

Usury Legalised

by

Henry Swabey

Chapter 9

Usury and the Church of England

by

Henry Swabey

List of Contents

1. Background	3
2. The Early Church	7
3. The Medieval Church	10
4. Before the Reformation	18
5. Church Mints	23
6. A Just and Stable Price	29
7. Cloth is My Bread	33
8. Partnership	37
9. Usury Legalized	51
10. Legalized Usury is not Legal	58
11. Usury Moralized	73
12. Eighteenth Century	81
13. After Waterloo	88
14. Christian Socialism	103
15. Recovery	114
<i>Bibliography</i>	124
<i>Appendix I Dante Aligheri</i>	126
<i>Appendix II Sir William Blackstone</i>	127
<i>Appendix III Tawney on Banking</i>	128
<i>Appendix IV Discourse Upon Usurye</i>	138
<i>Appendix V Tawney on Usury</i>	150

May 2008

a cesc publication

edited by Peter Etherden

Chapter 9. Usury Legalized

In this chapter we shall look at four writings about usury from the second half of the 16th century. We will consider first the writing of a *Layman* Dr Thomas Wilson¹ in his *Discourse Upon Usurye* published in 1572; then two popular conceptions of usury as portrayed by Thomas Kyd in his *Spanish Tragedy* first performed in 1599 and William Shakespeare in *The Merchant of Venice* written around 1594. Finally we will examine a *Latin Sermon* entitled *Legalised Usury is Unlawful*, delivered in Cambridge in 1585 by a *Churchman*, Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, whose writings are barely available to the public even in Latin.

In 1586, the year after *Andrewes' Sermon*, every parson in the *Diocese of Canterbury* was told by Whitgist to read Heinrich Bullinger's² *Defence of Usury* in which, for the first time, usury was commended. Even Calvin had only allowed it. But a bare permission was not enough. The yeast would leaven the whole dough.

At the time the *Progressive Theologians* were more in fashion than Thomas Wilson or Lancelot Andrewes. For the *Sack of Antwerp* in 1576 and the *Defeat of the Spanish Armada* had given Britain something like the *Financial Hegemony* she was to enjoy later. Largely by *Plunder*, the *Gold from Peru* and the *Silver from Potosi* had found its way to London. Slaving was most profitable, and founded many notable *Fortunes*.

In 1595 the *Dutch East India Company* was established, to be followed five years later in 1600 by its British rival the *British East India Company*. It was into such an atmosphere of *Frenzied Greed* and *Adventure* that Andrewes, Wilson and Bullinger delivered their discourses. *The City* chafed at the *Aristocracy*, each seeking allies among the evicted *Yeomen* and those annoyed at the rise in *Rent*. Macaulay would write later that:

“But for the hostility of *The City*, Charles I would never have been vanquished...and Charles II could scarcely have been restored.”³

It is alleged that Charles II was set up by the *Merchants* who feared the *Soldiers*. Be that as it may, *Capital* accumulated, and ‘its instruments became the *Ruling Class*’.⁴ Typical of the type was Sir Josiah Child, who in his *Discourse on Trade* declared:

“We can with ease pay a greater tax now in one year than our fathers paid in twenty.”

Dr. Thomas Wilson⁵ was a *Diplomat* and a *Member of Parliament*. Eventually he would be *Dean of Durham*⁶. His *Discourse upon Usurye* is discussed at greater length in an appendix. It had additional importance as being the work of a *Layman*.

In his *Preface* Wilson reminds his *Patron* that ‘the world is made for man and man is made for God’ and he asked Dudley:

“...to recall men to *Justice* who are so ready to wallowe in syn [lest] the *Antichrist* himself be *Lord of the Harvest*.”

In Wilson's opinion ‘usury is more rampant in England than in any place in *Christendom*’.

Wilson gives special warning against the *Dissembling Gospeller*, remarking that ‘the *Magistrate* abusing his office deserves more *Punishment* than doth the *Private Person*’. He wrote as a man who had exercised public authority in positions of trust, and approved of the Roman censors:

“The Romans never began to decay until usury lorded among them.”

This was substantially the opinion of Theodor Mommsen⁷ when writing three hundred years later.

¹ *Discourse on Usury* by Thomas Wilson was written in 1569 and published in 1572.

² Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575) succeeded Zwingli as head of the Zurich church and pastor at *Grossmünster*. He was one of the most influential theologians of the *Reformation* whose importance is only just beginning to be recognised. [Ed].

³ Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800-1859) was a *Whig* politician and an *MP* for Edinburgh. He wrote extensively as an *Essayist* and *Reviewer*. During the 1840s he began work on *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second*, publishing two volumes in 1848 and two further volumes in 1855. He had planned to bring his history down to the reign of George III but later his hope was to complete his work with the death of Queen Anne in 1714. However by the time of his own death in 1859 he had finished only one further volume. A sixth, bringing the History down to the death of William III, was completed by his sister, Lady Trevelyan, after his death. [Ed].

⁴ Brooks Adams in *Law of Civilization and Decay* written over a hundred years ago and available in a few libraries.

⁵ An abbreviation for *Doctor of Canon Law*. [Ed].

⁶ Such a career suggests a rather more practical and up to date man than Tawney would allow.

⁷ Christian Matthias Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903) was a German scholar, journalist, politician and archaeologist who was regarded as the greatest *Classicist* of the 19th century. He was a member of the *Prussian* and *German Parliaments* and his work on *Roman History* was regarded as a classic. In 1902 he was awarded the *Nobel Prize in Literature*. [Ed].

In his own day Wilson could see *Waste* and *Want* caused by usury which was ‘universally used’. His is not the protest of an old fashioned or cloistered *Traditionalist* but of a practical *Man of Affairs*. He has a good word for *Preachers* who ‘cry out continually against all *Usurers* with open mouth and in all their sermons’.

The *Usurers* would let the *Preachers* have their word when ‘others have the deeds and live in all wealth and idolytre in thys world’. The *Magistrates* were not cooperating with the *Preachers* so Wilson called for:

“...a new Solon⁸ who would come with a *Seisachtheia*⁹ - a *Relief of Burdens* - and take away the *Usurers'* books and their *Gains* and forbid such filthy *Lucre* by bringing in a *novas tabulas* - a *Clean Slate*.”¹⁰

Wilson writes of:

“...the extermination of wolves, who in their sheepskins covertly devour the flock of England - a sweet smelling sacrifice in the sight of God. Thieves steal for necessity, but *Usurers* rob and undo all men for *Greedy Gluttony*.”

“...the *Usurers* scratch up the whole *Realm of England*. Either they should be exterminated¹¹ or the *Common Law* of Edward should be revived whereby if twelve men could prove it, the ‘goods of the *Usurer* should turn to the good of the *Prince*’.

“...for men’s hungry desires grab after a great deal more than *Nature* craves. One man would have little cause for *Borrowing* if people could be content with the blessed frute of this *Lyttle Paradise of England*.”

Free Lending was to be looked for from *Christians*. Yet in the 20th century a *Clergyman* charges interest on a *Loan* to a friend ‘because it was good for him to pay it’. Wilson desires that:

“His natural country be perfect and blessed without danger of evil or infection of mischief to corrupt and destroy the noble land.”

Wilson’s discourse is addressed to a *Statesman*, Lord Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, who studied *Constitutions* and *Laws* in Latin and Italian. In it we see the clash between the *Patriot*, in the line of Edward I and III, who desired the *Welfare* of his *Own Land*, and the *International Class* of *Profiteers* who have sold their *Natural Loyalties*.

Wilson admits that he is aware that *truth produces hatred - veritas odium parit*. But he believes that the *Christian* should expect his usury from God.¹² The doctrine that God repays even if the poor man defaults does, it is true, require a somewhat more disinterested faith than was apparent after the *Reformation*. We may not hold with Cobbett that *Greedy* was the mark of the *post-Reformation Church* but this vice was more prominent and less bridled as the years from the *Middle Ages* succeeded each other.

Wilson explains that his *Discourse* will be in the form of an argument in which the *Preacher* Okerfee¹³, the *Merchant* Gromelgayner, the *Civilian* and the pettifogging *Lawyer* take part.

“To see the world, none are so ready to defend usury as those that have the least understanding in any profession.”¹⁴

Commendatory verses are written by William Wickham, *Chaplain* of Queen Elizabeth, John Garbrand of Oxford and John Cocus. Two of them mention Cato's opinion that *Usury* was equivalent to *Murder*. The opening of the last of the three is striking. John Cocus writes:

⁸ Solon (638-558 BC) was an Athenian *Statesman*, *Lawmaker* and *Lyric Poet*, renowned as a founding father of the Athenian polis. The geographer *Pausanias* lists him as one of the *Seven Sages* of the ancient world. [Ed].

⁹ *Debtors* had to surrender their land but continue cultivating it - giving one sixth of its produce to their creditors. Should the *Debt* exceed the perceived value of a *Debtor's* total assets, the *Debtor* and his family would become the *Creditor's* slaves. The same would result if a man defaulted on a *Debt*. The *Collateral* was the *Debtor's* personal freedom. Solon’s *seisachtheia* (relief of burdens) immediately cancelled all outstanding *Debts*, retroactively emancipated all previously enslaved *Debtors*, reinstated all *Confiscated Property* and forbade the use of *Personal Freedom* as *Collateral* in all future *Debts*. A ceiling to maximum property size was also instituted. [Ed].

¹⁰ Michael Hudson was busy researching Babylonian economic history at *Harvard University's Peabody Museum* when he wrote his history of *Debt Cancellations* or *Clean Slates*. The *Henry George School of Social Science* in New York printed a few dozen copies and stapled them together as a 124-page booklet entitled *The Lost Tradition of Biblical Debt Cancellations*. This pamphlet forms the basis of *Truth from Mesopotamia* by Boudewijn Wegerif. [Ed].

¹¹ *The Law* was bloody enough on thieves.

¹² In *Cristian Prologue to the Cristian Reader*.

¹³ It is noteworthy that the *Church* was not yet the *Sanctifier of Avarice*.

¹⁴ A good epitaph for the *Genevan Pettifogger*.

“*Est patriae Wilsonus amans, populique salutis, et graviter patitur publica damna seri.*”
Wilson loves his country and the people's safety, and *Public Loss* is a burden to him.

John Garbrand, *Prebendary of Salisbury* and *MA (Oxon)* sent Wilson a letter he found among the papers of the late Bishop of Salisbury. This would have been John Jewell, whose interest in the subject has been noted before. Jewell wrote on 20th August, 1569:

“If I were an *Usurer* never so greedily bent to spoil and rapine *ut sunt faeneratores* - as *Usurers* do, yet would I think myself most unhappy if such persuasions could not move me. Life to the book, death to usury - *ut vivat liber, pereat usura.*”

Wilson's *Discourse upon Usurye* was written in 1569 and published in 1572.¹⁵ It takes a similar form to Plato's *Symposium* and is attended by the *Preacher* Okerfee, the *Merchant* Gromelgayner, a Genevan pettifogging *Lawyer* and the *Civilian*. In Wilson's view they were living in an age when usury was 'more rampant in England than in any other place in *Christendom*'. This opinion was shared by many of Wilson's contemporaries.

The *Merchant* and *Lawyer* remark on the progress of the times, but the *Preacher* rebukes the lack of *Charity* and spread of usury but accepts that:

“Lawful *Trading* and *Adventure* to bring in our *Want* and carry out our *Plenty* hath ever been allowed, and without such traffic no *Country* nor *Kingdom* could flourish.”

The *Lawyer* complains of *Monopolists* and the *Merchant* of the *Customs*. The *Merchant* adduces as evidence of England's purity the whipping of *Beggars* and carting of *Whoremongers*. But, says the *Preacher*:

“In other countries they are more unwilling to offend against the *Common Weal* and there are fewer *Usurers* elsewhere than are here in England.”

The *Lawyer* sets out the faults of other nations, but the *Preacher* would have an England that is 'most perfect and without any fault where Faith in Christ works in charity - *valet fides in Christo quae per charitatem operatur*. Meanwhile the *Merchant* would prefer his treasure in a chest 'with the key about me' than in *Heaven*. “Store, syr, is no sore.” But despite his arguments *Parliament* passed the compromise *Usury Law* in 1571.

Before considering the views of Andrewes, we turn to the popular view of the time. In 1599 Thomas Kyd wrote, in the *Spanish Tragedy*:

“The left hand path, declining fearfully, was ready downfall to the deepest hell;
Where bloody furies shake their whips of steel, and poor Ixion turns an endless wheel;
Where Usurers are choked with melting gold...”

The condemned *Usurers* are followed by *Wantons*, *Perjurers* and *Murderers*, this being the company in which they were prominent.

In *The Merchant of Venice* Shakespeare takes up the traditional attitude when Shylock says in an aside upon his first appearance the thoughts intended to remind the audience of the inherited economic wisdom on usury:

“How like a fawning publican he looks. I hate him for he is a *Christian*. But more for that in low simplicity he lends out money *gratis* and brings down the rate of *usance* here with us in Venice and he rails on me, my bargains and my well won thrift which he calls interest.”

To which Antonio replies:

“Shylock, although I neither lend nor borrow by taking nor by giving of excess, yet to supply the ripe wants of my friend I'll break custom.”

Shortly afterwards in the third scene of *Act One*, Antonio practically recalls the *Medieval Teaching* about *Partnership* when he refers to the story of Jacob and Laban,¹⁶ and says:

¹⁵ A more extensive discussion of Thomas Wilson's *Discourse Upon Usurye* is included as *Appendix 4*. [Ed].

¹⁶ In the *Hebrew Bible* Jacob meets his cousin Rachel, Laban's younger daughter, by a well and falls in love. After a month he asks Laban for Rachel's hand in marriage. Laban agrees in return for working seven years. When the seven years are up, Laban switches Rachel for his older daughter Leah. In the traditional *Midrashic* version, which is not in *Genesis*, Jacob and Rachel suspected Laban would pull a trick like this as he was known as the *Deceiver* and had changed Jacob's wages hundreds of times. So they had devised signs by which Jacob could identify the veiled bride. But when Rachel saw her sister being led out, she had a change of heart because of the public shame Leah would suffer so she told Leah the signs. It was not until the following morning that Jacob realized. Laban justified himself by saying that it was unheard of to give the younger daughter before the older. So Jacob worked out a new deal with his Father-in-Law. Jacob could marry Rachel but he had to work another seven years for her. After the wedding celebrations for his marriage to Leah, Jacob marries Rachel...and works for Laban for another seven years. [Ed].

“This was a *Venture*, sir, that Jacob served for; a thing not in his power to bring to pass, but swayed and fashioned by the hand of heaven. Was this inserted to make interest good? Or is your gold and silver ewes and rams?”

To this Shylock replies ‘I cannot tell. I make it breed as fast,’ before making the observation that Antonio had ‘many a time and oft in the *Rialto* rated me about my monies and my *usances*.’

This provides Antonio with the opportunity to rebuke Shylock with the words:

“If thou wilt lend this money, lend it not as to thy friends; for when did friendship take a breed of barren metal of his friend?”

Antonio ends the verbal exchange with a reference to non-usurious trade:

“Come on, in this there can be no dismay;
My ships come home a month before the day.”

Further passages in the *Merchant of Venice* show that Shakespeare was fully aware of *Economic Issues*. It is also clear where his sympathies lie. In the third scene of *Act Three*, Shakespeare has Shylock say: ‘Gaoler, look to him. Tell not me of mercy. This is the fool that lent out money *gratis*’. While two scenes later he has Lancelot comment that ‘this making of Christians will raise the price of hogs. If we grow all to be pork eaters we shall not shortly have a rasher on the coals for money’. To which Jessica retorts that ‘in converting Jews to Christians, you raise the price of pork’.

Elsewhere Shakespeare maintained the distinction between ‘summer seeming lust’ and ‘avarice’.¹⁷ And in the second scene of *Act Three* of *Measure for Measure* Shakespeare has the bawd's servant Pompey remark upon the law closing the brothels:

“T’was never merry world since, of the two usuries, the merriest was put down
And the worsier allowed by order of law a furred gown to keep him warm.”

This view is reminiscent of Dante's triple distinction in *The Inferno* between *Sins of Incontinence*, *Violence* and *Deceit*. He placed usury low down in the second division, very near Geryon, the *Monster of Fraud*.

Even in the 18th century the *Humorists*, and Smollett in particular, kept this trace of *Medieval Thought*. To them the *Sin of Incontinence* was not the only or the gravest sin.

In the next ten years, the *Canons of the Church* against usury were re-enacted, and there was some reaction against the *Puritans* when Bancroft succeeded Whitgift and ejected three hundred *Puritans*. In *Popular Comedy*, the *Puritan* was often synonymous with the *Usurer*.

But 1610 is probably the crucial date in *English Church History*, as far as usury and what it entails is concerned. For the choice for the vacant *Primacy* was between Lancelot Andrewes¹⁸ and the ‘bigoted Calvinist’ Abbot, who was backed by those who would profit from Calvin's *System of Trade*.

To understand the meaning of this and the reason why the country wanted Andrewes for its *Archbishop of Canterbury*, we shall have to investigate the lesser known works of Andrewes and consider his *Treatise* which has remained in Latin.

Andrewes made no compromise about usury at all. In *The Moral Law Expounded* he treats of the *Christian Life* under the heading of the *Ten Commandments*. Under the *Eighth Commandment*: ‘Thou shalt not steal’, he discusses the *Rights of Ownership* which are: *Jus*, Possession; *Fructum*, Profit; *Consumptionem*, consumption, enjoyment; and *Alienationem*, transference.

The *Owner* has the right to translate the whole dominion or the profit - *jus fructum*. Andrewes also maintains the traditional distinction between *Consumables* (e.g. wine where use and consumption is identical for use involves consumption), and *Non-Consumables* (e.g. lands, houses etc., which could be used without being consumed or used up). He says:

“Now if he do translate a thing liberally and for a time, then it is called *mutuum*, a loan; he *Lendeth* it, but without consideration. And if he translate the thing but not the use of it, then it is *Borrowed* to be used, *commodatum*.”

He soon makes it quite plain whether it is possible to use money without consuming it. He says:

¹⁷ Macbeth 14, 3.

¹⁸ Some of Andrewes’ qualities have been appreciated by T.S. Eliot and others.

“We come to say there is *furtum occultum*, close theft...and a third thing under this heading we may account of the felonies of *gratuita beneficia*, of liberality; as *judex nummarius*, an *Usurer* to sell money, being *vitiosa contractus*, an *Unlawful Contract*.”

Andrewes meant by ‘unlawful’ that it was contrary to *Divine Law*, as did Aquinas, for usury at this time of writing was not banned by the *Human Laws of England*. These quotations display a knowledge of *Usurious Practice* and *Evasion* and require further explanation which is provided by Andrewes in his *Treatise on Usury* which deals with these questions and clarifies them fully.

Andrewes’ quotes Psalm 112, Verse 6:

“For he shall never be moved. The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance.”

And Psalm 37, verse 21:

“The wicked borroweth and payeth not again. But the righteous dealeth graciously and giveth.”

And St. Luke Chapter 6, Verse 35:

“But love your enemies and do them good, and lend never despairing. Hope for nothing back¹⁹ and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the sons of the most High. For he is kind towards the unthankful and evil.”

This is a crucial verse in his arguments, following on from the previous *Verse 34*:

“And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? Even sinners lend to sinners, to receive again as much.”

Andrewes was referring to the atmosphere of *Our Saviour's Kingdom* and clearly bringing out the contrast with that of the *Moneylenders' Realm*. Nothing must be hoped for, and it should return a great reward. To continue with Andrewes' doctrine:

“*Gratuitum* and *Mutuum* - Loan and no hope of recompense - must go together. Whosoever he be who setteth a *Price* upon that liberality, *vendere mutuum*, to *Sell a Loan*, it is a *Corruption of Virtue*, for *donatio* is *liberalis alienatio sine ullo mercede*, a *mutuum* is *ad tempus*. A *Gift* is a free *alienationem* – transfer - forever, without any reward at all, and a *Loan* is but for a time.”

This teaching sounds at first to be most restrictive on *Commerce*. But in the first place the *Catholic Mind* did not consider this a particularly bad thing. Secondly the *Doctrine of Partnership*, of sharing the risks as well as the profits, gave sufficient encouragement to *Honest Enterprise*.

Andrewes gives here a somewhat new argument against usury: It was one of the subjects to which he had given particular attention.

The work of Lancelot Andrewes has appeared relevant in several points to the 20th century - his *Devotions* are one example. His style impressed T.S. Eliot, who not only wrote an essay on him, but also opened his *Journey of the Magi* with a quotation;

The Rev. Canon Vidler also quotes from Andrewes in *Christ's Strange Work*, a passage in which the Bishop complained that all attention was given to *Gospel* and none to *Law*.

On the question of usury Andrewes makes a permanent contribution which is not rendered out of date by the centuries any more than his style, his devotion or his realization that *Law* is needed besides *Gospel*.

Aquinas had argued from the *Nature of Money*; the 16th century *Divines* argued from the results of usury; while Andrewes argues straight from the *New Testament*, after mentioning both the other reasons. He mentioned the first at some length when he classed usury as a *Theft*, and the second in using the word *Felonies*.

He quotes Leviticus Chapter 27 against *Coyners*:

“And all thy estimations shall be according to the shekel of the sanctuary. Twenty gerahs shall be the shekel.”

This principle still holds good, for in modern times it is not a question of the intrinsic value of the *Currency* but of *Purchasing Power*. By *Devaluation* and other devices²⁰ the *Purchasing Power* of a *Nation's Currency* may be

¹⁹ Hope for Nothing Back - *meden anelpize* - is an Andrewes' quotation.

²⁰ Ezra Pound pointed out that ‘*Coupons*, direct descendants of the *Truck System* that limited purchases to certain shops, are a *Devaluation*, as the unit will not buy certain goods without a supplementary ticket, doled out by the *Bureaucrats*.’

damaged. This has certainly happened in England, as a comparison of prices now with those quoted some pages earlier will show.

Andrewes, then refers to *St. Augustine's Canon* that there is no remission of sin unless restitution of the theft is made - *non demittitur peccatum nisi restituatur ablatu* - and he mentions Nehemiah Verse 7:

“Then I consulted with myself and contended with the nobles and rulers and said unto them, Ye exact usury everyone of his brother. And I held a great assembly against them. Restore, I pray you, to them even this day their fields, their olive yards, their vineyards, their houses, also their hundredth part of the corn, the wine, the oil, that ye exact of them.”

These authorities both require the *Restitution* of usury taken on *Money* or *Goods* that have been lent. Andrewes, in his *Defence of Tithes*, said that by this method, *Priest* and *People* shared in the *Vagaries of Nature*, and were involved together in *Plenty* or *Scarcity*.

In his treatise he called St. Augustine a substantial writer⁷ but took care to find out what he said about usury. Aquinas gives more than once the answer to the question of *Restitution*, which makes a reality of *Christian Penance*.

Andrewes insists on the standard of the *Just Price* - *justum pretium* and his conclusion is:

“If we come not to increase money - *generare pecuniam*, by none of these ways, we are *Just Lords*.”

In discussing the *Eighth Commandment* in *A Pattern of Christian Doctrine*, Andrewes mentions:

“Benefits and good turns which should be done freely, and not looking for a reward, as the *Usurers* sell their money.”

From about 1450 or on Lancelot Andrewes a good deal earlier, *Money Power* had been warring on *Christian Morality*. The common complaint, needless in view of the *Partnership Doctrine*, was that *Usury Laws* were restrictive and prevented the *Expansion of Trade*.

By the crucial date of 1610, this power had gained its first moral ally in Calvin, and opposition was being shuffled away as old-fashioned. Such men as Bullinger were useful, with their *Decades*, to the new aspirants for the real throne of power.

But the *Church* wanted Lancelot Andrewes - a quite outstanding Christian and Bishop in many aspects, - as her Archbishop, and the *Faith* might yet have been preserved. He was the *Enemy of Usury and Enclosures* as is made clear in his *Book on Tithes*, and the *Friend of the Common Man* and of the *Welfare of the Country*. While opposing enclosure Andrewes threw his full weight against usury, for the spirit of *Usurious Monopoly* was the spirit of *Enclosure*.

It will never be known why those in control preferred not to have Andrewes and contrived to supplant him with Abbot ‘the apostle unaware of modernity, secularism, usury and industrialism who was a good man according to his lights²¹ for he built alms houses at Guildford. But he was apparently quite unsuited to the *Office of Primate*. It would appear that the interests of the *Church* were not the first consideration of those in control.

Andrewes was the outstanding champion, in the name of *True Religion*, of the earlier system in which the *Church* controlled²² *Business Morality*. Not yet were cruel malpractices condoned with the excuse that business was business.

To Andrewes, all life was God's, and money was a vital aspect of life. On the other hand, the interests that had by 1610 gone far towards control still felt a real or specious need for religion of a sort, but could not afford a recurrence of the religion of the *Church* which touched on money.

In his *Word in Season* on the *Pillars of Government*, Andrewes shows an awareness of the real issues not displayed by latter day *Statesmen*. The pillars are *True Worship of God* and *Right Administration of Justice*. *True Worship* involves *pietas* - the love of God and man (one word covers both), and this carries with it *aequitas*, which is fundamentally inconsistent with the practice of usury. He writes that:

“To hate sin for conscience sake is a pillar on which the building of the *State* will stand in safety...the Christian duty of parting charitably with one's own must strengthen the *Civil* one of not taking injuriously the property of others.”

²¹ “...and if thy light be darkness...”

²² Religion: Binding back to reality.

Today, the duty of not taking injuriously the *Property* of others receives no strengthening of any kind, but rather the taking is strengthened by *Force of Law* and implemented through *Tax* and *Legalized Confiscation*.²³

Before, however, considering the results of 1610 on the teaching of the *Church* and the practice of the *State*, it would be helpful to consider the whole teaching of Lancelot Andrewes on the subject. Few realize that he gave the matter special attention. But in fact he delivered a *Latin Treatise* about it.

A translation of this after more than 350 years will be the best answer to those who maintain that the great²⁴ Andrewes gave the burning question of usury only passing attention. I shall give the full translation, which is not elsewhere available, and the text can only exist in rare Latin copies. Such works up to a few years ago would have been left in that limbo, but today we realize that Andrewes' zeal was not misapplied and that his scale of values was better proportioned than our own.

◀ Chapter 8

▶ Usury and the Church of England ◀

Chapter 10 ▶

²³ Hence the crime wave?

²⁴ There are few who would deny him greatness.