his 'bay nag', as the horse previously sent to him was lame. In addition to the bay nag, the boy wanted his pied nag

---

[570] Ibid., p.239-40.
[571] Ibid., p.242.
[572] Ibid., p.244.
[573] Ibid., pp.256-57.
[574] As a minor the 5th Earl of Rutland was a Royal ward, and the Queen had to decide whether his wardship would be sold to someone or would be kept by the Court of Wards. The Queen opted for the latter.
[575] Probably Burghley redirected the government over all financial issues to the Dowager Countess, though it was contrary to the practice of the Court of Wards.
[576] Probably the old lodgings of the young Earl were not appropriate to his new position. New bedding and furniture arrived in Cambridge on 17 June 1588, and the Earl thanked his mother for her care.

sent to him as well.[577] Thus, Rutland was provided with horses which he could use to gain physical exercises. Rutland was a rather good student, and spent about seven years altogether in Cambridge. There is relatively detailed data on his whereabouts for five years and eight months (between 24th November 1587 and July 1593). During this time he was present in the University for four years and a month in all; eleven and a half months he spent visiting his mother, and another three months in London.

Table 4.1. Rutland's whereabouts between 24th November 1587 and July 1593.[578]

Cambridge		Belvoir		London	
Arrival	**Departure**	**Arrival**	**Departure**	**Arrival**	**Departure**
24.11.1587	8.03.1588	8.03.1588	15.05.1588		
15.05.1588	30.01.1589			30.01.1589	18.02.1589
18.02.1589	19.03.1589	19.03.1589	17.04.1589		
17.04.1589	26.08.1589	26.08.1589	18.09.1589		
18.09.1589	3.03.1590			3.03.1590	16.03.1590
16.03.1590	18.04.1590	18.04.1590	30.04.1590		
30.04.1590	22.08.1590	22.08.1590	5.10.1590		
5.10.1590	15.01.1591	15.01.1591	2.02.1591		
2.02.1591	1.07.1591	12.07.1591	15.09.1591		
15.09.1591	18.12.1591	18.12.1591	9.01.1592		
9.01.1592	04.1592			04.1592	
06.1592	07.1592	07.1592	08.1592		
09.1592	12.1592	04.1593	9.05.1593		
9.05.1593	07.1593				

It is very difficult to see how these rare and short visits to his mother could be called tearing 'between his guardian and his mother', as Stone called them.[579] Each time when Rutland left his mother for Cambridge she gave him a token of £5 in gold. Sometimes Rutland wrote Burghley asking the opinion of his guardian about whether he should accept the invitation of his mother to visit her at Belvoir. On 18th August 1589 Burghley permitted his young ward to visit his mother and other friends in the country on the condition that his tutor and books would accompany him to Belvoir. Burghley stressed his firm belief that knowledge would serve you 'in all ages, in all places and fortunes'.

---

[577] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.250-51, 256, 260.
[578] Ibid., I, pp.266, 268-9, 281, 320; IV, p.394-96, 401-03, 408.
[579] Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.178.

However Burghley emphasised that learning 'must be governed allweiss with the knolledg and feare of God, for otherwise it will prove but a vanyty, and leade you to folly'.[580] Thus, Rutland's studies were not to be interrupted even by the summer.

On 20 August Jegon informed the Countess about their planned journey.[581] The Bishop of Lincoln was eager to see Rutland. According to Jegon, the bishop seemed 'to affect and love' Rutland (who was thirteen years old at the time). The party intended either to dine or to spend a night with the Bishop. Next day they were going to visit Roger Manners of Uffington.[582] From Uffington they went directly to Belvoir. A good half of the letter was dedicated to the question of attendance.[583] There is no doubt that people around the Earl took his position very seriously.

A letter with recommendations on proper behaviour at Court, written by Roger Manners of Uffington to Rutland's eldest sister, Bridget, bore a Postscript from the Earl who commended their granduncle's advice and hoped that his sister 'will perform it'.[584] Lady Bridget was advised to pray to God; to 'applie [herself]... hollye' to the Queen's service; to be diligent, secret and faithful; to be of reverent behaviour towards her elders

---

[580] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.274-275. Stone sees in this letter the close control that Burghley had over the young Earl (L.Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.177.). However there are some other possible explanations of its tone and content. Stone mentions the lawsuit between the two Dowager Countesses of Rutland, Isabel and Elizabeth, and the fact that Burghley obviously was on the side of Countess Isabel and her daughter Lady Elizabeth, Burghley's granddaughter-in-law. He omits, however, to mention the dates of the letters. Rutland's letter reached Burghley in the very midst of this suit. Probably he could have visited his mother without asking Burghley's consent, as Burghley showed that he was pleasantly surprised by Rutland's effort to consult him. It is worth remembering that during all this period Rutland lived under the care of a very experienced careerist, Mr. John Jegon, Master of Corpus Christi and later a bishop. In Belvoir Castle there are Jegon's letters of advice to the Dowager Countess Elizabeth that show Jegon as a very cunning politician (HMC *Rutland*, I,p.266). It is also possible that Jegon advised Rutland to ask Burghley's permission to visit Belvoir. I do not insist that my explanation of the meaning of Rutland's sending this letter is the only correct one, my intention is just to show that there could be more than one explanation of the reasons for sending any letter once we take into account what the sending of the letter tells us, instead of simply using its content.

[581] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.275.

[582] Roger Manners of Uffington was the 5th Earl's granduncle and a member of the Royal household.

[583] Jegon considered that at their departure from Cambridge they needed only the groom with a trunk horse. Near Cambridge there was 'a gentleman with £40 a year, living within three miles of Cambridge who would be ready to serve my Lord. He would put him to no charge and would be ready to ride and go with him'. Though the Earl of Rutland was less then thirteen years old, there were gentlemen who considered it useful to form ties with him. Jegon intended to send a message out of Uffington, so that 'some two or three gentlemen might meet us between Uffington and Belvoir'.

[584] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.275-6.

and superiors, to be civil and courteous to her equals, to show favour and gentleness towards inferiors; to be no meddler in the causes of others, and to be silent and not to hurt anyone with her speech. Clearly, Rutland endorsed traditional ideas of proper feminine behaviour.

Rutland continued to follow his 'book well', but remained under the command of others.[585] He obediently followed his mother's order to get rid of one of his servants, though Rutland saw no fault in him. In the summer of 1590 Jegon was elected Master of Corpus Christi College. Rutland wanted to follow his tutor and change college, and sought Burghley's opinion on the matter. On 12 August Burghley sent his approval, agreeing in advance that the Earl could come to Belvoir 'whan my Lady your mother shall desyre to have you at Beavoyr this huntyng tyme'. Burghley was sure that when Rutland would be 'weary of huntyng' he would 'recontynew some exercise of huntyng in your book'.[586]

On 1 October 1590 Rutland was admitted Fellow-Commoner of Corpus Christi.[587] He continued his studies successfully there. He enjoyed learning, and this brought him excellent results. Now fourteen years old, Rutland was considered 'the best of his time and companions'.[588] However Roger Manners of Uffington was more concerned about his behaviour. He demanded that the Dowager Countess 'admonishe my Lord of Rutland and thos aboute him to have care of his maners that his behavior be sevill, and to fation his speech and intertayment according to the person and his calling'. This indicates that Manners wanted the Countess to explain to her son that his position

---

[585] Ibid., p.282.
[586] Ibid., p.283.
[587] J.Venn, op.cit., v.III, p.135.
[588] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.284-85. The same letter which informs us about this gives some idea of his lodgings in Cambridge. Rutland and his retinue occupied at least three rooms. His drawing room was 12 m^2; he had a bedroom, and at least one room for his attendants. Jegon considered that the four daily waiters who lived with Earl were sufficient for his status. There was a shortage of beds and bedding, so the Dowager Countess was asked to supply them, as well as some clothes.

as an Earl involved responsibilities as well as pleasures. The Countess definitely tried to lecture her son. On 21 October 1591 the young Earl thanked his mother for her care and direction, but assured the Countess that his behaviour would not give her reasons for worry: 'the cariage of myselfe both towardes God and my booke, my comelinesse in diet and gesture, shall be such as your Ladyship shall hear and like well of'.[589] Somewhere in 1593 Rutland visited London and was admitted to the Inner Temple. Probably in 1594 Rutland visited Cambridge occasionally.

The Dowager Countess's disbursement book throws some light on the cost of the Earl's education.[590] In 1588 Mr Jegon received £70 'to be imployed to my sonne's use at Cambridge'; another £4 was sent as a present to the boy personally. On 29 July 1588 Jegon was sent £50. Next day Jegon wrote back about the fate of this money. £44 15s. 11d. of it was to be paid for 'discharge of the Midsummer quarter'.[591] So, it seems that Rutland's stay at University cost approximately £180 per year. In 1589 Jegon received £140 from the Countess, in 1590 the sum was £309. We have seen that in the case of the 2nd Earl of Essex such sums were provided by his guardians, not by his mother; in Rutland's case, all sums were given by the Dowager Countess herself for reasons unknown.

By the end of 1594 Burghley probably considered that Rutland had learned enough at the University. In December of that year he informed the Dowager Countess that the Queen gave her consent for the Earl's trip abroad.[592] Burghley acknowledged that he was as ignorant of the state of Rutland's affairs as the eighteen-year-old Earl himself. Burghley wanted the Countess to acquaint her son with the situation before his Grand Tour. Six years after becoming Rutland's guardian, he was still desiring to 'understand the same [Rutland's estate]'. Rutland gained an MA degree on 20 February 1595 and

---

[589] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.296, 297.
[590] Ibid., IV, p.394.
[591] Ibid., I, p.256.
[592] Ibid., pp.324-25.

thereafter embarked on European travel. In 1598 Rutland was incorporated MA at Oxford. On 2 February 1599 (between his participation in the Azores expedition and the Ireland war) he was admitted to Gray's Inn, thus, following Elyot's advice to young aristocrats to study English law.

4.1.3. Influences.

A number of individuals undoubtedly played crucial role in the formation of the adult Rutland.

His father, John Manners of Helmsley, was a younger brother of the 3rd Earl of Rutland and succeeded his brother in the title in 1587.[593] John Manners married Elizabeth, fourth daughter of Francis Charlton of Appley Castle, before 1572.[594] This marriage was certainly not an example of the sort of practices that Lawrence Stone considered normal amongst the nobility. Stone argued that younger brothers of peers rarely married; if they did marry they did so late in the life.[595] But John Manners married when he was less than twenty years old, and in advance of the marriage of his brother, the Earl.[596] The 4th Earl of Rutland received the renewal of the offices and stewardships of his late brother. According to the repeated comments of the 4th Earl's correspondents, he

---

[593] He was born before 1552. Stone characterizes him as 'not a scholar or a statesman, but a bluff, simple country gentleman suddenly elevated to a position of great authority' (L.Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.175). However he matriculated at Cambridge (fellow-commoner at St. John's College) in September 1564, where he probably studied two years. Then, in 1566 he was admitted to Gray's Inn, becoming an 'Ancient' in 1568 (G.E.Cockayne, *The Complete Peerage*, XI, p.259). While the 3rd Earl was busy serving the state he did not hesitate to entrust his younger brother with management of the family estates. According to letters from 1586 he became more and more involved in local affairs.

[594] Cockayne gives the year of marriage of John Manners, 4th Earl of Rutland, as before 1575. However in the article dedicated to the Barony of Roos, Cockayne mentions that the eldest daughter of John Manners, Bridget, was born on 21 February 1572, so presumably Manners married sometime in May 1571. They had five sons and four daughters (the eldest son, Edward, died in infancy; the third daughter, Mary, died in early childhood; and a fourth daughter, Francis, was born posthumously).

[595] Stone, *Crisis*, p.595.

[596] Though one contrary example does not undermine a general argument, however it is worth saying that Stone failed to mention this particular contrary example, this raising doubt about how many more contrary examples he preferred to ignore.

was 'in very gracious terms with the Queen'.[597]

The 4th Earl died when his son was only eleven years old, but it seems probable that he was responsible for the boy's initial interest in learning. After all, it was a father's responsibility to provide his heir with an appropriate tutor and teacher, according to Elyot. We know nothing about boy's tutor, but he was provided with a teacher in York. Almost the first thing that John Manners did after he inherited the title and became independent in means was to send his eldest son to Cambridge.[598] He was the moving force behind the boy's earlier education, and probably inspired in his son an interest in learning.

Let us have a look at the boy's mother. Elizabeth Charlton was the fourth daughter of a gentry family of good blood. She married John Manners of Helmsley before 1572; and in 1587 her husband became the 4th Earl of Rutland. Soon after, on 24 February 1588, she became the Dowager Countess of Rutland. Stone in both *The Crisis of the Aristocracy* and *The Family, Sex and Marriage* proclaimed that Tudor noble families were unaffectionate, and he saw the frequency of second marriages of spouses as a sign of this lack of mutual love and compassion.[599] As the Earl of Northumberland said in 1609, it was very common for a widow to remarry soon after her first husband's death. If

---

[597] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.221, 229, 230, 232. It seems that he had no problems in performing his new offices and responsibilities. Stone bases his low view of Rutland's abilities as a statesman on a letter of the 4th Earl in which he described his own character (HMC *Rutland*, I, p.219). The letter was written to Robert Cecil on 15 June 1587, two months after his brother's death, in order 'to acquaint' Cecil with himself. Rutland stated that he was not a hypocrite, and did not 'love anyone for wordly respect'. He professed his trust in God. Rutland confessed that he had a choleric temper, but was sure that he would be able, with God's help, to constrain himself in his new public offices. It is most doubtful whether we should to take Rutland's words that he was 'unfit and unworthy of such a calling [to be an Earl]' at their face value. Cecil would probably have considered Rutland very rash if he had written that he was completely ready for his new position and worthy of it. It could be said that this letter to Cecil was written by a good politician. The Earl confessed that he had some minor defects of character, but that he intended to do his best to overcome them. Stone also sees a sign of the 4th Earl's 'uncertain temper' in the lawsuit which he started with the Dowager Countess of Rutland about her legacies, immediately after his late brother's funeral (L.Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.175). However Stone fails to notice that Rutland, in fact, won. Rutland received what he wanted, the right first to pay the debts of his late brother, and only then to part with valuable leases bequeathed to his sister-in-law. Probably, Rutland was a better lawyer then Stone credits him with being.

[598] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.392-93.

[599] Stone, *Crisis*, pp.590-91; Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage*, pp.93-114.

there is any truth in Stone's reading of this evidence, then the Countess loved her husband, for the question of a second marriage never arose during seven years of her widowhood. The Countess built impressive tombs to her husband and his elder brother.

Even those scholars who reject Stone's claims in general suggest that he might have been right about the unaffectionate character of noble marriages.[600] It seems very difficult to support a deduction from the fact of frequent remarriage alone. That the majority of widows and widowers remarried could just as well lead to the contrary conclusion, that people remarried because of the loss of companionship to which they had grown accustomed. In fact Stone did not provide his reader with any statistical data regarding the frequency of remarriage. Furthermore, contrary to another of Stone's opinions about distance between parents and children, the Dowager Countess Elizabeth was a very affectionate mother who cared about her children. It has already been mentioned that Stone's view has been disputed by Ralph Houlbrooke and Linda A. Pollock, who showed that there often existed between parents and their children strong emotional bonds.[601]

Stone also suggested that in noble families brothers were frequently on much more cordial terms with their sisters than with other brothers.[602] The Manners family contradicts this idea as well. The Countess managed to create a very affectionate atmosphere in her family. Her three elder sons loved each other, and the younger ones sent presents to the eldest and came to visit him in Cambridge. It seems that Rutland retained close connections with his younger brothers and sisters in spite of his almost permanent stay in Cambridge. In January 1591 Rutland, staying at Lady Wharton's, was sorry to re-

---

[600] A.Macfarlane, *History and Theory*, v.18 (1979), pp.103-126; R.Mitchinson, *The New Review* (02.1978), p.41; J.H.Plumb, *NYRB* (24.11.1977), p.30; H.Thomas, *The Listener* (8.12.1977), p.752; K.Thomas, *Times Literary Supplement (TLS)* (21.10.1977), p.1226; E.P.Thompson, *New Society*, v.41 (8.09.1977) pp.499-501K.Wrightson, *English Society 1580-1680* (London, 1982), pp.71-73, 103-04;

[601] R.Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England* (Oxford, 1998); L.A.Pollock, *Forgotten Children. Parent-Child Relations from 1500 to 1900.* (Cambridge, 1983), pp.137, 190, 199-200, 262-267.

[602] Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage*, p.115

ceive the news that he would not see his younger brother Francis there, because the weather prevented him from travelling. The Earl was glad that his other brother, George, had recovered from his ague, but was sorry that his 'swate' sister now caught it.[603] The Earl was clearly worried by the news of his brother's and sister's illness.

Between 1588 and 1593 the Countess managed to provide her eldest son in Cambridge and her daughter at Court with considerable sums, £1301 5s. 3d. and £1011 2d. respectively. She did her best to protect the interests of her son against the claims of the elder Dowager Countess of Rutland. There is no published set of estate accounts that could show whether she was a good or a bad manager. The 9th Earl of Northumberland wrote of the general inability of women to manage their husbands' affairs because of their lack of education and practice. However there are many successful examples of women who governed their estates including Elizabeth Hardwicke the Countess of Shrewsbury. It is difficult to determine for sure to which category the younger Dowager Countess of Rutland belonged.

It seems that there was a considerable intimacy between the boy and his mother. Jegon sent his early reports on Lord Roos to the Earl, but the boy himself wrote a letter to his mother on 4 February 1588.[604] He did not want to show himself forgetful of his mother. On 4 March 1588, after his father's death, the new Earl of Rutland wrote a letter to his widowed mother trying to comfort her.[605] He assured her of his perfect health. Rutland wrote that he daily prayed God 'to preserve your good Ladyship in the like health and welfare, in whom is my only staye'. He begged his mother 'now more and more – if it be possible – increase your carefull love and lovinge care for me'. Rutland promised to be always a 'most obediente dutifull and thankefull sonne'. The pathos,

---

[603] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.396; I, p.288.
[604] Ibid., p.239-40.
[605] Ibid., p.242.

tone and high feelings of the letter were a little diminished by a postscript, 'good madame have me in remembrance for some linnen'. Presumably necessity added this line to his affectionate letter. Two weeks later the Earl wrote another letter, longing to see his mother.[606]

The widowed mother never forgot her absent son. In July she sent him some fat venison, his horse and some money for his personal expenses, and was again thanked by her son.[607] On 22 October 1588, eight months after the death of her husband, the Dowager Countess of Rutland gave birth to her last child, a girl who was to be named Frances. Her eldest son immediately congratulated his mother on the safe birth.[608]

It is worth mentioning that when Roger Manners of Uffington wanted Rutland's behaviour to be improved, he did not write himself to his young relative but demanded the Dowager Countess to lecture her son. Probably, he knew that mother had greater influence on her son than he did. The Dowager Countess probably provided her son with a sense of family. In his formative years, the young Earl felt the mother's love and care and his warm letters show that he appreciated her concern for him. Later, when he came of age he always cared for his younger brothers and sisters, and so the affectionate relations created by the Countess among her children survived her death.

Probably the next most influential person in the Earl's early life was his tutor, John Jegon.[609] John Jegon was elected a fellow of Queens' College in 1572, and filled successively the offices of college tutor, proctor in the University, and Vice-president. In 1590, under the influence of Burghley, Jegon was elected master of Corpus Christi College. Some of his pupils changed colleges with him, as Rutland did. Jegon freed Corpus Christi from financial difficulties and raised the standards of instruction. He was re-

---

[606] Ibid., p.244.
[607] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.250-1, 256.
[608] Ibid., p.262.
[609] *DNB*, X, pp.723-724.

ported to have combined 'the seriousness and gravity becoming a governor' with 'a most facetious disposition, so that it was hard to say whether his counsel was more grateful for its soundness, or his company more acceptable for the pleasantness thereof'.

Two months after the 4th Earl of Rutland's death his chaplain died. This chaplain was incumbent of the parish of Redmill. The Earls of Rutland were patrons of the living. There was no problem for the Dowager Countess in deciding who was worthy of it. Her answer was 'Mr Jegon, my son's tutor' 'on account of his care for the Earl'.[610] Seven years later, in 1595, the young Earl bestowed another living, that of Beckingham, on 'Mr. Doctor Jegon, my late tutor in Cambridge, a men well known for his sufficiency to be meet for a better place'.[611] There seems to have been another candidate for this place, but Rutland was sure of his right and did not intend to change his decision. The Earl retained a very close relationship with his tutor, even after leaving his care. When abroad, his eldest sister Lady Bridget stayed with her firstborn at Cambridge under the supervision of Mr. Jegon, who informed his former pupil of the state of her health and her financial difficulties.[612]

In 1603 Jegon became the Bishop of Norwich. The Belvoir archive preserves a letter from Lady Howard, who knew that he was 'the most likely to be preferred to the bishopric of Norwich'.[613] She asked Jegon to bestow some offices (that would be in the bishop's disposal) to a friend of hers. The letter was perfectly normal for the period. Probably, Jegon sent the letter to his chief benefactor, the Earl of Rutland in order to discover his opinion in the matter. Jegon's contribution towards the Earl's education is undeniable. Rutland's tutor was no retiring don, but a man who built for himself a successful public career. Possibly Jegon being himself a client of Burghley, helped to foster

---

[610] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.248.
[611] Ibid., p.381.
[612] Ibid., p.339.
[613] Ibid., p.386

the relations between Sir Robert Cecil and Rutland.

It is useful to remember the 5th Earl's guardian, Lord Burghley, who had control over the boy and influenced him in many ways. Burghley was probably not the most attentive of guardians, but he was perhaps not the least either. He did pay attention to the education and upbringing of his charge, and he helped to keep the wardenship of Sherwood Forest in the family.[614] However, in 1594 Burghley acknowledged that he knew nothing about the estate of his charge.[615] Two months after his father's death Rutland wrote Burghley a letter in which he wanted to 'shewe my selfe thankfull unto ... my goode Lorde and patrone' for his love towards Rutland. The boy considered he did not deserve this love and thought that 'in me your L. finde no cause'. [616]

As we have seen, the Dowager Countess of Rutland exercised considerable authority over her son. But, as well, Rutland was under strong influence from Jegon and Burghley. It is hard to endorse Stone's views about the existence of the conflict between these influences. A better case could be made about Roger Manners of Uffington who aspired to influence his grandnephew, but whose efforts were frustrated either by Jegon, or by the boy himself. On one occasion, Jegon vetoed the visit of his charge to Roger Manners, with the full agreement of the Dowager Countess.[617] The mode of Manners' letters to the Dowager Countess suggest that he did not have a strong personal influence over the boy, so when he really wanted some point to be brought to the Earl's attention he demanded that the Dowager Countess exercise her authority over him. It seems that this conflict did not reflect any difference in understanding of the Earl's proper role in society. Probably the origin of the conflict lay in Roger Manners' refusal to be an executor of the 4th Earl of Rutland's will, which meant that the Dowager Countess of Rutland

---

[614] HMC *Salisbury*, III, p.365.
[615] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.324-25.
[616] BL, Lansd.57, N82, f.188.
[617] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.256.

had to accept the responsibility.

4.1.4. Grand Tour.

At the beginning of the 1595 Rutland was ready to start his Grand Tour. However the road to the Continent refused to open immediately. The Dowager Countess Elizabeth died before a travel licence to the Earl was properly issued.[618] Rutland stayed at Belvoir until September. On 27 September Rutland was in London, and received his travel licence.

Before leaving for Europe Rutland received a very long letter of advice from the Earl of Essex, and a further two letters caught up with him on the Continent.[619] (These letters, especially the second one, and the authorship problem connected with them, have already been discussed in the first chapter). Essex himself did not go on a Grand Tour, but nonetheless in his circle the Grand Tour was understood to be an important part of a noble education, and by this time Rutland was clearly in contact with this circle. Essex advised Rutland to visit battlefields in order to 'confirm your natural courage, and be made more fit for true fortitude, which ... must grow out of discourse of reason'. The Queen's favourite wrote that Rutland's main aim must be 'the tilling and manuring of your own mind'. He had to attain knowledge, for knowledge will help one to have 'clearness and strength of judgement'. Knowledge, for Essex, was the basis of all virtues; he considered that the English nobility had too long despised knowledge and ignored the education of its sons.

Essex was sure that he did not need 'to persuade ... [Rutland] to the love of' knowledge and it was to 'be sought by study, by conference, and by observation'. Rutl-

---

[618] Cockayne thinks that she was buried on 24 March 1595 (Cockayne, XI, p.259). However it is highly unlikely. On 9 April Rutland received a letter informing him that 'the Queen and the Lord Treasurer think that ... you should not exceed the note [for the cost of burial] you have set down, but rather lessen it'.
[619] Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*, II, pp.7-20.

and was advised to study privately through books, even while travelling abroad. It was important, therefore, that he 'not often remove from place to place, but stay some time and reside in best'. In order to remember what he studied Rutland was advised to make notes and abridgements. Essex wanted his cousin to study either under the supervision of 'some good general scholar', whom he had to 'carry over with' him, or to stop at 'the universities abroad, where you may hear the professors in every art'. Rutland should test his knowledge and understanding of the matters studied through conversation and dispute with experts in each subject that he had studied. He should observe and analyse the causes of different events that he had either seen or studied. Essex emphasised that knowledge had to be sought for the love of virtue and not for praise._

It is very difficult to find out the exact date of Rutland's departure from England, on 2 October 1595 Rowland Whyte informed Sir Robert Sidney that 'my Lord Rutland is taking his leave, and means to be in Flushing within 14 days' and on 4 October Rutland rode 'post to Petworth to take his leave'. However Rutland moved 'to the sea-cost' only after 17 October. On 19 October Sidney was informed that Rutland would bring some letters to him from the Earl of Essex. On 22 October Rutland was already in Flushing, and on 27th Sir Robert Sidney was 'going to bring my Lorde of Rutland to the Haghe'.[620] Probably Sidney fulfilled his intention almost immediately, for by 3 November Rutland had visited Leyden and by the 5th, the Hague. On 2 November he was on his way to Amsterdam accompanied by Lord Thomas Burgh. Lord Burgh praised Rutland highly, 'his disposition is good; and the course he is entering into apt to supply to nature'.[621]

Sidney wrote a letter, probably praising Rutland, to his granduncle Roger Manners of Uffington. Manners said 'he would not take £100 to read this letter'; 'he was exceeding glad to heare such Praise, of my Lord of Rutland, because yt came from your

---

[620] HMC *De L'Isle*, II, pp.168-69, 174-77.
[621] HMC *Salisbury*, V, pp.438-41.

self, that he knowes can rightly iudge of the Hopes he expects in his Nephue...'.[622] On 21 November Lord Willoughby, who met Rutland on the Continent, was reminded by Captain John Buck to write to Roger Manners and 'make much of my Lord of Rutland'.[623] After Amsterdam Rutland went to Germany. On 8 February he sent a letter to his other granduncle, John Manners, from Heidelburg. Rutland's aim was Italy. Rutland certainly arrived in Italy before the 28th of March 1996. On that day he was entered in the Register of Padua University, thus following Essex's advice to study in foreign Universities.[624]

Sykes considers that the entry enables us to determine Rutland's route to Italy. A sixteenth century traveller in late February or early March would have had no alternative but the Brenner Pass.[625] His studies at Padua University cannot have been very long or substantial, because at the end of April he fell ill, and did not finally recover until the beginning of July.[626] Perhaps he studied alone or even attended lectures in the University between the attacks of the illness. He had intended to go from Padua to Rome, but these plans were shattered by illness. Instead, he went to Venice. On 25 September Anna, Dowager Countess of Warwick informed Roger Manners that from Rutland's letter from Venice she understood that he intended to go to France, and his route seems to have taken him through Germany and Switzerland.[627] In Geneva Rutland exchanged some money, and these bills of exchange help to determine his further route: on 9 March 1597 he was in Geneva, on 18th in Lyon, and on 20 April in Marseilles. Until 19 June Rutland

---

[622] A.Collins, *Letters and Memorials of State, in the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, Part of the Reign of King Charles the Second, and Oliver's Usurpation* (London, 1746), I, p.368

[623] HMC *Ancaster*, p.331.

[624] Padua, Archivio Antico dell'Universita di Padova, 30, f.94v (microfilm).

[625] Sykes, op.cit., p.162.

[626] T.Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth from the Year 1581 till the Death* (London, 1756), I, p.475; II, pp.26, 59, 85.

[627] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.333. On 10 January Rutland's accountant paid for the delivery of a case from Augsburg; some letters were sent to Rutland to Germany, as well. In Geneva, Rutland's cook, Thomas Beest, left his master and returned to England (HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.410-411).

stayed in Paris, but arrived in Rouen on 20 June. On the 30th he was in Dieppe, and on 4 July 1597 he returned to England through Plymouth.[628] While travelling, Rutland practised his knowledge of Italian and French, and saw a number of Italian, French and other European cities. During all of the travels, Rutland was accompanied by Robert Dallington, who was an experienced educator and had served as a schoolmaster, thus, again following Essex's advice, in this case to be accompanied by an experienced scholar.[629]

Rutland was one of the dedicatees of John Florio's *The World of Words* along with the Earl of Southampton and Countess of Bedford.[630] Florio's dedication and poem emphasized Rutland's learning and love for studies. According to Florio, all three of them [Rutland included] studied many different subjects in great depth and liked to read 'what the worlds best wits haue written, and to speake as they write'. Florio mentioned that Rutland knew Italian well before he went abroad, and perfected it while he stayed in Italy. In his dedicatory poem Florio described Rutland's achievement in Italian in the following way:

> In Italie your Lorship vvell hath seene
> Their manners, monuments, magnificence
> Their language learn't in sound, in stile, in sence,
> Proouing by profiting, where you haue beene;
> Bemantling graue conceits in colours greene...

After returning from his Grand Tour, Rutland was well equipped with knowledge, manners and experience to play his part in the complicated games of the Elizabethan court. He remained in contact with learned people in Europe whom he had met during his travels (as Francis Bacon recommended in his essay on *Travel*). In particular, he

---

[628] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.410-412.
[629] Ibid., IV, p.411. K.J.Höltgen, 'Sir Robert Dallington (1561-1637): Author, Traveler, and Pioneer of Taste, *The Huntington Library Quartely*, v.47 (1984), p.150.
[630] J.Florio, *The World of Words* (London, 1598), dedication.

continued to correspond with the famous protestant intellectual Caspar Waser, though this correspondence does not survive.[631]

Rutland's religious views have not yet been dealt with. It is known that Rutland's two younger brothers, Frances and Oliver, were Catholics, but nobody ever doubted Rutland's own religious orientation.[632] He was clearly a Protestant. At University he was under the care of a Protestant tutor, the future bishop of Norwich, and under the supervision of a Protestant guardian. As soon as Jegon was elected Master of Corpus Christi, he insisted on appointing 'a Cathechist', who should read a lecture every Thursday in term on some subject in divinity.[633] In his letter of advice on travel Essex was sure that Rutland 'still nourish[ed] the seeds of religion which during your education at Cambridge were sown in you'.[634] Moreover, in 1590 the Dowager Countess of Rutland hired Pierre du Moulin, a famous French Protestant, to become a Rutland's companion while he studied in Cambridge. Du Moulin mentioned that this arrangement permitted him to attend the lectures of Dr. Whitaker.[635] William Whitaker was a leading Puritan divine in Cambridge in the second half of the sixteenth century. He propagated the teaching of the church of England, interpreted in its most Calvinistic sense.[636] Very likely Rutland attended these lectures as well. Du Moulin stayed with Rutland until 1591, when he received a scholarship and no longer needed to earn his living. According to Sir Thomas

---

[631] *The Zurich Letters 1558-1602*, ed.Rev.H.Robinson, 2nd series (Cambridge, 1845), pp.326-327. Caspar Waser was a minister at Zurich, and professor of Hebrew there in 1596. In 1607 he was made a canon of Zurich, and professor of Greek, and in 1611 was appointed to the chair of theology. The Earl was ready to help Waser's pupil, Caspar Thoman, for Waser's sake, and did his best to help him to study in England. Rutland was aware of regulations in English Universities. He knew that foreigners were not admissible into English colleges. The Earl wrote a letter to the Queen's physician, though the latter only confirmed Rutland's words. It seems that Rutland was the only English nobleman with whom Waser was in close correspondence. All other persons mentioned in Thoman's letters as trying to help him were men associated with academic life.

[632] Rutland was liked by the bishop of Lincoln and tutored by future bishop of Norwich.

[633] Rev.R.Masters, *Masters' History of the College of Corpus Christi and the Blessed Virgin Mary in the University of Cambridge* (London, 1831), p. 145.

[634] Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*, II, p. 11.

[635] Pirre du Moulin, 'Autobiographie de Pierre du Moulin (1564-1658)' *Bulletin de la Societe de L'Histoire du Protestantisme Francais*, v. 7 (1858), pp.179-180.

[636] *DNB*, v. XXI, pp.21-23.

Arundel, Rutland at some time was read 'Aristotles polyticks' by 'one Cuff a certayne purytane skoller one of the whottest heades of my lo: of Essex his followers'.[637] The association with du Moulin and Cuff might help us to place Rutland in the circle of militant Protestants, to which belonged Leicester, Walsingham, Sir Philip Sidney, and Essex; and there are other things that will confirm this judgement. Robert Dallington, Rutland's travelling companion, later propagated the same views to Prince Henry.

It has already been noted that the very first surviving references to the Earl as a child were connected with learning. His formal education lasted nine years, and was completed - in good humanist fashion – by the practical education of the Grand Tour, equipping him for the *vita activa*. It can be argued that we cannot know whether he indeed learned much during his lengthy studies at University. Stone considered him 'a young man of some natural intelligence but who had failed to master the classics and whose main interests lay elsewhere'.[638] This opinion is based on the fact that in 1599 Rutland bought Livy in translation. However this proves nothing. One can read the original and still be interested in having a translation. The fact that Rutland bought Livy in translation does not mean that he did not know Latin. When Stone speaks about the books that Rutland bought in 1599 and 1600 he also omits to mention of *Observations upon the first five books of Caesar's Commentaries* and the *History of the Troubles of Hungary*,[639] surely evidence 'of more cultivated interests'.

Books accompanied Rutland from his childhood to his death. In 1603 he bought Sir William Segar's *Arms of the Knights of Garter*, in 1610 he bought a book of Donne, two volumes of statutes, and several works by King James I: *Basilicon Doron*, *Free*

---

[637] Quoted by A.Grafton and L.Jardine in 'Studied for Action: How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy', *Past and Present*, 129 (1990), p.33. Cuff was among those of Essex's followers who paid with their lives for their participation in the Revolt.
[638] Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.179.
[639] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.427.

Monarchy and his speeches.[640] His last purchase of five books was brought to him on 7 May 1612, a month before his death.[641] Rutland then bought Grimestone's *History of Spain*, Fougasses *History of Venice*, Camden's *Britannia*, Coriat's *Crambe* and *Odcombian Banquet*.[642] Both surviving lists contain many books on history. The interest in history was especially characteristic of a humanist education, and of humanist understandings of the world.

The surviving household accounts enable us to calculate that Rutland spent on books £12 1s. 10d. in seven years.[643] The 3rd Earl of Rutland had spent £22 18 s. 4d. on books in one year.[644] Does that suggest that he was more intelligent or more interested in learning and literature? The only way of answering the question would be to consider who read the books and what they read. The 3rd Earl's books remained at Belvoir, so the 5th Earl inherited them as part of a rich library which he enlarged with further purchases. But purchases alone don't tell the whole story.

It is worth remembering that Rutland's tutor was John Jegon who was known to demand very high standards of learning from his students. There is no evidence to suggest that his attitude towards noble pupils was different from his general attitude. Thus, Rutland was bound to know Latin and to have 'master[ed] classics'. We have seen that Rutland followed very closely Essex's advice on travel. However it was of principle importance for Essex that a nobleman must be educated in the classics and the seven liberal arts.[645] So we can safely assume that Rutland was educated in true humanist Renais-

---

[640] Ibid., pp. 444, 465. Sir William Segar, *Armes of the Knightes of the Noble Order of the Garter* (London, 1591); King James I, *Basilikon Doron* (London, 1603); *The True Law of Free Monarchies* (London, 1603).
[641] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.491.
[642] Louis de Mayerne Tarquet, *The Generall Historie of Spaine ... Translated into Englishe and Continued unto These Times by H.Grimeston* (London, 1612); Thomas de Fougasses, *The Generall Historie of Venice ... Englished by W.Shute, Gent.* (London, 1612); *The Odcombian Banquet, Dished Forth by Thomas the Coriat, and Served by a Number of Noble Wits in Praise of his Crudities and Crambe too* (London, 1611); *Coryat's Crambe* (London, 1611).
[643] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.408, 419, 427, 444, 465, 490-91.
[644] Ibid., pp.388-391.
[645] Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*, II, p.12.

sance manner.

So, Stone's assessment of Rutland's character seems groundless. The Earl did not forget all his learning after he left his classroom. Through all his life he was interested in literature and the arts. He valued highly a good education and was ready to help others to receive one. Rutland did not have children whom he could educate but he was very keen on providing education for his own relatives and other talented young men. He spent £39 3s. 9.5d. paying the tutors of his nephews Thyrwite, and for the education of young Thomas Leak, David Gallatine, and William Allan of Grantham in Cambridge.[646] Rutland bequeathed £20 to Queens' College and £20 to Bennett College (Corpus Christi)..

4.2. Participation in politics and warfare.

This section will examine the public and military career of the 5th Earl of Rutland. The advice literature, as we have seen, suggested that a nobleman was supposed to pursue the *vita activa*, with either a military or a civil career, to seek a benevolent patron, and to be rather practical in his relationship with people. Rutland followed all of these precepts, and forged for himself a distinctive identity as a Protestant nobleman.

4.2.1. First Steps.

It is very difficult to determine precisely when Rutland began to participate in politics. His first interview with the Queen occurred in February 1589 and introduced him to the world of the Royal Court. The Queen was very kind to the 12-year-old boy. She told him that she 'knewe my father for an honest man, and for my mother althoughe she knewe her not, she had hearde much good of her'. After informing his mother about

---

[646] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.426, 455, 462, 470, 473.

his success in London Rutland requested the Dowager Countess to send thanks to Burghley and Sir Francis Walsingham.[647]

It is important that Rutland sent thanks to both Burghley and Walsingham, who belonged to rival court factions. Simon Adams has argued that our present stereotypes of open and acute factional struggle at the Elizabethan court are not true for the first three decades of Elizabeth's reign up to Walsingham's death in 1590.[648] The main figures of the Elizabethan court, Burghley and Leicester/Walsingham, maintained relatively good working relations, which occasionally were strained by urgent political issues, and they did not try to test each other's hold on the Queen through patronage. Rutland's connections with the heads of the both factions in early 1590s confirm Adams's opinion. It is interesting that Rutland continued to be on friendly terms with leaders of the both factions in late 1590s, when according to all scholars the faction struggle was very acute. It can be presumed that both factions took an interest in the boy.

It was natural that Burghley, as the boy's guardian, paid him particular attention while Walsingham did not have such a duty. It is unlikely that the 12-year-old boy would have taken the initiative in approaching Walsingham. On the other hand Burghley was probably sure that he had greater means of influencing Rutland than anyone else had, so his attention could have been rather formal, while Walsingham had to show more active interest in the boy in order to secure his positive disposition for the future. It may be that Burghley relied on his position as a guardian to his noble wards too much. Almost all of his six wards (the 13th Earl of Oxford, the 2nd Earl of Essex, the 3rd Earl of Southampton, the 5th Earl of Rutland and the 4th Earl of Bedford), with the only exception being the 3rd

---

[647] Ibid., pp.268-9.

[648] S.Adams, 'Favourites and Factions at the Elizabethan Court' in *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c. 1450-1650*, eds. R.G.Asch & A.M.Birke (Oxford, 1991), pp.265-289; 'The Patronage of the Crown in Elizabethan Politics: the 1590s in Perspective' in *The Reign of Elizabeth: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. J.Guy (Cambridge, 1995), pp.20-45.

Earl of Rutland, showed political disloyalty to their former guardian. Even the 3rd Earl of Rutland started to lean towards the Earl of Leicester by the end of his life.

In March 1590 Rutland again visited London, but details of this visit are unknown. It may be presumed that Rutland continued his leaning towards the Walsingham/Essex faction. By June 1591, Rutland had formed a close friendship with the Earl of Southampton, another of Burghley's wards. Southampton visited Rutland in Cambridge, and together they visited for several days the Dowager Countess of Southampton, who was staying five miles from Cambridge.[649] Southampton was three years older then Rutland and had graduated from Cambridge in 1589. In 1590 he appeared at Court. The Queen liked him, and Southampton became an ally and friend of Essex.[650] Perhaps during his March of 1590 visit to London Rutland too became acquainted with Essex, though we do not for certain.

By 20 February 1595 Rutland was firmly within Essex's circle of influence, though he never broke with the Cecils. The Queen's favourite attended Rutland's graduation ceremony. At this period the Earl of Essex was seen as a paradigm of honour. His aristocratic lineage, his military career, his humanist education and Protestant religious views made him the embodiment of Sidney's chivalric ideal. Essex was Sidney's cultivated Protestant knight, ready to protect his country and serve his Sovereign. Essex inherited not only Sidney's wife but his popularity, as well. His circle craved for active military intervention against Catholic countries, especially Spain. Mervyn James remarks that in the Essex circle there was 'a sense of devoted adhesion to the military calling'.[651]

It is worth notice that in 1595 Rutland was on friendly terms with Sir Robert

---

[649] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.293
[650] *DNB*, XXI, pp.1055-1061.
[651] M.James, *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986), p.429.

Cecil as well. Rutland asked him to further the matter of his licence for travel through the latter's father, Lord Burghley, and directly with the Queen. It seems that Cecil promised to help Rutland with his licence. Rutland proclaimed that he would 'be always ready to requite to my uttermost' Cecil's efforts on his behalf.[652] One might think it strange that Rutland asked Cecil for help, since he was a friend and associate of Essex, but Rutland still continued to be Lord Burghley's ward. There could be other reasons. Adams sees Essex as 'the first Elizabethan political figure to equate control of patronage with power'.[653] Adams rightly notices that Essex tried to monopolise military patronage. However the Cecils were in better control of other lines of patronage. Hammer emphasizes that until the middle 1590s it was common to ask for help simultaneously from several powerful courtiers, even rivals.[654] He insists that the polarization of Elizabethan politics became extreme only after 1596-97. So, it was appropriate for Rutland to ask Cecil for help in non-military matters at this time.

During Rutland's Grand Tour his patron, Essex, was informed of his travels. On 6 November, less than three weeks after Rutland's arrival to Flushing, Sidney wrote a letter to Essex informing him that he sent the letters that he had received from Rutland to their addressees. Sidney hoped that Rutland 'will do exceedingly well, and the more if he follow your [Essex's] instructions'.[655] Rutland showed these instructions to his host. Sidney wrote nothing about Rutland's plans, expecting that he would write at length to Essex on the matter himself. If Rutland wrote this letter it does not survive. When Rutland went into Italy he was expected there by another of Essex's correspondents.

Dr Henry Hawkins was one of the foreign correspondents of Essex (or better to

---

[652] HMC *Salisbury*, V, pp.273, 365.
[653] S.Adams, 'The Patronage of the Crown', p.44.
[654] P.E.J.Hammer, 'Patronage at Court, Faction and the Earl of Essex' in *The Reign of Elizabeth: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. J.Guy (Cambridge, 1995), pp.65-86.
[655] HMC *Salisbury*,V, p.440.

say of his faithful secretary Anthony Bacon). Hawkins sent weekly intelligence to Bacon. Essex was interested in Rutland; so Manners was under Hawkins's watchful eye. Hawkins informed his patron about all of Rutland's movements, and sent details of his illness in Padua.[656] Rutland was himself in constant correspondence with Essex. They preferred to send letters to each other through George Gilpin of the Hague.[657] Some of Essex's letters were written by the Earl personally, like the letter informing Rutland that he was leading the Cadiz expedition. Hawkins was infuriated that neither Essex nor Bacon considered it necessary to inform him, their agent, about the fact.[658] Probably Hawkins was completely unaware of Essex's other contacts who might be better informed than he was.

The most serious attack of Rutland's illness happened in the beginning of July. Hawkins was sent from Venice to Padua in order to help Rutland to make a will. Rutland 'had thrice relapsed' into a dangerous fever. However when he [Hawkins] arrived to Padua he found Rutland recovering. Hawkins informed Bacon of all these circumstances in a letter of 7 July. Hawkins stayed in Padua for eight days. During this stay Rutland gave Hawkins 'a prayer made for the good success of the fleet' in English.[659] Later when the English fleet won, Hawkins translated this prayer together with a declaration about the victory into Italian. Probably Rutland did not intend such a fate for his prayer, or he would have translated it himself. As we have seen, he knew Italian very well before his departure from England. Hawkins assured Bacon that Rutland was 'an affectionate dependent' of Essex.[660] So, the young Earl had acquired a benevolent patron.

Either from personal liking or in Machiavellian spirit Rutland retained his con-

---

[656] Birch, op.cit., I, pp.428, 475.
[657] HMC *Salisbury*,VI, pp.74, 123.
[658] Birch, op.cit., II, pp.11-12.
[659] Ibid., pp.26, 59, 85.
[660] Birch, op.cit., II, p.140.

nections with Cecil. On 9 March 1597 Rutland wrote a letter to Sir Robert Cecil from Geneva. This letter was a reply to Cecil's. Rutland knew well how to write in an appropriate courtly style. He was grateful to Cecil for remembering him, and entreated Cecil 'to present his services to Her Majesty', Rutland assured Cecil that all his actions had only one aim – to be 'worthy of living' in the Queen's sight.[661] Events were to show that he did not mean this literally.

4.2.2. Azores Voyage and Marriage.

On June 19 Rutland sent a letter to John Manners from Paris informing him that he had decided to accompany Essex on 'this voyage', the Azores voyage, and after that he intended to return home.[662] Thus, he decided to participate in his patron's quest for military glory and fame, as the Sidnean chivalric ideal required. Rutland had a companion in mind to accompany him in 'this honourable action undertaken by the Earl of Essex'. This man was one Andrew Bussy, a bondman of Sir Robert Cecil, as he described himself in a letter to Cecil in which he sought permission to accompany Rutland. Rutland wrote that Bussy wanted 'to be a soldier rather than of any other profession', and noted that this spirit agreed with his own. Rutland did not want the Queen to be acquainted with his going to the expedition for 'I protest I would not have been stayed for anything in the world, so much I desire to know and see the wars'.[663]

It is very difficult to find any details of Rutland's participation in the expedition. The aim of the expedition was to destroy the Spanish fleet which was reported either to be either in Ferrol preparing to invade England or on its way from Ferrol to England.[664]

---

[661] HMC *Salisbury*, VII, p.102.
[662] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.339.
[663] HMC *Salisbury*, VII, pp.278, 329, 330
[664] G.B.Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux Earl of Essex* (London, 1937), pp.142-167; R.B.Wernham, *The Return of the Armadas. The Last Years of the Elizabethan War Against Spain 1595-1603* (Oxford, 1994), pp.159-182.

If he succeeded in this main aim, Essex had then to intercede and capture the main treasure fleet of the Spanish King near the Azores. Essex's fleet consisted of three squadrons, commanded by Essex himself, Sir Walter Raleigh and Lord Thomas Howard, the Vice Admiral. Rutland was on one of the ships in Essex's squadron.

A contrary wind held the fleet in Plymouth. On 10th of July the fleet attempted to start the expedition. However the wind increased to a great gale. The ships were scattered over the sea and the squadrons lost all means of communications. The tempest continued for another four days. Some ships started to return to the English cost. By the 19th of July almost all ships had returned. On 24 July 1597 Sir William Browne informed Sir Robert Sidney about affairs in Plymouth and added that 'my Lord of Rutland often honours mee, and in most effectionate kind Sort speakes of yow, and hath that honorable Conceit of your Worth, as I wold thinke he scarse cold have thoght vppon in these Yeares'.[665] The fleet finally left the English cost on the 14th of August. Another storm, on August 24th, again scattered the ships. About thirty of them, including Raleigh's squadron, were nowhere in sight. Essex abandoned the original plan of attacking Ferrol and sailed down to the next rendezvous point of the fleet, the Rock. On the way he received intelligence from Raleigh. The latter informed Essex that the Spanish fleet had gone to the Azores in order to accompany the treasure fleet home. Essex immediately ordered the fleet to sail to the Azores. Here on September 14 he managed finally to meet with Raleigh and his ships.

There is no point in following the progress of the expedition It did not bring fame to Essex. The only person who could be credited with any successes in it was Raleigh. Essex constantly failed to inform Raleigh about his changes of to their joint plans of action. Rutland witnessed the capture of Villa Franca on the island St.Michael. The

---

[665] HMC *De L'Isle*, II, p.287.

town was abandoned by the natives, so there was no resistance to the English. The only fighting occurred when English troops were withdrawing from Villa Franca. This operation was organized by Sir Francis Vere, but personally supervised by Essex with the help of Southampton, Rutland and other 'Gentlemen-adventurers'.[666] The limited fighting that occurred during the withdrawal allowed Essex to make 'young Noblemen and some other principall Gentlemen Knights, as Sir William Evers'.[667] In general this pursuit of glory and booty was rather unsuccessful. The expedition returned in October 1597. Throughout the expedition Rutland accompanied Essex, probably trying to confirm his natural courage as Essex had advised him to do three years before._

Rutland came of age soon after his return from the Azores expedition. He remained on very friendly terms with Cecil, in spite of his links with the Essex faction.[668] It seems that Rutland spent all of 1598 at Court. On 2 November he was with the Queen after supper 'with divers all night till 12 o'clock'.[669]

It might be assumed that Essex wanted to tie Rutland more tightly to himself and his faction, and it was probably he who proposed that Rutland should marry his stepdaughter, Lady Elizabeth Sidney, daughter of Sir Philip Sidney and Lady Frances Walsingham. The marriage took place in 1599; but only after considerable deliberation on Rutland's part. On 21 January 1598 Rowland Whyte informed Sir Robert Sidney that 'Lord Rutland ... is more cold in the matter of marriage with your niece'.[670] At this moment the lady in question was at least twelve years and two months old.[671] Rutland probably saw her rather frequently in the house of his patron. On 28 and 29 December 1598

---

[666] Sir F.Vere, *Commentaries, Being Diverse Pieces of Service Wherein He Had Command, Written by Himself* (London, 1657), pp.52-53
[667] Ibid., pp.63-64.
[668] HMC *Salisbury*, VII, p.483
[669] Ibid.,VIII, p.420.
[670] HMC *De L'Isle*,II, p.312.
[671] She was baptized 20 November 1585.

household accounts allow us to spot Rutland in Essex house.[672] Probably at this time Rutland had already changed his mind about the marriage with Lady Elizabeth Sidney.[673] Rutland married Lady Sidney before 15 March 1599. The Countess was about thirteen years and four months old. The young Countess continued to stay with her mother and grandmother, Rutland visiting her at Walsingham house on 28, 29 and 30 March, prior to his departure for Ireland.

Lady Sidney's marriage portion was £4,000 in cash.[674] She brought her husband some lands as well. Sir Robert Sidney's servant was sure that Sir Philip Sidney's widow and Rutland would receive not less then £40,000 from the sale of timber, rents and fines of the manors of Robertsbridge and Haldon, which were settled on Sir Philip's wife and daughter. According to him the manors themselves gave £1,200 per annum. These sums seem a little exaggerated, though it is obvious that they were considerable. It can be said

---

[672] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.416.

[673] Many recent scholars have almost certainly got the date of Rutland's marriage wrong, thinking that it took place between 1 September and 16 October 1599, though the correct information was available in Cockayne and *The Dictionary of National Biography* (Sykes, p.172; Guililov, Igra, p.259; Michel, p.212; Porohovchikov, p.154, Guililov, 'For Whom the Bell Tolled', p.170; Cockayne, XI, p.260; *DNB*,XII p.441). This presumption is based on Rowland Whyte's references in his two letters: 'He [Rutland] is often at Barn Elms, and I hear hath ... your niece Countess of Rutland, as young as she is' (1 September), 'My Lady Essex's Daughter was christened by the Earle of Southampton, the Lady Cumberland, and Lady Rutland, without much Ceremony' (16 October) [HMC *De L'Isle*, II, pp.387, 401-3]. It is obvious that on 16 October 1599 Elizabeth was the Countess of Rutland. One might ask why the first reference leads some to suggest that they had not yet been married in September. These scholars use the text of the letter published in Collins's *Letters and Memorials of State*. In his edition the sentence in question reads differently, 'He [Rutland] is often at Barn Elms, and I hear hath intend your niece to be Countess of Rutland, as young as she is' (Collins, II, p.120). These two versions of one and the same sentence are rather different. A note in the HMC publication clarifies the situation, 'Owing to an erasure by Collins this word cannot be read'. It is known that Collins 'took abominable liberties with the original manuscripts, scoring them through with his pen...' (HMC *De L'Isle*, II, p.viii). He seems not only to have erased a word in the letter of 1 September 1599, but to have added two others as well. This alone provides reasonable doubt about the beginning of September as the earliest date of the marriage. Doubts are strengthened by entries in the household accounts (HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.416-17). Starting from 20 March 1599 Thomas Screven mentioned purchases for 'my Lady', as well as for 'my Lord'. Screven never called married and unmarried sisters and daughters of his master simply 'my Lady'. If unmarried they were called 'mistresses' with the addition of the first name, if married they were called 'my Lady' with addition of their husband's family name. For Screven 'my Lady' meant 'my Lord's wife'. So, at least from 20 March 1599 Screven had a mistress of the house, as well as a master. In addition, on 15 March John Chamberlain wrote a letter to Dudley Carleton (PRO SP 12/270/57). In this letter the author informed the addressee of preparations for the Irish expedition. Carleton was told that 'the Earl of Southampton and Rutland (who lately married the Countess of Essex daughter), ... accompany him [Essex]'.

[674] F.Grose, T.Astle, eds., 'An Account of the Expenses of Robert Sidney, Earl of Leicester', *The Antiquarian Repertory, a Miscellaneous Assemblage of Topography, History, Biography, Customs, and Manners*, I (London, 1807), p.275.

that the 5th Earl of Rutland received an even larger marriage portion for his wife then his uncle, the 3rd Earl had done. They received the same cash portions. The 3rd Earl received £150 per annum, which by the time of his death resulted in approximately £2,100, but Lady Sidney's land gave £1,000 per year.[675] Lawrence Stone, typically, praised the 3rd Earl's profitable match but not the 5th Earl's, yet neither achieved much that was exceptional.[676]

Though Rutland was ready to strengthen his connection with Essex, he nevertheless received with his bride a handsome sum of money (thus satisfying also recommendations in the advice literature to choose a wealthy wife). It seems that this marriage was never consummated. There is circumstantial evidence of the Platonic nature of the Rutlands' marriage. On 8th July 1607 Rutland made a settlement of the manor of Ilfracombe in Devon on his wife and her heir, her uncle Viscount de L'Isle. It seems likely, then, that in 1607 Rutland no longer hoped to have children by his wife.[677] (In the section of this chapter dealing with patronage other evidence on the nature of the Rutlands' marriage will be presented.)

4.2.3. Participation in the Irish War.

On 1 April the newlywed husband left London for Belvoir and then Ireland. Essex promised Rutland that he could obtain the Queen's permission for him to go to

---

[675] PRO SP 14/70/38.

[676] Stone, *Family and Fortune*, pp.173, 181.

[677] BL, Add. 15914, f.73. Rutland enjoyed a very strange relationship with his wife. It seems that the Countess was only an occasional guest in her husband's house. This living apart started from the very beginning of the marriage. Rutland spent at least six months of the first year of his marriage in Ireland and at resorts. Next year he went to Holland and spent four months there, while his wife stayed in London. For the six months of 1601 that Rutland spent in the Tower, household accounts do not show the Countess as present in Rutland's London house. However she met him after his release. They came together in Uffington. Definitely the Countess played the part of hostess when James I stayed at Belvoir in April 1603, but the Rutlands then separated again: he went to London and then Denmark; she stayed in Belvoir and then went to meet the Queen. After 1603 when household accounts mention the spouses they are mostly living on different estates, the Earl in Belvoir, the Countess in Garredon. They moved independently from each other. It would be wrong to think that the spouses lived constantly apart. The spring of 1608 and the summer of 1610 were spent together by the Rutlands at Belvoir. But they were more commonly apart.

Ireland. On 17 January Rutland's going to Ireland with Essex was a simple fact for Chamberlain. However on 31 January he reported that the Queen had stopped many of Essex's followers from going, including Rutland.[678] In hope that he would finally receive the Queen's permission Rutland spent a considerable sum of money on equipment, sending his servant Edward Yate to France for some ammunition.[679] Rutland's proclaimed aim was the same as in the Azores' expedition, 'to enable myself to do the Queen the better service', but probably he wanted, in fact, to participate in another military campaign together with his patron and friends. It can be assumed that Rutland's 'desire to know and see the wars', expressed before the Azores expedition was not yet sated.[680] Rutland was expressly forbidden by the Queen to go to Ireland, but he hoped that Cecil would manage to calm her down.

Essex made Rutland a Colonel of Foot, and he was accompanied by his younger brother George Manners, who was knighted by Essex. On 8 May 1599 Rutland was happy that 'her Majesty takes no notice of my being here, and I desire she may continue yet in this mind'.[681] Rutland hoped that the opportunities of active service would enable him to prove to the Queen and all the world his value as a soldier, and in this way to justify his disobedience. On 14 May Thomas Screven updated Rutland on business matters and hoped that he would to return 'in safety with honour and victory'.[682] However the storm was already on Rutland, and Screven probably knew this.

On 27 April 1599 Lord Henry Howard informed Southampton that 'the Queen begins to storm exceedingly at my Lord of Rutland's incorporation into Jason's fleet, and means, she says, to make him an example of contemning princes' inhibitions to all

---

[678] PRO SP 12/270/16, 12/270/25.
[679] HMC *Salisbury*, IX, pp.149-50; HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.416-17.
[680] HMC *Salisbury*, VII, pp.278, 329, 330
[681] Ibid., IX, p.160.
[682] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.354.

that come after him'.[683] Lord Howard hoped that Rutland would have enough time to earn some honour 'which our worthy Lord shall compass by his valour', and then the Queen would show him some mercy. But the campaign brought little honour to any of its participants. On 18 May the Dowager Countess of Southampton informed her son that the Queen had sent for Rutland 'in great bitterness'; and he was expected to be committed to the Tower.[684] Rutland tried to ask his granduncle for help with the Queen, but Roger Manners refused to give any assistance, pleading that his 'credit in Court is now very little'. The only comforting piece of news that Manners was able to send consisted of the information that the Queen had forgotten about Rutland after giving him the order to return to England.[685] This order was sent to Essex on 13 May,[686] and received by him on 24 May. By 1 June Sir Robert Cecil was informed of its receipt.[687] Rutland obeyed the order and returned to England, though it seems that he stayed an extra four days in order to participate in the expected siege of Cahir castle.

There is a general problem in establishing what Rutland did or saw during his military expeditions. It is reasonable to assume that prior to the order of revocation Rutland remained with Essex.[688] Wernham has described Essex's own movements in Ireland in considerable detail, but he does not mention Rutland's participation in the expedition.[689] On 14 April Essex arrived in Dublin.[690] On the 17th he appointed Southampton his General of Horse. It was probably on the same day that Rutland was appointed Colonel of the Foot. Essex set out from Dublin on 9 May, but the foot had been sent ahead on

---

[683] HMC *Salisbury*, IX, p.438.
[684] Ibid., p.173.
[685] Ibid., p.180.
[686] PRO SP 63/205/59.
[687] Ibid., 63/205/65.
[688] H.Morgan's *Tyrone's Rebellion: the Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland* (Woodbridge, 1993) examines the event preceding 1596 and Essex's appearance in Ireland. W.T.MacCaffrey in his *Elizabeth I: War and Politics, 1588-1603* (Princeton, 1992) is more concerned with the political impact of Essex's Irish campaign (pp.418-420).
[689] Wernham, op.cit., pp.299-303.
[690] Harrison, op.cit., pp.211-226.

the 8th, so Rutland probably left Dublin then. On 16 May Rutland witnessed the passage of the army through the Cashel pass. The Irish intended to attack the army when it went through the pass, but Essex organized the passage very cleverly, and the total losses in the day's fighting were five killed and eight wounded out of 3,700 foot and 460 horse. Essex showed great energy and bravery in this action, crossing the pass constantly and co-ordinating the actions of the vanguard, fighting soldiers and rear-guard. By the 25th May Essex reached Waterford. His next aim was to capture the Castle of Cahir held by the Irish rebels. The castle was taken on 28 May after two days of bombardment and battle. Cockayne and *Dictionary of National biography* mention that Rutland was knighted by Essex on 30 May, after the capture of Cahir castle, the only considerable success of the campaign.[691] The Earl definitely returned to England by the 10th of June. It usually took between 7 and 10 days for a letter sent from London to reach Essex, suggesting that Rutland probably stayed until the capture of Cahir castle and then made a speedy return to England.

After that Rutland fell ill in England and went to Bath. From Bath, where he was recuperating from swelling to his legs, he wrote to the Privy Council in order to find out whether he should come up to London or could continue his treatment. The courtiers expected Rutland to be committed either to the Tower, or to Star Chamber, or to the

---

[691] Cockayne, XI, p.259; *DNB*, XII, p.940. Having failed to found the original source of this information I have considerable doubts about this date. The same entry as in Cockayne can be found in Shaw's *The Knights of England* (London, 1906), v.II, p.95). However in the introduction Shaw wrote that 'no words of mine can convey an adequate idea of the welter, chaos, confusion and contradictions of' manuscripts which were the basis of his list of Knights Bachelors. (Shaw, v.I, pp.ix-x). Shaw invited from everyone 'corrections, additions, or the indication of fresh sources' It seems probable that Rutland was knighted during the Azores voyage simultaneously with Southampton. In his *Memoirs* Vere definitely wrote in the plural about 'noblemen' knighted by Essex in Villa Franca. There were only two peers other than Essex himself in the expedition, Southampton and Rutland. Vere was very careful in making distinctions between noblemen (peers) and gentlemen. (Vere, *Commentaries*, pp.52-53, 63-64). Vere gave the name of Sir William Evers as knighted by Essex together with Southampton. However in Shaw's list of knights created by Essex in the Azores voyage this name is not mentioned Shaw gave names of three other gentlemen made knights together with Southampton. In *Marsters' History of the College of Corpus Christi* Rutland 'had the honour of knighthood conferred upon him, for his valour in' the Azores expedition (p. 271). So, it is reasonable to presume that Rutland was either knighted in the Azores voyage or was knighted twice.

Fleet.[692] Perhaps because of his illness, the Queen softened towards Rutland. She sent her Sergeant, Mr. Goodrous, to attend him, and he arrived in Bath on 28 June. Immediately, on 29 June, Rutland wrote to Cecil expressing his gratitude to the Queen and proclaiming that he 'resolved to honour and serve her ever to the loss of my last blood'. He wanted Cecil to assure Elizabeth that 'no man can be no more desirous to live in her princely favour than I, nor shall more joy in it nor adventure further to deserve it'.[693] Rutland heartily thanked Cecil, considering him responsible for softening the Queen's attitude to him. In July Rutland returned to London, and until September he actively participated in the life of the Court. Sir Charles Davers noted that Rutland escaped all punishment 'save the punishment of being kept at home'.[694] Sir Charles probably was well acquainted with the ideals of the Essex circle. Staying in the safety of England while his patron, friend and relative was battling in Ireland was indeed a most severe punishment for Rutland. By his own accounts he craved to see and participate in war, but instead was shut up at Court. Perhaps this contributed to what seems to have been his later aversion to the courtly life.

4.2.4. From the Irish War to the Essex Revolt.

Throughout 1599 Rutland continued to be on friendly terms with the leaders of both Court factions, Essex in Ireland and Cecil in England. In September he obtained the Queen's verbal promise of a grant to reunite certain walks with the office of Warden of Sherwood Forest, which Rutland was to hold. The Earl asked Cecil to bring the matter to a conclusion while he was living in the country, but it did not happen. On 8 April 1600 it was clear to the Earl that the Queen was ready to give him the office of the War-

---

[692] HMC *Salisbury*, IX, pp.197-98.
[693] Ibid., pp.217-18.
[694] Ibid., pp.245-7.

den but without the walks. He repeated to Cecil his reasons for desiring the office whole, so that 'I might better preserve both her Majesty's game and woods in that forest'.[695] However he was ready to accept any grant. On 14 June 1600 he was made Constable of Nottingham Castle and Warden of Sherwood Forest.[696]

At the beginning of October Rutland was back in London, by which time the Queen had recalled Southampton from Ireland as well. During October the friends almost never came to Court, and spent all their time in daily visits to the theatre.[697] Until the beginning of December Rutland continued to stay in London. On the 7th December he wrote that he would be glad to see Cecil at his departure if 'your [Cecil's] leisure or my haste would have permitted'.[698] This continued relationship between Rutland and Cecil is very interesting. Hammer maintains that after 1597 Essex's friends and followers were increasingly pressed to choose sides, and found it more difficult to straddle faction. This polarization does not appear to have affected Rutland. The evidence suggest that until the Essex Revolt itself Rutland retained close connections with Cecil, who helped him with his legal suits.

In April 1600 Rutland returned to London. On 10 June he held a dinner which was attended by his wife, and the Earl and Countess of Bedford, friends of Essex.[699] In the middle of June, after it became known that the States-General had decided to resume the war, Rutland expressed his desire to go to Holland again to seek military glory. The Earl of Northumberland, Essex's brother-in-law, had the same intention. 'The famous Earls of Rutland and Northumberland moved with the Low Countries honour, are em-

---

[695] Ibid., X, pp.104-5.
[696] It is worth underlining that the affair with the grant of Wardenship of Sherwood Forest started in November 1597. Probably the Queen would have issued the grant of the office to Rutland immediately if he had not tried to receive a fuller grant than that of his father and granduncle. It seems rather presumptuous to see in this grant of 14 June 1600 a sign of the Queen's particular pleasure at Rutland's marriage, or satisfaction 'that he intended to settle down', as Sykes does (Sykes, p.172).
[697] HMC *De L'Isle*, II, p.401.
[698] HMC *Salisbury*, IX, p.409.
[699] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.427-28.

barked thither...'.[700]

The two Earls received the Queen's permission, and took their leave from her on 5 July 1600, three days after the States took Nieuport.[701] Rutland spent almost four months in Holland, until the end of October. He was not much satisfied with the military action that he saw, writing regularly to Cecil to inform him of their lack of progress.[702] From the 5th of July Ostend was besieged by Archduke Albert, and Rutland and Northumberland had to obey the severe discipline imposed in Ostend by Sir Francis de Vere, with whom Rutland had served in the Azores Voyage. De Vere himself was absent from the place until 19th September having been wounded several days before the Earls' arrival.[703] Rutland was unlucky: military action always occurred in places that he was not in. It either finished before his arrival or started after his departure.

On 8 September Rutland asked Cecil to obtain the Queen's permission for him to go to France in order to see 'the war of Savoy', and to 'see so gallant an army and so brave a lieutenant as Lesdiguieres'. However the Queen intended to use Rutland's desire to visit France for her own purposes. She wanted him to be her ambassador to the French Court, congratulating Henry IV on his new marriage. Rutland knew that he would have to cover the burden of the office out of his own pocket, and did not want 'to play the King' due to his difficult financial position. He informed Cecil that he was going to return from the Continent and professed his friendship for him.[704] Perhaps the duties attached to this embassy did not quite live up to the ideology of active military service to the commonwealth to which Rutland was by now so obviously attached.[705] It can be

---

[700] HMC *Salisbury*, X, p.182.
[701] HMC *De L'Isle*,II, p.469; Collins,II, p.205.
[702] HMC *Salisbury*, X, pp.248, 265, 269.
[703] *DNB*, XX, pp.232-233.
[704] HMC *Salisbury*, X, p.307.
[705] It was unclear whether the ambassador would have dealt only with ceremonial matters or would have conducted other business as well. In the second variant Sir Robert Sidney was expected to be appointed as an ambassador, in the first variant Rutland was a possible candidate.

added that after Henry IV converted to Catholicism his position as a Protestant King-knight became ambiguous. Though Essex had some Catholic friends, and two of Rutland's younger brothers were Catholics, Henry IV's Catholic marriage probably was not an event on which Rutland could wholeheartedly congratulate the French King. It is equally possible that he did not approve the peaceful foreign policy of the elderly Queen.

On 26 September it was still unclear whether or not Rutland would have to go to France. Whyte informed Sir Robert Sidney that 'my Lord of Rutlands Friends [probably Cecil] doe labor to have hym spared'.[706] For the time being their labours were successful. On 24 October 1600 Rutland returned to London, where he was used to procure Sidney's return to England. On 30 October Rutland attended the Court and assured the Queen that Sir Robert Sidney was very ill, so she finally gave him leave to return from Flushing.[707]

4.2.5. From the Essex Revolt (8 February 1601) to the Death of Queen Elizabeth.

In October 1600 Rutland was back in London. He visited Essex; Essex and friends dined with him frequently.[708] Rutland was a personal friend of Essex, but he seems to have been unaware of the plans for the Revolt. During the subsequent investigation Sir Henry Nevill was to say that the Essex conspirators had intended to use Rutland in the revolt from the very beginning; but that 'they said they could not trust him with the matter above two hours before they attempted it'.[709] Probably Essex's friends and fellow conspirators were sure that they could count on Rutland if he were called to arms on the Essex's side, though his closeness to Cecil made him an unlikely participant

---

[706] Collins, op.cit., II, p.216.
[707] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.433; HMC *De L'Isle*,II, p.219.
[708] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.433-35.
[709] PRO SP 12/279/11.

in any conspiracy prior to the revolt itself. Rutland was on friendly terms with both Essex and Cecil.

It is worth saying a little about the chronology of the Revolt.[710] On the 3rd February a small group of Essex's friends, Rutland excluded, began consultations at Drury House about the strategy of the revolt. The discussions concerned plans to seize the Court, Tower and City. On the 6th February Essex's friends requested that *Richard II* be played at the Globe, and offered to contribute forty shillings to the takings. It was played the next evening. The movements of Essex's followers were reported to the Privy Council. The Councillors sent for Essex, but he refused to come. He was warned that Sir Walter Raleigh and Lord Cobham intended to murder him. Another messenger was sent from the Council and Essex again refused to come. The plotters in Essex house decided that it was time for action. They decided to strike next morning in the City. All night messengers were active summoning Essex's friends to Essex house.

Up to the Revolt itself Rutland was very sure of his position at Court. On 2 February the Queen had not yet abandoned the idea of sending Rutland to the French Court.[711] On 7 February (a day before the Revolt) one Henry Woodrington gave Rutland the advice either to break with Essex and retire to his estates, or to 'entertain favour of Mr. Secretary [Sir Robert Cecil]'. Rutland replied to this that 'he was on very good terms with Mr. Secretary'. The Earl wanted to show Woodrington the level of his influence, so he offered to arrange for him to be admitted to kiss the Queen's hand.[712] This evidence suggests that Rutland's position at Court had not been much impaired by Essex's disgrace, a fact omitted by Stone, probably because it did not fit with his view

---

[710] Harrison, op.cit., pp. 282-93. Unfortunately MacCaffrey is more interested in the political events preceding the Revolt than in the Revolt and its chronology (MacCaffrey, op.cit., pp.535-36). Wernham gives a good chronology of the Revolt, however he does not mention Rutland's participation in it, concentrating on Essex and Southampton (Wernham, op.cit., pp.347-365.

[711] PRO SP 12/278/27.

[712] Ibid., 12/278/56.

that all of the noble participants in the Revolt lost their influence and opportunity to gain financial and other benefits as a result of Essex's fall.[713] Interestingly, too, the facts that indicate the friendship between Rutland and Cecil are almost universally ignored by the scholars who write about Rutland in connection with the Shakespeare Authorship problem.[714] They prefer to see Rutland as a person all of whose Court connections were centred on Essex, a view which is very close to that of Stone. Both interpretations, Stone's and that of the Rutlandian scholars, make the figure of Rutland more simple so that he will more easily fit their theories. Both therefore miss the telling truth that the same person could be both a participant in the Essex Revolt and a friend of Cecil's._

In the early morning of February 8th, Essex's friends started to arrive at Essex house. Rutland, too, came to Essex house where he was informed that Lord Cobham and Sir Walter Raleigh wanted to kill Essex. He was ready to protect his friend's life. Rutland's two brothers, Francis and George, accompanied him. Essex told them that he wanted to take the City and 'revenge himself of his enemies, Sir Robert Cecil, Lord Cobham, and Sir Walter Raleigh'. Rutland was 'resolved to live and die with the Earl of Essex'. All movements around Essex house were reported to Secretary Cecil, who sent a warning to the Mayor of the City to be ready for emergencies. Later the Lord Keeper, the Earl of Worcester, Sir William Knollys, and Lord Chief Justice Popham arrived at Essex House, demanding entry in the Queen's name. They were allowed in without their servants. The Lord Keeper informed Essex and his followers that they had been sent from the Queen to understand the reasons for their gathering. They were told that if they had any particular grievances against any person the Queen promised that the case would be heard and judged. In reply to this, Essex shouted that his life was in danger. The Lord

---

[713] Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.182.
[714] Sykes is the only scholar who quotes Rutland's letters to Cecil at large, but does not comment on the relations between the two men.

Keeper wanted to have a talk with the Earl in private. The Queen's delegation and Essex went into his study. Essex resolved to attempt to seize the City. The delegation was left under guard in his house.

Essex and his followers, Rutland included, went into the City. They came to the house of the sheriff Smythe, who left as if to fetch the Mayor but in fact joined him in preparing to protect the City against Essex. Essex remained in the sheriff's house for two hours. Meanwhile Lord Burghley sent a herald to proclaim Essex the traitor. At 2pm Essex left Smythe's house on horseback and met the latter on Gracechurch street. Smyt- he told him that the Mayor had commanded him to yield and come to his house. At this point Essex realized that there would not be any assistance for his plans in the City and decided to return to his house. The way back through Ludgate was already barred with forces assembled by the Lord Mayor. Essex attempted to force his way back to his house. Several men died, and Essex retreated to the river and returned home by water. He sent beforehand Sir Ferdinando Gorges to free the Lord Chief Justice. However Gorges freed all the prisoners.

It was obvious that the Revolt had failed. Essex had either to surrender or to fight. He decided to fight, fortifying the house and burning all dangerous papers. In the evening the house was besieged by the Lord Admiral and his troops. Sir Robert Sidney was sent to persuade the rebels to surrender. They refused, and the Lord Admiral then offered to give safe passage out of the house to the Countess of Essex and Lady Rich, with their women. The Rebels explained that they need two hours for this operation, to unfortify the door to let the ladies out and to refortify it again. This demand was granted. The women left the house.

After further consideration, Essex decided to surrender on three conditions: 1) that he and his supporters would be dealt with civilly; 2) that they would receive fair tri-

als; and 3) that Essex's minister, Ashton, would accompany him to prison. The Lord Admiral agreed to the first two conditions, but needed to ask the Queen's permission regarding the third. The rebels surrendered and were imprisoned for the night in different London prisons. There were about ninety prisoners, among them five Earls, three other peers, and sixteen Knights. Some of the prisoners were transferred to the Tower on the morning of 9th February, when the examination of the prisoners began._

During the inquiry, Rutland stressed that Essex was most intimate with Southampton. He said 'that the Earl of Southampton showed himself discontented long before, and often said that the Earl of Essex had had great wrong and hard proceedings against him'. Rutland informed his examiners that Southampton sent his [Rutland's] servant, Edward Yate, into France and other places, probably for ammunition without him being informed.[715] Rutland's testimony clearly implicated Southampton very deeply in the planning of the Revolt. Presumably, their friendship was no longer in a healthy state. During the examination on 12 February, Rutland mentioned Sir John Davies, Sir Christopher Blount, Sir John Heydon, and sheriff Smythe as active organizing members of the Revolt, but his testimony was most damaging to Southampton.

Probably Rutland tried to lessen Essex's share in the crime by spreading it on others, especially on Southampton. It seems that the testimonies of other participants of the Revolt implicated Southampton much less. It is possible that Rutland wanted to lessen his own participation in the Revolt. However he was never seriously implicated in the organisation of the plot. The main conspirators acknowledged that the Earl of Rutland was kept in total darkness regarding the whole affair. Every evening during the month prior to the Revolt Rutland had guests to dinner, but Southampton was never amongst them. On 26 February Cecil wrote that Essex was already beheaded, and 'Blount,

---

[715] PRO SP 12/278/51.

Merrick, Davies, Davers, Littleton, and Cuffe are like to die, also Lord Sandys'. Cecil hoped that Southampton would be spared. He believed that he 'was drawn in merely for love of Essex', but had then taken a lead in the conspiracies among the Drury house circle. Cecil expected difficulties in saving Southampton's life. There appeared to be no such problem with Rutland, and Cecil expected that he would obtain the Queen's mercy.[716]

Rutland, imprisoned in the Tower, was permitted to have the use of furniture and other things from his London house, and lived comfortably enough.[717] The Earl's own servants took care of his diet and sent him food and drink.[718]

Rutland's relatives were shocked by his participation in the Revolt. Roger Manners wished that 'my three nephewes had never byn borne then by so horrible offence offende so gratius a sufferan, to the overthrow of ther howse and name for ever, alwais before loyall'.[719] On 16 February Roger Manners wrote that the Queen had sent him a message in order to comfort and assure him that she had no doubts about his loyalty to her. Manners informed his elder brother that Cecil promised 'to doe for our Erl his best indevor'. Rutland, he said, was 'generally more pytied in Court then eny other'. Manners urged that this letter be burned. On 23 February Screven, who was in touch with Cecil, informed John Manners that Rutland would be punished by fine.

Rutland's co-operation with the inquiry made it clear from the beginning that his life or honour was not in danger. On 11 March he was unofficially informed by Cecil

---

[716] Ibid., p.598.
[717] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.366. On 9 February Rutland received a bedstead with valance, curtain and quilt of ash-coloured damask; a white rug and a green rug, two Spanish blankets, a pair of fustian blankets, two feather beds and bolsters, a quilt, a pillow, a mattress, three pairs of sheets, three pillow bears, three pairs of 'pallate' sheets, four table clothes, a dozen napkins, a chamber pot; a chair, a stool, and a long cushion of ash-coloured damask; a suit of hangings of tapestry containing five pieces, a round red carpet, two Turkey carpets. Two days later he requested some additional furniture: two window pieces, a bed with canopy and furniture, a dozen shirts, two pairs of sheets and pillow bears, two table cloths and two dozen napkins, three long towels, a square table and a round table, a fire shovel, fire pan, tongs, warming pan, four covered stools, six pewter dishes, trenchers, saltcellar, and basin, a close stool, two chamber pots, and three candlesticks.
[718] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.435.
[719] Ibid., I, p.366.

that the Queen intended to fine him.[720] On 13 March the Council permitted Rutland, Lord Sandys, Lord Cromwell, and Lord Monteagle to walk on leads.[721] By 20 March, Francis and George Manners were released from their imprisonment, and so, of the three Manners participants in the Revolt, only Rutland continued in prison. On 21 March Roger Manners forwarded to Sir Robert Cecil two of Rutland's letters to him. In the first, Rutland expressed his deep repentance for his actions. He grieved that he had 'lost idly and ungraciously her Majesty's most gracious favour, which she vouchsafed always unto me far beyond my merit'. Rutland declared that he had decided to show his dutifulness by writing 'a true project of my whole estate'. In this second letter he stated that his revenues were £3,124 18s. 7.5d. He paid annuities and rents to the Queen for the sum of £791 3s. 4d.; he owed £5,000 in marriage portions for his three sisters; his personal debts amounted to £4,991 5s. 6d.[722] The same day Cecil wrote to Roger Manners and assured him that he had always honoured the Manners house. Cecil mentioned that in spite of the jealousy that he might have felt because of 'his [Rutland's] match', he did the Earl 'any honour I could'. This sentence is the only indication that Lady Elizabeth Sidney might have had more than one suitor.

On 8 May Rutland was brought before the Council together with other peers. He was fined £30,000, the Earl of Bedford £20,000, Lord Sandys £10,000, Lord Monteagle £8,000, and Lord Cromwell £5,000.[723] Rutland's brothers were fined 400 marks each.[724] Rutland's fine seems extraordinary. His participation in the Revolt was minor, he fully co-operated with the inquiry, he was never in danger of death, unlike Lord Sandys, but he was fined three times more than Sandys. A week later there was a talk about the miti-

---

[720] Ibid., pp.366-7, 373-74.
[721] PRO SP 12/281/68.
[722] HMC *Salisbury*, XI, pp.141-42.
[723] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.374-76.
[724] Different sources give different sums, between 400 and 1000 marks each.

gation of Rutland's fine. Screven hoped that the younger Manners brothers would not need to pay anything, and expected Rutland soon to be released from the Tower.[725] Rutland expressed the same hopes in his letter to John Manners. It seems that their hopes concerning the fine were justified, for on June 10 the Lords who participated in the Revolt appeared before the Council again. Rutland's fine was mitigated £10,000. He wrote to Cecil that he was ready to pay this fine, but mentioned as well his strained conditions. Rutland also proclaimed that he desired 'willingly to sacrifice his life in her Majesty's service'.[726]

Rutland assiduously attempted to restore his credit with Cecil. On 24 June he wrote Cecil a letter in which he professed his love for him. Rutland expected Cecil to doubt his feelings because of his participation in the Revolt, but declared that people whose affections Cecil would not doubt would witness the Earl's love for him. Rutland clearly understood that his relatively light punishment was due to Cecil's support.[727]

The Queen decided to confine the prisoners to the houses of their friends and relatives faithful to the Crown. On 11 July Rutland informed Cecil that he would prefer to be confined to the house of his cousin, Francis Fortescue, who was ready to receive him. He added that it had become very hot in the Tower.[728] In this matter Rutland's wishes were not taken into account. He was released from the Tower on 7 August and confined to the house of his granduncle Roger Manners of Uffington. He was forbidden to move more than four miles from the house.[729] After two days in his London house the Earl and his wife went to Uffington on 9 August 1601. No one expected that the Rutlands would stay in Uffington for long. Roger Manners had a store of food for only six weeks. At-

---

[725] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.376-77.
[726] HMC *Salisbury*, XI, p.230.
[727] Ibid., p.246-7.
[728] Ibid., p.283.
[729] PRO SP 12/281/67-68.

tempts to obtain Rutland's freedom were made as early as in the middle of September.[730] Screven had hopes that it would be possible for Rutland to return to Belvoir at the beginning of October.[731]

On 28 September Rutland received the Queen's writ of summons to the Parliament, which was accompanied by a letter 'from the Lords of the Privy Council commanding me from her to forbear my appearance there, and not stir further than the place that is limited unto me'.[732] Rutland naturally obeyed. He asked the Queen only to permit him to 'see the lands' that he had to sell in order to pay his fine and 'to have the liberty of my own house'. The Queen refused the request. She had already exchanged imprisonment in the Tower for imprisonment in a relative's house and was not prepared to do more. On 21 December Rutland begged the Lords of the Privy Council to obtain liberty of movement for him.[733] He needed to sell some lands; to deal with Isabel, Dowager Countess of Rutland, who had decided to use Rutland's disgrace in order to gain some lands from him; and there was a shortage of victuals and fuel in Uffington. This cry for mercy was finally heard by the sovereign. Somewhere between the end of December 1601 and the middle of January 1602 Rutland was permitted to live in his own house and to move around the country about his business. The Earl considered Cecil the person chiefly responsible for helping to obtain this liberty.[734] On 27 January Rutland informed Cecil of his happiness at being free.

Rutland spent the last fourteen months of Queen Elizabeth's life mostly in Belvoir. In November 1602 he visited London on business. The Christmas of 1602 he

---

[730] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.379.
[731] Ibid., p.380.
[732] HMC *Salisbury*, XI, p.396. Foster writes that 'By the early Stuart period, indeed earlier, peers and bishops expected to be summoned to the upper House not at the king's pleasure but by right'. However the monarch could follow the writ with a letter forbidding attendance of the Parliament. (E.R.Foster, *The House of Lords, 1603-1649. Structure, Procedure and the Nature of Its Business* (Chapel Hill and London, 1983), p.16).
[733] Ibid., p.529.
[734] Ibid., XII, p.33.

spent in Rutlandshire, at the house of Sir John Harrington.[735] The Earl's offices had not been taken from him, so he occupied himself with local business and some suits in law.[736] All this time Rutland kept asking Cecil to assist him to receive complete forgiveness from the Queen.[737] At the beginning of March 1603 Lady Howard assured Rutland that the Queen 'hath promised ... I [Rutland] shall see her Highness and kiss her hand'. But the Queen was unable to fulfil this promise. She died on 23 March 1603. England had a new monarch, King James VI of Scotland and I of England.

4.2.6. From James VI and I's Accession to Rutland's Withdrawal Into the Country.

James VI's representatives were in correspondence with the 2nd Earl of Essex, as his secretary Henry Cuff readily admitted during the investigations of the Revolt.[738] As soon as James heard of Essex's failure he sent the Earl of Mar and Abbot of Kinloss as ambassadors to Elizabeth. Essex corresponded with James through Mar. The ambassadors were ordered to ask in the warmest manner for Essex's life. However Essex was beheaded before their arrival.[739] The official aim of the Revolt was to open the Queen's eyes to Cecil's presumed conspiracy in favour of the Spanish infanta as a future English monarch. Essex was thus effectively the champion of James VI's claim to the throne. So, it is not surprising that James regarded Essex's former followers as his potential friends. Though it was Cecil who engineered James's smooth succession to the English throne, the King probably wanted to enlarge his base of support in England, rightly presuming that those who opposed Elizabeth could become his friends._

On the day after the Queen's death Screven wrote Rutland a letter in which he

---

[735] PRO SP 12/286/13.
[736] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.385, 387.
[737] HMC *Salisbury*, XII, p.99, 289, 679.
[738] *Correspondence of King James VI of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and Others in England During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. J.Bruce, Camden Society, (1861), pp.81-90. Harrison, pp. 27, 45, 86, 253, 258-259, 270.
[739] *The Zurich Letters*, p.332.

advised the Earl to proclaim the King in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, and then to offer his services to James. Rutland was advised to send his favourite brother, Sir George Manners, to the King 'with [a] message of love and duty'.[740] By these actions Rutland would show to James his eagerness to serve him. Rutland followed Screven's advice. On 25 March he proclaimed James King of England at Grantham, on 26 at Nottingham, and on 27 at Belvoir.

James accepted Rutland's services. The King included Belvoir castle in his progress from Scotland towards London. The preparations for the Royal visit started in the beginning of April. Repairs were made in the Castle, additional cooks were hired and extra provision was bought. On 20 April Rutland went to Worsop to meet the King. James stayed in Belvoir on 22 and 23 April, 'where his Highnesse was not only Royally and most plentifully received, but with such exceeding joy of the good Earle and his honourable Lady, that he tooke therein exceeding pleasure'.[741] Then Rutland accompanied his sovereign to London.[742] Rutland's youngest brother Oliver was knighted during the King's stay at Belvoir with 49 other gentlemen. At the same time James remitted Rutland's fine and restored the Earl to all his lands (some of the Earl's manors were kept as security until he paid the Crown the fine imposed).[743]

The King enjoyed Rutland's company and appears to have liked him personally. Rutland's name opened the list of fourteen noblemen allowed in the King's Privy Chamber in July 1603.[744] Rutland's credit with the King was so high that Henry Constable asked him to try to discover James's opinion of him.[745] The King granted Rutland the office of Keeper of the Royal Park of Beskwood and Clipston for life, and appointed

---

[740] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.389.
[741] J.Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First* (London, 1828), p.91.
[742] HMC *Rutland*, pp.440-43.
[743] HMC *Salisbury*, XV, p.72.
[744] Ibid., p.220.
[745] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.391.

him First Commissioner to invest the King of Denmark, James's brother-in-law, with the order of the Garter at Copenhagen and to attend the christening of the Danish King's son and heir.[746] Rutland thus received a commission which was very similar in nature to that which he avoided under Elizabeth, but now Rutland was not in a position to choose, and accepted the King's favour in appointing him First Commissioner.

Rutland left England at the very end of June, at the same time professing his love for Cecil, and suggesting that if he had ever doubted Rutland's feelings, they would talk the matter over.[747] Rutland spent about two weeks in Denmark, feasting and celebrating. On 19 July he was back on English soil. The honour of being the King's ambassador cost Rutland about £1,333 6s. 9d.[748]

James seemed satisfied, and appointed Rutland Lord Lieutenant of Lincolnshire on 20 September 1603. Rutland had sought this office since October 1598.[749] He thus received from James the office that he had not managed to receive from Elizabeth I. Sometime before September 1604 Rutland became Steward of the Queen's manor of Grantham.[750] He desired to be reimbursed some of the expenses incurred in the King's service, and asked allowance for his transportation costs in Denmark. Cecil, now Viscount Cranborne, helped Rutland to obtain this.[751]

In 1604 Rutland had a suit before the Privy Council, and this was vehemently supported by the King and Cranborne. The latter wrote to the Council on Rutland's behalf, delivering to it 'the King's gracious disposition to the Earl'. Cranborne added several lines about 'the particular love and friendship between the Earl' and himself.[752]

It would be natural to expect Rutland now to resume his Court career, which has

---

[746] PRO SP 14/2/5.
[747] HMC *Salisbury*, XV, p. 385.
[748] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.444-45, 447-48.
[749] PRO SP 12/268/97.
[750] HMC *Salisbury*, XVI, p.318.
[751] Ibid., p.460.
[752] Ibid., p.426-427.

been interrupted by the Essex Revolt, and to seek royal favour. But it seems that he was not of courtly disposition. Before 1601 he used his favour with the Queen mainly in order to receive permission to go abroad for war. In 1603 he used the King's favour in order to obtain some compensation for his service. James's inclination to peace was apparent from the beginning of his reign, and Rutland perhaps realised that he could not hope for any future military activity. Instead, he resigned himself to living on peace in his estates. In March 1604 Rutland ordered Belvoir castle to be prepared for his return. He accompanied the King to Royston, while his wife stayed in London, and then, in July 1604, Rutland went to Belvoir.[753]

4.2.7. From 1604 to Rutland's death.

Rutland spent most of the remaining eight years of his life at Belvoir castle. It would be wrong to imagine him as a hermit, completely retired from life and shut up in his castle. Rutland occasionally came to London; when his health permitted he attended Parliament and fulfilled his other Court obligations. In August and September 1606 he participated in entertainments for the King of Denmark in London. Rutland gave Christian IV presents which cost him £109 2s. 8d. On 8 August the Earl gave a banquet for the Danish King and his Privy Council at Detford. This banquet cost him £110 3s. 3d.[754] Rutland was also a ring bearer at the investiture of Prince Henry as Prince of Wales on 10 June 1610. However, altogether he spent not more than two months per year in London.

Whatever his avoidance of court life, a few ceremonial occasions apart, Rutland had a great sense of responsibility. He did his best to preserve the King's game and

---

[753] HMC *De L'Isle*, III, p.128.
[754] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.457-59.

woods.[755] He actively executed all his various offices, and thus dealt with libels thrown in a parish church in Caistor, with offenders against the king's bill of enclosure, with purveyance in Lincolnshire, and with those who at the beginning of 1612 wanted to be relieved from buying the right to have a privy seal, this purchase disguising a loan to the King.[756] Rutland was in a position to bestow various offices in Lincolnshire, so he was besieged by suitors, as well.[757]

The estate accounts of the Manners family have not been published in full and access to them is presently forbidden. It is therefore difficult to reach a full assessment about Rutland as a landlord and estate manager. While Rutland was abroad in 1596 John Manners informed him of the Christmas audit.[758] After returning from the Azores, Rutland arrived on his estates in the first half of December 1598. On 15 December Rowland Whyte informed his master that 'the Earle of Rutland is at Bever Castell, and continues there till Candelmas [2nd February], to looke to his Auditt, and the State of his Liuinge'.[759] Rutland stayed in Belvoir until the beginning of April, where he was preoccupied with estate matters. He wished particularly to sell his wife's lands, and to buy some others closer to the bulk of his own property, so that the estates could be managed more effectively.[760] Lawrence Stone, who was allowed access to the Rutland estate papers, did not provide detailed information on Rutland's achievements as a manager of his estates, though he reluctantly admitted that between 1596 and 1602 Rutland had made some productive investments.[761]

---

[755] Ibid., I, pp.395, 406, 410, 415, 416, 422-23, 427; PRO SP 14/7/25, 14/45/151, 14/48/112; HMC *Salisbury*, XIX, p.64; XXI, p.63.
[756] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.406, 430, 433; HMC *Salisbury*, XIX, pp.196, 198, 330.
[757] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.408; HMC *Salisbury*, XIX, pp.152-53.
[758] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.332.
[759] Collins, op.cit., II, p.151.
[760] Ibid., II, p.174.
[761] Stone, *Family and Fortune*, p.180. Having been unable to consult the original sources I do not want to debate Stone's statement that Edward Manners, 3rd Earl of Rutland, was the person who modernised the Rievaulx iron mines. The correspondence between the 3rd Earl and his younger brother, then John Manners of Helmsley, future 4th Earl of Rutland, does suggest, though, that John Manners of Helmsley was the person who practically modernised the mines, which brought considerable income to his sons, the 5th, 6th and 7th Earls

Because of his considerable wealth and influence Rutland frequently helped those of his less fortunate relatives who required assistance. A simple request for money was among the most common requests.[762] Rutland had a number of problems with his close and distant relatives. Isabelle, Dowager Countess of Rutland, continued to pursue various suits against her nephew, though even the Attorney General considered her to be in the wrong.[763] Sir Oliver Manners, the Earl's youngest brother, went abroad and in 1608 there were rumours that he had become a Jesuit, though they proved to be untrue.[764] At the same time Rutland had to help Sir Francis Manners to obtain a second wife by settling 1000 marks (£667) yearly on him.[765]

Rutland did his best to provide his nephews with a proper education and further his nieces in life. He paid the tutors of his nephews Thyrwite.[766] Rutland left £50 per year to each of his three Thyrwite nephews, and wanted them to be properly educated and brought up.[767] He left £1,000 to his niece Catherine Manners and £500 to each of his other two nieces, Bridget Thyrwite and Elizabeth Willoughby.

While in the country Rutland was in weekly correspondence with his London representative, Thomas Screven, who informed him of all the events at Court and the progress of Rutland's various business matters in London.[768] In addition to Screven's information, Rutland received foreign news from different correspondents in London and on the Continent.[769] In 1605 Rutland intended to go abroad for three years.[770] Probably

---

of Rutland.

[762] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.407, 422, 423, 433, 439.
[763] Ibid., I, p.396.
[764] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.413, 414, 419-20, 424-27; PRO SP 14/32/47, 14/54/51, 14/66/96; HMC *Salisbury*, XVIII, p.313. The situation of his brother was especially awkward to Rutland at a time when he himself was known to have been among the three peers whom the Gunpowder plotters wanted to save from death (PRO SP 14/17/9). Rutland professed his complete innocence in the matter, and happily no one ever suspected him, though he did have two Catholic brothers, Francis and Oliver Manners.
[765] Ibid., pp.396. 413-14, 416, 423.
[766] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.455, 470.
[767] PROB 11/120.
[768] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.394-96, 413-14, 418-19, 423-28, 430-36, 438.
[769] Ibid., pp.420-21, 429-30, 434.
[770] PRO SP 14/17/81.

the condition of his health prevented him from realising this wish.

The household accounts of Belvoir castle give some insight into Rutland's character and occupations in the country, especially in comparison with his ancestors' practices. It is possible to obtain more or less comparable sets of data for the 1st, 2nd and 5th Earls and the Elizabeth, Dowager Countess of Rutland from the published accounts, though the sets are not fully comparable.[771]

Household accounts reveal Rutland's position in society, and the people with whom the Earl was in most frequent contact. While Rutland lived in the country he received a considerable number of presents from commoners, local gentlemen, officers and knights. Local noblemen sent the Earl presents as well. Household accounts show that 76 presents were given to Rutland between 1597 and 1612.[772] 64 of the 76 senders of the gifts, 84% of the total, were gentlemen or peers and 13% were commoners. The first category consisted of 41% gentlemen and gentlewomen, 25% knights, and 18% peers (mainly local barons).

There is no point in looking individually at the gifts. About 59 of them consisted of foodstuffs, mainly of local origin. Rutland received four horses and three hunting birds. It is worth mentioning that out of 9 does and stags, 3 were sent by gentlemen, 3 by knights, and 2 by peers. The same situation is found with the presents of fowls: 16 out of 17 presenters were gentlemen and knights. Fish, fruits, and cheeses were mainly sent by neighbours of gentle status. The list of those sending presents to the 5th Earl's does not differ significantly from the list for his great-grandfather, the 1st Earl.

The 1st Earl was a courtier and favourite of Henry VIII; the 5th Earl preferred to be a country nobleman who occasionally visited London. Household accounts mention

---

[771] For example, all four sets have some data on expenses on entertainment, but the 1st and 2nd Earls' accounts lack information on educational expenses.
[772] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.413, 424, 436, 446, 452-55, 457, 462-64, 467-71, 476-77, 490.

114 presents given to the 1st Earl between 1525 and 1542; 90 of the 114 senders (79%) were gentlemen or peers. The 5th Earl was not less popular than the 1st Earl. It has already been observed that the higher the position of the nobleman, the lower the number of gifts he sent. In the accounts of the Rutlands there are very few entries for gifts sent out. They were mostly the recipients of gifts and not the senders of them. The 5th Earl of Rutland sent New Year gifts to the monarch, to four or five officers of state, and to some of the Queen's ladies-in-waiting. Occasionally he sent small tokens to Salisbury.[773] 55% of the 5th Earl's expenses on gifts and reward was spent on New Year presents, in comparison to 67% of the 1st Earl's.

Some interesting observations about Rutland's character could be made on the basis of sums that he paid to carriers of the presents. Rutland was very close to the lower margin of the scale for a prominent nobleman when he gave a reward to those who brought him a present. Rutland's tips were modest, though Rutland thought about his own household servants and ordered his 'executor that he will 'show a general care of all my servants in ordinary and give unto every one of them some portion according to their time place and merit in my services as he in his discretion shall think meet for my honour'. He rewarded ten of his personal servants with the sum of £20 each. Three especially valued servants received bequests of £20 per annum each. Rutland usually paid generously to entertainers, as well, and the same was true of his alms-giving.

Rutland gave really large sums to single paupers, not less than 2s. 6d. For the 1st Earl the most characteristic sum was 4d., which was the equivalent of 1s. in the 5th Earl's day. The 1st Earl spent £2 4s. 10d. on alms, about 0.63% of the total sum disbursed on gifts and rewards; his son, the 2nd Earl, spent £1 13s. 8d., 1.1%; the Dowager Countess disbursed £39 12s. 10d., 66%; the 5th Earl spent £100 3s.10d., 6.2% of the total

---

[773] Ibid., pp.413, 424, 430, 439, 446, 458, 463, 465-66, 473, 492; I, pp.395, 426, 432.

sum disbursed on gifts and rewards. During twelve weeks in 1604 Rutland gave weekly sums of £5 to sick people. During this period the state was increasingly eager to organise relief of the poor in the localities. But it is clear the 5th Earl of Rutland preferred to participate personally in the process. Not withstanding the development of the poor law Rutland actually increased alms-giving in relation to his predecessors in the title.

In 1593 the Dowager Countess started building a hospital 'for the relieve of 6 poor persons to be taken out of the number of poor servants of Belvoir from time to time'.[774] However she did not finish the project. Rutland stated in his will that 'it was always my intention to end the work began and intended by my honourable good mother deceased'. Rutland ordered his executor, his brother Francis, to finish the work. The Earl assigned 'for ever all my fee simple lands in Muston ... for relie(ve)f of purer 6 persons forever'. He wanted the parsons of nearby parishes to visit the hospital. Rutland insisted that his brother 'enter into bond of £1500 to my good friend the Lord Compton and Mr Drow ... for performance of this my bequest touching the said hospital and my meaning therein'.

Rutland personally appointed officers in almshouses where he was a patron. In July 1609 the Countess of Rutland reminded her husband of his promise 'for the poore man having a place in the hospital'.[775] This poor man, Richard Gilbert, was recommended to the Countess by her nurse. Lady Rutland asked her husband 'lett him [Richard Gilbert] have your letter for it because it will help the poore woman [nurse] to £20'. It is hard to tell whether this Richard Gilbert was an officer in the almshouse or a lodger. One thing is evident, that the Countess's nurse was a broker and had to receive £20 for her mediation. On 21 February one Ralph Sheldon asked Rutland 'for a place in the almshouse at Warwick which is now void and in your [Rutland's] gift' on behalf of a

---

[774] PROB 11/120.
[775] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.417.

servant of the late Roger Manners of Uffington.[776] Rutland seems to have been very conscientious in his concern for the poor.

Not all Rutland's time in country was spent in charitable work or fulfilling the function of his offices. The accounts witness that all three Earls and the Dowager Countess of Rutland liked entertainment.

Table 4.2. The Expenses on Entertainment of the Earls of Rutland.

Name	Real expenses on entertainers			1610 year inflation on 10 year basis****		Sum per entertainer*****
	Y*	E**	Sum	E***	Sum	Sum
Thomas Manners, 1st Earl of Rutland	6	72	£10 5s. 10d.	120	£42 4s. 9d.	7s.
Henry Manners, 2nd Earl of Rutland	7	20	£9 8s. 6d.	28	£21 19s. 10d.	15s. 8.5d.
Elizabeth Manners, Dow. C-ss of Rutland	3	20	£6 11s. 2d.	67	£24	7s. 2d.
Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland	10	31	£56 3s. 4d.	31	£56 3s. 4d.	£1 16s. 3d.

* Y – number of years during which money was spent
** E – number of entertainers
*** E – number of entertainers on 10 year basis
**** Expenses on entertainers adjusted to the level of inflation of 1610 year and 10 years as period of expenditure
***** Sum per entertainer adjusted to the level of inflation of 1610 year and 10 years as period of expenditure.

It is evident that the 5th Earl spent the most for his entertainment and was the most generous in paying entertainers. The other members of the family generally paid musicians, and while the 5th Earl continued that tradition, his accounts reveal the greater importance to him than to his ancestors of the players' companies.

Table 4.3. Share of Musicians and Players and Their Share of Expenses.

Earls of Rutland	Players		Musicians	
	Number	Expenses	Number	Expenses
Thomas Manners, 1st Earl of Rutland	28%	34%	65%	60%
Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland	32%	52%	45%	35%

Rutland's interest in players is not a total surprise. In October 1599, he spent a consider-

[776] Ibid., p.428.

able amount of time in the London theatres. From 1608 until 1612 Rutland spent Christmas in Belvoir castle, always providing himself with musicians and players for Christmas festivities.[777] When Rutland travelled to other towns he liked to be entertained with plays and music.[778]

In the country Rutland, like most of his class, spent much time hunting. Even on the eve of the Azores expedition, Cecil sent Rutland a warrant permitting him to hunt in the little park of Enfield.[779] The Earl was noted as a good huntsman, and accompanied James I on hunts when his health permitted. Rutland participated both in hawking and in hunting with dogs.[780] This occupation was typical for a nobleman living in country and recommended by Elyot and King James in order to keep noblemen fit for active military service. In his will Rutland bequeathed presents of horses and hawks to his friends.[781]

Probably not the least of the reasons for Rutland's retirement into the country was his ill health. Two severe blows to Rutland's health were struck in Italy, when he almost died in Padua in 1596, and after the Ireland expedition in 1599, when he spent some time in Bath. His health continued to be poor. When he went to Holland in 1600 and to Denmark in 1603, Dr. Marbeck provided him with 'the case of waters and other things for his Lo: jorney to the sea'. In December 1605 Rutland had a letting of blood, a standard medical procedure, and did not attend the Parliament of April 1606. The household accounts reveal the reason: he had a severe bout of colic.[782] In September 1606 Rutland's own health probably improved, but he was worried about his friend Salisbury's state of health.[783] In October 1607 Rutland again required the assistance of a doctor.[784]

---

[777] Ibid., IV, pp.464, 468, 471, 477.
[778] Ibid., pp.447, 449, 450, 462, 471.
[779] Though Roger Manners of Uffington considered that it would be better if permission would be changed in favour of the great park, which had a plenty of deer. The little park was in need of replenishing.
[780] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.467,471,477.
[781] PROB 11/120.
[782] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.402, IV, pp.431, 444, 457.
[783] HMC *Salisbury*, XVIII, p.292.
[784] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.461.

It seems that between the autumn of 1607 and 1610 Rutland improved, participating actively in hunts. However, in September 1610 Rutland had some weakness in his legs, and had to seek the King's permission to be excused attendance at Parliament.[785] From that moment Rutland's health went from bad to worse. The doctors were frequent visitors in Belvoir in 1611, and in November the Earl had a fit of gout.[786] In 1612 he went to Cambridge in order to consult the famous Dr William Butler. About 7 May 1612 'My Lord of Rutland ... was taken with a dead palsy and sometime was speechless', however on 21 and 28 May there were serious hopes of his recovery.[787] Rutland survived his fellow-sufferer, Salisbury, who died on 24 May 1612. However Rutland's health deteriorated again, and he died on 26 June 1612 at the age of almost 36.[788]

What can be said of Rutland's political identity and character? In different periods of his life he had several patrons, Lord Burghley, the 2nd Earl of Essex, and the 1st Earl of Salisbury. Rutland did not choose Burghley as his patron, though he definitely cultivated his friendly relationship with Salisbury. However his choice of Essex as his patron and friend was more deliberate. In Cambridge Rutland was brought up in a Protestant milieu. His early acquaintance with Du Moulin and Walsingham put him on the road of militant Protestantism. Through association with Southampton and, ultimately, Essex Rutland showed his determination to stay on the path of military glory pursued for honour, for religion and for Queen.

It seems, though, that Rutland was not particularly interested in the political life

---

[785] PRO SP 14/57/88.
[786] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.477, 490.
[787] HMC *Downshire*, III, p.297, 306; HMC *Rutland*, I, p.439.
[788] His body was embalmed using 'chimicall oyle of awmber' prepared by Sir Walter Raleigh. The embalming of the corpse cost £76 6s. (HMC *Rutland*, II, p.353). The body reached Belvoir on 20 July. It was a custom that the body should lie in state before the burial so that all relatives, friends and servants could pay their last respects to the deceased. However, according to the register at Bottesford Church, the body was buried there on the day of its arrival from Cambridge and the elaborate funeral ceremonies were celebrated two days later, on 22 July. Eller in his *History of Belvoir Castle* states that he was unable to discover the reason for this abnormal procedure (I.Eller, *History of Belvoir Castle* (London, 1841), pp.381-82).

as such. His inclinations were towards military adventure. He participated in the Azores expedition, in the Irish campaign, and in military actions in Netherlands. He was very reluctant to undertake ambassadorial duties during Elizabeth's reign, though he agreed to represent James I in Denmark. But that was at a time when he needed to cultivate new King's favour. Perhaps suprisingly, though, Rutland did not use the King's goodwill to advance his own court career and preferred to spend his life in the country, when his health prevented him from again seeking active military service on the Continent.

Rutland's involvement in military expeditions was noted by several poets. Jonson called him 'brave'.[789] The same heroic features of Rutland's character were the object of an epigram by John Weever in 1599.[790]

> It's not the sea which doth our land inclose,
> That makes vs mightie to withstand our foes:
> Nor farmes, nor mannours, but where manners be
> There stands the cittie, from foes danger free;
> If *Manners* then make vs our foes withstand,
> MANNERS may wel be cald ROOT of the LAND.

Weever stated that 'our land' (or 'cittie' – civic community) was protected not by fortifications but by 'manners', virtues. The poem invokes civic and humanistic theme of the overwhelming importance of virtue and manners in a person. Weever called the Earl the 'root of land' because he considered him the possessor of 'manners', not only in name but in his character as well. Clearly he glorified Rutland's virtues, military and civic, as the latter were not less important for the protection of the 'cittie'. Thus through poetry and pun, Rutland was proclaimed a virtuous knight rather than a courtly figure.

4.3. Cultural Influence and Patronage.

As we have seen, a nobleman was supposed to be liberal towards the learned and

---

[789] B.Jonson, *Poems*, ed. by C.H.Herford Percy and E.Simpson, v. VIII (Oxford, 1947), *Forest*, 12, lns.89-96, p.116.
[790] J.Weever, *Epigramme in the Oldest Cut, and Newest Fashion* (London, 1599), f.B4. Weever studied in Queens' College (Cambridge) in 1594-1598.

to be a patron of the arts. Nobility involved benevolence towards poets, writers, scholars and artists. Aristocrats gave them money or took them into their service. Sometimes, though, the nobility influenced writers and artists indirectly.

4.3.1. Rutland in Verse.

Rutland and his wife were the subject of a number of poems. The Countess of Rutland was the only child of Sir Philip Sidney, and, not least because of that, she attracted the attention of English poets. It is interesting to look at these poems in order to understand how the Rutlands were being presented by the poets. Any examination of the references to the Rutlands in the works of English writers and poets raises the question of who controlled this presentation – writers or patrons?

Rutland was one of the dedicatees of John Florio's *The World of Words* along with the Earl of Southampton and the Countess of Bedford, the Countess of Rutland's cousin. All three of them were called 'patrons of virtue, patterns of honour'.[791] Florio spent some time describing the features common to all three of his patrons. They were of gentle and high birth, and occupied high positions. They were generous and never tired of doing good. We have seen that Rutland was indeed a generous and charitable person, though Florio might well have had in mind not Rutland's general liberality and kind-heartedness, but to his benevolence towards learned people, writers, poets and the like. Florio was seeking patronage from Southampton, the Countess of Bedford and Rutland and thus was likely to have presented them in such a light as they, probably, wanted to see themselves.

Ben Jonson told Drummond that 'the Countess of Rutland was nothing inferior to her father S. P. Sidney in Poesie'.[792] In his epigram to the Countess, Jonson wrote that

---

[791] Florio, op.cit., The Epistle.
[792] *Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden*, ed.R.F.Patterson (London, 1923), ln.213.

Sir Philip Sidney would burn his book [*Arcadia*] if he would see what a perfection is his daughter.[793] In an *Elegy* written probably at the end of 1600 Jonson stated that the Countess almost had her father's poetic skill, 'or may have, when you will'.[794] The poet mentioned the Countess's beauty and noble blood, but her poetical gift was considered the most valuable of her good qualities. According to Jonson, Lady Rutland was very virtuous and occupied herself with reading books,

> Searching for knowledge, and to keep your mind
> The same it was inspired, rich and refined.[795]

He considered the Countess an example for other noble ladies, who should try to imitate her and obtain some little knowledge of the matters which Lady Rutland knew in depth. It is interesting that Johnson praised the Countess both in his poems and during his conversations with Drummond, when the Countess had already been long dead and buried. This suggests the sincerity of the opinion.

Jonson's praises and opinion were seconded by John Florio in his dedication of the second book of his translation of Montaigne's *Essays* to the Countess of Rutland and Lady Rich.[796] Florio called the Countess 'Your Cognizance'. He considered the Countess a proficient and perfect scholar and commended her love of languages. The two dedicatees were compared with Cornelia in their bounty to learned and virtuous strangers, whom they treated as real guests not as entertainment. Both women were noble, learned, proficient in languages and music. They combined all these positive qualities with 'vncurious gravitie and all accomplish't vertue'. Lady Rutland however was 'enheritrix' of her father's poetical fame and her mother's beauty. Thus, again there is a hint that the Countess was a poetess equal in talent to her father.

---

[793] B. Jonson, *Poems*, (*Epigrams*,79), p.53.
[794] Ibid., (*The Forest*,12), p.116.
[795] Ibid., (*The Underwood*, 50, lns.25-30), pp.224-225.
[796] *Essays of Montaigne*, trans. John Florio (London, 1603), ff.R2r-R3v.

Jonson said that Sir Thomas Overbury was in love with the Countess and dedicated to her his *Wife*.[797] He asked Jonson to read it to the Countess, which the latter did, while praising its author. Overbury wanted Jonson to inform the Countess of his feelings, but Jonson refused, considering this immoral. Probably Lady Rutland was somehow informed of Overbury's feelings and reminded him of several lines from his own poem 'he comes too near, who comes to be denied'.[798] Thus, the Countess again proved her virtuousness.

Francis Beaumont in his poetical letter *Ad Comitissam Rutlandiae* mentioned that she was full of virtue, with a white soul, and a beautiful face. Every word that the Countess spoke was 'sweet and mild'.[799] Being virtuous-minded the Countess did not like to listen to praises of her 'own perfections', because she did not take 'a pride to have [her] virtues known'. In his *Elegy on the Death of the Virtuous Lady Elizabeth, Countess of Rutland*, Beaumont wrote that Sir Philip Sidney left two children, his *Arcadia* and his daughter, 'who for virtue, wit, beauty, were loved of all'. Lady Elizabeth was considered a more faultless issue. Beaumont called the Countess 'Rutland the fair', she was the muse of all English poets.[800] According to Beaumont the poets could not write a word on her death, because their muse was dead. Beaumont exclaimed in anger that 'Sorrow can make a verse without muse'. Oddly no one except Beaumont wrote a poem on the Countess's death.[801] It is worth stressing again that both Florio's dedication to the

---

[797] *Conversations with Drummond*, lns.214-19.
[798] In original 'he comes too neere, that comes to be denide'.
[799] *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher* (London, 1840), II, p.710-11.
[800] Ibid., p.711.
[801] Robert Chester's book of poetry, *Loues Martyr: or, Rosalins Complaint* (London, 1601) contained the first printing of Shakespeare's poem known as 'The Phoenix and the Turtle'. This volume is the only one in which a Shakespeare poem was published alongside the poems of other poets, including Johnson, Chapman, and Marston. Guililov considers that *Loues Martyr* was a poetical requiem to the Earl and Countess of Rutland by the best English poets. The Chester volume has attracted considerable attention from Russian scholars, I.M.Gililov, 'For Whom the Bell Tolled: A New Dating for Shakespeare's "The Phoenix and the Turtle", and the Identification of Its Protagonists' in *Russian Essays on Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, eds. A. Parfenov and J. G. Price, (London, 1998), pp. 146-84. Guililov thoroughly studied the Folger and British Library copies. Relying on internal evidence Guililov suggests 1612-1613 as the date of the printing of the final version of the Chester volume.

Countess and Beaumont's Elegy to her spoke of her excellent qualities, though in the case of Beaumont nothing was to be gained by praising the Countess.

Poets also provide us with some information which Rutland, most probably, would have preferred to remain uncovered. As mentioned, Rutland and his wife lived mostly apart. Some of the peculiarities of the Rutlands' life can be seen at the time of the marriage of the 3rd Earl of Essex. Essex and Lady Katherine Howard were expected to marry in the winter of 1605-1606. It was known that the Earl would attend Parliament at the end of January and the beginning of February.[802] In September 1605 Screven was unaware whether the Countess intended to come to London during the winter. The probability of the Countess not attending the marriage shocked bride's father, the Earl of Suffolk, who asked: 'What doth she not come to Lord of Essex marriage?' The Countess attended the marriage. However the Earl stayed in Belvoir and came to London in the end of January. The marriage was celebrated on 5 January 1606 with Jonson's masque *Hymenaei*, in which Lady Elizabeth had her part.[803] She came to London on 16 December and stayed there until the 7th of January. She participated in preparations for the masque, and some expensive clothes were bought especially for this masque. The Countess's participation in it cost Rutland £122 11s. 11d.[804]

Some information about the Platonic nature of the Rutlands' marriage can be found in the works of various poets. As early as the end of 1600, a year and a half after the marriage, Jonson wished that the Countess of Rutland would give birth to a son before the end of 1601.[805] Jonson's wish did not become reality. In 1603 this call to the Rutlands for procreation became louder. John Davies mentioned that the Earl and the

---

[802] HMC *Rutland*, I, p.395.
[803] B.Jonson, *Hymenaei or the Solemnities of Masque and Barriers at a Marriage* (London, 1606); S.Orgel, R.Strong, *Inigo Jones, The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, v.I (London, 1973), p.105.
[804] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.457-8.
[805] B.Jonson, *Poems*, *The Forest*,12, lns.98-100, p.116.

Countess had passed through troubles and joys, and now he prayed for them to produce a child.[806]

> Sweete *couple* that have tasted *sweete* and *sowre*,
> The sweetest *potion worldly weale* can taste;
> O let each others *sweetes* that *gaull* devoure
> Which with this sowre *VVorlds sweetes* is interlac't:
> And that *you* may doe so, your vnknowne *yours*,
> Will *praie*, so you vouchsafe to call him *ours*.

John Florio in his dedication to the Countess of 1603 emphasized the same issue. The Countess was praised for her intellectual and moral qualities but she was urged to 'to reape as much ioy by Iuno, as labour by Lucina, and honor by them both'.[807] In his dedication Florio wished that Lady Rutland, whom he considered the match of her parents in their best individual qualities (poetic talent and beauty) would become their match in the quality they held in common – parenthood. Florio promised that if she and her husband managed to produce a child, poets would join in their praise of her 'as kinde, in kindnesse them [her parents] as kinde suceeding'.

Probably Jonson wrote his epigram to the Countess of Rutland in the same year.[808] The poet called Rutland 'Ulysses', thus hinting at his various travels, and said that he 'hath ta'en leave to go, countries and climes, manners and men to know'. After James I's accession Rutland left England only once in 1603. In his epigram of 1600 Jonson wished Lady Rutland, and her family happiness. For the next two years the Rutlands were in disgrace and the Earl was solidly rooted to the English soil. So, 1603 seems to the most probable date for the poem.

In his epigram of 1603 Jonson hinted that Lady Rutland was unhappy in her married life. He reveals a very strange picture of the Rutland family: the Countess was 'a

---

[806] J.Davies, op.cit.
[807] *Essays of Montaigne*, f.R2.
[808] B.Jonson, *Poems* (*The Underwood*, 50), pp.224-225.

widowed wife', the Earl travelling somewhere far from her. Lady Elizabeth entertained herself with the society of her friends, relatives, allies, and books. In 1603 Jonson did not specifically wish the Countess to produce a child, as in the epigram of 1600. Why did Jonson stop urging the couple to produce a child? In his elegy on the death of the Countess, Beaumont wrote that he had heard that her marriage was never consummated, it was 'a sacrament of misery' for her, which 'could nothing change about thee but thy name'; 'in all things else [physical] thou rather led'st a life like a betrothed virgin than a wife'.

The only hints of the nature of the Rutlands' marriage are in the poems of Ben Jonson and Francis Beaumont. The latter clearly was not completely sure of the situation, having heard of it only second-hand. Jonson was much more assured. Jonson told Drummond how one day he was 'at table with my Lady Rutland' and her husband came in. Later the Earl accused his wife of keeping table for poets. The Countess informed Jonson in a letter about her conversation with the husband. The poet replied to her, and Rutland intercepted this letter, but never challenged Jonson personally.[809] Jonson and Beaumont scholars mention this episode and interpret it as a sign of Rutland's negative attitude towards poets in general.

However there is another universally ignored part of the *Conversations* in which Jonson told his host that he wrote 'a Pastorall jntitled the May Lord, his own name is Alkin... In his first storie Alkin ... bringeth the Clownes making Mirth and foolish Sports'.[810] Jonson said that other heroes of the pastoral impersonated the Countesses of Bedford and Rutland, Overbury, the Earl of Pembroke, and Lady Wroth. Some 'inchanteress' was based on the Countess of Suffolk; her daughter, 'somersets Lady',

---

[809] *Conversations with Drummond*, lns.357-360. It is worth mentioning that this story in *Conversations* immediately follows the information that 'Lady Wroth is unworthily maried on a Jealous husband'. It is possible that Jonson attributed Rutland's reaction to jealousy.
[810] Ibid., lns.393-401.

was shown as well. So, Jonson wrote a pastoral where the Countess of Suffolk and her daughter were portrayed negatively and all Rutlands' friends positive. This 'somersets Lady' was Lady Francis Howard, divorced wife of the 3rd Earl of Essex, whose marriage was celebrated with Jonson's masque.[811] A situation in which the Countesses of Suffolk and Somerset were negative heroines put the date of this pastoral after 1609, or even after 1613.

Among Jonson's poems there is only one pastoral, the unfinished *The Sad Shepherd.* Here among the list of characters we can find Alken the Sage. There is no other hero with such a name in Jonson's plays or masques. Alken enters the stage with a joyful crowd, which starts singing and playing, then they go hunting. Through all the pastoral the heroes constantly ask Alken for advice. All the action of the pastoral takes place in Sherwood forest. The list of the characters includes Robin Hood, the Chief Woodman of Sherwood forest; Friar Tuck, chaplain and steward; Little John, bow-bearer; Scarlet and Scathlock, huntsmen; George-a-Green, usher of the bower; Much, bailiff or acater; Robin Hood's Lady Marian; five shepherds (including Alken); three shepherdesses; a witch, her son, daughter, and hind; and a devout hermit. It is worth remembering that in pastoral language 'shepherd' meant a poet. It is known that Lucy Harringtom, the Countess of Bedford and Lady Mary Sidney-Wroth were amateur poetesses. Jonson and Overbury were professional poets.

This Robin Hood with his retinue resembles a mighty nobleman more than a highway robber. When Marion enters, she brings a stag which she killed with her dogs. This pastime was perfectly normal for a noble Lady, however the usual tale of Robin Hood does not include Marion hunting in the woods. Robin Hood invited shepherds and

---

[811] While her husband was abroad she fell in love with Sir Robert Carr. In 1613 she decided to have her marriage annuled on the ground of the physical incapacity in her husband. On 25 September 1613 the commissioners pronounced in favour of the annulment. Lady Essex was shortly afterwards married to Carr, who was created Earl of Somerset (*DNB*,V, p.390).

shepherdess to the vale of Belvoir to a feast in the forest. It is very difficult not to see the Earl and Countess of Rutland in this Robin and his Marion.[812] Sherwood Forest and Belvoir vale are geographically situated in different counties.[813] At the period the only common link between them was that Rutland was the Warden of the Sherwood forest and lived in Belvoir vale. So, in fact we see a scene in which a Lord and his Lady (probably the Earl and Countess of Rutland) invited poets to their house for a feast. In fact, it was Robin who brought shepherds to the Forest for a feast. This seems to demonstrate Rutland's positive attitude to the poets (if we accept that he was himself the model for Robin Hood). So perhaps Rutland did not have a negative attitude to poets in general, but was displeased with one poet, Ben Jonson. Robin and his Marian were called

> '... the sum and talk
> Of all that breathe here in the green-wood walk.
> Or Belvoir vale.
> The turtles of the wood.
> The billing pair.
> And so are understood
> For simple loves, and sampled lives beside'.[814]

The shepherds started to talk about love, and one of them said that 'the truest lovers are least fortunate'. Alken agreed with him, but another shepherd pointed to Robin and Marion as a happy example. At this point Alken started to make enigmatic comments. Each of his comments taken out of context seems perfectly normal and follows the theme. However when taken in context it becomes obvious that he is arguing with the other shepherds or rather cooling their admiration for this perfect loving couple. He agreed with every word about the qualities of Robin and Marion, but behind all his comments there was the impression of a man who knew about the personal intimate re-

---

[812] F.G.Fleay in his *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, I, pp.379-381, was absolutely sure that Robin Hood and Maid Marion of *Sad Shepherd* were the Earl and Countess of Rutland.
[813] Sherwood Forest occupied one fifth of Nottinghamshire, parts of Derbyshire and Yorkshire. Belvoir vale lies in Leicestershire.
[814] B.Jonson, *The Sad Shepherd*, ed. by C.H.Herford Percy and E.Simpson, VII (Oxford, 1941), Act I, Scene V, pp.21-22.

lations of the couple. He emphasized the chastity of their relationship.[815] Probably, Jonson was sure that the Rutlands' marriage never existed in deed. It is not our aim to explain why this happened.[816]

We have seen, the portraits of the Countess of Rutland given by poets and writers during her life and after her death did not much differ from one other. The situation with the Earl of Rutland is more complicated. Poems dedicated to the Earl during his life were all complimentary. In fact, the only negative comments came from Jonson's conversations with Drummond. Jonson's comments suggest that in his works he checked himself, for his treatment of the Earl of Rutland in his poems towards his wife was respectful, even friendly. Robert Evans has had a considerable difficulty, in analyzing Jonson's poems written to the Countess of Rutland, reconciling the Rutland that he found in these poems with Stone's characterisation of the Earl.[817] Evans's belief that Stone's characterisation was absolutely true led him to try to guess when it was that Rutland must have quarreled with Jonson, seeing Jonson's negative posthumous comment on Rutland as a sign of this quarrel. However if *The Sad Shepherd* is taken into account, then Jonson's attitude towards Rutland appears to have been positive and respectful after all.

---

[815] Actually the original title of the pastoral *May Lord* hints in the same direction. Jonson used the double meaning of the word 'may', 'the fifth month of the year in the Julian and Gregorian calendar' and 'a maiden, virgin'; the words 'May Lord' together had the meaning of 'a young man chosen to preside over the festivities of May day' (*OED*, IX, pp.498, 504). So, May Lord could mean 'the Lord of the month of May', with which month Robin Hood was traditionally connected. In F.J.Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (New York, 1965), III, p. 180 is given a ballad 'Robin Hood Rescuing three Squires', it opens with the following stance:

There are twelve months in all the year
As I hear many men say,
But the merriest month in all the year,
Is the merry month of May.

However the title of the pastoral could mean 'Virgin Lord', as well.

[816] The fact is that the 5th Earl of Rutland and his Countess did not have any children. After their almost simultaneous death the title passed to the Earl's younger brother, Francis, who became the 6th Earl of Rutland.

[817] R.C.Evans, *Ben Jonson and the Poetics of Patronage* (London, 1989), pp.38-53.

4.3.2. Cultural Patronage.

It was shown that Rutland became closely connected with Essex, or at least with his friend Southampton, from 1591. At the Accession Day celebrations of 1590 Essex was symbolically proclaimed Sidney's successor.[818] Essex inherited from Sidney, together with his widow, his reputation as an embodiment of the virtues of Protestant chivalry. Sidney was seen as an ideal courtly gentleman, an admirer of Italian culture and defender of the Protestant faith. Sidney's Protestantism did not stop him from his efforts to introduce into English culture elements of an Italian one which could transform it into more vivid and picturesque form. Thus, Sidney confirmed in practice the advice, he had given to his younger brother when he was travelling abroad, that even from Catholic counties some useful things could be borrowed.[819]

The one figure most closely associated with Rutland himself and indirectly connected with Sidney, was Robert Dallington. K.J. Höltgen has said of Dallington that he 'made a largely unacknowledged contribution to the culture and thought of Elizabethan and Stuart England'.[820] Höltgen proves rather persuasively that the author of *The Strife of Loue* published in 1592, who disguised himself under the letters R. D., was Robert Dallington.[821] The work was dedicated to the 'Thrise Honourable and ever lyving vertves of Syr Phillip Sydney Knight'; to those 'who living loved him, and being dead give him his dve'; and to the Earl of Essex.[822] In this work Dallington expressed the idea of the artist as a semi-divine creator whose works might even surpass nature. The book insisted that viewers of works of art had to cultivate their minds in order to appreciate the beauty of the visual arts. In his dedication to Essex the author mentioned that he intended to

---

[818] R.Howell, *Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1968), p.9.
[819] *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney and Hubert Languet*, ed.S.A.Pears (London, 1845), pp.198-99.
[820] K.J.Höltgen, op.cit., p.147.
[821] Ibid., pp.153-54.
[822] R.D., *The Strife of Loue* (London, 1592), ff.A1v-A2v.

write a more serious book and dedicate it to Essex. Essex's reaction to the dedication of this book is unknown.

Dallington accompanied first Rutland and then his younger brother, Francis, on their Grand Tours. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that somewhere between 1592 and 1595 Rutland, Essex's friend and ally, took Dallington into his service, justifying Dallington's hope of finding employment among the followers of the Sidnean chivalric ideal. Dallington participated together with the Manners brothers in the Essex Revolt and was fined £100.[823] Dallington continued to be employed by Rutland until 1605 serving him for at lest ten years. He was something between a friend and a trusted servant for Rutland, and the Earl left him £100 in his will. In October 1605 Rutland recommended Robert Dallington to Prince Henry's service.[824]

Roy Strong has noted that many figures around the Prince had either direct or indirect links with the Essex circle.[825] That included Rutland. Furthermore, the Prince's closest personal friends (the 3rd Earl of Essex, Viscount Cranborne, and Sir John Harrington) were all well known to Rutland. Essex was his halfbrother-in-law, Cranborne his friend's son, Harrington his 2nd cousin-in-law. It can be said that Prince Henry inherited Sidney's ideal of the chivalric educated Protestant knight from Essex, and the fact that Prince Henry was the heir to the throne even emphasized his closeness to Sidney's Arcadian princes. Rutland actively helped to form the circle of people around the Prince. At the end of 1609, on the threshold of the Prince's official investiture, his household was formally settled. Rutland recommended that Dallington be included in the list of members of the Prince's household.[826]

Rutland had a particular connection with the household of Henry, Prince of

---

[823] K.J.Höltgen, op.cit., p.158.
[824] HMC *Salisbury*, XVIII, p.328.
[825] R.C.Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales, and England's Lost Renaissance* (London, 1986), p.224.
[826] HMC *Salisbury*, XXI, p.170

Wales. The culture of Henry's household has been the subject of several studies. Jerry Williamson was the pioneer in studies of Prince Henry's court.[827] He formed his study on the creation of Prince Henry's image as a Protestant knight, and the obligations and limitations that this image put on the prince. Williamson thought that the Protestant militant image was artificially constructed around Prince Henry, and that he took the image and his position as a defender of Protestantism so seriously that it alarmed some of his contemporaries, and the King himself. The other major study of Prince Henry's circle is Roy Strong's, and it is particularly concerned to examine his cultural world. Strong confirmed that Prince Henry was deeply influenced by the ideology of militant Protestantism. He adored Henry IV and grieved after his assassination. Henry planned to restore of the English fleet to its former glory. Strong was especially interested in Henry's collection of works of art and his patronage of architects and painters.

It is worth remembering that in 1612 Cleland wrote that 'the most rare persons in Vertue and Learning that can be found' lived in the Prince's household.[828] Dallington may have been one of them. In 1609 Dallington presented to Prince Henry a manuscript copy of his *Aphorismes Ciuile, and Militare ... out of Guicciardine*. This copy survives in the Northamptonshire Record Office.[829] A full and revised text of the work was published in 1613.[830] Dallington dedicated the printed edition of his *Aphorismes* to Prince Charles, and noted in the foreword that he had read the work to Prince Henry, who enjoyed discussing its contents.

Dallington's work was an attempt to adapt Francesco Guicciardini's *Italian History*. It differed in form from Guicciardini's work, but in any case they had different

---

[827] J.W.Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart, a study of 17th century personation* (New York, 1978).
[828] J. Cleland, *The Instruction of a Young Noble-Man* (London, 1612), p.35.
[829] Northamptonshire Record Office, Finch-Hatton MSS., F.H.315.
[830] R.Dallington, *Aphorismes Ciuill and Militarie: Amplified with Authorities, and Exemplified with Historie, out of the First Quarterne of Fr. Guicciardine* (London, 1613).

aims. Dallington picked aphorisms from the *Italian History* (we have seen that books on history dominated Rutland's list of purchases and he seems to have shared Dallington's interests). Each aphorism was followed by quotations from authors in several languages; the classical Greek and Roman philosophers (Tacitus and Seneca especially) were used alongside the contemporary political writer, Justus Lipsius. After these quotations came a suitable passage from the *History*.

The choice of the aphorisms says a lot about the ideas of Prince Henry's circle, and of the Sidney/Essex world of which Rutland was a part. Dallington's first aphorism considered prolonged peace in a country as a very dangerous thing.[831] Essex was of the same opinion in his letter on travel to Rutland: 'I account no state flourishing but that which hath neither civil wars nor too long peace... Polities bodies are like our natural bodies, and must as well have some exercise to spend their humours, as to be kept from too violent or continual outrages which spend their best spirits'.[832] Dallington grieved for the abuse of power by vicious and ambitious courtiers. He criticized those, who strove for the sovereign's favour and were ready for immoral actions in order to obtain this favour.[833] The book was rather Machiavellian in its ideas. The prince had to be Janus-like, two-faced and should draw a line between his private and public appearances.[834] However there were some points of difference. A Machiavellian prince might do anything that he deemed necessary; Dallington's prince could do anything necessary for the preservation of state and commonwealth but not for self-aggrandisement. The general good of state as understood by the ruler was considered the main concern of the prince. Any action was pardonable for the sake of the commonwealth. Ideas of commonwealth's good were paramount for Sidney and Essex as well.

---

[831] R.Dallington, *Aphorismes*, f.B.
[832] Spedding, *The Letters and the Life*, p.12.
[833] R.Dallington, *Aphorismes*, ff.B2v, C2.
[834] Ibid., ff.Y4v-Aa1r.

Dallington's interest in Tacitus, Seneca and Lipsius put his ideas into the world of the 'new humanists' represented by Lipsius and Montaigne.[835] Their works combined Tacitist, sceptical and stoical approaches to politics. Lipsius and Montaigne put self-interest at the head of their ideas. Their works were crucial for the development of the concept of '*raison d'état*'. Anything, even religious views, could be subordinated to the peace of the country. This idea of peace seems, at first, to be far away from the ideas of Sidney/Essex circle of Protestant militarism. However, for Essex and his followers civil peace *was* the first priority, though they thought that it was best achieved by foreign war.[836] It is highly probable that Rutland was acquainted with the ideas of Lipsius and Montaigne, as well. After all, Dallington visited Europe together with Rutland, and Rutland's wife was a dedicatee of a translation of Montaigne's *Essays*.

The ideas of Lipsius and Montaigne could have influenced Rutland when he decided to withdraw from active political and public life. Lipsius and Montaigne sympathised with Seneca's stoicism, especially with the concept of 'apatheia'.[837] They paid especial attention to the ideas of self-preservation from external attack and from internal passion. In their works, self-interest was given priority over concern for others. Montaigne himself preferred a life of quiet philosophical contemplation rather than one of public office holding (though he gave in to the persuasions of his fellow citizens and served as Mayor of Bordeaux for two years). Thus, the 'new humanists' accepted and actually advocated the possibility of withdrawal from the active life. Rutland might have found in Montaigne some justification for the withdrawal from public life that marked his life after the first few years of the Jacobean period. Unlike Montaigne, Dallington advocated the active life for the sake of the commonwealth.

---

[835] R.Tuck, *Philosophy and Government 1572-1651* (Cambridge, 1993), p.45.
[836] Ibid., p.107.
[837] Ibid., p.51.

While in Henry's household Dallington retained close relations with Rutland helping him in his business affairs, sending the Earl detailed letters full of foreign news, and visiting him when he came up to London.[838] Dallington was among the persons who witnessed Rutland's will in Cambridge in 1612.[839] After the 5th Earl's death Dallington continued to be a friend of Francis Manners, 6th Earl of Rutland.

Dallington was connected with Rutland throughout the latter's adult life. Dallington's admiration of Italian culture, his adherence to militant Protestantism and his interest in Stoic philosophy are all things that Rutland seems to have shared. This sympathy may help account for Rutland's patronage of Dallington and his mention of him in his will.

Though the chief, Dallington was not the only member of Prince Henry's household who had previous connections with Rutland. Another was Inigo Jones. More or less the very first thing that is known for certain about Jones is that in 1603 he received payment from the 5th Earl of Rutland as a 'picture maker'.[840] In the same year he accompanied Rutland in his embassy to Denmark. Strong thinks that Jones probably accompanied Rutland's younger brother, Francis, during the latter's Grand Tour of 1597, and presumed that Jones was brought to Queen Anne's notice by the Danish King in 1604.[841] In the late 1604 he started preparations for *The Masque of Blackness*, commissioned by the Queen for herself and her ladies to dance in. Lucy Harrington, Countess of Bedford, a member of Queen Anne's inner circle and a close friend and 2nd cousin of the Countess of Rutland, was among these ladies.[842] The next confirmed appearance of Jones was as designer of the masque *Hymenaei*, which was written for the Countess of Rutland's

---

[838] HMC *Rutland*, I, pp.414, 416, 434; IV, pp.448-49,451,453.
[839] PROB 11/120.
[840] HMC *Rutland*, IV, p.446.
[841] Strong, op.cit., p.110.
[842] S.Orgel, R.Strong, op.cit., p.89.

halfbrother's marriage. The Countess herself participated in the masque together with the Countess of Bedford. It seems more likely that those two Countesses brought Inigo Jones to the Queen's attention. Anyway Jones first known employment was with Rutland, and (whether or not Strong is right in his suggestion that Jones accompanied Francis Manners to Europe in 1597) Jones did stay with Rutland during the last turbulent years of Elizabeth's during Rutland's involvement in the Essex Revolt.

Marshall rightly writes that the imagery of the Jacobean public theatre and of the Jacobean Masques was sharply contrasted.[843] The military imagery of the plays was closer in mood to that of Prince Henry's circle, while masques reflected the more pacifist mood of the Royal Court. Though Jones was a member of Prince Henry's household, like Dallington, the two men's ideas were, in essence, rather different. It is worth noting that Jones was mainly used by the Prince as architect, not as a theatrical designer. In his works Dallington expressed his positive attitude towards Italy and his militant Protestant views. Jones's designs for Court Masques served other purposes. Rutland actively and consistently patronized Dallington, but there was not the same relationship with Jones. This may tell us something of Rutland's cultural and political attitudes. Rutland, indeed, seems never to have participated in Court masques. It may be that Rutland preferred the public theatre (which he attended frequently for a time) while the Countess favoured masques. It is reasonable to assume that Rutland was a patron of Dallington, while his wife might have helped Jones to attract the interest of the Queen.

As we have seen the Sidnean chivalric ideal included cultural patronage as one of the occupations of a nobleman. Essex was known as a patron of the arts and was a dedicatee of approximately seventy-seven books.[844] Rutland was Essex's follower in this

---

[843] T.Marshall, *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages under James VI and I* (Manchester, 2000), pp.88, 122.

[844] F.B.Williams, *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books before 1641* (London, 1962), p.53.

as well as in military matters, though on a much more moderate scale. He was the dedicatee of only three books.[845] We do not know whether Rutland sought these dedications or not. Fox has argued that in the last decade of Elizabeth's reign literary patronage was in decay.[846] Dedications to noblemen brought much less return in the shape of patronage and money rewards than in previous periods. Fox mentions that some dedicatees preferred to know in advance about the prospective dedication of the book to them.[847]

In the 1570s and 1580s the sum of £3 was considered an extremely generous gift by the dedicatee to the author of a book. From the early 1590s this monetary reward fell further to £1.[848] Perhaps this tendency continued further in the seventeenth century. However in the Rutland household rewards to the authors of the books did not change. In 1599 and in 1603 Rutland was presented with two maps by one John Baptist Beotio, in both cases Beotio received £2.[849] In August 1611 Cotgrave received £3 as a reward for presenting his French Dictionary to the Countess of Rutland; the sum was paid by the Earl's household.[850] The dictionary was not even dedicated to the Countess, making the size of the reward more notable. Rutland was, it seems, a generous patron.

It could be said that Rutland's idea of patronage was rather consistent. He took into his household Robert Dallington and Inigo Jones, and both later found a place in Prince Henry's household. His own cultural tastes and ideas most probably agreed with those propagated by Dallington rather than those of Jones. He was not as eager as his wife to participate in the visual displays of the Jacobean Court, but he compensated this

---

[845] A.Willet, *Sacronum Emblematum Centuria vna ...* (1592), STC 25695; J.Florio, *A Worlde of Words or Most Copious, Dictionerie in Italian and English* (London, 1598), STC 11098; J.Davies, *Microcosmos. The Discovery of the Little World, with the Government thereof* (Oxford, 1603), STC 6333.
[846] A.Fox, 'The Complaint of Poetry for the Death of Liberality: the Decline of Literary Patronage in the 1590s' in *The Reign of Elizabeth: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. J.Guy (Cambridge, 1995), pp.229-257.
[847] Ibid., p.234.
[848] Ibid., pp.234-36.
[849] HMC *Rutland*, IV, pp.424, 446.
[850] Ibid., p.490.

with financing her participation. In any case, one can be an admirer of the visual arts and entertainment while remaining reluctant to participate in them. The mantle of patron of arts passed to Prince Henry from Sidney's shoulders via Essex and his friends.[851] Rutland was one of these friends. If Essex was the inheritor of Sidney's honours and reputation partly through his marriage to his widow, Rutland was a minor participant in this role through his marriage to Sidney's only daughter.

Rutland lived up to these expectations generally, and in the sphere of cultural patronage particularly. His relationship with Jonson was ambiguous, but nevertheless Jonson paid tribute to him in his unfinished *Sad Shepherd*. Rutland was connected with Ben Jonson, Inigo Jones and Robert Dallington, his wife was muse for a wide circle of English poets.

4.4. Conclusion.

Humanist literature and sixteenth and seventeenth century advice literature saw nobility as combining in itself the old medieval ideal of a nobility of blood with the new ideal of a nobility of military, civic and intellectual virtue. The latter could be developed only through humanist education. In order to be considered truly noble one had to receive a proper bookish education. This ideal was especially influential and powerful in the Sidney/Essex circle. In his letters on travel Essex stressed that even if one wanted to pursue a military career, one still had to study the seven liberal arts in order to develop one's mind and virtues. When civil virtues had been acquired, military ones should then be cultivated. The combination of the two ideals meant that new nobleman had to be pious, educated, liberal, brave, and faithful to their sovereign and commonwealth.

The 5th Earl of Rutland was chosen for this case study because his life is gener-

---

[851] Sir Philip Sidney, Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke and the Earl of Southampton received 30 different dedications each; Prince Henry was a recipient of 115 dedications (Williams, pp.93, 94, 124, 170, 204).

ally ignored by scholars (at least, by those not invested in Shakespeare authorship studies). It seems that Rutland was among those noblemen who embraced the new ideal from childhood. He received an excellent education, having studied seven years in Cambridge. He never stopped pursuing knowledge, as Essex advised him. While abroad Rutland registered at the University of Padua intending to study there. He seems to have studied in Gray's Inn. Books accompanied him throughout his life and almost to the grave.

From his University years onwards Rutland became attached to Essex's faction and thus accepted the Sidnean chivalric ideal as his personal ideal. He tried to live up to this standard. He closely followed his patron's advice during his foreign travels. After his return to England Rutland accompanied Essex on all his military enterprises, trying to receive the necessary military experience required for a Protestant humanist knight. Rutland consciously attached himself to the ideals of militant Protestantism. Even Rutland's marriage to Sidney's only daughter and Essex's stepdaughter confirmed his attachment to the Sidney/Essex chivalric ideal. However the death of his friend and relative Essex probably led to Rutland's seeming awareness of the impossibility of following his ideal in a society governed by an essentially different idea. Perhaps recalling the neoStoic ideas of Lipsius and Montaigne, Rutland withdrew from public life. If his first retirement to his estates was enforced, the second one was voluntary.

Rutland chose not to pursue a Court career, but served the Crown as a local governor. He and his wife had close connections with major poets. Rutland had never forgotten the ideals of his youth. He helped to shape the court of Prince Henry, probably hoping that Prince Henry as the heir to the throne could try to revive the old Sidnean ideal for the entire nation. And Prince Henry did not fail the hopes of Essex's old friends. He was everything they wanted their prince and sovereign to be. It is possible

that when Rutland was dying he felt some satisfaction that his youthful ideals were not dead, they manifested themselves vividly in Prince Henry. Henry, of course, died less than five months after Rutland. The hopes of militant Protestantism died with him.

CONCLUSION.

The aristocracy has, in various ways, received considerable attention from historians. The aim of this thesis has been to add to that work by exploring the changing ideal of nobility, its implications for their public life, and the ways in which the nobility responded to changing ideals. In addition, it has been throughout an intention to escape from the anachronistic judgements of the aristocracy and their lives that have tempted many historians, and to show something of the ways in which anachronism might be avoided.

5.1. The Noble Ideal

The Tudor and early Stuart period witnessed a considerable change in the idea of true nobility and of its place in society. Humanist authors created a new ideal of the nobility. In the most finished form this ideal considered a man noble only if he was educated in the *studia humanitatis*, was adorned with civil virtues and served his commonwealth. Distinctions of social origin and class did not in principle exist in this ideal. However, later it was adjusted in order to accommodate the realities of sixteenth century life. The hereditary nobility was the most powerful social group in society, and no ideal that ignored this fact was of much use. Instead three categories of nobility were identified: noblemen who came from ancient families; noblemen who achieved their nobility through learning and service to the commonwealth; and noblemen from ancient families who studied the *studia humanitatis*, proved themselves to be virtuous, and desired to serve their commonwealth in the council chamber or on battlefield. The last type was considered the true nobility, in which birth, education and virtue all came together.

Thus the medieval ideal of a nobleman as predominantly a knight-warrior evolv-

ed into the ideal of an educated chivalric Protestant knight at the service of the commonwealth. The new ideal did not break completely with the old one; it was closely connected with the traditional medieval ideal of a nobleman and tried to incorporate some features of the old ideal, giving it a new humanist significance. Medieval noblemen were supposed to be liberal towards the poor, and the clergy. In the humanist ideal this was complemented by liberality towards scholars, friends and foreigners. Like medieval noblemen, humanist noblemen had to be ready to participate in wars for the sake of their commonwealth and Prince, but they should not pursue any private wars, and were expected (as Protestants and servants of the commonwealth) to obey their sovereign. The new aristocracy was advised to adopt modesty in clothes and diet, though the tradition of magnificent display was, in kind, retained in Humphrey's ideal, in which it was admitted that the nobility needed to entertain their equals in a grand style.[852] The most important demand of the new ideal for a nobleman was to be educated in a humanist and 'bookish' manner, and in particular to have a classical education. A true nobleman combining the ancient blood of his ancestors with his personal learning was supposed to be a Counsellor to the Prince and to give him advice which would rather benefit the entire commonwealth than serve his own or his Prince's self-interest.

Obviously the new ideal required sixteenth and seventeenth century noblemen to be educated differently from the old nobility. English humanists drew up detailed plans for the proper education of a noble child. They divided this education into several stages. The appropriate classical and humanist authors were recommended for each of these stages.

The appearance of a rich advice literature was another interesting feature of the time. Unlike general manuals on education, advice letters, including those on travel,

---

[852].Humphrey, *The Nobles* (London, 1563), f.Q1v.

were often addressed to particular individuals whose personal qualities were known to the authors of the letters. These authors were frequently the leading politicians of the time. They gave recommendations on proper noble conduct and life. Their advice was considered especially valuable, and sometimes was printed for a wider circle of readers than originally intended.

One important set of advice letters was sent by the 2nd Earl of Essex to his friend and relative the 5th Earl of Rutland. These went far beyond the travel recommendations that they had been supposed to represent, and gave a condensed description of Essex's ideal nobleman who combined humanist learning with Chivalrous and civic virtues.

5.2. Sources.

Sixteenth and seventeenth century humanist tracts and advice literature have been examined in order to determine which patterns of behaviour and education were considered appropriate to nobleman. A particular feature of the present dissertation has been the attempt to use household accounts to produce some information about the way the nobility actually behaved.

The attempt has been made to use household accounts not as the sources of purely economic information, but to supply information on noble customs and manners. Household accounts have proved to be very important sources. Collectively, they enable us to find out what expenses were normal for the nobility, thus helping to avoid anachronism in judging such matters. Scales of reward appropriate to each of the group of the nobility have been derived from the accounts. These scales could be used in a case-study of any member of the aristocracy, and could help to show the level of his or her personal participation in the processes of reward and alms-giving. The accounts used collectively provide a picture of noble life that can be used as a guard against anachronistic judge-

ment of individuals. In more general biographical and historical researches it is worth taking into account the extent, volume and geography of rewards. Accounts could help in providing information on people's whereabouts, character and mode of life.[853]

In our case the household accounts provided us with valuable evidence of Rutland's whereabouts, his personal tastes and habits, his position in local society and other issues. This case-study shows the importance of using of all available types of sources, including letters, household accounts, advice literature and literary sources. Taken together these sources provide a historian with a more objective picture less prone to anachronistic mistakes. They proved, in particular, that Stone's account of the 5th Earl and his character was grossly anachronistic and misleading.

The Earl of Rutland was portrayed by Stone as a spendthrift not interested in culture and education. Stone based his characterisation of Rutland on some preconceptions which are not proved by the evidence, and his judgement seems to be considerably exaggerated. Close study of Rutland's life raises some more general questions regarding Stone's methods. The Manners family contradicts the majority of Stone's general conclusion regarding the habits and manners of late Tudor and early Stuart peerage in *The Crisis of the Aristocracy* and *The Family, Sex and Marriage*. However the Manners family was not mentioned as an exception in these books. So, was the Manners family the only one that contradicted Stone's understanding of noble practices? Ralph Houlbrooke and Linda A. Pollock have argued in general that rather close relations existed within Tudor and Stuart families.[854] Even for the nobility, Spence, in his *Lady Anne Clifford: Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery*, provides another example of a close

---

[853] However the household accounts also give the opportunity for further research. It is possible to get from them information about other aspects of life. The patterns and scales for wardrobe expenses, food disbursements, expenses on dogs and horses, servants' wages and other aspects of a noble household's everyday life can be derived from the household accounts. These scales could bring greater objectivity into judgements passed on the lives of individuals.

[854] R.Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England* (Oxford, 1998); L.A.Pollock, *Forgotten Children. Parent-child Relations from 1500 to 1900.* (Cambridge, 1983).

emotional bond between a mother and her child in late Tudor and early Stuart England.[855]

One can say that one misinterpreted figure in history does not matter much. But it does. Stone's portrait of Rutland has been used by others. In *Ben Jonson and the Poetics of Patronage* Robert Evans has a very interesting analysis of Jonson's poems written to the Countess of Rutland.[856] Stone's characterisation of Rutland is an integral part of the analysis.[857] Thus, the anachronistic judgement of one historian can lead to a literary analysis based on faulty ground. Where and when will this chain of mistakes and misinterpretations end?

5.3. Liberality as One of the Noble Virtues.

The present research has chosen to concentrate attention on the realization of the noble virtue, in particular, that of liberality, one of the key virtues of the humanist nobleman. The understanding and practice of liberality in the period was examined as a case-study in the viability and reality of professed humanist virtues. This virtue received its exemplification in the tradition of reward and alms-giving. Liberality was divided into several categories: alms to poor; gifts to clerics; scholarships and rewards to the learned, and help and assistance to one's friends.

It was shown that the ancient tradition of liberality was alive and influential at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries. Though humanists criticised a liberality based not on true Christian mercy but on the desire for display and the search for honour and respect, rewards and alms-giving were partly means of displaying one's social status in early modern England. Alms and reward-giving helped the

---

[855] R.T.Spence, *Lady Anne Clifford: Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery (1590-1676)* (Stroud, 1997).
[856] R.C.Evans, *Ben Jonson and the Poetics of Patronage* (London, 1989), pp.38-53.
[857] Ibid., pp.40, 52-53.

nobility to maintain a network of patronage and to build closer ties to their localities. There are clear patterns discernible in the giving of alms and rewards. There were relatively clear levels of noble expenditure on different items of consumption, depending on the precise social standing of the nobleman.

Rutland's patterns of expenditure on rewards and alms showed his generosity towards the poor and his interest in the performing arts. His level of rewards to servants of various noblemen clearly proclaimed his social status, and the lists of rewards given to those who brought him presents from their masters demonstrated his high standing in local society.

5.4. The Education and Formation of a Nobleman.

I have examined the practical implementation of the educational ideas of English humanists, and presented, in as much detail as sources permit, an examination of the education provided by the Sidneys, the Cecils, the Manners, the Percies, and the Devereux families to their members. The actual costs of noble education have been examined, comparing the material provided by household accounts with the figures which are found in the humanists' manuals. Although this material can give no more than the barest outline of the education of the nobility, it nonetheless provides us with some insight into the formation of a noble culture.

The humanists of the first half of the sixteenth century wanted noble children to be brought up at their homes with good teachers and tutors under the general supervision of their fathers. At the turn of the century, humanists began to see grammar schools and Universities as appropriate places for educating the nobility. There appeared a new stage in the noble education of the second half of the sixteenth century, the Grand Tour. This did not appear in any of the acknowledged manuals on noble education, so these manu-

als were complemented by numerous advice letters on travel.

The recommendations of English humanists regarding children's education were carried into practice, creating a new educated, cultivated and more cosmopolitan nobility. The parents consciously wanted their children to be educated in the new way demanding from them at least knowledge of Latin, if not always of Greek. Noble parents expected from their sons knowledge of classical Roman and Greek philosophy and history. The Grand Tour was intended to complement this theoretical knowledge derived from books and tutors with observation of different political systems, manners and traditions existing in contemporary Europe. Cranborne, at least, achieved this result through his Grand Tour.

However the cost of the new education was much higher than humanists had suggested. The Grand Tour was an especially expensive enterprise. The cost of education differed with the social position of the student, being the least for a child of a lesser nobleman and the greatest for a child of a powerful courtier. Scales appropriate to each of the group of the nobility have been calculated for the cost of noble children's educational and maintenance expenses. A comparison of these scales with the real expenses of particular noble families might help to determine the level of importance that he or she gave to education.

A case study of the life of Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland showed in detail the formation of a Protestant humanist nobleman and the ways in which he purposefully fashioned his own understanding of his place and function as a nobleman throughout his life.

The 5th Earl of Rutland has been largely overlooked by English historians. From his childhood Rutland was placed in a Protestant milieu. His early acquaintance with Essex and his friends led to his partly conscious efforts to fashion and educate himself

up to the humanist ideals of the Sidney/Essex circle. It is significant that Rutland followed Essex's advice and shaped his life in accordance with it. Even his marriage was subordinated to his political views. Rutland is rarely taken into account by historians of the Essex revolt, though he was a significant person who retained his place near Essex and was Cecil's friend at the time of the Revolt.

The figure of the Earl seems especially interesting because of his connection with the Earl of Essex and the Court of the Prince of Wales. Rutland and his wife had considerable influence on English culture in the period and helped actively to shape it. However strange it might have seemed to Lawrence Stone, Rutland can be considered a model of a humanist nobleman who took very seriously the new ideal of nobility propagated by English humanists in the sixteenth century. He tried to live up to this ideal and failed, so that at the end of his life Lipsius's and Montaigne's neoStoic ideas might have seemed to speak more directly to his disillusioned soul.

Thus, in several ways Ciceronian and Stoic humanist tracts were not empty theoretical exercises. These works helped members of the nobility to find their place in a changing world.

Appendix 1. Cost of Education and Maintenance

Table A.1. William and Francis Cecil, children of Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury (between 1608 and 1612).

William			Francis		
£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
13863	17	6	2911	15	8
Total			**16775**	**13**	**2**

Table A.2. Roger, Frances, George, Oliver, Bridget, Elizabeth, and Francis Manners, children of John Manners, 4th Earl of Rutland (between 1588 and 1600).

Roger			Frances			George			Oliver			Bridget			Elizabeth			Francis		
£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
4301	16	1	647	2	5	422	3	2	232	4	2	1001	0	2	39	3	11	12	16	5
Total			**6656**	**6**	**4**															

Table A.3. Algernon, Henry, Dorothy, and Lucy Percy, children of Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland (between 1601 and 1618).

Algernon			Henry			Two daughters		
£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
3794	18	11	673	10	7	179	19	2
Total			**4648**	**8**	**8**			

Table A.4. William and Francis Cavendish, children of Sir William Cavendish (between 1599 and 1608).

William + Francis			William			Francis		
£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
191	1	2	234	8	8	51	10	4
Total			**477**	**0**	**2**			

Appendix 2. Rewards Given by the Nobility: Summary Scales

Category		Lesser nobility	Prominent nobility	Court Nobility
poor:	individual alms	from 1d. to 2s.	from 2d. to £1, typical 6d.-5s.	
	to collectors	from 1s. to 5s	about £2	
	weekly	from 4s. to £1	from 10s to £5	
Servants bringing letters		from 4d. to 1s.	from 2s. 6d. to 10s.	
Different servants		from 4d. to 7s. 6d.	from 12d. to 20s.	
Servants bringing presents	fruits, cheeses	from 4d. to 1s.	from 6d. to 3s.	from 2s. 6d. to £1
	meats	from 8d. to 6s. 8d., typical 3s.	from 5s. to £1 10s., typical 10-15s.	
	poultry	from 1d. to 1s., typical 6d.	from 1s. to £1, typical 1s. - 2s. 6d.	from 2s. to £1, typical 5s.
	fish	from 2d. to 8d.	from 1s. to 6s. 8d., typical 1s. - 2s.6d.	from 2s. 6d. to £1
	edible things	from 1d. to 1s.	from 2s. 6d. to £2	
	horses		from £1 to £5	
	dogs		from 6s. to £1.	
	hunting birds		from £1 to £3 5s.	
	book by author		from £1 to £10	
	book by smb.		from 5s. to £1	
	miscellaneous	from 1d. to 18d.	from 2s. 6d. to £2	
Servants of other house-holds	per house	from 1d. to 20d. (to equal in status) from 2s to 10s. (to superior)	from 1s. to £3	from 3s. to £10
	Departments		from 1s. to 12s.	from 10s. to £1
	cooks	2s.	from 3s. to 12s.	From 5s. to £4
Monarch's servants	individuals		from 2s.6d. to 20s.	from 2s.6d. to £2
	departments		from 15s. to 25s.	from 15s. to £2 10s.
Keepers	of hunting parks	from 3s. 4d. to 5s.	from 10s. to 20s.	
	gate openers	from 3d. to 9d.	from 6d. to 2s.	from 6d. to 5s.
Baptism:	midwife, nurse	from 6d. to 3s.	from 10s to £3, typical £1 - £2	from £1 to £3
	child	from 1s. to £1 4s.	from £1 to £40	from £1 to £30
Doctors:	surgeon		from 5s. to £1 10s.	from £1
	physician	up to £13 6s. 8d.	from 10s. to £15.	from £6 13s. 4d.

Appendix 2. Rewards Given by the Nobility: Summary Scales (continued)

Category		Lesser nobility	Prominent nobility	Court Nobility
Entertainers:	players	from 8d.. to £1, typical 5s.-10s.	from 15s. to £10., typical £1 10s.	
	musicians	from 4d. to £1 10s., typical 1s.-3s.	from 5s. to £5, typical 10s. - 15s.	
	beasts	from 3s.4d. to 6s.	from 3s 4d. to £2, typical £1	
Miscel.		relatives	10s.	from £4 to £30
		teachers		from 20s to £10
		servants leaving service	from 5s. to £1.	from £3 to £20
		clerics	from 1s. to £2	from £2 10s. to £20

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Reference works

G.E.Cockayne, *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom*, 14 vols. (London, 1926).

Dictionary of National Biography, 22 vols. (Oxford, 1921-22)

J.P.Kenyon, ed., *A Dictionary of British History* (London, 1986).

The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th edition, 29 vols. (Chicago, London, 1990).

The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed., 20 vols. (Oxford, 1989)

A.W.Pollard and G.R.Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (London, 1986).

Sir W.Sterry, ed., *The Eton College Register 1441-1698* (Eton, 1943).

F.B.Williams, *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books before 1641* (London, 1962).

II. Primary sources.

1. Manuscript sources.

Archivio Antico dell'Universita di Padova, Padua.

v.94 (microfilm) – book of registration for foreign students.

British Library

Add. MSS

15,914, f.73 - acknowledgement by Roger Manners, Earl of Rutland, of having received from Viscount Lisle his bond for settling land on his wife; date. 8 July, 1607.

27,962A, f.189v – transcripts from the public archives at Florence of the correspondence of the Florentine ambassadors to England.

12,511

37,232Q, ff.94, 97, 97v.

38,137, f.173 - copies of letters of advice on travel to the 5th Earl of Rutland from the 2nd Earl of Essex.

Egerton MSS

2,599, f.233v. – yearly allowances for Thomas Sisley and Thomas Campion, beginning at Christmas, 1582.

Harley MSS

813, f.7

4,888, f.20

6,265; f. 115 - copies of letters of advice on travel to the 5th Earl of Rutland from the 2nd Earl of Essex.

4,698 – Book of Queen Elizabeth I's jewels, presented to her as New Year gifts.

Lansdowne MSS

23 - 62. Debts owned by the Earl of Essex, 1576; 63. Mr. Wright's account of disbursements for the Earl of Essex, 1576; 66. The contents of the Earl of Essex's will; with an estimate of his estate, 1576; 67. An account of the funeral expenses of the Earl of Essex, 1576.

25 - 19. Essex, from Cambridge, to Burghley, May 13, 1577; 21. Essex, from Cambridge, to Burghley, June 10, 1577 (Latin.); 26. Essex to Burghley, October 23, 1577 (Latin.); 45-55, 82-84. Various accounts and bills for

disbursements for the use of 2nd Earl of Essex in 1576 and 1577.

57 - 82. Rutland at Queen's College, Cambridge, to Burghley, April 23, 1588.

Northumberland MSS

U.I.3 (1-3) microfilms 361-363 – household accounts of the Earls of Northumberland.

Cavendish Manuscripts, Chatsworth House

MSS 7, 8 – books of weekly household accounts of Elizabeth Talbot, Dowager Countess of Shrewsbury;

MSS 10a, 10b, 23, 29 - books of monthly household accounts of William Cavendish.

Lambeth Palace Library

MSS 699 – letters of George Talbot, 6th Earl of Shrewsbury (1580).

Longleat House

Devereux MSS, MS 5 – accounts of expenses of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, between 1576 and 1581.

Northamptonshire Record Office

Finch-Hatton MSS., F.H.315 – a manuscript copy of R.Dallington, *Aphorismes Ciuill and Militarie: Amplified with Authorities, and Exemplified with Historie, out of the First Quarterne of Fr. Guicciardine* (London, 1608).

Public Record Office

PROB 11/71 - will of Edward Manners, 3rd Earl of Rutland,

PROB 11/72 - will of John Manners, 4th Earl of Rutland,

PROB 11/120 - will of Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland,

PROB 11/122 - will of Oliver Manners

SP 12/264/57 – letter from Sir Robert Cecil to the 2nd Earl of Essex, July 26, 1597.

SP 12/268/97 - letter from Thomas Cecil, Lord Burghley to Sir Robert Cecil, October 10, 1599.

SP 12/270/16, SP 12/270/25, SP 12/278/27, SP 12/286/13, SP 14/70/38– letters from John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton of January 17, 1599; January 31, 1599; February 3, 1601; December 23, 1602; August 11, 1612.

SP 12/278/51 – examination of Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland on February 12, 1601.

SP 12/278/56 – declaration of Henry Woodrington before Lord Chief Justice Popham, February 13, 1601.

SP 12/279/11 – declaration of Sir Henry Nevill, March 2, 1601.

SP 12/281/67-68 – chronological contemporary notes relating to the Essex Revolt, August 1601.

SP 14/2/5 – grant of the office of keeper of the Park of Beskwood and Clipston to Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland, June 9, 1603.

SP 14/7/25 – letter from Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland to Sir Thomas Lake, April 13, 1604.

SP 14/17/81 – letter from James I to Master of an unknown College, 1605?.

SP 14/32/47 – licence for Sir Oliver Manners to remain abroad, May, 13, 1608.

SP 14/45/151, SP 14/48/112, SP 14/57/88 - letters from Roger Manners, 5th Earl of Rutland to Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury, June 26, 1609; October 17, 1609; September 30, 1610

SP 14/54/51 - letter from Sir Oliver Manners to Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury, May 17, 1610.

SP 14/66/96 - letter from Edward, Lord Vaux to Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury, October 26, 1611.

SP 14/109/17 - letter from John Paget to Dudley Carleton, May 6, 1619.

SP 14/172/2 – letter from Sir Francis Nethersole to Dudley Carleton, September 2, 1624.

SP 63/205/59 – letter from the Privy Council to the 2nd Earl of Essex, May 13, 1599.

SP 63/205/65 - letter from the 2nd Earl of Essex to the Privy Council, May 24, 1599.

SP 99/11/727, SP 99/12/125, SP 99/12/164 – letters from Venetian ambassador to the Doge and Senate, December 3, 1609; December 2, 1610; January 21, 1611.

SP 99/12/88, SP 99/12/113, SP 99/12/116, SP 99/12/122, SP 99/17/442 – descriptions of audiences of English ambassador to Venice with the Doge and Senate, November 3, 1610; November 19, 1610; November 26, 1610; November 30, 1610; May 4, 1622.

SP 99/12/90 - report about arrival in Venice of William Cecil, Viscount Cranborne, November 4, 1610.

<u>Salisbury Manuscripts, Hatfield House</u>

Accounts 160/1 - a note of rewards given between 20 July and 6 September 1603.

Box G/2 - book of expenses of William Cecil, Viscount Cranborne between June 1605 and September 1606.

Box G/4 - book of expenses of William Cecil, Viscount Cranborne at Cambridge between October 1606 and August 1607.

Estate Papers and Accounts 6/31 – household accounts of Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury between 1608 and 1612.

v.228 – correspondence between Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury, and his son William Cecil.

Sidney Manuscripts, deposited at the Centre for Kentish Studies, Maidstone.

U1475 A4/1-5; A5/1; A5/6-7; A7; A33/3; A50/15; A56/1-3; A59/1 – household accounts of the Sidney family between 1562 and 1586.

2. Primary Sources Published before 1700.

J.Berners, *The Boke of Saint Albans ... Containing Treatises on Hawking, Hunting and Cote Armour* (St Albans, 1486).

The Boke of Noblenes: That Sheweth How Many Sortes [and] Kyndes There is ... Translated out of Laten into Frenche, and Now into English by me Iohn Larke (London, 1550).

R.Carew, *Survey of Cornwall* (London, 1602).

R.Chester, *Loues Martyr: or, Rosalins Complaint* (London, 1601).

J.Cleland, *The Instruction of a Young Noble-Man* (London, 1612).

T.Cooper, *The Art of Giving* (London, 1615).

R.Dallington, *A Method for Trauell. Shewed by Taking the View of France. As it Stoode in the Yeare of Our Lord 1598* (London 1605?).

R.Dallington, *Aphorismes Ciuill and Militarie: Amplified with Authorities, and Exemplified with Historie, out of the First Quarterne of Fr. Guicciardine* (London, 1613).

R.D., *The Strife of Loue* (London, 1592).

J.Davies, *Microcosmos* (London 1603).

The Deligtful History of Celestina the Faire. Daughter to the King of Thessalie: Shewing How She Was Tnchaunted by the Three Fairies: with the Strange Aduentures, Trauels, Chiualries, Turnies, Combats, Victories, and Loues of Diuers Wandring Princes and Knights Errant, but Especially of Sir Marcomyr of Tharsus, Who Did Conquest Hir by the Sword, and Enioied Her Afterwards in

Mariage, with the Thessalian Kingdome for Hir Dowrie, and His Perpetuall Inheritance (London,1596).

P. D'Oliua, *The Mirrour of Nobilitie, Mappe of Honor, Anotamie of Rare Fortunes, Heroycall President of Loue: VVonder for Chiualrie, and Most Accomplished Knight in All Perfections* (London, 1588).

T.Elyot, *The Defence of Good Wvomen* (London, 1540).

J.Ferne, *The Blazon of Gentrie: Deuided into Two Parts. The First Named The Glorie of Generositie. The Second, Lacyes Nobilitie. Comprehending Discourses of Armes and of Gentry. Wherein is Treated of the Beginning, Parts, and Degrees of Gentlenesse, vvith Her Lawes: of the Bearing, and Blazon of Cote-Armors: of the Lawes of Armes, and of Combats* (London, 1586).

J. Florio, *The World of Words* (London, 1598).

E.Ford, *Parismus, the Renoumed Prince of Bohemia: His Most Famous, Delectable, and Pleasant Historie. Conteining His Noble Bttailes Fought Against the Persians. His Loue to Laurana, the Kings Daughter of Thessaly. and His Traunge Aduentures in the Desolate Iland. With the Miseries and Miserable Imprisonment, Laurana Endured in the Iland of Rockes. And a Description of the Chiualrie of the Phrygian Knight, Pollipus: and His Constant Loue to Violetta* (London,1598).

The Heroicall Aduentures of the Knight of the Sea ... (London, 1600).

The Historie of the Two Valiant Knights: Syr Clyomon Knight of the Golden Sheeld, Sonne to the King of Denmarke: And Clamydes the White Knight, Sonne to the King of Suauia (London, 1599).

The History of the Excellent Knight Generides (London, 1506?).

L.Humphrey, *The Nobles* (1563)

B.Jonson, *Hymenaei or the Solemnities of Masque and Barriers at a Marriage* (London,

1606).

The Knyght of the Swanne (London, ca.1522); *A Mery Playe Bothe Pytthy and Pleasaunt of Albyon, Knighte* (London, 1566?).

T.Malory, *The History of the Most Noble and Valyant Knight, Arthur of Little Britaine* (London, 1582).

G.Markham, *The Most Honorable Tragedie of Sir Richard Grinuile, Knight* (London, 1595).

C.Middleton, *The Famous Historie of Chinon of England: with his Strange Aduentures for the Loue of Celestina Daughter to Lewis King of Fraunce. VVith the Worthy Atchiuement of Sir Lancelot du Lake, and Sir Tristram du Lions for Fair Laura, Daughter to Cador Earle of Cornewall, Beeing All Knights of King Arthurs Round Table* (London, 1597).

M.Montaigne, *Essays of Montaigne*, trans. John Florio (London, 1603).

R.Mulcaster, *The First Part of the Elementarie VVhich Entreateth Chefelie of the Right Writing of Our English Tung* (London, 1582).

The Myrrour of Knighthood: in Which Is Prosecuted the Illustrious Deedes of the Knight of the Sunne, and his Brother Rosicleer, Sonnes vnto the Emperour Trebatio of Greece: with the Valiant Deedes of Armes of Sundry Worthie Knights (London, 1599).

G.B.Nenna, *Nennio: or A Treatise of Nobility: wherein Is Discoursed What True Nobilitie Is, with Such Qualities as Are Required in a Perfect Gentleman*, transl. by W.Iones (London, 1595).

Office of Christian Parents (1616).

T.Palmer, *Essay of the Means How to Make Our Travailes into Forraine Countries the More Profitable and Honourable*, 1606.

J.Osorio, *The Five Bookes of the Famous, Learned, and Eloquent Man, Hieronimus*

Osorius, Contayninge a Discourse of Civill, and Christian Nobilitie: A Worke no Lesse Pleasaunt then Profitable for All, but Especiallye the Noble Gentlemen of England, to Vievv Their Lives, Their Estates, and Conditions. Translated out of Latine into Englishe by William Blandie late of the Universitie of Oxeford, and now fellow of the middle Temple in London (London, 1576).

R.Parry, *Modratus; or, The Adventures of the Black Knight* (London,1595).

J.Partridge, *The Worthie Hystorie of the Moste Noble and Valiaunt Knight Plasidas, Otherwise Called Eustas, Who Was Martyred for the Profession of Jesus Christ* (London, 1566).

M.Pfintzing, *The Adventures and a Portion of the Story of the Praiseworthy, Valiant, and High-Renowned Hero and Knight, Lord Tewrdanmckh* (Nuremberg, 1517).

H. R, *Pheander, the Mayden Knight: Describing His Honourable Trauailes and Hautie Attempts in Armes, with His Successe in Loue: Enterlaced with Many Pleasant Discourses, wherein the Grauer May Take Delight, and the Valiant Youthfull, Be Encouraged by Honourable and Worthie Aduenturing, to Gaine Fame* (London, 1595)).

F.Sabie, *The Fissher-Mans Tale: of the Famous Actes, Life and Loue of Cassander a Grecian Knight* (London, 1595).

Sir William Segar, *The Booke of Honor and Armes* (London, 1590).

J.Selden, *Titles of Honour* (London, 1614).

Sir F.Vere, *Commentaries, Bing Diverse Pieces of Service wherein He Had Command, Written by Himself* (London, 1657).

J.Weever, *Epigramme in the Oldest Cut, and Newest Fashion* (London, 1599).

3. Primary Sources Published After 1700.

S.Adams, ed., *Household Accounts and Disbursement Books of Robert Dudley, Earl of*

Leicester 1558-1561, 1584-1586, (Cambridge, 1995).

R.Ascham, *The Schoolmaster* (1570), ed. L.V.Ryan (Ithaca, New York, 1967)

Francis Bacon, ed.B.Vickers (Oxford, 1996).

G.R.Batho, ed., *The Household Papers of Henry Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland (1564-1632)* (London, 1962).

T.Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth from the Year 1581 till the Death* (London, 1756).

J.Bruce, ed., *Correspondence of King James VI of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and Others in England During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, Camden society, (1861).

Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series of the Reign of Elizabeth 1561-1562 (London, 1866).

W.A.Carrington, ed.,'Stewards' Accounts Preserved at Haddon Hall', *Journal of Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 16 (1894), pp.61-85.

A.Collins, *Letters and Memorials of State, in the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, Part of the Reign of King Charles the Second, and Oliver's Usurpation* (London, 1746).

W.B.Devereux, *The Lives and Letters of Devereux, the Earls of Essex* (London, 1855), 2 vols..

E.Dudley, *The Tree of the Commonwealth*, ed. D.M. Brodie (Cambridge, 1948).

T.Elyot, *The Boke Named The Governour* (1531) (London, 1907)

Erasmus, *Enchiridion Militis Christiani. An English Version*, ed.A.M.O'Donnel, Early English Text Society, Nº282 (Oxford, 1981)

D.Gurney, ed., 'Extracts from the Household and Privy Purse Accounts of the Lestranges of Hunstanton from A.D. 1519 to A.D. 1578', *Archaeologia*, 25 (1834),

pp.411-566

F.J.Furnival, ed., *Meals and Manners in Olden Times, Early English Text Soc.*, 1st ser., xxxxii (London, 1868).

F.Grose and T.Astle, eds., 'An Account of the Expenses of Robert Sidney, Earl of Leicester', *The Antiquarian Repertory, a Miscellaneous Assemblage of Topography, History, Biography, Customs, and Manners*, I (London, 1807), pp.274-295.

F.Grose and T.Astle, eds., 'Instructions on Travel to His Son, by Henry Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland', *The Antiquarian Repertory, a Miscellaneous Assemblage of Topography, History, Biography, Customs, and Manners*, IV (London, 1809), pp.374-80.

J.Harrington, *Nugae Antiquae*, ed. H.Harington (1779) (Hildesheim, 1968).

G.B.Harrison, ed., *Advice to His Son, by Henry Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland*, (London, 1930).

W.C.Hazlitt, ed., *Inedited Tracts Illustrating the Manners, Opinions, and Occupations of Englishmen During the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* ... (New York, 1968).

I.M. *A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Serving-Men* (1598), publ. Shakespeare Association Facsimilies 3 (Oxford 1931).

Historical Manuscript Commission, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, K.G., Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, 24 vols. (London, 1883-1976))

Historical Manuscript Commission, The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, G.C.B., Preserved at Belvoir Castle, 4 vols. (London, 1888-1905), v.24

Historical Manuscript Commissio, Report on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Ancaster,

Preserved at Grimsthorpe (Dublin, 1907).

Historical Manuscript Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings, 4 vols. (London, 1928-47).

Historical Manuscript Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley, Preserved at Penshurst Place, Kent, 6 vols. (London, 1925-66).

Historical Manuscript Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton, Preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire (London,1911).

Historical Manuscript Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire, Preserved at Easthampstead Park, Berkshire, 6 vols (London 1924-1995)

James VI, *The Basilicon Doron of King James VI*, ed.J.Craigie (Edinburgh, London, 1944).

Ben Jonson, *Poems*, ed. by C.H.Herford Percy and E.Simpson, v. VIII (Oxford, 1947).

Ben Jonson, *The Sad Shepherd*, ed. by C.H.Herford Percy and E.Simpson, v. VII (Oxford, 1941), pp.5-54.

R.Lull, *The Book of the Ordre of Chyvalry, translated and printed by William Caxton from a French Version of Ramon Lull'a "Le Libre del Orde de Cauayleria"*, ed. A.T.P. Byles (Early English Text Soc., clxviii, London, 1926).

J.H.Markland, ed., *Instructions by Henry Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland Touching the Management of His Estates, Officers, &c* (London, 1838).

Thomas Moffet, *Nobilis, or a View of the Life and Death of a Sidney*, eds. V.B.Heltzel and H.H.Hudson (San Marino, 1940).

Pirre du Moulin, 'Autobiographie de Pierre du Moulin (1564-1658)' *Bulletin de la Societe de L'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, v. 7 (1858), pp.170-182, 333-344, 465-777.

G.Ornsby, ed., *Selections from the Household Books of the Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle*, Surtees Society 68, 1878.

R.F.Patterson, ed., *Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden* (London, 1923).

H.Peacham, *The Complete Gentleman, The Truth of Our Times, The Art of Living in London* (1622), ed. V.B. Heltzel (Ithaca, New York, 1962).

S.A.Pears, ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney and Hubert Languet*, (London, 1845).

H.Robinson, ed., *The Zurich Letters 1558-1602*, 2nd series (Cambridge, 1845).

W.Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. by M.Hattaway (Cambridge, 2000).

Sir Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poesie* (Cambridge, 1923).

Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, ed.M.Evans (Harmondsworth, 1977).

J.Skelton, *Poetical Works of John Skelton*, ed.A.Dyce (London, 1843).

Sir Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum* (Cambridge, 1982).

J.Spedding, ed., *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, 7 vols. (London, 1861-74).

The Statutes of the Realm, IV (London, 1963).

W.Stevenson, ed., 'Extracts from *The Booke of the Household Charges and Other Paiments Laid out by the Lord North*', *Archaeologia*, 19 (1821), pp.283-301.

J.L.Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman: a Sixteenth Century Manual*, ed. C.Fantazzi (Chicago, London, 2000)

H.B.Warfel, ed., *Four Tudor tracts on Education* (Florida, 1966).

L.B.Wright, ed., *Advice to a Son.Precepts of Lord Burghley, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Francis Osborne* (Ithaca, 1962).

The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher (London, 1840).

II. Secondary Literature

1. Articles, Essays and Reviews

S.Adams, 'Favourites and Factions at the Elizabethan Court' in *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c. 1450-1650*, eds. R.G.Asch & A.M.Birke (Oxford, 1991), pp.265-289.

S.Adams, 'The Patronage of the Crown in Elizabethan Politics: the 1590s in Perspective' in *The Reign of Elizabeth: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. J.Guy (Cambridge, 1995), pp.20-45.

J.S.A.Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England' in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, eds. K.Sharpe and P.Lake (Basingstoke, 1994), pp.161-198.

J.S.A.Adamson, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Long Parliament' in *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed. J.Morrill (London & New York, 1990), pp.49-92.

P.Aries, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *The American Historical Review*, 83 (Dec., 1978), pp.1221-1224.

M.Ashley, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *The Listener* (18.03.1965), p.420.

R.Ashton, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *The Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 22 (1969), p.308.

G.E.Aylmer, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *Past and Present*, 32 (1965), pp.113-125.

E.G.Barber, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *American Sociological Review*, 31 (Jun., 1966), p.424.

M.W.Beresford, Review of Stone *Family and Fortune. Studies in Aristocratic Finance*,

Renaissance Quarterly, 27 (Summer, 1974), pp.218-219.

D.S.Berkowitz, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 32 (Winter, 1979), pp.396-403.

B.Bradshaw, 'The Tudor Commonwealth: Reform and Revision', *Historical Journal*, 22 (1979), pp.455-476.

A.Briggs, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *Encounter* (01.1985), p.53.

H.Brogen, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *The Listener* (6.09.1984), p.22.

C.W.Brooks, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *The English Historical Review*, 101 (1986), pp.176-79.

H.Buszello, Review of Stone *Family and Fortune.Studies in Aristocratic Finance*, *Erasmus*, 31 (Wisbaden, 1980), p.382.

A.T.Byles, 'Medieval Courtesy Books and Prose Romances of Chivalry' in *Chivalry: A Series of Studies to Illustrate Its Historical Significance and Civilizing Influence*, ed. E.Prestage (London, 1928), pp.183-206.

D.Cannadin, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *The New York Review of Books* (20.12.1984), p.64.

M.Capmbell, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 24 (Apr., 1967), pp.302-304.

K.Charlton, 'The Teaching Profession in Sixteenth-and-Seventeenth-Century England' in *History and Education*: *the Educational Uses of the Past*, ed. P.Nash (New York, 1970), pp.24-61.

C.Clay, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 38 (1985), pp. 452-54.

D.C.Coleman, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *History*, 51 (1966), pp.165-178.

D.C.Coleman, Review of Stone *Family and Fortune. Studies in Aristocratic Finance*, *History*, 59 (1974), pp.458-59.

R.L.Colie, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *Renaissance News*, 19 (Spring, 1966), pp.48-54.

S.Collins, ''A Kind of Lawful Adultery': English Attitudes to the Remarriage of Widows, 1550-1800' in *The Changing Face of Death: Historical Accounts of Death and Disposal*, eds. P.C.Jupp and G.Howarth (Basingstoke, 1997), pp.34-47.

F.W.Conrad, 'The Problem of Counsel Reconsidered: the Case of Sir Thomas Elyot' in *Political Thought and the Tudor Commonwealth*, eds. P.A.Fideler and T.F.Mayer (London, New York, 1992), pp.75-107.

R.Cust, 'Honour and Politics in Early Stuart England: the Case of Beaumont v. Hastings', *Past and Present*, 149 (1995), pp. 57-94.

J.Doelman, '"A King of Thine Own Heart": The English Reception of King James VI and I's *Basilicon Doron*', *The Seventeenth Century*, 9 (Spring 1994), pp.1-9.

H.Dubrow 'The Message from Marcade: Parental Death in Tudor and Stuart England' in *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, eds. B.S.Travitsky and A.F.Seeff (Newark, London, 1994), pp.147-167.

G.R.Elton, Review of Jordan *Philanthropy in England*, *Historical Journal*, 3 (1960), pp.89-92.

A.Fox, 'Sir Thomas Elyot and the Humanist Dilemma' in A.Fox and J.Guy, *Reassessing the Henrician Age. Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500-1550* (Oxford, 1986), pp.52-73.

A.Fox, 'The Complaint of Poetry for the Death of Liberality: the Decline of Literary Patronage in the 1590s' in *The Reign of Elizabeth: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. J.Guy (Cambridge, 1995), pp.229-257.

I.M.Gililov, 'For Whom the Bell Tolled: A New Dating for Shakespeare's "The Phoenix and the Turtle", and the Identification of Its Protagonists' in *Russian Essays on Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, eds. A.Parfenov and J.G.Price (London, 1998), pp.146-84.

J.Gillis, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *Journal of Inter-disciplinary History*, 10 (1979), pp.121-28.

C.Gittings, 'Expressions of Loss in Early Seventeenth-Century England' in *The Changing Face of Death: Historical Accounts of Death and Disposal*, eds. P.C.Jupp and G.Howarth (Basingstoke, 1997), pp.19-33.

A.Grafton & L.Jardine 'Studied for Action: How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy', *Past and Present*, 129 (1990), pp.30-78.

C.M.Gray, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *Canadian Historical Review*, 47 (March, 1966), p.73.

P.E.Hammer, 'Letters of Travel Advice from the Earl of Essex to the Earl of Rutland: some Comments', *Philological Quarterly*, 74 (1995), pp.317-25.

P.E.J.Hammer, 'Patronage at Court, Faction and the Earl of Essex' in *The Reign of Elizabeth: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. J.Guy (Cambridge, 1995), pp.65-86.

M.P.Hannay, '"O Daughter Heare": Reconstructing the Lives of Aristocratic English-women' in *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, eds. B.S.Travitsky and A.F.Seeff (Newark, London, 1994), pp.35-63.

B.J.Harris 'Aristocratic Women and the State in Early Tudor England' in *State, Sovereigns & Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of A.J. Slavin*, eds. C.Carlton, R.L.Woods, M.L.Robertson, and J.S.Block (Stroud, 1998), pp.3-24.

J.H.Hexter, 'The Education of the Aristocracy during the Renaissance' in Hexter, *Reap-*

praisals in History (London, 1961), pp.45-70.

C.Hill, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *New Statesman* (21.05.1965), p.803.

C.Hill, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38 (Summer, 1985), pp.337-340;

K.J.Höltgen, 'Sir Robert Dallington (1561-1637): Author, Traveler, and Pioneer of Taste', *The Huntington Library Quartely*, 47 (1984), pp.147-177.

H.Hulme, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *The American Historical Review*, 71 (Oct., 1965), pp.173-174.

J.Hurstfield, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *The Listener* (18.03.1965), p.934.

W.K.Jordan, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *The Journal of Modern History*, 38 (Dec., 1966), pp.428-429.

J.Kennyon, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *The New York Review of Books* (7.07.1966), p.23.

R.Lachmann, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *Contemporary Sociology*, 14 (Jul., 1985), pp.439-442.

W.T.MacCaffrey, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *Political Science Quarterly*, 81 (Jun., 1966), pp.306-307.

W.T.Maccaffrey, Review of Stone *Family and Fortune. Studies in Aristocratic Finance*, *The American Historical Review*, 79 (Dec., 1974), pp.1547-1549.

A.Macfarlane, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *History and Theory*, 18 (1979), pp.103-126.

F.McCormick, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *The Scriblerian*, 2 (Aut 1985), p.91.

J.Max Patrick, Reviews of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *Seventeenth Century News*, 24 (Aut, 1966), p.37; *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, 42 (Win., 1966), p.xxvi.

E.Miller, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *The Historical Journal*, 9 (1966), p.133.

R.Mitchinson, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *The New Review* (02.1978), p.41.

M.Pelling, 'Medical Practice in Early Modern England: Trade or Profession?' in *The Professions in Early Modern England*, ed. W.Prest (New York, 1987), pp.90-128.

D.H.Pennington, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *The English Historical Review*, 81 (1966), pp.562-565.

J.H.Plumb, Reviews of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *Economist* (01.05.1965), p.535; *Spectator* (30.04.1965), p.570.

J.H.Plumb, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *The New York Review of Books* (24.11.1977), p.30.

J.Scott, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *Social History*, 4 (1979), pp.509-16.

H.L.Smith, 'Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Women' in *Women and Literature in Britain 1500-1700*, ed. H.Wilcox (Cambridge, 1996), pp.9-29.

L.Stone, 'The Anatomy of the Elizabethan Aristocracy', *Economic History Review*, 1st ser., 18 (1948), pp.1-53.

L.Stone, 'The Educational Revolution in England 1560-1640', *Past and Present*, 28 (1964), pp.41-80.

L.Stone, 'The Elizabethan Aristocracy – A Restatement', *Economic History Review*, 2nd

ser., 4 (1952), pp.302-21.

L.Stone, 'The Size and Composition of the Oxford Student Body 1580-1909' in *The University in Society*, I, ed. L.Stone (Princeton, 1984), pp.3-110.

R.H.Tawney, 'The Rise of the Gentry 1558-1640', *Economic History Review*, 1st ser, 11 (1941), pp.1-48.

H.Thomas, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *The Listener* (8.12.1977), p.752.

K.Thomas, Review of Stone *Family and Fortune. Studies in Aristocratic Finance*, *The Listener* (18.08.1973), p.222.

K.Thomas, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *Times Literary Supplement* (21.10.1977), p.1226.

E.P.Thompson, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *New Society*, 41 (8.09.1977) pp.499-501.

F.M.L.Thompson, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *Times Literary Supplement* (7.09.1984), p.990.

J.A.Thompson, Review of Stone & Stone *An Open Elite?*, *The American Historical Review*, 93 (Feb., 1988), pp.138-139.

H.R.Trevor-Roper, 'The Elizabethan Aristocracy: an Anatomy Anatomized', *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 3 (1950/51), pp.279-298.

D.Underdown, Review of Stone *Family and Fortune. Studies in Aristocratic Finance*, *Journal of Economic History*, 36 (Sep., 1976), pp.794-795.

R.T.Warnicke, 'Eulogies for Women: Public Testimony of Their Godly Example and Leadership' in *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, eds. B.S.Travitsky and A.F.Seeff (Newark, London, 1994), pp.168-186.

E.William Monter, Review of Stone *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, *The*

Journal of Modern History, 50 (Sep., 1978), pp.502-506.

C.Wilson, Review of Jordan *Philanthropy in England*, *Englsih Historical Review*, 75 (1960), pp.685-687.

K.Wrightson, 'The Family in Early Modern England: Continuity and Change' in *Hanoverian Britain and Empire: Essays in Memory of Philip Lawson*, eds. S.Taylor, R.Connors, and C.Jones (Woodbridge, 1998), pp.1-22.

P.Zagorin, Review of Stone *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, *Journal of Economic History*, 26 (Mar., 1966), pp.135-137.

2. Books

A.Ayton and J.L.Price, eds., *The Medieval Military Revolution. State, Society and Military Change in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (London, New York, 1995).

A.L.Beier, D.Cannadine, J.M.Rosenheim, eds., *The First Modern Society. Essays in English History in Honour of Lawerence Stone* (Cambridge, 1989).

G.W.Bernard, *The Power of the Early Tudor Nobility. A Study of the Fourth and Fifth Earls of Shrewsbury* (New Jersey, 1985).

E.Berry, *The Making of Sir Philip Sidney* (Toronto; London, 1998).

M.C.Bradbrook, *The Rise of the Common Player. A Study of Actor and Society in Shakespeare's England*, (London, 1962).

P.Burke, *The Fortunes of the Courtier. The European Reception of Castilione's Cortegiano* (Oxford, 1995).

P.Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1994).

M.L.Bush, *The English Aristocracy: a Comparative Synthesis* (Manchester, 1984).

M.L.Bush, *Noble Privilege* (Manchester, 1983).

M.L.Bush, *Rich Noble, Poor Noble* (Manchester, 1988).

J.D.Carleton, *Westminster School: A History* (Hart-Davis, 1965).

F.Caspari, *Humanism and the Social Order in Tudor England* (Chicago, 1954).

E.Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian Cultural Relations Since the Renaissance* (London, 1998).

A.Cecil, *Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury* (London, 1915).

F.J.Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (New York, 1965).

K.Charlton, *Education in Renaissance England* (London, Toronto, 1965).

J.T.Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (London, 1969).

N.Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry, 1480-1680* (New Haven, London, 1999).

D.Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford 1997).

M.Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition* (Oxford, 1959).

N.Z. Davies, *The Gift in Sixteenth Century France* (Oxford, 2000).

C.Demblon, *Lord Rutland est Shakespeare* (Paris, 1912).

C.Demblon, *L'Auteur d'Hamlet et sa Monde* (Paris, 1913).

D.N.Durant, *Bess of Hardwick. Portrait of Elizabethan Dynast* (London, 1977).

J.Eales, *Women in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (London, 1998)

I.Eller, *History of Belvoir Castle* (London, 1841).

R.C.Evans, *Ben Jonson and the Poetics of Patronage* (London, 1989).

A.B.Ferguson, *The Chivalric Tradition in Renaissance England* (Washington, 1986), p.40.

M.Finch, *The Wealth of Five Northamptonshire Families, 1540-1640* (London, 1956)/

F.G.Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama 1559-1642* (New York, 1966).

E.B.De Fonblanque, *Annals of the House of Percy* (London, 1887).

A.Fox and J.Guy, *Reassessing the Henrician Age. Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500-1550* (Oxford, 1986).

H.Gatti, *The Renaissance Drama of Knowledge: Giordano Bruno in England* (London; New York, 1989)

M.Girouard, *Life in the English Country House: a Social and Architectural History* (New Haven, Mass., 1993).

I.M.Guililov, *Igra ob Williame Shakespeare, ili Taina Velikogo Fenixa* (Moscow, 1997).

H.J.Habakkuk, *Marriage, Debt, and the Estates System: English Landownership, 1650-1950* (Oxford, 1994).

A.Hadfield, *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545-1625* (New York, 1998).

P.E.J.Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics. The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597* (Cambridge, 1999).

G.B.Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux Earl of Essex* (London, 1937).

A.Haynes, *The White Bear: Robert Dudley, the Elizabethan Earl of Leicester* (London, 1987).

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

F.Heal, C.Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (London, 1994).

C.B.Herrup, *Crimes Most Dishonorable: Sex, Law, and the 2nd Earl of Castlehaven* (New York; Oxford, 1999).

The History of the University of Oxford, v. III, ed. J.McConica (Oxford, 1986).

R.Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England* (Oxford, 1998).

R.Howell, *Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1968).

M.James, *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge,

1986).

H.M.Jewell, *Education in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1998).

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

H.Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen. Universities and Society in Pre-industrial Britain 1500-1700* (London, 1970).

H.A.Lloyd, *The Gentry of South-West Wales, 1540-1640* (Cardiff, 1968).

W.T.MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics, 1588-1603* (Princeton, 1992).

R.W.Malcolmson, *Popular Recreations in English Society 1700-1850* (Cambridge, 1973).

T.Marshall, *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages under James VI and I* (Manchester, 2000), pp.88, 122.

R.Masters, *Masters' History of the College of Corpus Christi and the Blessed Virgin Mary in the University of Cambridge* (London, 1831).

J.Michel, *Who Wrote Shakespeare?* (London, 1996).

H.Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland* (Woodbridge, 1993).

J.Morgan, *Godly Learning. Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560-1640.* (Cambridge, 1986).

C.Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1998).

J.Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the first* (London, 1828).

R.O'Day, *Education and Society 1500-1800: The Social Foundations of Education in*

Early Modern Britain (London, 1982).

S.Orgel, R.Strong, *Inigo Jones, The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, I (London, 1973).

N.Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry. The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530* (London, New York, 1984).

J.M.Osborn, *Young Philip Sidney* 1572-1577 (London, 1972).

L.L.Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London, 1991).

M.Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640* (Cambridge, 1995).

H.Phelps Brown, S.V.Hopkins, *A Perspective of Wages and Prices* (London and New York, 1981).

L.A.Pollock, *Forgotten Children. Parent-child Relations from 1500 to 1900.* (Cambridge, 1983).

P.Porohovchikov, *Shakespeare Unmasked* (London, 1955).

W.R.Prest, *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts 1590-1640* (London, 1972).

C.Read, *Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth,* (London,1955).

C.Read, *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1960).

A.Simpson, *The Wealth of the Gentry 1540-1640: East Anglian Studies* (Chicago, 1961).

Q.Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1978).

Q.Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge, 1996).

P.Sidney, *The Sidneys of Penshurst* (London, 1901).

F.Shipulinskyi, *Shakespeare – maska Rutlenda. Trehvekovaya konspirativnaya taina istorii* (Moscow, 1924).

R.T.Spence, *Lady Anne Clifford: Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery (1590-1676)* (Stroud, 1997).

R.T.Spence, *The Privateering Earl* (Gloucestershire, 1995).

D.Starkey, ed., *Rivals in Power. Lives and Letters of the Great Tudor Dynasties* (London, 1990).

V.L.Stater, *Noble Government: The Stuart Lord Lieutenancy and the Transformation of English Politics* (Athens and London, 1994).

A.Stewart, *Philip Sidney: A Double Life* (London, 2000).

L.Stone, *Family and Fortune. Studies in Aristocratic Finance in the XVIth and XVIIth Centuries* (Oxford, 1973).

L.Stone, *The Crisis of Aristocracy 1558-1641* (London, 1965).

L.Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (London, 1977).

L.Stone & J.C.F. Stone, *An Open Elite? England 1540-1880* (New York, 1984).

L.Stone, ed., *The University in Society* (Princeton, 1984).

J.Stoye, *English Travellers Abroad 1604-1667. Their Influence in English Society and Politics* (New Haven, London, 1989).

R.Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales, and England's Lost Renaissance* (London, 1986).

R.Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography 3: Jacobean and Caroline* (Woodbridge, 1998).

C.M.Sykes, *Alias William Shakespeare?* (London, 1947).

L.E.Tanner, *Westminster School* (1951).

M.Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, 1987).

H.R.Trevor-Roper, *The Gentry* (Cambridge, 1953).

R.Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge, 1993).

D.Underdown, *Revel, Riot & Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford, 1985).

M.Wallace, *Sir Philip Sidney* (Cambridge, 1915).

F.Watson, *The English Grammar School to 1660* (London, 1968),

R.B.Wernham, *The Return of the Armadas. The Last Years of the Elizabethan War Against Spain 1595-1603* (Oxford, 1994).

H.Wilcox, ed., *Women and Literature in Britain 1500-1700* (Cambridge, 1996).

E.C.Williams, *Bess of Hardwick* (London, 1959).

J.W.Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart, a Study of 17th Century Personation* (New York, 1978).

C.M.Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (London, 1999).

B.Worden, *The Sound of Virtue. Philip Sidney's* Arcadia *and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven, London, 1996).

K.Wrightson, *English Society 1580-1680* (London, 1982).

K.Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* (New Haven, 2000).

3. Dissertations

M.M.Norris, 'The 1st and 2nd Earls of Rutland and Their Part in the Central and Local Politics of mid Tudor England' (Edinburgh Ph.D., 1996).