A SUPPLICACYON FOR THE BEGGERS. REPRINTED FROM THE ORIGINAL EDITION OF 1524

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649226771

A supplicacyon for the beggers. Reprinted from the original edition of 1524 by Simon Fish

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd. Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

SIMON FISH

A SUPPLICACYON FOR THE BEGGERS. REPRINTED FROM THE ORIGINAL EDITION OF 1524



A

SUPPLICACYON FOR THE BEGGERS.

REPRINTED FROM THE ORIGINAL EDITION OF 1524.



LONDON: WILLIAM PICKERING.

1845.

Archlord A. II. 92





HERE is no book of the fame period, which at the time of its publication occafioned greater remark, or was followed by more confiderable refults, than the

Supplication for the Beggars. The chief hiftorians of the Church of England speak of it, and how, to use Bishop Burnet's expression, it "took mightily." Sir Thomas More answered it in "The Supplycacyon of Soulys," i. e. in Purgatory, and his controversy with Tyndal was the consequence.

Yet, after all, there is little known of the real history of the book; which is shewn by the very evident errors into which Burnet and Foxe have fallen with regard to it. Burnet, in his loose way, places it under the date of 1534; and Foxe, in his account of the year 1530, making an apology however, that it should have come in fix years before, and quaintly adding, "the missing of a few yeares in this matter breaketh no great square in our story."

flory." This would bring back the date to 1524, but in the next paragraph Foxe fays that it was probably written about 1528.*

But "The Supplication" must have been published as early as 1524, or at the latest in 1525: for in the year 1526 an injunction was iffued by Cuthbert Tonftall, Bishop of London, calling in all English translations of the Scriptures: (Foxe, 2, 284. Ed. 1641: and Strype, Memorials 1, 165. Ed. 1721.) and ftrictly prohibiting about eighteen other books, at the head of which stands, in bad preeminence, " the Supplication of Beggars." Wilkins, (Concilia, 3, 706) gives us this edict or injunction, iffued by the authority also of Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury. Again, in the year 1530, a public instrument agreed upon, fays Wilkins, (3, 728) in an Affembly of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Durham and others, by order of King Henry the Eighth, was put forth "containing divers heretical and erroneous opinions, selected from various books, which had been confidered and

condemned."

Omiffions and errors such as these would break, one might think, very great squares in History, though we may agree with Foxe, that in his story, an affertion more or less, and a confusion at one time worse consounded than at another, makes but little difference.

condemned." One of those is from "the Supplication," and is the passage beginning, "There be many men of great literature, &c." and ending "in all holy Scripture." And, once more, in the same year, (Wilkins, iii. 737) or, with less probability, in 1529, (Strype, i. 165) a Royal Proclamation was published "for restiting and withstanding of most damnable heresies sown within this realm by the disciples of Luther, and other heretics, perverters of Christ's religion;" at the end of which, with some other books, "the Supplication of Beggars" is strictly prohibited.

Neither is it certain who was the Author: and when we ascribe it to Simon Fish, we have, it may be, many authorities with us in number, but in fact only the Editor of the Edition of 1545, and perhaps Foxe.* It is true that there is not much evidence to support his statement, and upon the other hand, it must be acknowledged, even much less to contradict it. An account of Fish is given in Wood (Athense Oxon. i. 59. Ed. 2813) and it is supposed that he died of the plague about 1530. The Authorship of such a book as "the Supplication"

Compare also a passage in Sir Thomas More's Apology, (Works, Lond. Fol. 1557, p. 881) cited by Dr. Bliss, in his additions to the Athenæ. i. 59.

was not, in those days, an honour which a man would rashly claim, or which would be attributed to any one without some reason.

Having been so rigidly suppressed, we cannot wonder at the extreme rarity of this tract:
so rare indeed is it, that the copy from which
the present is reprinted, is the only one which,
after much enquiry, the Editor can trace.
About the year 1545, it was published in a
volume with another book of the same fort,
"the Supplication of the poor Commons:"
copies of which are in the Bodleian and the
British Museum libraries: Foxe also has reprinted it.

There are several stories told how it was introduced to the notice of Henry the Eighth; and, although these may not be entitled to much credit, yet, the fact seems well authenticated, that the king did read, and at first was well pleased with it. Henry, no doubt, would be pleased with any thing which might forward his immediate purpose. No stories, however exaggerated, no lies, however palpable, came amiss to him about the Monks and Clergy of his day, when his exchequer was exhausted, and the Abbey lands lay almost within his grasp, but still as yet, beyond it, for want of pretext. Some say that Anne Boleyn gave

him the book: others, that one of the copies which were thrown about the streets was brought to him, and Foxe gives us a very circumftantial account, fufficiently curious to be related here, whether true or false. He says, (ii. 280) "One Edmund Moddis, the King's Footeman, being with the King in talk of religion, and of the new bookes which were come from beyond the feas, faid, if it might please his grace to pardon him, and such as he would bring to his grace, he should see such a booke, as was marvele to heare of. The king demanded what they were. He faid, two of your Merchants, George Elyot and George Robinson. The King pointed a time to speake with them. When they came before his prefence in a privy closet, he demanded what they had to fay or to fhew him. One of them faid, that there was a booke come to their hands, which they had there to shew his grace. When he faw it, he demanded if any of them could read it. Yea, faid George Elyot, if it pleafe your grace to heare it. I thought fo, faid the King, for if need were, thou canft fay it without booke. The whole booke being read out, the King made a long pause, and then sayd, if a man should pull downe an old stone wall, and begin at the lower part, the upper part thereof might