

**Reforming Nationhood:
England in the Literature of the Tudor Imperial Age, 1509-1553**

By

Stewart James Mottram

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

University of Leeds

School of English

May 2005

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own, and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material, and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

For Bex, and for my parents, Jean and David Mottram

Acknowledgements

I owe a great debt of gratitude to my supervisor Professor David Lindley. His guidance and advice has had an enormous influence on the architecture and argument of the thesis, and his comments on drafts have helped curb my natural tendency towards discursiveness. Always generous with his time, and willing to listen to the many ideas I have thrown at him over the past few years, he more than anyone else has helped make this thesis what it is today.

Many other members of staff at the School of English have offered help and advice on specific areas of research. I have greatly appreciated the comments of staff at the Renaissance Research Group, chaired by Professor Paul Hammond. Their feedback on papers has helped influence my approach to Udall's *Respublica* and Morison's *Lamentation*. Thanks also to Professor Andrew Wawn, for his constructive criticism, and to Dr Catherine Batt, for her help with translating the French coronation oath of Edward II, to which I refer in Chapter One. Dr Syrithe Pugh offered some useful starting-points for my investigation of the late classical concept of *imperium*, and Dr Anthea Fraser Gupta offered advice on People's dialect in *Respublica*. I would also like to thank Dr Anthony Wright of the School of History, with whom I discussed the apologetics of Antonio de Guevara and Mercurino de Gattinara.

The thesis could not have been written without the financial support of the University of Leeds and Brotherton Trust. I was awarded a three-year Research Scholarship in October 2001, and a grant from the Brotherton Library Scholarship Fund in March 2004, to cover the cost of research visits to London and Cambridge. Members of staff in the manuscripts and early printed books departments at the British and Cambridge University Libraries were all incredibly friendly and helpful, as was Ms Gill Cannell at The Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Many thanks are also due to the assistance of staff at the Brotherton Library, in Special Collections and Document Supply.

Various parts of the thesis are about to appear in print. Some material from Chapters One and Two is included in my forthcoming article for *Renaissance Studies*, 'Reading the rhetoric of nationhood in two Reformation pamphlets by Richard Morison

and Nicholas Bodrigan' (currently at press). Most of Chapter Three is being published later this year, as 'Imagining England in Richard Morison's pamphlets against the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536)', in *Comitatus*, 36 (2005).

Of course, a great debt is due to friends and family – to my parents, for their unwavering support and enthusiasm, and particularly to Dr Eric Langley, who has not only been a great friend to me these past ten years, but who this last week has been busy proof-reading the thesis. Thanks also to Dr Gillian Roberts, and to Yeliz Biber. Last, but by no means least, thanks to Becky. Her love and support has made all of this possible.

All errors that remain, I acknowledge mine.

Abstract

The thesis explores the relationship between empire and nationhood in the literature of the Royal Supremacy. In so doing, it contests the assumptions of the social historians Michel Foucault, Benedict Anderson, Jürgen Habermas, and Ernest Gellner – all of whom have dated the dawn of the nation-event on our Western political horizons from the end of the eighteenth century. The thesis invites important outcomes for our perception of early Tudor political culture, and for our wider appreciation of the origins of English national identity. It differentiates the Habsburg imperial idea from the Tudor ideology of empire inherited by Henry VIII upon his accession in 1509. It then distinguishes both these imperial ideologies from Henry's pretensions, as enshrined in the 1533 Appeals Act, to empire in the English Church. Despite these differences between the Habsburg and Tudor ideologies of empire, each received identical expression in propaganda that identified both England and the Holy Roman Empire with Virgil's Golden Age. The first two chapters explore the Golden Age motif in pageantry produced for the joint London *Entry* of Henry VIII and Charles V (1522), and for the *Entry* of Anne Boleyn in 1533. Chapter Two concludes that the function of the 1533 *Entry* as propaganda for the Royal Supremacy was undermined by the similarities between its stagecraft and that of the 1522 *Entry*.

The thesis responds in its final three chapters to the problems posed by these similarities in the staging of empire at this time. Chapters Three and Four explore the significance of the character England in two of Richard Morison's political pamphlets, both written in 1536, and in John Bale's play *King Johan* (c. 1538). The development of this character coincides with the dissemination of the English Bible in the later 1530s. The thesis argues that the character England embodies an English national identity – an identity based on Bible-reading, and on obedience to scriptural passages that command obedience to kings. Mary's accession in 1553 marked the end of England as a character in Royal Supremacy literature. The final chapter, on Nicholas Udall's *Respublica*, a play performed before Mary at Christmas 1553-54, explores disillusionment with the English Bible as an instrument for social reform, and with the English national community that Morison and Bale had constructed around this Bible's readership.

Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	iii
Contents	iv
Abbreviations and Conventions	v
Introduction	1
PART I: EMPIRE	
1 'An Empire off hitself': Exploring the Habsburg and Tudor Ideas of Empire in the <i>Entry</i> of Charles V and Henry VIII (1522)	14
2 'This Realme of Englund is an Impire': Royal Supremacy and the Rhetoric of Empire in the <i>Entry</i> of Anne Boleyn (1533)	51
PART II: ENGLAND	
3 'If England coude speake': Rebellion and the Rhetoric of Nationhood in Richard Morison's Pamphlets against the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536)	98
4 'Enter Ynglond': Staging Nationhood in John Bale's <i>King Johan</i> (c. 1538)	123
5 Commonwealth in Crisis: Riot, Rebellion, and Nicholas Udall's <i>Respublica</i> (1553)	168
Conclusion	217
Bibliography	222

Abbreviations and Conventions

BL	British Library
CCCC	Corpus Christi College, Cambridge
<i>CSP (Edward VI)</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Edward VI, 1547-1553, Preserved in the Public Record Office</i> , ed. by C. S. Knighton, rev. edn (London: HMSO, 1992)
<i>CSP (Spanish)</i>	<i>Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere</i> , ed. by Gustav Adolph Bergenroth and others, 13 vols in 20 parts (London: HMSO, 1862-1954)
<i>CSP (Venetian)</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in other Libraries of Northern Italy</i> , ed. by Rawdon Brown and others, 38 vols (London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1864-1947)
<i>CWE</i>	<i>The Collected Works of Erasmus</i> , ed. by R. J. Schoeck, B. M. Corrigan, and others, 86 vols (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974-)
<i>DNB</i>	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: From the Earliest Times to the Year 2000</i> , ed. by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 60 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
Douai	Douai Old Testament: <i>The Holie Bible Faithfvllly Translated Into English, Ovt Of The Avthentical Latin [...] By the English College of Doway</i> , 2 vols (Douai: Laurence Kellam, 1609-10; STC 2207)
EETS	Early English Text Society
<i>LP</i>	<i>Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII: Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and Elsewhere in England</i> , ed. by J. S. Brewer and others, 21 vols of 35 parts (London: Longman, 1862-1910)

<i>NCE</i>	<i>New Catholic Encyclopedia</i> , ed. by Thomas Carson and Joann Cerrito, 2nd edn, 15 vols (Detroit: Gale, 2003)
<i>ODP</i>	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of Popes</i> , ed. by J. N. D. Kelly (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986)
<i>SP (Henry VIII)</i>	<i>State Papers Published under the Authority of His Majesty's Commission: King Henry VIII</i> , 11 vols ([London]: [His Majesty's Commission for State Papers], 1830-52)
<i>Statutes</i>	<i>The Statutes of the Realm</i> , 9 vols (London: printed by George Eyre and Andrew Strahan, 1810-1828)
<i>STC</i>	<i>A Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640</i> , ed. by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, 2nd edn, rev. by W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson, and Katharine F. Pantzer (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976)
<i>TRP</i>	<i>Tudor Royal Proclamations: Volume 1, The Early Tudors (1485-1553)</i> , ed. by Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964)
<i>TRP 2</i>	<i>Tudor Royal Proclamations: Volume 2, The Later Tudors (1553-1587)</i> , ed. by Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961)
Vulgate	<i>Biblia</i> (Venice: Hieronymus de Paganinis, 1492)

Original spelling and punctuation have been maintained in all quotations. If the slash (/) occurs in manuscript and early printed material, then it is reproduced in quotations. My use of the slash in this respect is distinguishable from my use of the spaced upright stroke (|), which marks line divisions in verse quotations. The tironian *and* is represented by the ampersand (&). Initial *ff* is reproduced as *F*, long *s* (*f*) as *s*, and *yogh* as *gh*. Contractions have been expanded and enclosed within square brackets. Insertions into manuscript and early printed material are enclosed within insertion carets (^inserted text^); deletions are struck-through (~~deleted-text~~). Ellipses are represented by three points enclosed within square brackets ([...]). Interpolations of my own are bracketed and italicised ([*interpolated text*]). Conjectural readings are bracketed and prefaced with a question mark ([?conjectural text]).

A note on capitals. Capitals are used for titles (king, duke, pope etc) when these appear in full (eg. the King of England, the Duke of Norfolk), when they are used specifically (eg. King Henry VIII, Pope Clement VII), or, if a title is used incompletely (eg. the King, the Duke), whenever it is obvious from the context that a particular individual is implied. Sobriquets (eg. the Bishop of Rome, Constantine the Great) are also capitalised. I have found it beneficial to capitalise 'Empire', 'Emperor', and 'Imperial' when these terms refer specifically to the Habsburg, Ottoman, Holy Roman, or ancient Roman Empires (eg. Imperial army, Imperial court). I use lower case when referring to the Tudor 'empire' of England, to 'empire' as an abstract idea, or to an 'imperial' ideology, crown, or office.

Bibliographical references to texts other than those included in the above list of abbreviations are given in full in a footnote after the first citation in each chapter. References accord with the conventions of the *MHRA Style Guide* (London: MHRA, 2002). Very long titles are suitably abbreviated in footnotes, and the full title reproduced in the Bibliography. If no ambiguity is possible, later references – to page (p. or pp.), signature (sig. or sigs.), folio (fol. or fols.), or line (l. or ll.) numbers; or to books (bk.), chapters (cap.), or paragraphs (para.) – are given in parentheses after quotations in the text. Signature numbers in roman have been expressed in arabic numerals.

The early Tudor period produced three different versions of the complete English Bible – the Coverdale, Matthew, and Great Bibles. Each of these was in part based upon Tyndale's own translations of the New Testament, Pentateuch, and historical books of the Old Testament. In view of this fact, I have found it disadvantageous to select a standard Bible version for the purpose of quotations. In Chapters One, Two, and Five, biblical quotations (all of which are from the Old Testament) cite from the text of the Vulgate (1492). Accompanying English translations cite from the text of the Douai Old Testament (1609-10). The subject matter discussed in Chapters Three and Four demands that I cite from a range of English Bible texts and editions, and these are detailed in the footnotes to these chapters.

Bible chapters remained unversified in both Vulgate and English language versions until the introduction of verses into the Geneva Bible (1560). All of the Bibles to which I make

reference in the thesis were printed before 1560, but in the interests of clarity I have expressed citations from biblical passages in chapter and verse. In all cases, these verse citations refer to the texts of the Douai (1609-10) and Rheims (1582) Testaments.

Unless otherwise stated, all translations are my own.

Introduction

England was imagined as both an empire and a nation in the literature of the Royal Supremacy. The imperial idea was enshrined in the preamble to the Act in Restraint of Appeals (24 Hen. VIII, c. 12), passed on 7 April 1533. The Appeals Act, which forbade foreign courts from presiding over legal cases originating in England, was designed to prevent the See of Rome from intervening in what Archbishop Cranmer referred to as Henry VIII's 'great cause of matrimony'.¹ It spoke of England as an 'Empire', autonomous as well from 'the See of Rome as fromme the auctoritie of other foreyne potentates', and it alleged that this imperial idea was grounded on the authority of 'dyvers sundrie olde autentike histories and cronicles'.²

The same year, in 1533, Henry commissioned the antiquarian John Leland to 'serche and peruse the Libraries of hys realme in monasteries, couentes [*sic*], and colleges', with the aim of cataloguing those old authentic histories and chronicles that were said to affirm the imperial idea enshrined in the Appeals Act.³ At New Year 1546, Leland presented Henry with a 'small treatyse' (sig. B7^v), a progress report that spoke of his travels to all of the libraries and religious houses in England, and of the 'profyte [*that*] hath rysen by the aforsayd iourneye, in bryngunge full manye thynges to lyght, as concernynge the vsurped autoryte of the Byshopp of Rome and hys complayces, to the manyfest and vyolent derogacyon of kyngely dygnyte' (sig. C5^v). The Appeals Act had claimed historical precedent for its idea of England as an 'Empire', compact of Church and state, and 'gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King'.⁴ Thirteen years later, Leland was finally compiling the historical evidence that would lambaste the pope's claims to exercise authority over the English Church. In his treatise, Leland spoke of a four-volume work – the *De uiris illustribus*, which was published posthumously in 1709 as *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis* – wherein he had 'digested' the names of all

¹ *LP*, VI (1882), 152.

² 'An Acte that the Appeles in suche Cases as have ben used to be pursued to the See of Rome shall not be from hensforth had ne used but wythin this Realme', in *Statutes*, III (1817), 427-29 (p. 427).

³ *The laboryouse Journey & serche of Johan Leylande, for Englandes Antiquitees, geuen of hym as a newe yeares gyfte to Kynge Henry the viij. in the .xxxvii. yeare of his Reygne, with declaracyons enlarged: by Iohan Bale* (London: [S. Mierdman for] John Bale, 1549; STC 15445), sig. B8^v. All references are to the signature numbers of this edition.

⁴ *Statutes*, III (1817), 427.

English writers ‘wyth their lyues and monumentes of learnynge’ (sig. C7^v).⁵ Leland also spoke to Henry of works-in-progress: of a book describing the ‘mountaynes, valleys, mores, hethes, forestes, woodes, cyties, burges, castels, pryncypall manor places, monasteryes, and colleges’ of Henry’s realm (sig. D4^v); of a book detailing ‘the auntyent names of hauens, ryuers, promontories, hilles, woodes, cities, townes, castelles, and varyete of kyndes of people’ in England (sig. D7^v); of a fifty-volume history of England and Wales; and of a book entitled *De nobilitate Britannica* – a genealogy of the royal and other noble families of England. To these printed encyclopaedias of all things English, Leland intended to add one more, engraved on a tablet of silver, and designed to appeal directly to Henry’s self-image as emperor of England. ‘Thus instructed’, he wrote to Henry,

I trust shortly to se the tyme, that like as Carolus Magnus had amo[n]g his treasures thre large and notable tables of syluer, rychely enameled, one of the syte and descripcion of Constantynople, an other of the site and figure of the magnificent citie of Rome, and the third of the descripcion of the worlde. So shall your Maiestie haue thys your worlde and impery of Englande so sett fourthe in a quadrate table of syluer, yf God sende me lyfe to accomplyshe my beginning, that your grace shall haue ready knowledge at the fyrst sighte of many right delectable, fruteful, and necessary pleasures, by contemplacion therof, as often as occasyon shall moue yow to the syghte of it. (sig. D5^v)

God unfortunately did not send Leland life to accomplish his beginning. He appears to have fallen victim to insanity at some point in 1546, and he died in April 1552. In 1549 John Bale published Leland’s New Year’s gift to Henry under the title *The laboryouse Journey*. In its preface, Bale explained that another friend of Leland’s had written to him ‘iii. yeares a go, dolourouslye lamentynge hys soden fall’. Leland, this writer had explained to Bale, was ‘in suche a frenesy at thys present, that lytle hope I haue of hys recouer, wherby he myghte fynyshe such thynges as he began’ (sig. B3^v). Bale was eminently qualified to continue the antiquarian work that Leland had already begun. The year before *The laboryouse Journey* appeared in London bookshops, Bale had published his own bio-bibliography of some fourteen hundred British writers – the *Illustrium*

⁵ *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis/ auctore Joanne Lelando Londinate. Ex autographo Lelandino nunc primus edidit Antonius Hall, A.M. Coll. Reg. Oxon. Socius.* (Oxford: E. Theatro Sheldoniano, 1709).

Maioris Britanniae scriptorum [...]summariu[m].⁶ In *The laboryouse Journey*, Bale took the opportunity to advertise the fruits of his own ‘laboryouse serche for olde and newe wryters’ (sig. G3^v), and to append the names of some four hundred and seventy-five writers who had been omitted from the *Summarium*, and whose works Bale intended to include in a revised catalogue, eventually published between 1557 and 1559 as the *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytannie [...] catalogus*.⁷

Bale’s enthusiasm for Leland’s antiquarian projects is everywhere present in the extensive commentary that accompanies the text of Leland’s New Year’s gift in *The laboryouse Journey*. Leland claimed to have encountered ‘manye thynges’ in monastic libraries that were written against the ‘vsurped autoryte of the Byshopp of Rome’. In his commentary, Bale affirms that ‘in all ages haue there bene some godly writers in Engla[n]de, which haue both smelled out, & also by theyr writynges detected the blasphemouse fraudes of [...] the Romysh byshop’ (sig. C6^r). He commends the suppression ‘of the sodomitrouse Abbeyes & Fryeryes’ (sig. A2^v), but laments that in the Dissolution ‘so lytle respecte was had to theyr lybraryes for the sauegarde of those noble & precyouse monume[n]tes’ contained within them (sig. A7^v). Like Leland, Bale sees utility in the works of ‘godly writers’ opposed to papal pretensions to supremacy in the English Church. Like Leland, he seeks to press these historical works into the service of the Royal Supremacy – to justify Henry’s self-image as emperor by allusion to ‘frutefull auntye[n]t authors’, who ‘inueye agaynste the false doctryne of papystes’ (sigs. C6^v-7^r). Referring to Leland’s intention to engrave the ‘impery of Englande’ in a ‘quadrate table of syluer’, Bale defends Leland’s use of the word ‘empire’ to describe the realm of England. ‘In that he calleth Englande an empire’, Bale writes, Leland ‘doth non otherwyse than ded bothe Josephus and Egesippus, wyth other notable Historianes’ (sig. D6^r). The Appeals Act had called England an empire, and had claimed that in so doing it was simply echoing the language of ‘dyvers sundrie olde autentike histories and cronicles’. It is to historical precedent that Bale also refers when he writes to defend Leland’s language of empire, and in *The laboryouse Journey* he is more specific than was the preamble to the Appeals Act

⁶ *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum [...]summariu[m]* ([Wesel]: [D. van der Straten for] Ioannem Ouerton, 1548; STC 1295).

⁷ *Scriptorum illustriu[m] maioris Brytannie quam nunc Angliam & Scotiam uocant catalogus [...] Autore Ioanne Baleo Sudouolgio Anglo, Ossoriensi apus Hybernos iam pridem episcopo*, 2 vols (Basil: Ioannem Oporinum, 1557-59; STC 1296 Variant).

about which of the histories and chronicles were sympathetic to the imperial idea enshrined in statute. Bale suggests that England had long been called an empire, and he names a number of English kings who had themselves borne the 'Imperiall Crowne' which in the Appeals Act is bestowed upon Henry and his successors.⁸ 'The empire therof', Bale writes, 'is manifest in kinge Brennus, in great Constantyne, in Arthure, and in Edwarde the third' (sig. D6^v).

Bale had not been the first apologist for the Royal Supremacy to identify the English 'Empire' enshrined in statute with the empires of King Arthur and of Constantine the Great. Printed in 1533, Polydore Vergil's *Anglica historia* had claimed that Constantine's mother was British, and that, as a Briton, the Emperor Constantine had bequeathed his imperial crown to the future kings of England. 'Albeit the imperie remained not longe after in the stocke of Constantine', Vergil had written,

the maiestie of his imperie coulde not perishe, sith that even at this presente the kinges of Englande, accordinge to the usage of their aunciters, doe weare the imperiall diademe as a gifte exhibited of Constantinus to his successors.⁹

The way in which Vergil uses the Emperor Constantine as a precedent for Henry's own self-image as emperor of England is typical of the language in which the empire enshrined in the Appeals Act found expression in the literature of the Royal Supremacy. The first part of this thesis explores the ways in which England was imagined as an empire in the pageants of two Tudor royal entries into London – the 1522 *Entry* of the Emperor Charles V and Henry VIII, and the 1533 *Entry* of Anne Boleyn. The 1522 *Entry* was occasioned by the Anglo-Imperial alliance against Francis I of France, and Chapter One reads the stagecraft of this *Entry* in relation to the rhetoric of Charles and Henry's military alliance. It argues that the Emperor Charles V was constructed as a crusader in the apologetics of the Habsburg Empire, and that this construction was used to justify Charles's self-image as *Dominus mundi*, or lord of the world. Apologists for Charles V envisioned that the Emperor would through crusade undertake to establish an era of

⁸ *Statutes*, III (1817), 427.

⁹ *Polydore Vergil's English History, from an Early Translation Preserved Among the MSS. of the Old Royal Library in the British Museum: Vol. 1, Containing the First Eight Books Comprising the Period Prior to the Norman Conquest*, ed. by Henry Ellis (London: Camden Society Publications, 1846), pp. 98-99.

Christian peace on earth, and they had likened this *pax Christiana* to the Golden Age, which according to Virgil's fourth *Eclogue* would be re-established on earth under the son of the goddess Astraea. It was as a crusader, and as the son of Astraea, that the Emperor appeared in the pageants of the 1522 *Entry*, but the chapter argues that Henry was also presented as the son of Astraea in the *Entry*, and that these parallels between Charles and Henry's presentation in the *Entry* reflect their identical roles in the rhetoric of the Anglo-Imperial alliance, as crusaders in a holy war against the King of France.

It was in the language of the Golden Age that the expansive ideology of the Habsburg Empire found expression in the 1522 *Entry*. By casting Henry alongside Charles as the son of Astraea, and by conferring imperial crowns upon both the Emperor and King of England, I argue that the *Entry* was concerned to define Henry in relation to Charles as an emperor in his own right, but that this Tudor imperial idea differed from the Habsburg ideology upheld at the court of Charles V. Henry's imperialist pretensions therefore predated the Royal Supremacy, but although Henry was already in 1522 identifying himself as an emperor, I argue that the form of the empire to which he was at that time laying claim was distinct, both from the Habsburg Empire of Charles V, and from 'Empire' as it would subsequently be defined in the preamble to the Act of Appeals.

Chapter Two explores the imperial ideology of the Royal Supremacy, and the language in which this ideology was given expression. Charles's apologists may have likened the Emperor to the son of Astraea, but they also identified him with the Emperor Constantine. It was to Constantine that Henry was also likened in the literature of the Royal Supremacy, and the second chapter explores how this parallelism influenced the presentation of England in the 1533 *Entry* of Anne Boleyn. It reads the 1533 *Entry* in relation to the writings of the fourth-century Christian apologists Lactantius and Eusebius, both of whom identified Constantine as the son of Astraea, and upheld Constantine's Christian Empire as the divinely-intended setting for the establishment of the Golden Age on earth. In the *Entry*, it is Anne Boleyn who is identified with Astraea, and England that is imagined as the Golden Age. In its presentation of Anne and England, I argue that the 1533 *Entry* borrowed from the apologetics of Constantine's Christian Empire, and that it did so in order to identify Henry's English 'Empire' with the Christian Empire under Constantine. It was in relation to Constantine that Henry's self-image as Emperor was

constructed in the 1533 *Entry*, but I argue that the effectiveness of the *Entry* as propaganda for the Royal Supremacy was undermined by the fact that Habsburg apologists also identified Constantine with Charles V. Charles and Henry were both compared to Constantine in this period, but Constantine was used in Tudor apologetics to symbolise a very different form of empire from that upheld at the Habsburg Imperial court. The Habsburg imperial idea was expansionist, in so far as it envisioned Charles as lord of the world. When the word ‘Empire’ was used in the Appeals Act, it was England’s insularity, its autonomy from outside powers, which was instead being emphasised. It was the similarities in the presentation of Charles and Henry that undermined the value of the 1533 *Entry* as royalist propaganda. I argue that these rhetorical similarities blurred the distinction between the semantics of the Habsburg and Tudor imperial ideas, and that this obscured the clarity of the *Entry*’s ideological standpoint, because it made ambiguous the form of the empire to which Henry was laying claim in 1533.

Part One of the thesis explores the ways in which England was imagined as an empire in the early sixteenth century. Part Two explores how England was imagined as a nation. As Bale defended Leland’s description of England as an empire in *The laboryouse Journey*, so his commentary upon Leland’s New Year’s gift also speaks to a sense of English national identity. Writing with reference to the ‘frutefull aunce[n]t authors’, who ‘inueye agaynste the false doctryne of papystes’, Bale himself inveighs against those who suppress ‘their wyttye workes’ to the prejudice of the common profit (sig. C6^v-7^r).

A fylthy bastarde is he to Englande, and a moste cruell enemy to all good lernyng, that wyll now obscure their names and destroye their workes, to the landes perpetuall dyscommodyte. As some vnnaturall chyldren haue done now of late, to serue their pryuate affeccyons more than the comen welthe. (sig. C7^v)

Bale praises Leland’s antiquarian project because, like Leland, he sees utility in the preservation of writings opposed to ‘the ambycouse empyre of the Romysh byshop’ (sig. C6^r). These old authentic histories and chronicles can be used to justify Henry’s own pretensions to empire in the English Church, but their preservation also constitutes the criterion upon which Bale bases his idea of Englishness – for whilst Bale writes that Leland was ‘a naturall frynde’ (sig. D4^v) to England, he condemns as bastards those ‘vnnaturall chyldren’ who go about to destroy the ‘wyttye workes’ of our ancestors.

According to Bale, Leland's laborious search of libraries not only produced ammunition with which to attack the Bishop of Rome, it also threw up Bible commentaries by writers whose interpretation of scripture contradicts the hermeneutics prescribed by the Roman Church. 'An other cause Iohan Leylande bryngeth fourth' for his 'serche of lybraries', Bale writes, is 'that the scriptures of God myght therby be more purely taught then afore in the Romish popes time' (sig. C1^r). As Bale applauds the preservation of anti-papal treatises, so he commends the conservation of anti-papist exegeses of scripture, for with these Bible commentaries, Bale argues, 'al kyndes of wicked superstycyons, and [...] sophystycall doctrynes myghte be remoued hens, to the amendement or els more clere aperaunce of the true Chrysten fayth' (sigs. C1^{r-v}).

Whilst some old authentic histories and chronicles support the 'Empire' enshrined in the Appeals Act, other 'auncye[n]t authors' support the beliefs and practices of the reformed Church of England, with its emphasis on Bible-reading, and on obedience to the Crown. Both these types of document can be pressed into the service of royalist propaganda, however, for both are sympathetic to the King's self-image after 1533 as 'Sup[re]me heede', or emperor, of the English Church and state. The first English Bible to be countenanced in England was the so-called Coverdale Bible, which was available in London bookshops by early 1536.¹⁰ Coverdale dedicated his Bible to Henry VIII, and in his dedicatory epistle he stressed the importance of the Bible in the propaganda war against the pope. The Appeals Act had used old authentic histories and chronicles to support its claim that England was an 'Empire [...] gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King'. In his dedicatory epistle, Coverdale pointed out that the scriptures were just as sympathetic to the imperial ideology of the Royal Supremacy. The Bible, he wrote, also 'declareth most abou[n]tdauntly that the office, auctorite and power geuen of God vnto kynges/ is in earth aboue all other powers' (sig. †2^v).

So the Bible upholds the imperial idea enshrined in the Appeals Act just as much as do treatises opposed to 'the ambycouse empyre of the Romysh byshop'. Bale predicates English national identity in *The laboryouse Journey* upon the preservation of 'wyttye workes' written against papal supremacy, but he also speaks to a sense of

¹⁰ [Miles Coverdale], *Biblia: The Byble, that is, the holy Scrypture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully translated in to Englyshe* ([Southwark]: [James Nicolson], 1535; STC 2063.3).

Englishness that is based upon the reading of the English Bible itself – and upon obedience to those passages in scripture that command obedience to kings. ‘He that naturallye loueth hys lande’, Bale writes in *The laboryouse Journey*,

obeyeth therwyth the commaundementes of God concernyng the loue of his neyber, and the faythful obedyence of kynges. Whych I instau[n]tly desyre al godly subiectes to folow, to the prayse of him which gaue those necessarye commaundementes. (sig. B6^v)

Like those anti-papal treatises that Bale exhorts his readers to conserve, the Bible is a means by which English subjects can learn obedience to the Crown. It is this that recommends Bible-reading to Bale as one of the benchmarks of English national identity. When England is imagined as a nation in *The laboryouse Journey*, it is as a readership of ‘godly writers’ – a readership who obey the ‘commaundementes of God’ concerning obedience to kings. The way Bale imagines England as a nation is in this respect no different to the way he and Leland imagine England as an empire – for in both, the king is upheld as ‘Sup[re]me heede’ of the Church in England.

Part Two of the thesis explores how the idea of England as a nation of Bible-readers found expression in the literature of the Royal Supremacy. England occurs as a prosopopœia in Richard Morison’s two pamphlets against the northern rebellions of 1536 – the *Lamentation [...] of seditious rebellyon* and the *Remedy for Sediton*. In these pamphlets, England is constructed as a mother who speaks to the rebels in order to admonish their obedience to the Crown. Morison, like Bale in *The laboryouse Journey*, makes English national identity contingent upon kinship with mother England. Chapter Three approaches Morison’s pamphlets as Royal Supremacy propaganda, and argues that within them, Morison turned to prosopopœia as a means of popularising the Royal Supremacy. Henry’s self-image as emperor had been defined in relation to Constantine in the pageants of the 1533 *Entry*. Chapter Three argues that in 1536, Morison reverted to mother England as a mouthpiece for ‘Impire’ as it had been defined in the Appeals Act. The chapter notes that in the *Remedy*, Morison’s England uses scripture to support her admonition that the rebels acknowledge Henry as their ‘Sup[re]me heede’. It reads the *Remedy* in relation to the writings of Tyndale and Coverdale, and concludes that the

England of the *Remedy* speaks to a sense of Englishness that is based upon obedience to the Bible's commands concerning obedience to kings.

Two years later, mother England again appeared on the stage of John Bale's *King Johan*. Chapter Four explores the likelihood that *King Johan* was performed at Archbishop Cranmer's Canterbury residence over Christmas 1538-39. The chapter approaches the earliest version of the play-text, which is dateable to around the time of the Canterbury performance, as a comment upon current affairs in 1538. This was the year that Cromwell enjoined all incumbents to purchase for their parishioners a copy of the Great Bible, and the chapter reads the play in relation to these momentous events for the English laity and the English evangelical movement. In *King Johan*, as in *The laboryouse Journey*, Bale makes Bible-reading the basis of English national identity. I argue that in the earliest version of his play, Bale is optimistic that a nation of Bible-readers – obedient to God and to kings – would be established in England in the era of the Church Bible.

Bale's optimism was short-lived, for in 1543 the King forbade most of his subjects to read the Bible which five years earlier he had sanctioned for the use of the laity. When Edward succeeded his father in January 1547, he immediately revoked the laws prohibiting Bible-reading, and restored the Great Bible to its place in church. Nicholas Udall, who with Leland had authored the verse spoken in the 1533 *Entry*, had been as optimistic about the restoration of the Great Bible in 1547 as Bale had been about its publication eight years beforehand. In his preface to the English edition of Erasmus's *Paraphrase* (1548), Udall imagines England as a second Israel – a land flowing, not only with 'mylke and honey', but with 'the free exercise of Goddes moste holy woorde'.¹¹

Edwardian England failed to live up to Udall's expectations, for whilst many professed knowledge of the Bible, few attempted to put God's commandments into practice. The rich took from the poor, and the poor sought redress in acts of riot and rebellion, which were clean contrary to the obedience that God demands of a king's subjects. This, at least, was the satirical vision of England under Edward VI that Udall presented in his play *Respublica*, performed at the Marian court over Christmas 1553-54.

¹¹ *The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the newe testamente* (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1548; STC 2854), sig. a6^v.

Within it, Udall expresses his disillusionment with the direction of government policy under Edward, but also with the idea – to which he had so enthusiastically spoken in the *Paraphrase* – of England as a nation of Bible-readers, obedient to God and the Crown. The fifth chapter reads *Respublica* in relation to sermons preached at the Edwardian court by the likes of Hugh Latimer and Thomas Lever. It compares their criticism of Edwardian social reforms to the play's satire of Edwardian government. In this final chapter, I argue that *Respublica* stages the demise of Englishness as it was constructed in the literature of the Royal Supremacy – of the nation of Bible-readers imagined by Morison and Bale, and embodied in their character of mother England.

* * *

Both Morison and Bale use prosopopœia to give expression to a national community of Bible-readers, a community obedient to God's commands in scripture concerning obedience to kings. The England that Morison and Bale imagine is in this respect consistent with the empire enshrined in the Appeals Act. This act had defined England as an 'Empire [...] gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King', and it is upon obedience to this 'Sup[re]me heede and King' that Bale and Morison also predicate English national identity. The thesis argues for a relationship between the English nation imagined in Royal Supremacy literature, and the English empire defined in the Act of Appeals. In so doing, it departs from the assumptions of the social historians Michel Foucault, Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner, and Jürgen Habermas, all of whom have in the last three decades dated the dawn of the nation-event to the dusk of the age of empire, placing its origins in the eighteenth-century era of democratic government. They argue that Western democracies emerged in this century to displace imperial, or monarchical systems of government, and that this political revolution gave birth to national identity.

Foucault writes that in the eighteenth century, the all-seeing and all-knowing disciplinary mechanisms of Bentham's penal institution – the Panopticon – were writ large upon the European nation-state. He argues that governments had in this period wanted to exercise power more economically, and that they had subjected citizens to certain individuating techniques, each designed to create an impression of government as

an omnipresent, but invisible institution.¹² Foucault coins the phrase ‘panopticism’ to describe this exercise of power, and in his last work, *Technologies of the Self*, he argues that panopticism gave birth to a new political mindset, a new attitude towards the nation-state. In the age of panopticism, individuals were integrated into the totality of the state. As a result, Foucault argues that the state itself acquired self-consciousness at this time, that it became aware of its own finality, and anxious for its own preservation.¹³ Foucault contends that the eighteenth century witnessed the awakening of the nation-state in Western Europe, and that with the dawn of the nation-state came the dawn of national identity.

Foucault argues that at the end of the eighteenth century the ‘project of reconstituting the Roman Empire vanishes forever’.¹⁴ For Foucault, then, nationhood supersedes empire, and he is joined in this assumption by Benedict Anderson, who argues that the eighteenth-century ‘Enlightenment’ witnessed the ‘the dawn of the age of nationalism’, and the ‘dusk’ of the age of empire.¹⁵ Both Anderson and Foucault date the origins of national identity to an age of enlightened disillusionment with the grand narratives of empire; both assume that nationalism emerged to displace what Anderson calls the ‘hierarchical dynastic realm’ with the ‘fragmented, pluralized, and territorialized’ communities of modern-day nation-states.¹⁶

The more recent narratives of the social historians Ernest Gellner and Jürgen Habermas also date the dawn of nationhood to the dusk of empire in the eighteenth

¹² Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. by Alan Sheridan (London: Penguin, 1979), pp. 195-228. ‘There are two images, then, of discipline. At one extreme, the discipline-blockade, the enclosed institution, established on the edges of society [...] At the other extreme, with panopticism, is [...] the gradual extension of the mechanisms of discipline throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, their spread throughout the whole social body, the formation of what might be called in general the disciplinary society’ (p. 209). See also ‘The Eye of Power: A Conversation with Jean-Pierre Barou and Michelle Perrot’, in Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. and trans. by Colin Gordon (Brighton: Harvester, 1980), pp. 146-65.

¹³ Michel Foucault, ‘The Political Technology of Individuals’, in *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, ed. by Luther H. Martin, Hick Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), pp. 145-162.

¹⁴ ‘The Political Technology of Individuals’, p. 152.

¹⁵ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983, rev. 1991), p. 11.

¹⁶ *Imagined Communities*, p. 7; p. 19.

century. Gellner writes that ‘nationalism is rooted in modernity’.¹⁷ For Habermas, our modern, democratic age is defined by its ‘public sphere’ – a forum wherein public opinion finds voice via the media of newspapers and television. Habermas dates the public sphere to ‘the eighteenth century’, and he argues that it emerged alongside ‘national and territorial states’ at this time. Habermas contrasts this post-Enlightenment, ‘bourgeois’ phenomenon with its antecedent – what he calls the ‘representative public sphere’ of medieval feudal society, in which the categories of public and private intersect in the king, the phenomenal embodiment of power. For Habermas, the representative public sphere is defined by this lack of distinction between the office of government and the person who governs, between the categories of public and private, state and sovereign. Because the king embodies both the public and the private, Habermas argues that monarchical government is incompatible with the public sphere, and with the idea of national identity that he constructs around this forum for debate. ‘Representation in the sense of a bourgeois public sphere, for instance the representation of the nation’, Habermas writes, ‘has nothing to do with the medieval representative public sphere – a public sphere directly linked to the concrete existence of a ruler’.¹⁸

This thesis explores how England was imagined as an empire and a nation in Royal Supremacy literature. In so doing, it seeks to redress these critical exclusions of the nation from the age of empire and monarchical government. I argue that English national identity can be antedated to at least two centuries before it appears on the historical horizons of Foucault, Anderson, Gellner, and Habermas. I also contest the assumptions that inform their dating of the nation-event in Western Europe to the demise in the eighteenth century of monarchical systems of government. These social historians suggest that nationhood superseded empire in the eighteenth century. I argue, however, that ideas of empire and nationhood in fact operated alongside one another in the early Tudor period.

* * *

¹⁷ Ernest Gellner, *Nationalism* (London: Phoenix, 1998), p. 13.

¹⁸ Jürgen Habermas, ‘The Public Sphere’, *New German Critique*, 3 (1974), 49-55 (pp. 50-51).

Part I

EMPIRE

Where by dyvers sundrie olde autentike histories and cronicles it is manifestly declared and exp[re]ssed that this Realme of Englund is an Impire [...] gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King.

Appeals Act (24 Hen. VIII, c. 12)

Chapter 1

‘An Empire off hitself’: Exploring the Habsburg and Tudor Ideas of Empire in the *Entry* of Charles V and Henry VIII (1522)

The *Entry* into London of Charles V and Henry VIII took place on the evening of Friday 6 June 1522. According to Edward Hall’s account, Charles and Henry rode side-by-side in identical ‘Coates of Clothe of Golde, embraudered with Siluer’, and they were serenaded on their way towards Southwark by Sir Thomas More, who ‘made to them an eloquent Oracion, in the praise of the twoo princes, and of the peace and loue betwene them’.¹ The procession met with the first pageant at the gate to London Bridge, which was flanked with the two giants Hercules and Samson. Between them they held aloft an iron chain, upon which was listed the lands and dominions over which Charles ruled as Emperor-elect. The list is included in the anonymous *Descrypcion of the pageantes*, a second, slightly variant account preserved on six manuscript folios contemporary with the *Entry*, and now bound into Corpus Christi College Cambridge, MS 298.² The second pageant had been erected on London Bridge itself. It depicted the story of Jason and the Golden Fleece. According to Hall, the armed figure of Jason stood behind the Golden Fleece and was flanked by the ‘fiery Dragon’ (sig. QQq6^v) that legend has Phrixus deploy to guard the fleece, and by a ‘fayre mayde representyng the lady Medea’ (sig. RRr1^r), the sorceress who helped Jason defeat the dragon and seize the fleece. A child explained to the Emperor that his coming to London had brought as much joy to its residents as had been brought to the citizens of Colchis by Jason’s conquest of the Fleece.

From London Bridge, Charles and Henry rode through streets lined on their left-hand side by the livery companies, and on their right by the clergy, until they arrived at the third pageant at the Gracious, or Grace Church Street Conduit. The author of the *Descrypcion* writes that Charlemagne was here depicted investing actors playing Henry and Charles with ‘ij swerdys and .ij. Crownys imperyall off gold’ (p.

¹ Edward Hall, *The vnion of the two noble and illustrate famelies of Lancastre & Yorke* (London: Richard Grafton, 1548; STC 12721), sigs. QQq6^r–RRr2^v (sig. QQq6^v).

² ‘The descrypcion of the pageantes made in the Cyte of London att the recevyng of the most excellent pryncys Charlys the fyfte Emperour, & Henry the viij. kyng off englonde’, CCCC, MS 298, II, 8, pp. 132-42. References to the *Descrypcion* are cited from the text of the manuscript. An abridged transcription of this account is printed in Robert Withington, *English*

135). According to Hall, Charlemagne had invested Charles with the sword of justice, Henry with the sword of triumphant victory. The fourth pageant had been erected outside the Leadenhall. It measured thirty-eight by eighty feet, and according to the *Descrypcion* consisted of a genealogical tree growing out of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and showing that the Emperor and King 'doo descende and com[e] lynially owt off the howse off englonde from the seide Joh[a]n off gawnte' (p. 136). Turning left onto Cornhill, the procession met with the fifth pageant at the Conduit. A pageant castle had been constructed across the street, with two towers emblazoned with the arms of the Emperor and King, and filled with musicians playing on trumpets, shawms and sackbuts. Between them sat the 'emprow[er] kynge Arthur w[i]t[h] a crowne imperiall', writes the author of the *Descrypcion*, and 'w[i]t[h] the rownde table before hyme' (p. 138). After a child had compared the Emperor to Arthur, the procession passed on its way to the Cornhill Stocks. This depicted England as an earthly paradise, encompassed with 'water full of Fyshe', and 'full of Roses, Lyllies & all other flowers curiously wrought, and byrdes, beastes and all other thynges of pleasure', writes Hall (sig. RRr1^v). According to the *Descrypcion*, the island was peopled with mechanical images of the Emperor and King bearing swords, which swords were cast away when Charles, Henry, and the rest of the procession approached. The two images then 'embrasede eche other in tokennyng off love and pease' (p. 139), and an image of God finally appeared above the stage to bless the peace-makers beneath him.

A rose opened at the Great Conduit, Cheapside, to reveal 'a goodly yong mayden' inside (p. 140), who offered a white and red rose to the Emperor and King respectively. The scene was watched over by ladies representing the four Cardinal Virtues, Justice, Prudence, Fortitude, and Temperance, each in one of four towers, and a child prayed that God might give the Emperor grace enough 'to defende the trew cristen people agaynst the infidelys' (p. 140). At the Standard in Cheapside was a second genealogical tree, this time tracing the lineage of Charles, Henry, his wife Catherine, and their daughter, the Princess Mary, to Alfonso the Wise, the thirteenth-century King of Castile. The ninth and final pageant had been erected at the Little Conduit, Cheapside. Against the backdrop of a pageant heaven, with sun, moon, and stars shining, it enacted the Assumption of the Virgin, which according to the *Descrypcion* was 'meruelous goodly co[n]veyde by a vyce and a clowde openyng w[i]t[h] Michael and Gabriel angellys knelyng and dyuers tymes sensyng' (p. 142).

Angels and the twelve apostles were joined on stage by Saints George and John the Baptist, and by a host of English saints – the Archbishops Dunstan and Thomas Becket, Bishop Erkenwald of London, and Kings Edmund and Edward the Confessor. Choristers sung psalms and hymns, and minstrels played the ‘swetyst musyke thatt cowed be devysede’ (p. 142). Charles and Henry then alighted in front of St Paul’s, and after hearing mass they continued on horseback to the Emperor’s lodging at Blackfriars.

Charles visited England in the summer of 1522 in order to reaffirm his and Henry’s commitment to war with Francis I. Charles, who disputed Francis’s claims to dominion in Milan and Genoa, had since the summer of 1521 been attempting to win control over French-occupied northern Italy. In two treaties, signed in August and November 1521, Henry had agreed to help the Imperial cause in exchange for a marriage alliance between Charles and the Princess Mary. Henry and Charles finalised the details of their combined assault against Francis in a third treaty, signed at Windsor on 16 June 1522, and it was as confederates in this war against the French King that they had entered London together just ten days beforehand on 6 June. Writing to his Secretary Jean de la Sauche the day after the *Entry*, Charles spoke of the ‘magnificent reception’ that he and Henry had received in London, and of the ‘solemn and costly pageants’ that had been erected in their honour, but he also spoke with enthusiasm about Henry’s commitment to war with France. ‘A great number of English troops have already crossed to Calais to join the Emperor’s’, Charles reported, and ‘the King has also prepared a good army by sea, which will join the Emperor’s in eight days’.³

The *Entry* was therefore occasioned by Charles and Henry’s confederacy against Francis, and it occurred against the backdrop of their preparations for a combined assault on the French King. The articles of the Anglo-Imperial treaties attempt to justify this war with France by casting Charles and Henry as crusaders in a holy war against heresy; Francis as the heretic that this holy war aimed to suppress. This rhetoric also influenced the presentation of the Emperor and King of England in the pageants of the 1522 *Entry*, and this chapter explores the ways in which the *Entry* echoes the Anglo-Imperial treaties by presenting the campaign against Francis as a crusade against heresy. Apologists for Charles V had encouraged Charles to undertake

³ *LP*, III.ii (1867), 977-78 (p. 977).

crusade against the Turk as part of his role as Holy Roman Emperor, and they had anticipated that Charles would through these holy wars establish a global empire on earth. I argue that the *Entry* also presents Charles as a world ruler by virtue of his role as crusader in the Anglo-Imperial alliance against France, and that the relationship in Habsburg apologetics between empire and crusade also influenced Henry's own presentation in the *Entry* as an emperor in his own right. Both Charles and Henry are invested with imperial crowns on the stage of the Gracious Street pageant; both are at the Cornhill Stocks identified with the *pax Christiana* that their joint crusade against Francis was expected to establish on earth. The rhetoric of the Anglo-Imperial alliance casts Charles and Henry as crusaders in a holy war with France, and in the *Entry* they share the same role as emperors and crusaders alike. The chapter explores these parallels between the presentation of Charles and Henry as emperors on stage, but it also argues for a difference between the Habsburg and Tudor ideas of empire at this time.

* * *

The title of Emperor was originally devised for Charlemagne by Leo III, to reward his diligence in defending Leo's position as pope against detractors at the Lateran who had tried to depose him in AD 799.⁴ Before acceding to the Frankish throne in AD 768, Charlemagne had pledged, alongside his brother, Carloman, and father, Pepin III, to protect the papal Church as part of the 'Donation of Pepin', concluded in AD 754. In recognition of the dignity of this new Frankish office, Pope Stephen II chose at this time not only to anoint Pepin III and his sons, but also to confer upon each of them the title *patricius Romanorum*, which 'implied an imprecise obligation to serve as protector of Rome and the Romans'.⁵ Leo III's subsequent decision to elevate Charlemagne to the imperial office was related to this, his role as defender of the Roman Church. The title of Emperor served to bestow upon Charlemagne a pre-eminence over other kings that would otherwise have been inadequately conveyed by Charlemagne's existing title of 'Patrician of the Romans'. Charlemagne's successors to the imperial crown continued to inherit an office that conferred dignity upon the bearer by virtue of his responsibility as Emperor to defend the integrity of Christendom, and the ecclesiastical supremacy of the pope's role within it as Vicar of Christ. It was this responsibility to protect the Church that imparted super-eminence to

⁴ See *ODP*, pp. 97-99.

⁵ *NCE*, III, 421-428 (p. 421).

the Emperor, as 'lord of Christendom, universal and omnipotent, the terrestrial agent of the divine Emperor, God'.⁶

The election in June 1519 of Charles V to the office of Holy Roman Emperor allied the German Imperial principalities to the Habsburg duchies in Austria that Charles had in January of that year inherited from his paternal grandfather, Emperor Maximilian I. These territories augmented Charles's already extensive patrimony over the Burgundian territories, most of which Charles had directly inherited in 1506 from his father, Philip the Fair, over the kingdoms of Castile and Navarre, and over Castilian conquests in the New World and along the North African coast. When his maternal grandfather, Ferdinand of Aragon, died in 1516, Charles was additionally bequeathed the kingdoms of Aragon, Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia.⁷ The contours of the European dominions over which the newly-elected Emperor Charles V now held sway were consequently coterminous with those of the Western Province of the ancient Roman Empire to an extent unrealised since the decline of the Western Empire in the late fifth century AD.⁸ Charles's colonial possessions in the New World even exceeded these ancient frontiers.

The extent of Charles's Empire gave concrete realisation to the nominal pretensions to world supremacy that he had inherited as one of the successors of Charlemagne to the title of Emperor. Its size was no accident, wrote apologists at the court of Charles V, but identified Charles as the instrument of providence for the establishment of Christian peace on earth. 'God the creator has given you this grace of raising you in dignity above all Christian kings and princes', Charles's Grand Chancellor Mercurino de Gattinara informed him, 'by constituting you the greatest emperor and king who has been since the division of the empire'.⁹ Not since

⁶ *NCE*, VII, 42-44 (p. 42). Charlemagne had styled himself as simply 'Emperor'. In the mid-twelfth century, Frederick Barbarossa was the first emperor to describe his territory as a 'Holy Empire', a term intended 'to signify that the empire was divinely ordained and worthy of sharing power and authority with the Roman Catholic Church in the Christian world' (p. 43). Frederick was also the first emperor to use the style *Dominus mundi*, which implied his suzerainty over other kings.

⁷ See William Maltby, *The Reign of Charles V* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 6-31.

⁸ Charlemagne was elevated in 800AD to an imperial office that had remained vacant since the deposition in 475AD of Romulus Augustus, the last Emperor to rule over the Western Province of the ancient Roman Empire. See *NCE*, VII, 42-44.

⁹ 'Historia vite et gestorum per dominum magnum cancellarium', ed. by Carlo Bornate, *Miscellanea di storia Italiana*, 48 (1915), 233-568 (pp. 405-06). Translated in John M. Headley, 'The Habsburg World Empire and the Revival of Ghibellinism', in *Theories of Empire, 1450-1800*, ed. by David Armitage, *An Expanding World, The European Impact on World History 1450-1800*, 20 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), pp. 45-79 (p. 50).

Constantine the Great himself, Gattinara here implies, has the Empire that Constantine divided into its Eastern and Western Provinces witnessed so superlative an Emperor as now appears in the person of Charles. The Empire under Charlemagne, or Charles the Great [Carolo magno], Gattinara writes in his *Responsiva oratio*, had remained divided because overrun by enemies of the Christian religion. The Empire under Charles V – Charles the Greatest [Carolo Maximo] – would, however, be reunited under the obedience of Christ.¹⁰

Like Gattinara, Charles's confessor, Bishop Antonio de Guevara of Guadix, was also concerned to identify Charles as the global overlord ordained by providence to oversee the institution of Christian peace on earth. In his treatise *El Relox de Principes*, written between 1518 and 1524, Guevara asserts how God himself 'willeth that there be but one Monarchyall kynge, and lorde of the worlde', and that the designs of providence in this respect have converged in Charles V.¹¹ 'For although your imperial estate is much, and your catholike perso[n]ne deserueth more', Guevara writes to Charles, 'your thoughtes are so highly bent vnto aduenturous deedes, & your harte so couragious to set vppon them, that your maiestie litle estemeth the inheritaunce of your predecessours, in respect of that you hope to gayne, to leaue to your successours' (sig. b4^r). Charles is intent on conquests beyond the contours of his already extensive patrimony, and Guevara writes that he would applaud such 'valiaunt deades' if 'warre is iustly begonne' (sigs. b3^{r-v}). His criteria for 'just war' are expounded later on in the *Diall*. 'I commend, approue, and exalte princes,' Guevara writes, 'whiche are carefull and stoute, to keape and defende that, whiche their prodecessours lefte them' (sig. K1^r). Guevara here condones the consolidation through war of territories already acquired, but he condemns the acquisition through conquest of territories beyond these existing frontiers. His caveat of the 'just war' would seem in this respect to condemn the 'aduenturous deedes' of conquest to which he believes Charles aspires. In fact, as Lisa van Hijum has suggested, Guevara's willingness to applaud wars incited through self-defence 'provides a theoretical justification for

¹⁰ The relevant passage from the *Responsiva* is reproduced in Headley, p. 71, n. 15. Headley cites from the text printed in Philip Frederick Hane, *Historia sacrorum* (Kiel, 1728), pp. 58-60.

¹¹ *The Diall of Princes. Compiled by the reuerende father in God, Don Anthony of Gueuara, Bysshop of Guadix. Preacher and Cronicler, to Charles the fyft Emperour of Rome. Englysshed oute of the Frenche, by Thomas North* (London: John Wayland, 1557; STC 12427), sig. k1^v. All references cite from this edition. For its date of composition, see Guevara's prefatory 'Argument of the Booke' (sigs. B6^r-C2^v). For discussion, see Ernest Grey, *Guevara: A Forgotten Renaissance Author*, *International Archives of the History of Ideas*, 4 (The Hague, NL: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), pp. 1-22.

Charles's crusading politics'.¹² This theoretical proviso upholding conquests undertaken in the name of crusade can be seen to influence the crusading rhetoric of the Anglo-Imperial alliance against France, concluded in 1521, and celebrated the following year in the London *Entry* of Charles V and Henry VIII.

The conflict between the Valois and Habsburgs arose from their rival claims to dominion over the duchies of Milan and Genoa.¹³ Louis XII of France seized Milan in 1499, but had been forced to surrender it to papal and Aragonese forces in 1512. Immediately after his accession in 1515, Louis XII's successor, Francis I, chose to re-invade Milan and annex Genoa. Habsburg pretensions to dominion in northern Italy followed Charles's election to the imperial office in 1519. Gattinara proposed strategic reasons for annexing Milan and Genoa, identifying northern Italy as a 'corridor' that could effectively conjoin Habsburg territories in northern and southern Europe by land, thus circumventing the existing need to circumnavigate the French-Atlantic seaboard. Gattinara's identification of Milan as the strategic axis around which the Habsburg Empire could revolve was reinforced by his belief in the spiritual centrality of the Italian peninsula in the global empire that he believed Charles would establish on earth.¹⁴ Possessed with this sense of Milan's two-fold importance as the spiritual heartland and strategic hub of Charles V's Empire, Gattinara began in 1520 to negotiate a confederacy with the pope that would compel the French to retreat from northern Italy. Francis I reacted to rumours of this papal-Imperial alliance with a series of pre-emptive attacks during the summer of 1521 against Castilian Navarre and Charles's Burgundian territories.

The outbreak of war led to English involvement in autumn 1521 as arbiter between France and the Empire at the Conference of Calais. Henry VIII was ostensibly bound by his pledge of perpetual friendship with Francis I, concluded in the Universal Peace Treaty of October 1518, and celebrated in June 1520 at the Field of Cloth of Gold, to side with France in its present conflict with the Emperor.¹⁵ The very

¹² Lisa M. van Hijum, 'Charles V and his Ideal: One Emperor, One Empire', in *The Propagation of Power in the Medieval West*, ed. by Martin Gosman, Arjo Vanderjagt, and Jan Veenstra, *Mediaevalia Groningana*, 23 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1997), pp. 129-142 (p. 138).

¹³ See Maltby, pp. 32-37, and *NCE*, III, 430.

¹⁴ See Headley, pp. 59-68.

¹⁵ The Treaty of Universal Peace was concluded between Henry VIII and the ambassadors of Francis I on 2 October 1518. The treaty also included Leo X, Maximilian I, and Charles I of Spain as the other principal confederates. Its articles are calendared in *LP*, II.ii (1864), 1372-3. For its relation to the Field of Cloth of Gold, see Joycelyne G. Russell, *The Field of Cloth of*

notion, however, of an Anglo-French alliance against the Emperor was seen to contravene the over-arching implications of the Universal Peace, which had identified Anglo-French union as the cornerstone around which a Europe-wide alliance could be built. Cardinal Wolsey's alleged role at the Calais Conference was to seek a truce between Charles V and Francis I, in accordance with Henry VIII's pledged obligations to the ideals enshrined in the 1518 treaty. His underlying objective, however, was to propose an alliance with the Emperor against France, and to pledge the Princess Mary as spouse to Charles V.¹⁶

The Anglo-Imperial alliance would shatter the *pax Christiana* that the 1518 Treaty of Universal Peace had sought tentatively to construct. In Erasmus's *Querela pacis*, first published in December 1517, the person of Peace admonishes the monarchs of England, France, and Spain to desist from internecine strife after the example of Christ. Erasmus fulminates against 'the disgraceful and frivolous pretexts' that 'Christian princes find for calling the whole world to arms', and he laments that 'the English are hostile to the French, for no other reason than that they are French'. 'How can something so trivial weigh more with people than so many natural ties, and so many bonds in Christ?', he asks. In his pacifist appeal to the reconciliation of conflict in Christendom, Erasmus echoes the unitary rhetoric being promulgated at this time in the epistles of Leo X. Addressing the princes of Christendom, Erasmus alludes to the fact that 'great Leo, peacemaker and lover of peace, has raised his standard with a general call for peace, proving himself a true vicar of Christ'.¹⁷ For Leo X, peace in Christendom constituted a necessary prerequisite for crusade against the Turk. In his letter to Henry VIII of 2 July 1517, Leo expatiates on the enormity of the Ottoman Empire, and exhorts that Henry take up arms against the Turk.¹⁸ Leo's plea to Henry VIII echoes the appeal made by Francis I the previous January. In a letter dated 21 January 1516, the Venetian ambassador Sebastian Giustinian reports that Francis had recently implored 'King Henry to muster an army and march on the Infidel'. Far from countenancing Francis's call to arms against the Turk, writes Giustinian, Henry had

Gold: Men and Manners in 1520 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 1-21, and Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 124-169.

¹⁶ This is corroborated by Wolsey's letter to Henry VIII, written on the day of his departure for Calais, 25 July 1521 (*LP*, III.ii (1867), 585). Wolsey forwards letters to Henry from Charles V, and comments that these show how inclined the Emperor is 'to the strait conjunction between your grace and him'. Wolsey's embassy to Calais is discussed in Greg Walker, *John Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 72-100.

¹⁷ *CWE*, XXVII (1986), 289-322 (p. 305, p. 315, p. 321)

¹⁸ *CSP (Venetian)*, II (1867), 396-97.

threatened to 'go to war with France', unless Francis stopped supporting the renegade Duke of Albany in his bid for the Scottish throne.¹⁹ 'Why is this evil passion not let loose upon the Turks?', Erasmus asks. 'Unholy conflicts' originating in Christendom, he suggests, can be sublimated through holy war against a 'common enemy'. By identifying a 'common purpose' around which Christian nations can unite, Erasmus concludes, such a crusade would itself produce the *pax Christiana* that Leo X was hoping to establish in Europe.²⁰

The clauses of the Treaty of Universal Peace, concluded in London on 2 October 1518, reiterate the relation between Christian conciliation and Christian crusade that Erasmus and Leo X both identify. This treaty committed England and France to an alliance against the Turk. As co-signatory, it seemed that Henry was finally heeding the crusading rhetoric of Leo X and Francis I. Included alongside the two signatories, as principal confederates in this crusade, were Leo X, the future Emperor Charles V, and his grandfather, Emperor Maximilian I.²¹ In a letter dated 5 October, the Venetian Signory instructed Giustinian to congratulate Henry VIII on his alliance with France, to resolve whether 'the King of England purposes mentioning the Signory in any league against the Turks', and, if so, 'to represent to the King the readiness of the State to act for the benefit of the Christian commonwealth'.²² The same day, Giustinian himself wrote from England to report the proclamation of Universal Peace at St Paul's. His letter implies doubt that the Signory's commitment to the cause of crusade would ever be put to the test, for it questions whether the elevated rhetoric of the Universal Peace accompanied any concrete resolve to carry out the planned crusade. 'After [...] an elegant oration', Giustinian recounts,

the King, the Cardinal of York, and the French ambassadors proceeded to the high altar, where the articles of the peace were read, and sworn by both parties, but in a tone audible only to themselves, which was tantamount to their having cancelled the words of the preamble concerning the expedition against the Turks.²³

The confederates of the Universal Peace never carried out their proposed expedition against the Turks, and their confederacy was in any event curtailed by the conclusion of the Anglo-Imperial alliance against France of 1521. The crusading

¹⁹ *CSP (Venetian)*, II (1867), 279-80.

²⁰ *CWE*, XXVII (1986), 314.

²¹ *CSP (Venetian)*, II (1867), 467-68.

²² *CSP (Venetian)*, II (1867), 463-64.

rhetoric of the Universal Peace nevertheless reappears in the clauses of the Anglo-Imperial treaties of August and November 1521. The first treaty, signed at Bruges on 25 August, commits England and the Empire to a combined offensive against France, beginning March 1523. Each confederate was to mobilise twenty thousand infantrymen and a ten-thousand-strong cavalry for a two-pronged assault upon northern France and its Italian dependencies. The treaty accounts for the repercussions of the ongoing Franco-Imperial conflict that negotiations at Calais were ostensibly attempting to resolve. If this conflict remained unresolved by November 1521, England would then be compelled to enter into the conflict on the side of the Emperor. The second treaty, concluded at Calais on 24 November 1521, reiterates these resolutions, which were reaffirmed in the Treaty of Windsor, concluded on 16 June 1522 as part of Charles V's visit to England.²⁴

Each of these treaties bears a stylistic resemblance, both to each other, and to the preamble of the Treaty of Universal Peace. This preamble consolidated Universal Peace by alluding to the commitment of its signatories to the cause of crusade. It echoes Erasmus in so far as it identifies in a 'common enemy' a 'common cause' around which Christendom can unite. The clauses of the Anglo-Imperial treaties similarly consolidate this bilateral confederacy by identifying the purpose of this alliance with the 'common cause' of crusade. Insofar as they identify Francis rather than the Turk as the 'common enemy' in this holy war, however, these two treaties disrupt the *pax Christiana* that the Universal Peace had aimed to establish, even as they appropriate its unitary rhetoric of crusade. The third article of the Treaty of Bruges mobilises the spiritual arm of Leo X alongside the armies of England and the Empire in an attempt to impart the inviolability of papal edict to their 'unholy conflict' with France. The sixth article binds the Pope to issue bulls of interdiction against France. The seventh alludes to the traditional office of the Emperor as protector of the papal Church, and exonerates his bilateral offensive with England in relation to this sacred role. The tenth identifies both Charles and Henry with this responsibility to defend the Roman Church. It condemns Francis as a heretic, and confirms that for this reason 'it shall be lawful for the Pope, Emperor and king of England to turn their arms against the enemies of the Christian faith'.²⁵

²³ *CSP (Venetian)*, II (1867), 462-63.

²⁴ *LP*, III.ii (1867), 620-21, 760-61, and 983-84.

²⁵ *LP*, III.ii (1867), 620-21 (p. 621).

These Anglo-Imperial treaties thus appropriate the crusading rhetoric of the Universal Peace in order to identify Francis and the Turk as ‘enemies of the Christian faith’. They present this ‘unholy conflict’ with Francis as a holy war against heresy, and so approach the Anglo-Imperial confederacy in relation to Charles and Henry’s continuing commitment to the ‘common cause’ of crusade. In a letter of 9 June 1522 to his Secretary Jean de la Sauche, Charles V wrote from London about the ongoing success of the Imperial campaign against Francis in Milan and Genoa, and about Henry VIII’s determination ‘to send still more men to Calais, to join the Emperor’s’. ‘Thus you will see the good condition in which we have set the affairs of the Church that were in danger’, Charles concludes.²⁶

It is this emphasis upon what Charles and Henry have done to defend Christendom from infidel attack that distinguishes the rhetoric of the Anglo-Imperial confederacy from the rhetoric of the Treaty of Universal Peace. The Universal Peace was concerned to identify the establishment of peace in Christendom as the outcome of the crusade it proposed. The Anglo-Imperial alliance is on the other hand less concerned with peace than with the agency of its confederates in ensuring the orthodoxy of the *pax Christiana* thus established. This transfer of emphasis between the treaties of 1518 and 1521 – the former associating crusade with peace, the latter with its peacekeepers – coincides with Charles’s election to the imperial office in 1519. Apologists like Guevara believed that Charles V would through crusade undertake to establish himself as emperor of a global *pax Christiana* here on earth, and it is in his role as champion of the Roman Church that Charles is figured in the rhetoric of the Anglo-Imperial alliance.

The rhetoric of the Universal Peace was on the other hand concerned to identify crusade as the ‘common purpose’ around which Christendom can unite. Its vision of a *pax Christiana* achieved through co-operative crusade was realised on the stage of a mask performed at Greenwich on Thursday 7 October 1518, as part of the festivities that followed the proclamation of Universal Peace the previous Saturday. The mask is described in two contemporary accounts. Hall’s *Vnion* supplies a brief description, which in substance is consonant with the more comprehensive anonymous account, written in Italian and dated 9 October 1518.²⁷ According to this account, the

²⁶ *LP*, III.ii (1867), 978-79. Papal-Imperial forces had thwarted French attempts to recapture Milan at the Battle of La Bicocca (April 1522). See Maltby, pp. 34-35.

²⁷ *Vnion*, sig. LL16^r. The Italian account is calendared in *CSP (Venetian)*, II (1867), 464-67.

disguising took place on Thursday evening, within what was probably the Great Hall at Greenwich. A throne had been aligned with the acting space to form a central axis around which three sections of seating had been arranged in rectilinear fashion.²⁸ From here, Henry, his court, and ambassadors from France and elsewhere, witnessed a mask that according to this Italian account opened with actors representing Turks and playing on drums. These were followed by a rider, ‘a person called Reaport, appareled in Crymosyn satyn ful of to[n]ges’, writes Hall, and ‘sitting on a flye[n]g horse w[i]t[h] wynges & fete of gold’. The Italian observer recounts that this winged horse had announced himself as ‘the horse Pegasus, who, having heard of this peace and marriage, flew to announce it to the whole world’. After this, the Italian account continues, a ‘handsome triumphal car’ depicting a castle upon a rock was discovered behind a lowered curtain. Within the rock was a cave hung with silk curtains, and within the cave were housed ‘nine very handsome damsels with wax candles in their hands, all dressed alike’.²⁹ Nine male youths, also in matching livery, were seated about the rock, from which a grove of trees had sprung. This contained an olive tree with the arms of Leo X, a fir tree with the arms of Maximilian I, a lily with the arms of Francis I, a rose bush with the arms of Henry VIII, and a pomegranate tree with the arms of Charles of Spain – ‘In toke[n]’, Hall asserts, ‘[that] all these .v. pote[n]tates were ioined together in one league against [the] enemies of Christes fayth’. An infant girl, dressed as a queen and with a dolphin in her lap, was prostrated before the olive tree with her feet upon the base of the rose bush – an allusion to the marriage alliance between the Dauphin and Princess Mary, for which the Treaty of Universal Peace had made provision. The significance of this allegory was subsequently explained in French by Reaport, the rider of Pegasus.

“That rock is the rock of peace; the Queen and the Dauphin thereupon signify the marriage. The olive I have given to the Pope, because it signifies peace and it becomes his Holiness, as he is the commencement of this peace. Then I have given the fir to the Emperor as it is the tallest of trees, and the strongest, and therefore becoming him. [...] To the King of Spain I have given the pomegranate, because it is round, and he in like manner is well nigh lord of the whole globe. And as all these personages rejoyce at this peace, as also does the whole world, I planted the trees on the rock of peace.” The Turk replied, “Thou speakest not the truth: I, who am of this world, rejoyce not at it.” The other rejoined, “The whole world rejoices.” Thereupon the Turk said, “I will

²⁸ For theatrical conventions at the Tudor court, see John H. Astington, *English Court Theatre, 1558-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 75-95.

²⁹ *CSP (Venetian)*, II (1867), 466.

now show whether I have soldiers in the world;" and so some 15 armed men appeared on each side and fought a tourney.³⁰

The Greenwich mask approaches crusade as a cooperative exercise to be undertaken by all five confederates of the Universal Peace. Its political allegory, Hall suggests, betokens the 'league against [the] enemies of Christes fayth' that had been concluded the previous Saturday at St Paul's, and which had included as principal confederates each of the potentates whose ensigns appeared on the rock of peace.

In contrast to this *pax Christiana* produced through cooperative crusade, apologists for Charles V identified the Emperor alone with this responsibility to undertake crusade, and they upheld his pretensions to world rule in relation to his role as champion of the universal Church. This relation between Charles's aspirations to world rule, and his responsibility as Emperor to undertake crusade, had been anticipated as early as 1516 in the iconography of the device commissioned that summer from the Milanese humanist Luigi Marliano to celebrate Charles's recent accession to the crown of Aragon.³¹ Marliano's device first appeared in October 1516, when it adorned Charles's seat at the eighteenth chapter of the Burgundian Order of the Golden Fleece, the first chapter to be held since Charles's coming of age in January 1515, and so the first over which Charles, in his majority as Duke of Burgundy, would preside as master. A panel containing a version of this painted device survives from the nineteenth chapter, convened at Barcelona in March 1519, in anticipation of Charles's election to the imperial office that June. It consists of twin columns, each on islands circumvented by water. In between the columns is depicted a fire-steel and flint with a spray of sparks.³² According to Rosenthal, the fire-steel and flint refer back to the late fourteenth-century devices of the crusader John the Fearless, which depicted a carpenter's plane and spray of wood shavings, and later the sparks struck by the fire-steel and flint, in recognition of his pledge in 1396 to reduce the forces of Islam little by little. His son, Philip the Good, institutionalised his father's crusading resolve by founding the Order of the Golden Fleece in 1430 for the purpose of defending Christendom against infidel attack.³³

³⁰ *CSP (Venetian)*, II (1867), 467.

³¹ Charles inherited the crown of Aragon upon the death of Ferdinand of Aragon on 23 January 1516. The invention by Marliano of Charles's device has been dated to July 1516. See Earl E. Rosenthal, 'The Invention of the Columnar Device of Emperor Charles V at the Court of Burgundy in Flanders in 1516', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 36 (1973), 198-230 (p. 222).

³² The panel is reproduced in Rosenthal, plate 31a.

³³ See Rosenthal, pp. 199-211.

Marliano incorporated the sparks of John the Fearless in the device he designed for Charles as Master of the Order of the Golden Fleece. Rosenthal argues that by accepting this device, Charles ‘meant to recall the pledge of 1396 and to present himself as the descendant who would fulfil the sacred vow to retake the Holy Land’ (p. 205). The iconography of Charles’s device anticipates his commitment as Emperor to the cause of crusade, and it is this relation between empire and crusade that Marliano chose to emphasise in the sermon he delivered before the eighteenth chapter of 1516. In this sermon, Rosenthal asserts, Marliano had ‘envisioned a global empire, larger and more powerful than any previously known, under a single Christian ruler – the new Master of the Order of the Golden Fleece’ (p. 223). Marliano compares the onus of the imperial office being prepared for Charles with the burden of the tasks assigned to the legendary Hercules, and in so doing he alludes to the other element of Charles’s device, the twin columns that legend has Hercules place at the Straits of Gibraltar. These columns functioned in legend to delimit the western-most boundaries of the classical world. Their depiction in Charles’s device alongside the crusading connotations of the fire-steel and flint therefore functioned to identify Charles as the new Hercules who would redefine the contours of Christendom through crusades against the Ottomans. The device intimates that Charles will use his new role as master of the Order of the Golden Fleece to embark on a crusade against the Turk, and it celebrates the fact that in so doing he will ‘expand Christian rule’, writes Rosenthal, “‘beyond the Columns of Hercules”, east and west, to the ends of the earth’ (p. 230).

The articles of the Anglo-Imperial treaties relate the offensive they propose to the Emperor’s responsibility to defend Christendom from infidel attack. In so doing, they identify Francis with the Turk as the ‘common enemy’ that requires extirpation. The crusading rhetoric of the Bruges and Calais treaties of 1521 was echoed in the third article of the Treaty of Windsor, concluded on 16 June 1522. This alludes to an expedition against the Turk, but argues that this can only be undertaken once peace has been established in Christendom. It was the ambition of Francis I that was undermining this *pax Christiana*, the article contends, and it explains that England and the Empire had therefore undertaken to attack Francis in order to suppress his ambition and so establish peace on earth.³⁴ It was this need to reconfirm the Anglo-

³⁴ *LP*, III.ii (1867), 983-84.

Imperial treaties of 1521 that had occasioned Charles's visit to England the following summer, and the pageants with which he was greeted upon his *Entry* into London on 6 June 1522 anticipate the crusading rhetoric of the treaty concluded at Windsor ten days later. Apologists had related the Emperor's crusading role to the global empire that they believed Charles would establish on earth. What effect did Henry's participation as a confederate in the Emperor's holy war against Francis have upon Charles's pretensions to world supremacy? We have seen how in his letter of 9 June 1522, Charles had affirmed 'the good condition in which we have set the affairs of the Church that were in danger'. The plural pronoun involves both Charles and Henry in this holy war with Francis. Their mutual claims to be defending Christendom through war with France serve to question the hierarchy between the Emperor and other kings that was implied by apologists concerned to present Charles's claims to world rule in relation to his role as champion of the Church. That their equality of function undermined the hierarchical distinction between the Emperor and King of England is implicit earlier on in Charles's letter of 9 June 1522. 'On the 6th entered London in great triumph,' he writes, 'not only like brothers of one mind, but in the same attire'.³⁵ Like the Anglo-Imperial alliance that it celebrates, the rhetoric of the 1522 *Entry* presents this 'unholy conflict' with France as a holy war against heresy. It stages the shared responsibility of its protagonists, Charles and Henry, to protect the Roman Church from infidel attack, but in so doing, I want to argue that the rhetoric of the *Entry* undermines the hierarchy between the Emperor and other kings that apologists for Charles V were concerned to construct.

* * *

Aside from the accounts in Hall's *Vnion* and the anonymous *Descrypcion of the pageantes*, two other documents associated with the 1522 *Entry* are today extant. The London Aldermen commissioned Latin verses from William Lily to accompany six of the nine pageants performed as part of the *Entry*, and an anonymous English translation of these was printed with the Latin text in a pamphlet produced by Richard Pynson in 1522.³⁶ Lily's Latin verses were reprinted, with minor textual variants and

³⁵ *LP*, III.ii (1867), 978.

³⁶ *Of the tryu[m]phe/ and the v[er]ses that Charles themperour/ & the most myghty redouted kyng of England/ Henry the. viii. were saluted with/ passyng through London* ([London]: Richard Pynson, [1522]; STC 15606.7). A transcription is printed in C. R. Baskervill, 'William Lily's Verse for the Entry of Charles V into London', *The Huntington Library Bulletin*, 9 (1936), 1-14 (pp. 8-14). For Lily's commission, see Baskervill, pp. 3-4, and Anglo, pp. 187-88.

deviations, in Hall's *Vnion*. Hall omits Lily's Latin *Acclamatio* to the Emperor, and reproduces these verses without attribution to Lily.³⁷ An anonymous and apparently contemporary draft-plan of the pageant sequence was reprinted from an unidentified source in *Lord Somers's Tracts* (1748). Entitled 'The Entry of Charles I. into London', it contains descriptions of each pageant, with some comments on their significance.³⁸

The accounts in Hall and the *Descrypcion* are substantially consistent with one another, although there is a significant discrepancy in their descriptions of the seventh pageant at the Great Conduit, Cheapside. Both accounts describe a quadrant-shaped castle, with walls emblazoned with escutcheons depicting the arms and devices of the Emperor and King. The *Descrypcion* goes on to relate that a rose descended from the castle to reveal a maiden inside, whereas this detail is omitted in Hall. According to Hall, the four Cardinal Virtues stood in each of the four towers of the castle. In the *Descrypcion*, they stand at the castle gate.³⁹ The account of this seventh pageant in the 'Entry of Charles I' agrees with the anonymous *Descrypcion* against Hall's variant account, although its account of the second pageant on London Bridge, and of the eighth pageant at the Standard, diverge in other respects from Hall and the anonymous *Descrypcion* alike. It is in this respect difficult to surmise which of the two accounts in the *Vnion* and *Descrypcion* is the more reliable, and the following discussion is sensitive to discrepancies between each of these respective accounts.

The author of Pynson's *Tryumphe* is concerned neither to describe the pageants, nor to transcribe the 'prouerbes many folde' that, he asserts, were 'subtilly conueyed/ at eche place' along the pageant route. 'Why shulde one write/ that eche man with his eye | Dyd wel beholde and se', he asks (sig. A2^r). The author translates Lily's Latin verses into 'rude englysshe' – verses that had been spoken by children 'in dyuers places', but which had been apparently intelligible to 'fewe or none' of the Londoners who had witnessed the *Entry* (sigs. A2^{r-v}). The first to be translated is Lily's *Acclamation* 'To the moost highe and mighty emperour Charles'. 'God gyue the grace/ long luckely to raigne', Lily writes.

³⁷ See Jean Robertson, 'L'Entrée de Charles Quint a Londres, en 1522', in *Fêtes et Cérémonies au Temps de Charles Quint*, ed. by Jean Jacquot (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1960), pp. 169-181 (pp. 172-173).

³⁸ *A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts*, 2nd edn, rev. by Walter Scott, 13 vols (London: for T. Cadell and others, 1809-15), I (1809), 32-33. This is a revised edition of *Lord Somers's Tracts*.

That thou mayst with thy shelde of hye iustyce/
 The christen people/ fortyfie and sustayne
 Agaynst false enemyes who alway deuyse
 Us to enuade/ after a moche cruell gyse
 Moores/ sarazins/ turkes/ people without pyte
 By thy mighty power/ subdued nowe may be. (sig. A3^v)

Lily's eulogy echoes Habsburg apologists, insofar as it relates the Emperor's pretensions to world rule to his role as defender of Christendom. 'With thy prowes Charles lyke a conqueroure | The vnyuersall worlde/ thou doost illustrate', Lily asserts (sig. A3^v). For Lily, as for Guevara and Gattinara, it is the unprecedented size of Charles's inherited Empire that identifies the Emperor as he whom God has ordained to establish Christian peace on earth. 'Of Europe Charles/ the riche and great pusaunce', Lily writes,

kyngdomes/ cyties/ and townes without semblaunce
 Reioyse manyfolde/ to obey vnto the
 And that thou shuldest/ their lorde and captayne be. (sig. A3^v)

The ideological consonance between Lily on the one hand, and Guevara and Gattinara on the other, occurs on the level of their common identification of Charles as a world ruler by virtue of his role as champion of the universal Church. Many of the pageants in the *Entry* likewise present Charles as defender of Christendom and *Dominus mundi* alike. Charles and Henry rode westwards from St George's bar and met the first of the nine pageants in front of London Bridge. This was one of the three pageants for which no verse had been commissioned from Lily. Hall writes that the pageant was peopled by two giants, who respectively represented Samson, 'with the Jawe bone of an Asse in his hande', and Hercules, who held in his 'a mightie Clubbe'. These figures bore a tablet between them, 'in the whiche', writes Hall, 'was written in Golden letters, all the Emperours Stile' (sig. QQq6^v). Instead of a writing-tablet, the *Descrypcion* describes an iron chain, upon which 'the namys off all the landys and domynyons wher the emperour is kyng and Lorde' were similarly written in letters of gold, 'in tokenning thatt the emperour is able to holde all those domynyons by pour and strengyth as the seyde gyauntys holde the same cheyne by pouer and strengyth[e]' (p. 133).

³⁹ *Vnion*, sig. RRr1^v; cp. *Descrypcion*, p. 140.

This comparison between Hercules's physical strength and Charles's political power alludes to the iconography of Charles's personal device. Marliano had incorporated the Herculean Columns into this device in order to imply that Charles's Empire was in size conterminous with the geography of the antique world. The device positions these columns on either side of a fire-steel and flint, elements associated with the Order of the Golden Fleece, and emblematic of its commitment to crusade. The *Entry* likewise incorporates allusion to Hercules and the Order of the Golden Fleece. In so doing it also aims to identify Charles's future territorial conquests as the fruits of his proposed crusades. The subject-matter of its first two pageants seems deliberately imitative of the iconography of Charles's device. The position of Hercules before London Bridge frames allusions in the second pageant on the Bridge itself to the Order of the Golden Fleece, just as Charles's device uses the Herculean Columns to frame the fire-steel and flint. The plan of the 'Entry of Charles I into London', reprinted in *Lord Somers's Tracts*, positions Hercules and Samson 'at either side of the gate' to London Bridge, over which the procession passed on its route from Southwark to Gracious Street.⁴⁰ As they approached these two giants, therefore, Charles and Henry would have glimpsed the second pageant, which according to Hall was positioned 'in the middes of the Bridge' itself (sig. QQq6^v). 'Upon the draw-bridge', the 'Entry' asserts, 'shall be one pageant of Jason with the golden fleece; because the emperor giveth the golden fleece, as the king of England doth give the garter'.⁴¹ The allusions in this pageant to the legend of Jason at Colchis were intended to point to the Order of the Golden Fleece over which Charles presided, and to point moreover to its commitment to crusade.

From the perspective of Charles and Henry as they processed towards London Bridge, the subject-matter of these first two pageants, and their positioning in relation to one another, would have acquired an iconographical configuration identical to that of Charles's device. His device frames the emblem of the Order of the Golden Fleece with the Herculean Columns, and viewed from the south-side of London Bridge, these two pageants likewise flank allusion to the legend of the Golden Fleece with the legendary figures of Hercules and Samson. This resemblance could not have been purely coincidental, but suggests a conscious borrowing by the pageants's devisers from the iconography of the Habsburg Empire.

⁴⁰ *A Collection of Tracts*, I, 32.

⁴¹ *A Collection of Tracts*, I, 32.

The fifth pageant, at the Cornhill Conduit, consisted of a mock castle with two towers, each emblazoned with the arms of the Emperor and King of England. In between these towers, writes the author of the *Descrypcion*, a palace had been constructed,

where sattu the ryght noble and victorious emprow[er] kynge Arthur w[i]t[h] a crowne imperiall in complett harnes and a swerde in hys hande w[i]t[h] the rownde table before hyme. Whiche was accompanied w[i]t[h] all the noble prynces that were vvnder his obeisaunce [...] Also ther was a childe goodly appareldde whiche saluted the emprow[er] in laten v[er]sis laudyng & resemblyng hym in noblenes to the seyd Arthur. (p. 138)

An English translation of this child's address to Charles V is printed in Pynson's *Tryumphe*. It compares 'the fame of worthy Arthure' (sig. A5^r) as a military conqueror with the similar reputation for war-like deeds enjoyed by King David amongst the Israelites, Hannibal amongst the Carthaginians, Alexander the Great amongst the Greeks, and Cato amongst the Romans.⁴² It is against the backdrop of this panoply of military heroes that Lily subsequently foregrounds the potential of Charles V to achieve conquest on a similar scale. He foresees that Charles will establish a *pax Christiana* on earth, and he relates its advent to Charles's providential role as champion of Christendom.

So thou Charles/ thou Cesar armypotent
Shalt cause thy fame and honour for to blowe
Ouer all the worlde/ from Eest to Occydent
That all folkes thy worthynesse shall knowe
For the we shall to the hygh god/ our knees bowe
Prayeng hym to sende the/ the hygh victory
That peace in erthe/ may raigne unyuersally. (sig. A5^r)

It is its expansiveness 'from Eest to Occydent' that for Lily defines the compass of the global empire that he expects Charles to establish here on earth. Lily's verse also in this respect implies allusion to the iconography of Charles's personal device. On the one hand, the columns with which Hercules had defined the westernmost frontiers of the ancient world served in Marliano's device to imply a point of

⁴² Lily's reference to 'Cato' could refer to either of two statesmen named Marcus Porcius Cato. Given the imperialist aspirations of the other military figures to whom Lily here alludes, it is probable that he here intends Cato 'the Censor', the one-time consul of northern Spain, rather than his great-grandson Cato the Younger (95-46 BC), the conservative republican and opponent of Julius Caesar's own imperialist aspirations. According to Plutarch, Cato the Censor boasted in 196 BC that he had captured more towns than he had spent days in Spain. See Alan E. Astin, *Cato the Censor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 28-50 (p. 47).

departure from which Charles's Empire could continue to expand westwards, building upon its existing Caribbean colonies to make conquests in South America itself. On the other, the occidental orientation of the Herculean Columns are in this device accompanied by the fire-steel and flint, which looks eastwards towards the Ottoman Empire, inasmuch as it represents Charles's commitment to crusade as master of the Order of the Golden Fleece. Lily, like Marliano, looks forward to an era of Christian peace under the rule of Charles V. Like Marliano, he anticipates that Charles will establish 'peace in erthe' through conquests and crusades undertaken 'from Eest to Occydent'.

The stagecraft of the *Entry* therefore echoes propaganda produced at the court of Charles V, and it does so in order to identify the imperial office with the cause of crusade, and to emphasise the centrality of the Emperor's role as champion of the Church in establishing Christian peace on earth. All this is a far cry from the Universal Peace, and its pledge to establish a *pax Christiana* through co-operative crusade. In a letter dated 5 June 1517, Erasmus had downplayed the importance of the Empire, arguing that it existed 'more in name than in reality', and that 'the world will not greatly feel the absence of such a monarch if Christian princes are united in concord among themselves'. The majesty of the ancient Roman Empire had 'gradually faded in the brilliant light of the Gospel, as the moon fades before the brightness of the sun'. 'Whether that ancient empire should be restored as it was once, is an open question', Erasmus contends. 'For my part', he continues, 'I do not think any intelligent man would desire this [...] so far is it from seeming right to defend and revive an institution which for many centuries now has been largely outdated and non-existent'.⁴³

Erasmus's identification of the waning moon with the decline of Empire implies allusion to the medieval commonplace of comparing the Apostolic See to the sun and the Empire to the moon.⁴⁴ This comparison is derived from the hierarchy between sun and moon in Genesis 1.16, and it was first adapted by Pope Innocent III to the context of the twelfth-century Investiture Struggle.⁴⁵ Innocent interpreted Genesis 1.16 to mean that the temporal power borrows authority from the spiritual

⁴³ *CWE*, IV (1977), 373-383 (pp. 381-82).

⁴⁴ For discussion, see Dante, *Monarchia*, trans. by Prue Shaw, Cambridge Medieval Classics, 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. xxvii-xxviii, and Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), p. 10.

⁴⁵ See *NCE*, VII, 42-44.

power in the same way as the moon borrows light from the sun. In the *Monarchia*, Dante rejects this idea that the hierarchy between sun and moon can be taken as precedent for papal supremacy over the Empire. Dante represents Emperor and pope as equal luminaries derivative upon Christ, whose work they undertake as the temporal and spiritual arms of divine providence here on earth.⁴⁶ Like the rhetoric of the Universal Peace, Erasmus had eclipsed the majesty of the Empire with the mutuality of a co-operative crusade against the Turk. For Dante, it is the Emperor himself who overshadows other princes of Christendom, to hold sway over a global empire as the *Dominus mundi* ordained by providence. Dante's imperial ideology anticipates that espoused by apologists like Guevara and Gattinara, although whereas Dante looked to the Emperor of his day, Henry VII, for the realisation of world empire, it is Charles V whom these apologists identify as lord of the world. 'Furthermore', writes Dante in *Monarchia*,

the world is ordered in the best possible way when justice is at its strongest in it. Thus Virgil, wishing to praise the age which seemed to be emerging in his day, sang in his *Eclogues*: 'Now the Virgin returns, the reign of Saturn returns'. For 'the virgin' was their name for justice, whom they also called 'Astraea'; the 'reign of Saturn' was their name for the best of times, which they also called 'golden'. Justice is at its strongest only under a monarch; therefore for the best ordering of the world there must be a monarchy or empire. (p. 23)

For Dante, Virgil's vision in his fourth *Eclogue* of a world restored to the peace and justice of the antique Golden Age anticipates the establishment in the Christian era of a *pax Christiana* under the absolute justice of the Holy Roman Emperor. Guevara also identifies imperial government as the best arena for the exercise of justice, and he echoes Dante in personifying this imperial exercise of justice in the person of Astraea. Guevara writes that 'betwene. 2. of the Zodaicall signes (Leo, and Libra) is a virgine named iustice: the whiche in times paste dwelled amonge men in earth, and after she was of them neglected, she ascended vp to heauen' (sig. F4^r). Following Virgil, Guevara asserts that the 'olde worlde that ran in Saturnes dayes (otherwyse called the golden worlde)' (sig. b6^v) will be re-established on earth with the return of Astraea – this 'virgine named iustice'. Like Dante, Guevara anticipates that the justice of Astraea will be embodied in the Emperor of his day. 'It is a great matter, that Prynces be pure in lyfe, and that theyr houses be well ordered, to the ende that theyr iustyce be of credyte', Guevara admonishes Charles V. 'For he

⁴⁶ *Monarchia*, pp. 107-113.

whiche of him selfe is vntrustye, there is small hope, that an other at hys handes shoulde haue iustice' (sig. F5').

In the political geographies of Dante and Guevara, it is the Emperor – whether in the person of Henry VII or Charles V – who exercises justice single-handedly over a global Golden Age of Christian peace, a world restored to the justice that in Virgil's fourth *Eclogue* is embodied in the goddess Astraea. The relation in Guevara's apologetics between this Golden Age and the Empire of Charles V also recurs in the sixth pageant of the 1522 *Entry*, where the Emperor appears on stage against a backdrop reminiscent of the Golden Age as described by Virgil and Ovid. The sixth pageant at the Cornhill Stocks is unusual in two respects. It is one of the three pageants in the *Entry* for which no verse was commissioned from Lily, and yet is also the only pageant in the sequence that has been identified as the work of a particular person, that of the London printer John Rastell.⁴⁷ Both Hall and the *Descrypcion* give accounts of the pageant, and it is from the more detailed of these accounts, that of the *Descrypcion*, that I quote:

Also att the Stockys ther dyd stand a pageaunte off an ylonde betokenyng the Ile off englonde compassede all abowte w[i]t[h] water made in siluer and byce lyke to waves off the see and rockys ionyng therto watelde abowte w[i]t[h] roddys off siluer and golde and wythyn them champion[e] contrey: mountayns and wooddys where were dyuers beste[s] goyng abowte the mountayns by vyces, and dyuers maner off trees herbys and flowres, as roses, dayeses, gyloflowres, daffadeles and other so craftely made that hitt was harde to knowe them from very naturall flowres, and in the mountayns pondys off fressh water w[i]t[h] fische. (pp. 138-39)

With its superabundance of flora and fauna, the geography of this 'champion[e] contrey' transforms the 'Ile off englonde' into the idyll of the Golden Age described by Ovid and Virgil. In *Metamorphoses*, Ovid describes the landscape from which mankind has been banished, and to which it would be restored, Virgil foresees, through the intercession of Astraea. As this 'Ile off englonde' overflows with species of 'trees herbys and flowres', so 'flores [flowers]' likewise 'natos sine semine [sprang unplanted]' in the everlasting Spring that Ovid describes.⁴⁸ 'Ipsa quoq[ue] immunis: rastroq[ue] intacta: nec ullis | Saucia uomeribus: per se dabat omnia Tellus [The earth herself, without compulsion, untouched by hoe nor ploughed by plowshare,

⁴⁷ For its attribution to Rastell, see Anglo, pp. 196-97, and Baskervill, p. 4, n. 1.

⁴⁸ *P[ublii]. Ouidii Nasonis Metamorphoseos Libri moralizati cum Pulcherrimis fabularum principalium figuris* [Lyon: Iacobi Mareschal, 1519], fol. 8^r.

of herself gave everything]', Ovid asserts (fol. 8^v). The production of crops without prior cultivation is not only a feature of the bygone era that Ovid describes, but also of the future idyll that Virgil foresees. Addressing the child that will be borne by Astraea, and under whom a 'gens aurea [golden race]' will emerge on earth, Virgil prophesies that the earth 'ipsa tibi blandos fundent cunabula flores [herself pours out for you a cradle of tempting flowers]'.⁴⁹ In the 'Ile off englonde', it is the Emperor himself who is cast into the role that Virgil here assigns to the son of Astraea. 'And att the co[m]myng off the emprow[er] the bestys dyd move and goo, the fisshes dyd sprynge, the byrdes dyd synge reioysyng', the *Descrypcion* recounts (p. 139). In this pageant, it continues,

ther were ij goodly ymages one in a castell lyke to the emprow[er] in visage, and the other in an herbar wyth rosys lyke to the kynge[s] grace with ij swerdys nakyd in ther handys. Whiche castell, garden, and the ymages dyd Ryse by a vyce. The ymages dyd beholde eche other, and then cast away ther swerdys by a vyce, and w[i]t[h] another vyce ioyned eche to other and embrasede eche other in tokennyng off love and pease. (p. 139)

An 'ymage off the father off hevyn all in burnyd golde' (p. 139) appeared at this point above the stage, to praise the peace between England and the Empire that is here betokened by the fact that both Charles and Henry choose to discard their swords on stage. Written about this image of God were the words in Latin of the seventh Beatitude from Matthew 5.9, which the *Descrypcion* translates as 'blessed be they thatt be the peaseable people for they shallbe callyd the very children off godde' (p. 139). The swords that these images of the Emperor and King of England cast aside would have reminded Charles and Henry, as they rode past this pageant at the Cornhill Stocks, of the swords with which actors playing their parts had been invested by the Emperor Charlemagne on the stage of the third pageant at the Gracious Street Conduit. Hall comments that a small fortress with three towers had been constructed at this Conduit. 'In the middle tower', he writes,

was a clothe of estate, vnder whiche sat one representyng the Emperour, and in the third tower represe[n]tyng the kyng. And Charlemagne hauyng ii. swordes gawe to the Emperour the sworde of Iustice, and to the kyng the sworde of triumphant victory, & before him sat the Pope to whom he gawe the croune of thorne & thre nayles. About this pagiant were sette all the armes of the electors of thempyre. (sig. RRr1^v)

⁴⁹ 'Ecloga III. Pollio', in *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera* (Paris: Roberti Stephani, 1532), sigs. B2^v-4^v (sig. B3^r)

Hall then transcribes, without authorial acknowledgment, Lily's Latin verse for this pageant. The *Tryumphe* translates the first stanza as follows:

Charles clere lampe/ of christen nacyon
 Of the it is spoken/ playnly in wrytyng
 Of great Charles/ to haue generacyon
 And eke thou Henry/ our souerayne lorde and kyng
 Thy great laude of swete virtue/ so bright shynyng
 Highe doctryne/ wysdome faythe/ and relygion
 Dothe excell the fortune/ of kynges echone. (sigs. A4^{r-v})

The exercise of justice was for Dante and Guevara identifiable with the goddess Astraea, and in the *Diall of Princes*, Guevara had compared Charles to Astraea's son, his Empire to the Golden Age that her son was destined to re-establish on earth. As deviser of the 'Ile off englonde', Rastell also casts the Emperor into the role that Virgil had forecast for the son of this 'virgine named iustice'. Charles's role as embodiment of justice is reinforced by the fact that Rastell has the on-stage figure of the Emperor hold a sword reminiscent of the 'sworde of Iustice' that Charlemagne had earlier bequeathed to an actor playing Charles in the pageant at the Gracious Street Conduit. This exercise of justice is for Habsburg apologists bound up with the Emperor's role as champion of the Church; the Golden Age that they anticipated Charles re-establishing on earth with his victory in crusades against the Turk. Guevara had identified the Emperor with the goddess of justice, and he had applauded crusade as the sort of 'just war' through which Charles would come to establish a Christian Golden Age on earth. In the 'Ile off englonde', Rastell also identifies justice with the justice exercised in the theatre of crusade. If the sword that Rastell's image of the Emperor holds on stage is reminiscent of the 'sworde of Iustice' with which Charles had been invested at Gracious Street, then so too is the sword that Henry holds at the Cornhill Stocks identifiable with 'the sworde of triumphant victory' that he had earlier received at Gracious Street from the Emperor Charlemagne. In the context of the Anglo-Imperial alliance that the *Entry* upholds, this sword of victory can be taken to refer to the anticipated outcome of Charles and Henry's holy war against Francis I. By having Charles and Henry discard their swords on stage 'in tokenyng off love and pease', Rastell echoes the rhetoric of the Anglo-Imperial alliance, which justified England and the Empire's war with France by alleging that Francis stood in the way of the sort of Christian peace to which both Charles and Henry were themselves committed. Rastell certainly identifies the Golden Age he recreates on stage with the justice of Charles V, but he also associates this exercise of justice with the 'just war'

that both the Emperor and King of England were preparing to undertake against France. Dante and Guevara had exclusively identified the Emperors of their day with the justice embodied in the goddess Astraea, and the *Entry* echoes their apologetics by having Charlemagne bequeath the 'sworde of Iustice' to the Emperor alone. Charles reappears at the Cornhill Stocks with a sword reminiscent of this 'sworde of Iustice', but the pageant also emphasises the instrumentality of Henry's role as crusader in establishing the Christian Golden Age of the 'Ile off englonde'. It is as confederate crusaders that Charles and Henry appear at the Cornhill Stocks, and Rastell implies that their 'just war' with Francis will establish in Christendom the sort of *pax Christiana* that is here enacted on stage.

This equality between Charles and Henry, in terms of their mutual role as champions of holy Church, is acknowledged by God himself, whose image appears in the 'Ile off englonde' in response to Charles and Henry's embrace, and whose blessing identifies both confederates in the light of their embrace as 'the peaseable people' and 'very children off godde'. It is also acknowledged in the placards that according to the *Tryumphe* were posted 'at euery pagiant' in the *Entry* (sig. A3^r). The same two verses were 'writen in letters of golde' upon every placard: 'Carolus Henricus uiuant. Defensor uterq[ue] | Henricus Fidei. Carolus Ecclesiae'. A rather free translation is provided in the *Tryumphe*:

God saue noble Charles/ and pusant kynge He[n]ry
And gyue to the[m] bothe: good helth/ lyfe/ & long
The one of holy churche defender right mighty
The other of the faithe/ as cha[m]pions moost strong. (sig. A3^r)

The inscription identifies Henry and Charles together as 'defensor uterq[ue] [both defenders]'. In so doing, it celebrates the conferment upon Henry and his successors of the title *Fidei Defensor*. This was promulgated by Leo X in a bull dated 11 October 1521, although according to Hall, Henry would wait until 2 February 1522 before hearing Cardinal Wolsey formally pronounce him 'defendor of the Christian faith'.⁵⁰ By underlining the equality of Charles and Henry, in terms of their mutual presentation in the articles of the Anglo-Imperial alliance as champions of Christendom, the inscription, like Rastell's pageant at the Cornhill Stocks, undermines the singularity of Charles's role as *Ecclesiae Defensor* within the apologetics of Guevara and Gattinara. These apologists anticipated that Charles would establish

himself through the 'just war' of crusade as overlord of an era of Christian peace on earth. The rhetoric of the Anglo-Imperial alliance had on the other hand presented Henry alongside Charles as a defender of the Church in their holy war with Francis, the Christian Turk, and it is within this role that both the Emperor and King of England are likewise presented in the rhetoric of the 1522 *Entry*. Charles and Henry are both cast as crusaders on the stage of the 'Ile off englonde'. This equality serves to undermine the hierarchy between the Emperor and other kings that is upheld in the apologetics of the Habsburg Empire, on the basis of the Emperor's traditional role as champion of Christendom. In the verse he composed for the pageant of Charlemagne at the Gracious Street Conduit, Lily chose to undermine this hierarchy between the Emperor and King of England by asserting that Henry, like Charles, 'dothe excell the fortune of kynges echone', by virtue of his role in the Anglo-Imperial alliance as champion of holy Church. A more explicit affirmation of Henry's imperial status alongside the Emperor's is played out upon the stage itself of the Gracious Street pageant, if we accept the alternative account in the *Descrypcion* over the above-quoted account in Hall. This account agrees with Hall's in its description of a tripartite stage peopled with Charlemagne, the pope, and actors playing Charles and Henry. The *Descrypcion* departs from Hall when detailing the gifts that Charlemagne bestowed upon the Emperor and King of England. 'In the myddys' of this pageant, the *Descrypcion* asserts, stood Charlemagne 'holdyng in his hande ij swerdys and .ij. Crownys imperyall off gold, offeryng oon[e] to the emprow[er] and the other to the kyng[es] grace' (p. 135).

Hall writes that Charlemagne had at Gracious Street invested Charles and Henry with the swords of justice and triumphant victory respectively, but according to the alternative account in the *Descrypcion*, Charlemagne had also conferred imperial crowns upon the Emperor and King of England. Apologists like Guevara anticipated that Charles would through crusades against the Infidel undertake to establish a global empire, and Guevara had identified Charles with the son of Astraea, Charles's global empire with the Golden Age that Astraea's son would re-establish on earth. Rastell's 'Ile off englonde' echoes Guevara's apologetics in so far as it also casts Charles into the role that Virgil had forecast for the son of Astraea. Like the rhetoric of the Anglo-Imperial alliance it sought to celebrate, however, Rastell's pageant emphasises that Henry was also instrumental in the establishment of Christian peace through crusades

⁵⁰ *Vnion*, sig. Pp6^v. See Anglo, pp. 173-74.

against the Christian Turk, Francis I. In the 'Ile off englonde', Rastell implies that it is this confederacy between the Emperor and King of England that will serve to establish on earth the sort of Christian Golden Age enacted on stage. Rastell casts both Charles and Henry as the sons of Astraea, and he does so in recognition of their mutual presentation as champions of Christendom in the rhetoric of the Anglo-Imperial alliance. The *Entry* invites its audience to read imperialist pretensions into its presentation of Charles and Henry as crusaders on stage, and these pretensions are made explicit at Gracious Street, when, according to the *Descrypcion*, Charlemagne conferred 'Crownys imperyll' upon Charles and Henry alike. Apologists for Charles V had celebrated the size of his inherited patrimony, and anticipated that Charles would further expand his Empire beyond the Columns of Hercules to the four corners of the world. This expansionist ideology of empire is also identified with Charles in the *Entry*, for Lily compares Charles to 'the vnyuersall worlde' in his *Acclamation*, and in his verse for the pageant at the Cornhill Conduit, he upholds Charles as a 'Cesar armypotent', whose fame will blow 'ouer all the worlde/ from Eest to Occydent'. If it is the crown of this universal empire that Charlemagne confers upon the Emperor at the Gracious Street pageant, then what sort of empire might the imperial crown that is here bestowed upon Henry betoken? Charles's aspirations to world rule are in the *Entry* related to his role as champion of Christendom. Does Henry, like Charles, also aspire to world rule by virtue of his role in the Anglo-Imperial alliance as a defender of the Church?

* * *

An imperial crown was again conferred upon Henry VIII in the preamble to the Act of Appeals, promulgated eleven years after the 1522 *Entry* in April 1533. 'Where by dyvers sundrie olde autentike histories and cronicles', the preamble asserts, 'it is manifestly declared and exp[re]ssed that this Realme of Englonde is an Impire [...] gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King having the Dignitie and Roiall Estate of the Imperiall Crowne of the same'. According to Philip Grierson, the term 'Imperiall Crowne' functions in the Appeals Act as shorthand for describing the powers it invests in the King of England. The act made Henry 'Sup[re]me heede' over a political body 'compacte of all sortes and degrees of people', and divided 'in termes and by names of Sp[irit]ualtie and Temporalitie'.⁵¹ In the rhetoric of the Royal Supremacy, the term

⁵¹'An Acte that the Appeles in suche Cases as have ben used to be pursued to the See of Rome shall not be from hensforth had ne used but wythin this Realme' (24 Hen. VIII, c. 12), in

'Imperiall Crowne' stands for Henry's newfound pretensions to empire in, or authority over, the English Church, but the Royal Supremacy statutes were also accompanied by images of Henry wearing a 'closed', or imperial crown. The first of Henry's Great Seals predates the Royal Supremacy and depicts Henry wearing the circlet-shaped open crown. Henry commissioned a further two Seals during his reign, however, the second in 1532, the third in 1542. Both depict Henry wearing a closed crown that consists of a circlet with two intersecting arched bands of metal. The closed crown first became symbolic of empire when it was adopted by Habsburgs who were elected to the office of Holy Roman Emperor in the mid-fifteenth century. The Lancastrian kings of England had adopted the closed crown as early as the late fourteenth century, but Grierson asserts that in England the closed crown did not come to be associated with imperialist pretensions until the accession of Henry VII in 1485.⁵² Grierson observes that before the accession of Henry VII, the closed crown was used in England 'as a crown of a type distinct from that worn by the kings of France' (p. 129), but that the minting of the first English sovereign in 1489 marks a watershed in the iconography of the closed crown in England. Henry VII was depicted on this coin wearing a closed crown identical to that worn by the Emperor Maximilian I on the Flemish real d'or, minted in 1487. Grierson interprets the resemblance between the designs of these two coins as a deliberate attempt by Henry VII to define himself in relation to the Holy Roman Emperor as an emperor in his own right. For Grierson, the incorporation of the closed crown on the 1489 sovereign, together with its introduction on groats issued around this time, represent 'inconspicuous but not unimportant contributions to the development of the imperial idea in England in the Tudor period' (p. 134).

The closed crown imprinted on the 1489 English sovereign is of the same design as the crown borne by Henry VIII on his Great Seal of 1532. Grierson notes that both Henry VII and VIII had in their iconography adopted the design of the Habsburg imperial crown, and he interprets their use of the closed crown as indicative of the development from 1485 of a Tudor imperial idea that would receive its fullest expression in the preamble to the 1533 Appeals Act. Despite the iconographical

Statutes, III (1817), 427-29 (p. 427). Philip Grierson, 'The Origins of the English Sovereign and the Symbolism of the Closed Crown', *The British Numismatic Journal*, 33 (1964), 118-134.

⁵² Dale Hoak has more recently argued that the closed crown acquired imperialist connotations in England as early as the reign of Henry V (d. 1422). See Dale Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', in *Tudor Political Culture*, ed. by Dale Hoak (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 54-103.

resemblance between the Habsburg and Tudor closed crowns, Grierson distinguishes the Habsburg imperial ideology from the imperialist pretensions of these two Tudor kings. His analysis fails to also differentiate early Tudor pretensions to empire from empire as it was defined in the preamble to the Act of Appeals. Henry VII had harboured imperialist pretensions that found expression in the iconography of the 1489 sovereign, Grierson suggests, and this early Tudor imperial idea had 'prepared the way' for Henry's pretensions in 1533 to empire in the English Church (p. 134). Grierson is not the only critic to assume that the imperial ideology of Royal Supremacy had received formative expression in the imperialist pretensions of Henry VII and the young King Henry VIII. Writing fifteen years after Grierson, Walter Ullmann asserted in 1979 that 'the substance of the Act in Restraint of Appeals merely spells out in detail what had been in Henry's mind some twenty-four years earlier', at the time of his coronation in 1509.⁵³ Ullmann grounds his contention upon the evidence of an extant coronation oath corrected by Henry VIII's own hand. Henry appears to have revised this oath in the early 1530s in order to bring its content into line with the Cesaropapist ideology of the Royal Supremacy, but Ullmann argues that Henry had in fact made these autograph interlineations at the time of his coronation in 1509, some two decades before his pretensions to empire in the English Church were enshrined in the Act of Appeals.

Ullmann asserts that the oath which Henry amended had been a 'new draft [...] submitted to his approval'. Henry's 'dissatisfaction with the traditional coronation promises', he argues, had 'made him order a new version' at the time of his coronation in 1509 (p. 183). Writing at the turn of the twentieth century, Legg also assumes that this oath had been especially composed for Henry VIII. Henry, he writes, had 'ordered a new oath to be drafted', but, he continues, this 'new draft does not seem to have pleased him, and with his own hand he has corrected it so as to bring it into absolute accord with his views'.⁵⁴ In the 1930s, Schramm contended that the oath amended by Henry was much older than Legg had believed, and Ullmann would later assume. He suggests that this oath was in fact a later fourteenth-century variant of the oath originally compiled in 1308 for the coronation of Edward II.⁵⁵ At his coronation, the

⁵³ Walter Ullmann, 'This Realm of England is an Empire', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 30 (1979), 175-203 (p. 184).

⁵⁴ *English Coronation Records*, ed. by Leopold G. Wickham Legg (Westminster: Archibald Constable, 1901), pp. 240-41 (p. 240).

⁵⁵ See Percy Ernst Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation*, trans. by Leopold G. Wickham Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), pp. 213-216.

nobility had compelled Edward to recite a revised version of the twelfth-century 'Anselm' oath. To the three *praeceptas* obliging that the king keep the peace, condemn iniquity, and temper justice with mercy, the rescension sworn by Edward added a fourth request that the king uphold all legislation made by 'the people'.⁵⁶ A French translation of Edward's Latin oath was enrolled in the records of his 1308 coronation. A variant version of this oath, also in French, is printed in Stubbs's *Constitutional History of England*, and Schramm asserts that it was upon an English translation of the oath transcribed by Stubbs that Henry had later exercised his pen.⁵⁷ A word-for-word comparison between this French oath and the oath interlined by Henry VIII upholds Schramm's assumptions that the latter was a translation of this fourteenth-century variant of the oath composed for Edward II. The following transcription of the oath amended by Henry has been cross-checked with Stubbs's transcription of the French original.

{fol. 100^r} The Othe of the kinge[s] highnes ^{at every coronation}. ~~This is the othe that~~ the King shall ^{then} swere at ~~the~~ coronacion that he shall kepe and mayntene the ^{lawfull} right and the lib[er]tees of ~~holie churche~~ of olde tyme gr[au]nted by the rightuous Cristen Kinge[s] of Englonde ~~and that he~~ ^{to the holy chirche off ingland nott preiudyciall to hys Iurysdyction and dignite ryall and that he} shall kepe all the lond[es] honours and dignytes rightuous and {?} ^{freedommes nott preiudiciall to hys Iurysdyction and dygnite ryall} of the crowne of Englonde in all man[er] hole w[ith]out any man[er] of mynysshement/ and the righte[s] of the Crowne hurte decayed or lost to his power shall call agayn vnto the auncyent astate/ And that he shall ~~kepe the peace of the holie churche and of the clergie and of the people w[ith] good aecorde~~ ^{Indevore hym selfe to kepe vnite in hys clergie and temporell subiectes}/ And that ^{he shall accordyng to hys co[n]science} ~~he shall do~~ in ^{all} his iudgemente[s] ^{mynystere} equitye ~~and~~ right[uous] iustice ~~w[ith]~~ ^{diseression} ^{shewyng wher is to be shewyd mercy} ~~and mereye~~/ And that he shall gr[au]nte to holde lawis and ^{approvyd} customes of the realme/ and ^{lawfull} and nott preiudyciall to hys crowne or Imperiall Iuris[diction] ^{to his power} {fol. 100^v} kepe them and affirme them which the folk ^{noblys} and people have made and chosen ^{w[ith] hys co[n]sent}. And the evill Lawes and customes hollie to put out and stedfaste and stable peace to the people of his realme kepe and cause to be kept to his power ^{in that whych honour and equite do require}.⁵⁸

Henry is as king only willing to uphold 'lawfull' rights and liberties claimed by the English Church, and having originally qualified his promise to uphold the

⁵⁶ For the context of the 1308 revisions to the 'Anselm' oath, see Schramm, pp. 75-79. For discussion of the revisions themselves, see Schramm, pp. 203-07, and Lawrence E. Tanner, *The History of the Coronation* (London: Pitkin, 1952), pp. 15-24.

⁵⁷ Schramm, p. 214. William Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England: In its Origin and Development*, 4th edn, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), II, 109, n. 2.

freedoms of state with the proviso that these do not prejudice ‘hys Iurysdyction and dygnite ryall’, Henry evidently decided to move this saving phrase so as to further delimit the rights and liberties he grants to his Church. Henry then alters the wording of the king’s original promise to ‘kepe the peace of the holie churche and of the clergie and of the people’, so that it reads to ‘kepe vnite in hys clergie and temporell subiectes’. This pledge to preserve the unity of ‘hys clergie and temporell subiectes’ echoes the wording of the Appeals Act, which had upheld Henry as ‘Sup[re]me heede’ of a political body divided ‘in termes and by names of Sp[irit]ualtie and Temporaltie’. As this act had used the term ‘Imperiall Crowne’ as shorthand for Henry’s headship over Church and state alike, so in the oath he amended, Henry likewise subordinates clergy and laity to the supreme headship of ‘hys crowne or Imperiall Iuris[diction]’.

Henry amended this oath in order to bring its *praeceptas* into line with the imperial ideology enshrined in the Appeals Act. For Ullmann, this ideological consonance between act and oath implies that Henry was already at the time of his coronation claiming authority over the English Church, ‘some twenty-four years before’ these imperialist pretensions found expression in the Appeals Act. Grierson asserts that Henry VII’s imperialist pretensions in the late fifteenth century had ‘paved the way’ for the passage of the Appeals Act in 1533, and Ullmann also argues that the imperial ideology enshrined in this act was identical to that which Henry had inherited from his father upon his accession in 1509. Ullmann bases this argument upon the assumption that Henry had undertaken to amend this oath in preparation for his coronation in 1509, but the weight of evidence argues against this supposition. As Legg asserts, ‘there is no evidence that the oath thus revised was ever used’ at the coronation of Henry VIII (p. 240). Schramm likewise disassociates the oath from the occasion of Henry’s coronation in 1509. Like Legg, he identifies the oath sworn by Henry VIII, and by his father before him, with the ‘Lytlington’ version of the oath contained in the *Liber regalis*. The four *praeceptas* of the 1308 oath had been expanded after 1363 at the instigation of Abbot Nicholas Lytlington of Westminster, to include a fifth request obliging the monarch to uphold the rights and privileges of the Church in England. It was the ‘Lytlington’ recension that had formed the basis of the oath sworn by Henry VII at his coronation in 1485, and according to Schramm, ‘no alterations except a few verbal improvements were made’ to this oath for the coronation of Henry VIII (p. 213).

⁵⁸ BL, Cotton MSS, Tiberius E VIII, fols. 100^{r-v}.

The oath amended by Henry was therefore based upon a version of an oath that was itself superseded in the later fourteenth century by the Lytlington recension. It was the Lytlington recension that since the accession of Henry IV in 1399 had been recited at every coronation up until that of Henry VII in 1485.⁵⁹ This fact alone argues against Ullmann's assumption that the oath interlined by Henry had been revised for use in his coronation in 1509. The Lytlington recension had by the time of Henry's accession in 1509 been in use for over a century, and it is therefore most unlikely, had Henry expressed a desire to amend the oath he was to recite at his coronation, that he would have been offered anything other than a copy of the Lytlington recension to correct. Not only was the oath that Henry amended obsolete, insofar as it was based upon a recension that had been superseded over a century before Henry's accession in 1509, it was also obscure, since as an 'unofficial' variant of the 1308 recension, it had never before been recited at a coronation service, either before or after the introduction of the Lytlington recension in 1399. 'It was never authoritative', Schramm asserts of the version of the oath revised by Henry VIII.

It was an error to include it in a collection of statutes, but, as soon as it had appeared there, it was translated into English along with other texts. Hence the text which Henry VIII examined and found altogether inadequate for his ideas. (p. 216)

Schramm's narrative of a chance find by Henry VIII of an obscure and obsolete oath upon which to exercise his pen certainly suggests a more plausible provenance for these revisions than does Ullmann's assertion that Henry had revised the oath in preparation for his coronation in 1509. Writing fifteen years after Schramm, Tanner asserts that the oath was 'altered by the King after his crowning', and that Henry had done so 'with the intention of bringing the oath into conformity with his later and altered views of his position as head of the Church' (p. 23). In defining these views as 'later and altered', Tanner questions the assumption, to which both Grierson and Ullmann would later give expression, that the imperial ideology enshrined in the Appeals Act had already been formulated in the earlier Tudor period by Henry VII and the young King Henry VIII. Far from giving expression to pretensions that he had inherited from his father, I would suggest that Henry VIII's claim in the Appeals Act to exercise authority over an 'Empire' compact of Church and state arose from the immediate context of what Archbishop Cranmer termed Henry's

'great cause of matrimony' – his convictions after 1527 that his eighteen-year marriage to Catherine of Aragon contravened the Levitical prohibitions proscribing marriage to a deceased brother's wife.⁶⁰

It was Charles V's embargo upon the export from Rome of bulls annulling Henry's marriage to Catherine of Aragon that led to the trade-off of the Royal Supremacy, whereby Henry exercised his new-found imperialist pretensions over the English Church to gain his annulment from a pliant See of Canterbury, only to lose the good opinion of Emperor and pope in the process. On 16 April 1533, nine days after the passage of the Appeals Act through parliament, Eustace Chapuys, the Emperor's ambassador in England at this time, wrote to Charles V to report his latest audience with Henry on the subject of the Royal Supremacy.⁶¹ Chapuys had gone to court to complain that the Appeals Act, which provincialised canon law by prohibiting foreign courts from hearing law suits originating in England, had been promulgated to the visible prejudice of Catherine of Aragon's own appeal to Rome in the matter of her marriage with Henry VIII. The King, Chapuys alleged, 'wished to compel' Catherine 'to renounce her appeal, and leave her case to be decided by his subjects, who, through promises or threats, or from pure fear [...] would only determine according to his fancy'.⁶²

In his response, Henry affirmed that 'the statute of prohibition had been passed by Parliament, which the Queen, as a subject, was compelled to obey'.⁶³ The Emperor, he asserted, 'had no right to interfere with his laws, and, whatever might be said of them, he would pass such laws in his kingdom as he liked'.⁶⁴ Chapuys disclosed to Henry VIII that as ambassador he had been given 'express power and command' by the Emperor 'to treat of the affair of the Queen's marriage [...] and do

⁵⁹ See Schramm, pp. 211-213.

⁶⁰ *LP*, VI (1882), 152. Leviticus 18.6 states 'Turpitudine[m] vxoris fr[at]ris tui no[n] reuelabis: q[ui]a turpitude[m] fratris tui e[st] [No man shal approach to her that is next of his bloud, to reueale her turpitude]' (Vulgate, sig. f5^v; Douai, I, 297). Leviticus 20.21 restated this proscription, and condemned its transgressors to a childless marriage. 'Qui duxerit vxore[m] fr[at]ris sui: re[m] facit illicita[m]: turpitudine[m] fr[at]ris sui reuelauit: absq[ue] filijs erit [He that marieth his brothers wife, doth an vnlawful thing, he hath reuealed his brothers turpitude: they shal be without children]' (Vulgate, sig. f6^v; Douai, I, 303). For the origins of Henry's great cause of matrimony, see Virginia Murphy's introduction to *The Divorce Tracts of Henry VIII*, ed. by Edward Surtz and Virginia Murphy (Angers: Moreana, 1988), pp. i-xliv. See also Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 41-78.

⁶¹ *LP*, VI (1882), 163-169.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 165.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

all other things necessary for the preservation of the Queen's right'.⁶⁵ We have seen that as Emperor, Charles V inherited an office traditionally concerned with defending Christendom and the authority of the pope within it.⁶⁶ As nephew to Henry's wife, Charles V had in addition to these professional obligations a personal interest in defending the pope's disputed prerogative to determine Henry's 'great cause of matrimony' against detractors like Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. In a letter from Chapuys to Charles V dated 1 October 1530, Brandon is reported to have claimed that the English 'care neither for Pope or Popes [...] not even if St. Peter should come to life again', and that this was because 'the King was absolute both as Emperor and Pope in his own kingdom'.⁶⁷

As King of England, Brandon here asserts, Henry exercised the same authority over his temporal and spiritual subjects as that which was exercised by the Emperor and pope elsewhere in Christendom. Brandon here uses the term 'empire' to express Henry's claims to exercise independent authority over the clergy and laity in England, and the same vocabulary would be used three years later when Henry's pretensions to supremacy in Church and state received formal expression in the preamble to the Appeals Act. This identification of empire with self-government restored to the concept of empire the elasticity it had enjoyed in ancient Rome, as a term expressive in the Roman Republic of authority over a bounded territorial unit, but which evolved under the Roman Empire to describe the size of the territory over which the Emperor held sway.⁶⁸ It was this expansionist ideology of empire that was upheld in the apologetics of Charles V, but Henry's pretensions in 1533 to empire in the English Church did not imply that he too was aspiring to the sort of global empire that apologists expected Charles to establish here on earth. Brandon's use of the term 'empire' was influenced by a humanist sensitivity to the semantic range of *imperium* in late classical political discourse, and it was the classical idea of empire as self-government that also informed the vocabulary of the Act of Appeals. 'It was *imperium* such as understood by humanists', Koebner asserts of the imperial ideology enshrined in this act. 'A term expressive of dignity and splendour, but not of precedence of other

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 207.

⁶⁶ For discussion, see 'Holy Roman Empire', in *NCE*, VII, 42-44.

⁶⁷ *CSP (Spanish)*, IV.i (1879), 734.

⁶⁸ See David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, Ideas in Context, 59 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 28-30.

kingdoms – not at all claiming world-supremacy'.⁶⁹

The vocabulary of empire had been used to express Henry's claims to self-government in England before the inception in 1527 of his 'great cause of matrimony', but it was only once Clement VII proved unwilling to grant Henry his annulment that this English ideology of empire began to acquire the Cesaropapist connotations implicit in Brandon's comments to Chapuys, and in the preamble to the Act of Appeals. In 1530, Brandon claimed that Henry was both pope and emperor in England by virtue of his pretensions to supremacy over the English Church and state. Thirteen years beforehand, another Englishman, Cuthbert Tunstall, the future Bishop of London and Durham, had also used the term 'empire', but this time it was only to describe England's independence from the Empire of Maximilian I, not its autonomy from both Empire and Apostolic See alike. On 12 February 1517, Tunstall wrote a letter to Henry VIII in his capacity as English ambassador to Maximilian I.⁷⁰ The letter relates Tunstall's recent conversation with the Cardinal of Sion, and it reports the Cardinal's communication to Tunstall of Maximilian's apparent intention to resign the Empire to Henry VIII. Maximilian himself seems to have shown little intention during his lifetime of securing the succession of Henry VIII, however. His death in January 1519 seems instead to have cut short his attempts to advance the pretensions of his grandson, Charles, by having the Electors nominate him 'King of the Romans'.⁷¹ Tunstall was most probably aware of this discrepancy between Maximilian's alleged sponsorship of Henry VIII and his actual support for the future Charles V. His letter constitutes a diplomatic attempt to detract from the significance of what Maximilian is purportedly proposing to Henry, without explicitly accusing Maximilian of duplicity in this regard. Tunstall argues that even if Maximilian were to successfully solicit the Electors on Henry's behalf, his election would nevertheless be nullified by the fact that, as King of England, Henry was not subject to the Empire. The Imperial nominee must in the first instance be a prince of the Empire, Tunstall remarks, 'wheras your Grace is not, nor never sithen the Cristen faith the Kings of Englonde wer subgiet to th'empire'. Tunstall here asserts the political autonomy of England in relation to the Holy Roman Empire, and he goes on to equate self-government with imperial rule. 'But the Crown of Englonde', Tunstall asserts,

⁶⁹ Richard Koebner, "The Imperial Crown of this Realm": Henry VIII, Constantine the Great and Polydore Vergil', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 26 (1953), 29-52 (p. 51).

⁷⁰ *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, ed. by Henry Ellis, 1st ser., 3 vols (London: Harding, Triphook, and Lepard 1824), I, 134-138.

⁷¹ See Maltby, pp. 19-20.

is an Empire off hitself, mych bettyr then now the Empire of Rome: for which cause your Grace werith a close Crown. And therfor yff ye were chosen, sens your Grace is not off th'empire, the Election wer voide. And iff your Grace shuld accepte the said Election, therby ye must confesse your realme to be under subjection off th'empire to the perpetual prejudice off your successor.⁷²

Tunstall confers a 'close Crown' upon Henry VIII because he considers England, in its relation to the Empire, as 'an Empire off hitself', conterminous with the northernmost contours of Habsburg dominion in the Netherlands, and yet, by virtue of its insularity, autonomous from the imperial jurisdiction of Maximilian I. Tunstall upholds England as an empire by virtue of its autonomy from Maximilian's Empire in Europe, but his assertion of England's self-government in this respect does not at the same time imply its jurisdictional independence from the Apostolic See. The term 'Imperiall Crowne' is used in the Appeals Act as shorthand for the authority it invests in Henry, as supreme head of the English Church and state. The imperial, or 'close Crown' that Tunstall conferred upon Henry in 1517 is instead symbolic of Henry's claims to self-government over the state of, but not the Church in England. The Tudor ideology of empire departed after the inception in 1527 of Henry's 'great cause of matrimony' from empire as it had been defined by Tunstall in 1517. In so far as both these Tudor ideologies identify empire with self-government, however, both depart in their understanding of empire from the global empire that apologists like Guevara and Gattinara anticipated Charles V establishing here on earth.

* * *

Writing with reference to the imperial crowns that Charlemagne conferred upon Charles and Henry at the pageant in Gracious Street, Dale Hoak asserts that 'there can be little doubt that [...] on the eve of Charles's visit, Henry VIII thought of himself as very like an emperor, as much the "imperial" heir of Charlemagne as any wearer of the crown of the Holy Roman Empire' (pp. 83-84). Henry's imperialist pretensions are in the *Entry* articulated in a vocabulary identical to the language in which the Holy Roman Empire receives expression on stage. In his *Acclamation* to the Emperor, Lily hopes that Charles, in his role as defender of Christendom, will with his 'shelde of hye iustyce' protect 'christen people' from invasion by 'Moores/ sarazins/ turkes', and

⁷² *Original Letters*, I, 136.

other infidels. Apologists for Charles V had envisioned that the Emperor would through crusade undertake to establish an era of Christian peace, and Guevara had likened this *pax Christiana* to the Golden Age, which according to Virgil would be re-established on earth under the son of Astraea. Charles is presented as the son of Astraea in the 'Ile off englonde' at the Cornhill Stocks, but the pageant also identifies Henry as Astraea's son, in recognition of his role alongside the Emperor as defender of Christendom in the articles of the Anglo-Imperial treaties against Francis I. By casting Charles and Henry as the sons of Astraea, and by conferring imperial crowns upon the Emperor and King of England, the rhetoric of the *Entry* borrows from the vocabulary used by Habsburg apologists, and it does so in order to define the empire that Henry was claiming for himself in relation to the empire that was being claimed by his apologists for Charles V.

Although Charles and Henry each receive identical expression in the rhetoric of the 1522 *Entry*, the Tudor imperial idea current at the time of the *Entry* was substantially different from the Habsburg ideology of empire that apologists like Guevara and Gattinara had constructed for Charles V. The imperial crown that Henry received from Charlemagne at the Gracious Street Conduit was the 'close Crown' that Tunstall had identified with the King of England some five years beforehand, not the close crown that had been worn by Habsburg Emperors since the end of the fifteenth century. Henry revised his imperialist pretensions after 1527, in response to Clement VII's unwillingness to annul his marriage with Catherine of Aragon. The Cesaropapist empire enshrined in the Act of Appeals departs in ideology from each of the empires that were being claimed for Charles V and Henry VIII at the time of the 1522 *Entry*. Despite this fact, ideologues for Henry VIII still chose to articulate the Royal Supremacy within the vocabulary of empire that had been used in the 1522 *Entry* to define Henry's pretensions to the empire of England in relation to the global empire being claimed for Charles V. The following chapter will explore how Henry's pretensions after 1527 to empire in the English Church were presented in the *Entry* into London of his new queen, Anne Boleyn, in 1533. It will compare the rhetoric of the 1533 *Entry* with that of the 1522 *Entry*, and will argue that these rhetorical echoes compromised the function of the 1533 *Entry* as Royal Supremacy propaganda.

Chapter 2

‘This Realme of Englonnd is an Impire’: Royal Supremacy and the Rhetoric of Empire in the *Entry* of Anne Boleyn (1533)

Anne Boleyn’s *Entry* into London took place on Saturday 31 May 1533, the day before her coronation at Westminster Abbey on Whitsunday 1 June. Parliament had passed the Act in Restraint of Appeals less than two months earlier on Monday 7 April. The Appeals Act had affirmed that England was an empire, autonomous of the Holy Roman Empire, but also independent of the See of Rome. By preventing Rome from intervening in what Archbishop Cranmer termed Henry’s ‘great cause of matrimony’, the act had allowed Cranmer to annul Henry’s marriage with Catherine of Aragon, and to legitimise his clandestine marriage to Anne.¹

Cranmer pronounced sentence on the validity of Anne and Henry’s marriage on 28 May, and the *Entry* occurred in the happy aftermath of this verdict three days later.² The passage of the Appeals Act had paved the way for Anne’s coronation, and the *Entry* proved the first opportunity for Henry to give public expression to ‘Impire’ as it had been defined in the preamble to this act – an empire compact of Church and state, and ‘gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King’.³ Where the Habsburg Empire was expansionist, the empire of the Appeals Act was insular. Its imperial idea was distinct from the Habsburg ideology of empire, but it was also separate from the earlier Tudor imperial idea, which together with this Habsburg ideology had informed the stagecraft of the 1522 *Entry*. In 1517, Tunstall had defined England in relation to the Habsburg Empire as ‘an Empire off hitself’. This early Tudor idea of empire evolved between 1527 and

¹ *LP*, VI (1882), 152. Edward Hall writes that Henry and Anne were secretly married in November 1532, on the feast of the Translation of St Erkenwald (ie. 14 November). See *The vnion of the two noble and illustrate famelies of Lancastre & Yorke* (London: Richard Grafton, 1548; STC 12721), sig. MMM5^v. According to Eustace Chapuys, however, the marriage took place in January 1533, on the feast of St Paul’s Conversion (ie. 25 January). See *CSP (Spanish)*, IV.ii (1882), 674. For discussion, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 637-38.

² See MacCulloch, p. 94.

³ ‘An Acte that the Appeles in suche Cases as have ben used to be pursued to the See of Rome shall not be from hensforth had ne used but wythin this Realme’ (24 Hen. VIII, c. 12), in *Statutes*, III (1817), 427-29 (p. 427).

1533 in response to Henry's 'great cause of matrimony'. It came to define Henry's right to exercise authority over the English Church, and so to judge for himself the validity of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon without interference from Rome.

This chapter approaches the 1533 *Entry* as propaganda for Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church. It shows how this imperial ideology informed the stagecraft of Anne Boleyn's *Entry*, which cast Anne as Astraea, and identified England under Henry VIII with the Golden Age described in Virgil's fourth *Eclogue*. The motifs of Astraea and the Golden Age had also been used as metaphors for empire in the 1522 *Entry*. The Tudor imperial idea had evolved between 1522 and 1533, but the language in which these ideas were articulated had nevertheless remained the same. This chapter explores how these confluences between the stagecraft of the 1522 and 1533 *Entries* affected the impact of the 1533 *Entry* as Royal Supremacy propaganda.

* * *

The guilds of London had accompanied Anne upon her boat journey from Greenwich to the Tower on Thursday 29 May. 'But for to speake of the people that stode on euery shore to beholde the sight' that greeted Anne's arrival at the Tower, writes Edward Hall, 'he that sawe it not would not beleue it'.⁴ According to Hall, Anne had been accompanied in her journey up-river by 'fiftie barges' bedecked with the banners of the guilds to which they each belonged, and headed by a foist 'full of ordinaunce', with 'a great Dragon continually mouyng, & castyng wyldfyer' (sig. NNN2^v). Ships anchored at shore so as not to obstruct the procession had also fired 'diuers peales of gunnes' in honour of Anne (sig. NNN3^f), and 'great melody' was heard as she landed at the Tower to be greeted with a kiss by the King (sig. NNN3^v).

According to Hall, Henry himself had commanded that the aldermen of London 'make preparacion, aswell to fetche her grace from Grenewyche to the Tower by water, as to see the citie ordered and garnished with pageau[n]tes in places accustomed, for the

⁴ Edward Hall, *Vnion*, sigs. NNN2^f-OOO1^f (sig. NNN3^v). Hall's account is reproduced in *Ballads from Manuscripts*, ed. by F. J. Furnivall, Ballad Society Publications, 1-3, 10, 2 vols of 4 parts (London: Taylor; Hertford: Austin, 1868-73), I (London: Taylor, 1868), 365-373.

honor of her grace when she should be conueyed from the Tower to Westminster' (sig. NNN2^v). A 'common counsail' of aldermen had been convened on Wednesday 14 May 1533, in response to their receipt of Henry's letter the day before. The minutes of this meeting record the City's initial estimate concerning the number of pageants that it felt could be feasibly prepared in time for Anne's *Entry* into London a fortnight later.⁵ According to these, the aldermen had agreed to stage three pageants on Saturday 31 May, 'one at the ledenhill the second at the standerd yn chepe the thyrde at the litell conduit in chepe'. 'The sayd conduytes' at the Leadenhall and in Cheapside, the minutes continue, were 'to be goodly hangyd & garnysshed w[i]t[h] mynstralsy & chyldern syngyng', whilst 'wyne rennyng' from the 'standerd aforesayd' was the sight that the aldermen had confirmed would greet Anne, as her procession wended its way westwards along Cheap towards Westminster Hall.⁶ The minutes record the appointment of four aldermen to submit these proposals for approval to 'the kynges most honourable Cownsayll', and they conclude with a series of petitions for the aldermen to put to members of the Privy Council at this meeting. A version of these petitions is preserved in the dramatic miscellany, Egerton 2623.⁷ This lists six petitions, and it singles out one member of the Privy Council for particular mention. 'Plaisith you to knowe of the Duke of Norf[olk]', the list begins, 'whether the Clergie shall gyue attend[a]unce when the quenes grace shall come thorough london as they dyd when the Emp[r]our came into london' in 1522. The second item on the list asks whether Norfolk could induce the 'estrangers enhabytyng w[i]th[in] thys Citie' to 'make of them selff[es] any pagent[es] or be contrybitares to the pageint[es] of the Citie'. Could he not also help obtain for the City the services of 'the kyng[es] mynstrell[es] for the ffurnyssheyng of the pagent[es] and barges', the list continues, as well as 'some workemen out the kynge[es] work[es] for the pagiant[es] be cause the tyme is verye shorte'? The list concludes with a question concerning the three pageant devices that the Court of Aldermen had proposed for the *Entry*. Would 'my seid

⁵ The minutes are discussed in Gordon Kipling, "'He That Saw It Would Not Believe It": Anne Boleyn's Royal Entry into London', in *Civic and Ritual Drama*, ed. by Alexandra F. Johnston and Wim Hüsken, *Ludus: Medieval and Early Renaissance Theatre and Drama*, 2 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997), pp. 39-79 (pp. 45-48).

⁶ Corporation of London Record Office, *Repertory*, IX, fol. 1, cited in Kipling, 'Anne Boleyn's Royal Entry', pp. 45-46.

⁷ BL, Egerton MSS, 2623, fol. 5. The miscellany was compiled by John Payne Collier in the mid-nineteenth century. The petitions appear on the recto of a leaf that Collier has since appended to folio 5 of the manuscript. On a separate leaf, overlaying the insert, Collier has written: 'Temp. Henry VIII. Instructions, request for, on the passing of Anne Bullen through the City, addressed to the Duke of Norfolk. Asking the aid of the Kings Minstrels for furnishing the Pageants &c'.

lorde' the Duke of Norfolk 'haue eny other deuisse then these'?

Hall's account of the *Entry* indicates that Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, did indeed require more pageants than the three initially proposed by the aldermen at their meeting of 14 May. The minutes of the aldermen's meeting identify Edward Hall himself as one of the four civic representatives to have been chosen to liaise with Norfolk, and, as Gordon Kipling has observed, his account of the *Entry* 'must as a consequence be read as the account of one of [*the*] organizers' responsible for transforming 'the City's modest plan into the extensive show that was actually performed'.⁸ A total of six pageants were erected, along an entry route to Westminster Hall. The route deviates somewhat from the route along which Henry and Charles had processed eleven years earlier, in its point of departure from the Tower rather than from Southwark, and in its progress to Gracechurch Street by way of Fenchurch rather than via London Bridge. These six pageants were interspersed with six additional attractions – two poetry readings, two choral recitals, and two decorated conduits flowing with wine. Hall recounts how Anne met with the first of these six supplementary attractions at Fenchurch. Upon a scaffold stood children 'apparelled like marchauntes', and bidding Anne welcome to the City 'with two proper preposicions, both in Frenche & Englishe' (sig. NNN4^v). From here, the procession continued along Fenchurch, until it was confronted with the first of the six pageants at the corner of Fenchurch and Gracechurch Street. Upon a stage designed to represent Mount Parnassus sat an Apollo with lyre, a white marble representation of the fountain of Helicon running with 'Rennishe wyne' before him, and Calliope, eldest of the Nine Muses, at his feet (sig. NNN4^v). Her eight sisters, Clio, Erato, Euterpe, Melpomene, Polyhymnia, Terpsichore, Thalia, and Urania, were gathered on either side.⁹ The Privy Council had evidently heeded the City's petition for help from 'estrangers enhabytyng w[ith]in thys Citie' in meeting the cost of the *Entry*, for Hall writes that this second pageant had been made by the Easterlings, or Hanseatic 'marchauntes of the Stylliarde' (sig. NNN4^v). 'The Londoners wish to make all the inhabitants contribute to the costs of the coronation', Eustace Chapuys had remarked in a letter to Charles V dated Saturday 18 May 1533, and 'they compel even foreigners to contribute'. 'The Easterlings, as being

⁸ Kipling, 'Anne Boleyn's Royal Entry', pp. 46-47.

⁹ The names of the nine Muses are derived from Hesiod's *Theogony*, ll. 76-80, trans. by Richard S. Caldwell (Newburyport, MA: Focus Information Group, 1987), pp. 31-32.

subjects of your Majesty, would like to be excused', Chapuys continues, 'but the great privileges they enjoy here prevent them from objecting'.¹⁰ Chapuys may have been correct to assume that the Easterlings felt compelled against their will to participate in the *Entry*, but the Gracechurch Street pageant that they sponsored was nevertheless no piecemeal contribution to the pageantry of the day. According to Sydney Anglo, this was 'the most important pageant of the series', whilst Gordon Kipling has more recently noted that the Gracechurch Street pageant 'rightly stands at the head of the series as a statement of the show's theme'.¹¹

From the pageant *Of Apollo with the Muses*, the procession continued up Gracechurch Street, which according to Hall had been decorated for the occasion with 'fyne Scarlet, Crimosyn, and other grayned clothes', until it met with the second pageant *Of the Progeny of St Anne* at Leadenhall (sig. NNN3^v). Hall writes that 'a heauenly roffe' had been constructed, over a stage upon which was set a golden root 'enuironed with red roses & white'. A mechanically-controlled white falcon descended from the roof to perch on the root below. 'And incontinent came doune an Angell with great melody', Hall continues, 'and set a close croune of golde on the Fawcons head' – a gesture that anticipates Anne's forthcoming coronation as Queen at the same time as it recreates on stage the elements of closed crown, falcon, tree stump, and white and red roses that made up Anne's existing heraldic device as Marchioness of Pembroke.¹² Hall writes that beneath the root sat St Anne – the apocryphal mother of the Virgin Mary, Mary Salome, and Mary Cleophas – 'with all her issue beneth her' (sig. NNN4^v). From Leadenhall, the procession then turned left along Cornhill until it came to the Conduit, 'where wer thre graces set in a throne afore who[m] was the spryng of grace continually ronnyng wyne' (sig. NNN4^v). The three Graces correspond to the ancient Greek Charites, Aglaia,

¹⁰ *LP*, VI (1882), 226.

¹¹ Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), p. 258; Kipling, 'Anne Boleyn's Royal Entry', p. 64.

¹² Anne's elevation into the peerage occurred at Windsor on Sunday, 1 September 1532. See *Vnion*, sig. MMM2^r. For discussion, see Kipling, 'Anne Boleyn's Royal Entry', pp. 56-57; E. W. Ives, *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), p. 279; and Dale Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', in *Tudor Political Culture*, ed. by Dale Hoak (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 54-103 (p. 54). Kipling identifies this pageant as a panegyric in praise of Anne's recent ennoblement as Marchioness of Pembroke, whereas Hoak interprets the closed crown in this pageant as an 'obvious anticipation of Anne's own coronation'. However, I see no reason to regard these two perspectives as mutually exclusive.

Euphrosyne, and Thalia, whom Hesiod identifies as the daughters of Zeus by Eurynome.¹³ Hall recounts how each of these goddesses ‘gave to the queen a several gift or grace’, and that Anne had then departed from the Cornhill Conduit on her journey westwards along Cornhill, towards the Great Conduit and Standard in Cheap (sig. NNN4^v). The Great Conduit, writes Hall, ‘was newly painted with armes of devises: out of the whiche conduit by a goodly fountain set at the one end ranne continually wyne both white and claret all that after noone’ (sig. NNN4^v).

After she had received from the aldermen at the Cheap Cross ‘a thousand markes in golde in a Purse of golde’, Anne had then continued along Cheap to the fourth pageant at the Little Conduit (sig. NNN4^v). Its scene reprises a Romanised version of *The Judgement of Paris* as recounted in Lucian’s *Dialogues*, for Hall writes that upon its stage had stood Mercury, accompanied by Juno, Venus, and Pallas.¹⁴ Paris, whom Lucian cast as the reluctant adjudicator of this classical beauty pageant, is absent from the scene as it is described by Hall. Whereas Lucian’s three goddesses compete before Paris for the prize of the golden apple, their rivalry is apparently appeased by Anne’s presence before the pageant at the Little Conduit in Cheap, for Hall writes that the prize, which in Lucian’s account is awarded to Aphrodite, was at the Little Conduit presented to Anne ‘in the name of the iii. goddesses’ (sig. NNN4^v). Instead of a golden apple, Mercury presents to Anne ‘a balle of gold deuyded in thre, signifying thre giftes [the] which thre Goddesses gave to her, that is to saye, wysedome, ryches and felicitie’ (sig. NNN4^v-5^r).

A variant version of *The Judgement of Paris* is preserved in a second, anonymous account of the *Entry, The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon*, printed with royal consent by Wynkyn de Worde in 1533.¹⁵ Its account of this pageant at the Little Conduit in Cheap is

¹³ *Theogony*, ll. 907-909.

¹⁴ *Lucian: A Selection*, trans. by M. D. MacLeod (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1991), pp. 34-53.

¹⁵ *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne/ Wyfe vnto the moost noble kynge Henry the .viii.* (London: Wynkyn de Worde for Johan Goughe, [1533]; STC 656), reproduced in *The Maner of the Tryumphe of Caleys and Bulleyn, and the Noble Tryumphaunt Coronacyon of Quene Anne, Wyfe unto the Most Noble Kynge Henry VIII/ Printed by Wynkyn de Worde, 1532-1533*, ed. by Edmund Goldsmid (Edinburgh: the editor, 1885), pp. 17-37. All references are to STC 656. Goldsmid modernises the typographical conventions of STC 656. Six years before his edition, the *Tryumphaunt Coronacyon* was reprinted in *An English Garner: Ingatherings from our History and Literature*, ed. by Edward Arber, 8 vols (London: the editor, 1877-97), II (1879), 41-60. Goldsmid condemned Arber’s edition for its modernised spelling, and because it has ‘words and phrases inserted or inverted to suit the Editor’s taste’ (p. v).

consistent with Lucian's, insofar as it restores Paris as adjudicator of the beauty contest. The *Coronacyon* describes how Paris himself had presented the 'ball of golde' to Anne (sig. A4^v), whilst children are mentioned 'syngyng a balade to her grace/ & prayse to all her ladyes' (sig. A5^r). The discrepancies between this and Hall's description *Of the Judgement of Paris* constitutes the first of several between two heretofore very similar accounts of the *Entry*. The procession turned left after the Little Conduit in Cheap to enter St Paul's Precinct, where Anne was immediately confronted with the fifth and penultimate pageant at Paul's Gate. Upon its stage, writes the anonymous author of the *Coronacyon*,

sat .iij. fayre ladyes virgyns costly arayde with a fayre rou[n]de trone ouer their heedes / Where aboute was written this. Regina Anna prospere procede et regna/ that is in englysshe. Quene Anne prosper procede and reygne. The lady that sate in the myddes hauynge a table of golde in her hande wrytten with letters of asure. Ueni amica coronaberis. Come my loue thou shalbe crowned. And two au[n]gels hauyng a close crowne of golde bytwene their ha[n]des. And the lady on ye right hande had a table of syluer/ wherin was writte[n]. D[omi]ne dirige gressos meos. Lorde god dyrecte my wayes. The other on the lyfte hande had in another table of syluer written this. Co[n]fide in d[omi]no. Trust in god. And vnder theyr fete was a longe rol wherin was written this. Regina Anna nouu[m] regis de sanguine natu[m]/ cu[m] paries populis aurea secla tuis. Quene Anne whan y[ou] shalte beare a new sone of y[e] kynges bloode/ there shalbe a golden worlde vnto thy people. And so y[e] ladyes caste ouer her heed a multytude of wafers with rose leaues/ & about ye wafers were written with letters of gold/ this posey. (sig. A5^r)

Hall's account agrees that the tablet borne by the actress on the right was silver in colour, but he departs from the description in the *Coronacyon* of 'another table of syluer' on the left of the stage. Hall asserts that the leftmost actress had borne the 'tablet of golde with letters Asure', whereas the *Coronacyon* assigns this golden tablet to the actress in the middle.¹⁶ Hall recounts how 'an angell with a close croune' had sat beneath this central tablet, whereas it is two angels who hold this crown between them in the *Coronacyon*. There are also several minor discrepancies between the accounts in Hall and the *Coronacyon* of the *sententiae* written on the tablets and banderoles on stage. The *Coronacyon* assigns to the right-hand tablet the petition 'D[omi]ne dirige gressos meos [Direct my step, O Lord!]', which is derived from Proverbs 16.9: 'Cor ho[m]i[n]is disponit via[m] sua[m]: sed d[omi]ni est dirigere gressus eius [The hart of man disposeth

¹⁶ All citations to Hall's account in this paragraph are from sig. NNN5^r.

his way: but it perteyneth to our Lord to direct his progresse]'.¹⁷ The petition reappears in Hall as 'Domine directe gressus meos [My step, O direct Lord!]' . The imperative *dirige* is here replaced with the participle adjective *directe*, and the construction deprived of its verbal unit. The *Coronacyon* assigns to the left-hand tablet the imperative 'Co[n]fide in d[omi]no [Trust in God!]', which is derived from Psalm 117.8: 'Bonu[m] est co[n]fidere in d[omi]no: q[uam] [con]fidere in ho[m]i[n]e [It is good to hope in our Lord, rather than to hope in man]'.¹⁸ This reappears in Hall as 'confido in domine [I trust in God]', which replaces the imperative with the indicative mood.

From the pageant at Paul's Gate, the royal procession skirted the outermost limits of St Paul's Precinct until it met with the fourth of the six attractions in the *Entry*. Both Hall and the anonymous *Coronacyon* agree that a scaffold for two hundred school children had been erected at the 'East ende of Paules Churcheyarde against the schole', and that these children had recited before Anne a selection of eulogistic verses from Latin 'Poetes translated into Englishe'.¹⁹ From thence, the procession moved out of Paul's Precinct, and towards the fifth attraction at Ludgate, where 'on the ledes of saint Martyns Churche', writes Hall, had 'stode a goodly quere of singyng men and children whiche sang newe balades made in praise' of Anne (sig. NNN5^v). The paths of Hall and the *Coronacyon* again diverge in their descriptions of the sixth and final pageant at the Fleet Street Conduit. 'Upon the Conduite', writes Hall,

was made a toune with iiii. Turrettes, and in euery Turret stode one of the cardinall vertues with their tokens and properties, whiche had seuerall speches, promisyng the Quene neuer to leaue her, but to be aydyng and comfortyng her, And in the myddes of the tower closely was suche seuerall solempne instrume[n]tes, that it semed to be an heauenly noyse, and was muche regarded and praised. (sig. NNN5^v)

The *Coronacyon* also recounts that a four-turreted citadel had been constructed at the Fleet Street Conduit, but its description *Of the four Virtues* replaces the actresses who according to Hall had impersonated the Cardinal Virtues with inanimate 'fanés', or banners of metal. The *Entry* described in the *Coronacyon* is played out to the tune of the

¹⁷ Vulgate, sig. ii5^v; Douai, II, 292.

¹⁸ Vulgate, sig. hh4^r; Douai, II, 212.

¹⁹ *Vnion*, sig. NNN5^r; cp. *Coronacyon*, sig. A5^r.

'swete instrumentes' (sig. A5^v) that according to this account had been concealed inside the citadel at Fleet Street. Hall writes that Anne was also serenaded before her departure from the City by some 'diuers singyng men and children' at Temple Bar (sig. NNN5^r).

The twelve-part sequence of pageants and spectacles that grew out of this collaboration between members of the Court of Aldermen and Privy Council was to a greater or lesser extent the brainchild of a separate collaboration between John Leland and Nicholas Udall. Leland, a former King's Scholar in Paris, was in all probability enlisted to compose verses for the *Entry* by Thomas Howard, for Leland had acted as tutor in the early 1520s to the Duke's sixth son, Thomas.²⁰ In the later 1520s, Leland acquired positions at court as a royal chaplain and librarian, and he was presented with the Calais benefice of Pepeling in June 1530.²¹ He was evidently continuing to enjoy preferment at court at the time of the 1533 *Entry*, for his name is mentioned alongside Thomas Cromwell's in a list recording recipients of New Year's gifts from the King in January 1533.²² Whilst Leland's standing at court recommended him as 'an obvious choice for Norfolk to suggest as the deviser of the coronation pageants', it was probably Leland himself who had acquired the commission for Nicholas Udall, his former Oxford friend.²³ Just how much of the *Entry* can be attributed to this collaboration between Leland and Udall has been the subject of critical contention. In 1969, Sydney Anglo suggested that these 'two classical scholars devised both pageants and speeches' for the *Entry*, an assumption to which both Ives and King have also more recently assented, with Ives adding that '80 per cent of the work' can be attributed to Nicholas Udall.²⁴ Kipling agrees that the services of Udall and Leland had been co-opted 'to oversee [*the*] revision and expansion of the City's royal entry', but he argues against the assumption that Leland and Udall had authored the entirety of the *Entry* (p. 49). Whereas Ives identifies Leland and Udall as the 'two "makers" of Anne's six principal pageants', for Kipling it is only the three pageants *Of Apollo with the Muses*, *Of the three Graces* and *Of the Judgement of Paris* that represent 'exactly the sort of pageant that such classical scholars as Leland and

²⁰ *DNB*, XXXIII, 297.

²¹ *LP*, IV.iii (1876), 2919.

²² *LP*, VI (1882), 14.

²³ Kipling, 'Anne Boleyn's Entry', p. 50.

²⁴ Anglo, p. 248; cp. John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 50, and Ives, p. 274.

Udall might have devised'.²⁵ 'The pageants do not speak in the hired voices of Udall and Leland alone', Kipling asserts (p. 68). He approaches the three pageants *Of St Anne*, *Of the three virgins*, and *Of the four Virtues* as 'the citizen-devised traditional "core" pageants' that were agreed upon by the aldermen at their meeting of 14 May (p. 69). In relation to these, the humanist contributions of Leland and Udall constitute 'something of an afterthought imposed upon a series already designed' (p. 61). Their three classical offerings, Kipling concludes, probably represent 'the three additional pageants added to the City's original scheme after Hall's committee met with the Duke of Norfolk' (p. 60).

So whereas Anglo, Ives, and King attribute all six pageants to Leland and Udall, Kipling, who approaches the sequence as a synthesis of the classical and the traditional, only identifies the three 'classical' pageants with these two 'classical scholars'. Neither assumption has any basis in the only extant document to record Leland and Udall's collaborative contribution to the *Entry*, however. This consists of sixteen manuscript leaves of Latin and English verse. Of the five hundred and thirteen lines of Latin verse, three hundred and ten lines are in the manuscript attributed to Udall, and two hundred and three to Leland. The manuscript attributes all two hundred and twenty-one lines of English verse to Udall's authorship.²⁶ Leland's Latin verse is holograph; Udall's Latin and English verses are written in a second secretary hand that may or may not have been Udall's own. It is in this second hand that the following descriptive title appears on the recto of the first leaf.

Here aftir ensueth a copie of diuers and sundry verses aswell in latin as in Englishe deuised and made partely by Ihon Leland and partely by Nicholas Vuedale where of sum were sette vp and sum other were spoken and pronounced vnto the moste high and excellent Quene the ladie Anne wif vnto our sou[er]ain lorde king Henry the eight in many goodly and costely pageauntes exhibited and shewed by the mayre and Citizens of the famous Citie of London at suche tyme as

²⁵ Ives, p. 274; Kipling, 'Anne Boleyn's Entry', p. 60.

²⁶ BL, Royal MSS, 18. A LXIV, 16 fols. The verse ends on fol. 16^r. On its verso is the stamp 'MVSEVM BRITANNICVM', and on the facing page is pencilled '18 A. LXIV – 16 folios'. Thereafter follows 31 blank leaves. All references are to this manuscript. The verse is reproduced with revised punctuation in *Ballads from Manuscripts*, I (1868), 378-401 (p. 378). The edition erroneously attributes to fol. 15^v the eight lines of verse on fol. 16^r. Furnivall prints English paraphrases by John Wesley Hales of Leland and Udall's Latin verses on pp. 373-78 of his edition. Udall's English verse is also reproduced in Edward Arber's edition of the *Coronacyon (An English Garner*, II (1879), 52-60). The Latin and English verse in the manuscript has been enumerated by Ives, p. 274, n. 3.

hir grace rode from the Towre of London through the said Citie to hir moste glorious Coronac[i]on at the monasterie of Westmynster on Whitson yeue, in the xxvth yere of the Reigne of our said souerain lorde/. (fol. 1')

The English and Latin verses that ensue thus provide our only concrete evidence concerning the extent of Leland and Udall's contribution to the 1533 *Entry*. The manuscript attributes authorship to Leland and Udall for the verse 'spoken and pronounced' at some of these pageants, but at no time does it imply that either of them had a hand in designing the pageants themselves. Neither Anglo's assumption that Leland and Udall 'devised both pageants and speeches' for the *Entry*, nor Kipling's identification of 'the sort of pageant' that these 'classical scholars [...] might have designed', thus amount to anything more than the respective suppositions of these critics, for neither assumption is any way corroborated in the available evidence. Not only does the 'copie of diuers and sundry verses' contain insufficient evidence for Anglo's attribution of these pageants to Leland and Udall's workmanship, its omission of the *sententiae* presented on the stage of the pageant *Of the three virgins*, and of the 'seueral speches' spoken in Fleet Street by the Cardinal Virtues, also questions Anglo's assumption that Leland and Udall devised the speeches for all six of the pageants in the *Entry*. Kipling is therefore correct to point out that 'Leland and Udall contribute no verse whatsoever to the pageant of the three virgins at St. Paul's Gate', but his assumption that because of this 'they probably had no part in designing this traditional, non-classical pageant' (p. 68) seems equally applicable to the design of those pageants for which Leland and Udall did contribute verse, since at no time does the extant evidence imply that we should necessarily attribute authorship for the design of a pageant to the author of its accompanying verse. There simply exists no evidence for Kipling's identification of the three 'traditional' pageants as 'citizen-devised', nor for his assumption that Leland and Udall had designed the three 'classical' pageants at Gracechurch Street, the Cornhill Conduit, and the Little Conduit in Cheap. Kipling identifies these 'classical' pageants as afterthoughts 'added to the City's original scheme after Hall's committee met with the Duke of Norfolk', but this assumption relies upon our ability to associate the three 'traditional' pageants at Leadenhall, Paul's Gate, and the Fleet Street Conduit with the three pageants that had been originally proposed by the aldermen at their meeting of 14 May. Only in location, however, do the 'traditional' pageants *Of St Anne*, *Of the three virgins*, and *Of the four Virtues* bear any correspondence at all with the 'City's original scheme', prior to its collaboration with the Privy Council, of

'mynstralsy & chyldern syngyng' at Leadenhall, the Standard in Cheap, and the Little Conduit in Cheap.²⁷

Yet although unsubstantiated in the extant evidence, Kipling's assumptions about the authorship of the three 'classical' and three 'traditional "core" pageants' at least represent an attempt to come to terms with the apparent eclecticism of the *Entry*, with its macaronic of Latin and English verse, and its mixture of allusions on stage to both classical myths and Christian motifs. By contrast, Sydney Anglo, who dismissed the *Entry* as 'a dull, trite, and lamentably repetitious pageant series', also chose to dismiss its Christian iconography, for he heralded the *Entry* as the first 'truly classical' pageant series in England – only to sneer at its 'self-conscious Latinity', and 'thin veneer of commonplace literary allusions' (p. 248). King's appreciation of 'the conventional religious themes' in the *Entry* represents the other extreme in this critical reluctance to fully engage with the *Entry*'s eclectic blend of classical and Christian motifs (p. 50). King discusses Marian iconography in the pageants at Leadenhall and St. Paul's Gate, but he ignores altogether the use of classical myth in these and other pageants in the *Entry*.

King accommodates the *Entry* into his thesis concerning the longevity of medieval piety throughout the sixteenth century by focusing exclusive attention on its use of Christian motifs. It is on the other hand his belief in the comparative brevity of the Middle Ages that animates Anglo's appraisal of the *Entry* as the first 'truly classical' sequence in England. Anglo and King's reluctance to reconcile the classical with the Christian motifs in the *Entry* derives from an application to the field of literary criticism of what Cohen has termed an 'exclusionary model of temporality', within which the 'Middle Ages' are regarded as a cultural period of 'undifferentiated alterity', against which the epoch of the 'early modern' is defined.²⁸ Anglo and King both assume that the early modern classical revival emerged from the 'undifferentiated alterity' of an alleged medieval preoccupation with all things Christian. The one-sidedness of King's approach to the *Entry*'s 'conventional religious themes', and of Anglo's appraisal of its pageantry as 'truly classical' in conception, says more about where each of these critics are choosing to

²⁷ Kipling, 'Anne Boleyn's Royal Entry', p. 69; p. 60. Corporation of London Record Office, *Repertory*, IX, fol. 1, cited in Kipling, pp. 45-46.

²⁸ Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, 'Introduction: Midcolonial', in *The Postcolonial Middle Ages*, ed. by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 2000), pp. 1-17 (p. 3).

position the *Entry* in relation to this perceived paradigm shift between medieval and early modern than it does about the hybrid iconography of the *Entry* itself.

These same assumptions also inform Roy Strong's study of *Art and Power* in the Renaissance. Strong defines the 'state entry in the Renaissance manner' as a departure from the 'wholly biblical' iconography of the 'medieval entry'.²⁹ He argues that the 'images and ideas' in the Renaissance entry were 'derived from its rediscovery and study of the art, literature and thought of the classical world' (p. 6), and he asserts that these classical images entirely 'overlaid and transmuted' (p. 6) the 'remarkably consistent visual and iconographical vocabulary' (p. 7) of the medieval entry, in which 'the king as Christ or one of his scriptural prototypes, takes possession of the New Jerusalem', as part of a typological scheme that presents 'the earthly state' as 'a mirror of the heavenly' (p. 10). In *Enter the King*, Kipling also associates the medieval royal entry with a concern 'to envision the medieval city in terms of the imagined landscapes of the Apocalyptic New Jerusalem'.³⁰ Kipling writes that this medieval iconography was 'Christian instead of classical, and feudal instead of imperial' (p. 12), and he argues that it endured unadulterated throughout northern Europe until 'the royal entry experiences a revolution in emblematic form' at some point 'in the early to mid-sixteenth century' (p. 2). It is Kipling's assumptions about the evolution of royal entry iconography that accompany his approach to the three more 'classical' pageants of the 1533 *Entry*, as afterthoughts 'added to the City's original scheme' of a three-part pageant sequence that identifies Anne Boleyn with the Virgin Mary.

So how should we best approach the eclecticism of the 1533 *Entry*? My own reading of the *Entry* departs from the assumptions that govern these previous critical assessments of its eclectic iconography. I instead identify behind its ostensibly arbitrary blending of Christian and classical motifs the blueprint of a deliberately-contrived aesthetic inspired by the Christianisation of classical cosmology in the apologetics of the early Christian Church. Writing in the early fourth century AD, and in response to the Christianisation of the Empire under Constantine the Great, Christian apologists like

²⁹ Roy Strong, *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals, 1450-1650* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1984), pp. 10-11.

³⁰ Gordon Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 236.

Lactantius and Eusebius had attempted to syncretise the classical with the Christian, in an attempt to convert to Christianity the still largely pagan population of Constantine's Empire. This blending of the classical with the Christian also occurs in the 1533 *Entry*, and I want to argue that these early Christian apologists influenced the verse that Leland and Udall composed for the *Entry*. Both Lactantius and Eusebius wrote in praise of the Emperor Constantine, and both upheld his Empire as the divinely-ordained setting for the establishment of Christian peace on earth. I argue that by borrowing from Lactantius and Eusebius, Leland and Udall were attempting to identify Henry with Constantine, and England with the Empire that Constantine converted to Christianity. Udall, who attended Corpus Christi College, Oxford, between 1520 and 1529, would have had a copy of Lactantius's *Divine Institutes*, and probably also of writings by Eusebius, available to him in the college library.³¹ It cannot be proven that he and Leland were influenced by these fourth-century writers, but it is certainly possible that Udall at least had read Lactantius and Eusebius before 1533, and that he had allowed their presentation of Constantine's Christian Empire to influence the verse he composed for Anne Boleyn's *Entry*. The following discussion therefore reads the 1533 *Entry* in relation to writings by Lactantius and Eusebius. It argues that in the *Entry*, Udall and Leland intended to identify Henry's English 'Empire' with the Christian Empire under Constantine, and it goes on to explore other instances of this identification between Henry and Constantine in the literature of the Royal Supremacy.

The *Divine Institutes* of Lactantius was completed after Constantine's proclamation of the Edict of Milan in 313, and before Lactantius's own death four years

³¹ A Latin copy of Lactantius's *Institutiones divinae* (Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 51) was presented to the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, by the founder of the college, Richard Fox (d. 1528). The manuscript is described in the *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts, c. 435-1600, in Oxford Libraries*, ed. by Andrew G. Watson, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), I, 127. For the date of its acquisition by Corpus Christi College Library, see J. R. Liddell, 'The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the Sixteenth Century', *The Library*, 4th ser., 18 (1937-38), 385-416 (p. 400). The manuscript is item 261 in the 1589 Catalogue of Corpus Christi College Library, which Liddell reproduces on pp. 403-416. A printed copy of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastica historia* (Paris, 1512) also occurs in the 1589 Catalogue, no. 225. It was presented to the college by John Claymond, president of Corpus from the year of its foundation in 1517 until his death in 1536 (see Liddell, p. 401). The date of its acquisition by the college library is, however, unknown.

later in AD 317.³² The *Divine Institutes* attempts a systematisation of Christian doctrine, which was intended to serve as a counterpart to the *Institutes* of civil law, in the immediate aftermath of Constantine's institutionalisation of Christianity. Lactantius's appeal was to a pagan audience schooled in the Hellenistic culture of the later Roman Empire. His apologetics attempted to syncretise the classical and the Christian, and he did so by Christianising maxims drawn from the lessons of classical mythology. It was in order to teach us how to live justly, Lactantius argues in Book Five of the *Divine Institutes*, that Ovid had spoken in the *Metamorphoses* about life in the Golden Age, before Saturn was banished by Jupiter, 'et uirgo cæde madentes | Vltima cœlestum terras Astræa reliquit [and the virgin Astraea, last of the immortals, abandoned the blood-soaked earth]'.³³ Lactantius explains that Ovid and other pagan poets 'teach what it means to live justly' through 'examples of justice from the age of Saturn which they call "golden"'. The story of how Astraea, or justice, had abandoned the earth was for Lactantius a mythology based upon something that he and other Christians 'clearly understood', that 'justice was far removed from human matters'. Lactantius denies that Astraea was an actual goddess, but he argues for an allegorical interpretation of Astraea and the Golden Age that is consistent with Christian truth. As an allegory, he writes, the Golden Age 'must not be regarded as poetical fiction, but as truth' – 'For while Saturn was reigning, and the cults of the false gods had not yet been begun [...] surely God was worshiped' (bk. V, cap. 5 (p. 339)).

It is God himself who as embodiment of justice takes the place of Astraea in Lactantius's Christian cosmology. Lactantius assimilates the justice of the Golden Age to justice as systematised in Christian doctrine. He concedes that Ovid had been wrong to identify justice with Astraea, but he argues that Ovid's concept of justice was nevertheless consistent with 'a devoted and religious worship of the one God', since in the Golden Age mythology, the removal of justice from earth coincides with the beginning of the reign of the polytheistic pantheon of 'false gods' headed by Jupiter. According to Lactantius, the Christian God has recently 'sent a messenger', in the person of Christ, in order 'to lead

³² Firmianus Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes, Books I-VII*, trans. by Sister Mary Francis McDonald, O.P., *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, 49 (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1964). All references are to this translation. For its dating, see McDonald's introduction, pp. 3-10.

³³ P[ubl]ii. *Ouidii Nasonis Metamorphoseos Libri moralizati cum Pulcherrimis fabularum principalium figuris* [Lyon: Iacobi Mareschal, 1519], fol. 12^r.

back that old age and the justice that had been routed' (bk. V, cap. 7 (p. 343)), in fulfillment of the prophecy contained in Virgil's fourth *Eclogue*: 'Iam redit & virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna [now the Virgin returns, the reigns of Saturn return]'.³⁴ Lactantius asserts that Christ has now re-established the Golden Age on earth, but he explains that it is inhabitable only by those who have been baptised in the blood of Christ. 'Put aside from your hearts all evil designs', Lactantius counsels his pagan audience, 'and immediately that golden time will return for you, which you cannot attain in any other way than by beginning to worship the true God' (bk. V, cap. 8 (p. 345)).

For Lactantius, the justice embodied in Astraea is but an allegory of the justice that Christ has since restored to humankind. The desire to Christianise the ethics of classical mythology also informs the hermeneutics of that most celebrated of Lactantius's Christian contemporaries, Constantine the Great. In his fourth *Eclogue*, Virgil had prophesied that Astraea would restore the Golden Age through the birth of a baby boy. Under this boy's leadership, Virgil had sung, 'ferrea primum | Desinet, ac toto surget gens aurea mundo [the age of iron shall subside and a golden race arise throughout the world]' (sig. B3'). It was to these very lines that Constantine had alluded in his undated Good Friday *Oration to the Assembly of the Saints*, a copy of which was appended to the *Life of Constantine*, composed between AD 337 and 340 by his panegyrist Eusebius Pamphili, Bishop of Caesarea. 'We perceive that these words are spoken plainly and at the same time darkly, by way of allegory', Constantine wrote in his *Oration*. 'Those who search deeply for the import of the words, are able to discern the Divinity of Christ'. According to Constantine, Virgil was referring to the advent of Christ into the world when he sung of the baby boy that would be borne by Astraea. 'Who, then, is the virgin who was to come?', Constantine had asked his audience. 'Is it not she who was filled with, and with child of, the Holy Spirit?'³⁵ Constantine identified Astraea with the Blessed Virgin, and he interpreted as an allegory for the Immaculate Conception, the miraculous birth that Virgil had foreseen.

³⁴ 'Ecloga III. Pollio', in *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera* (Paris: Roberti Stephani, 1532), sigs. B2^v-4^v (sig. B2^v).

³⁵ 'The Oration of the Emperor Constantine, which he Addressed "To the Assembly of the Saints"', in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. by Henry Wace and Philip Schaff, 14 vols (Oxford: Parker; New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1890-1900), I (*Eusebius*), 561-580 (cap. 19 (p. 576)).

Constantine went further than his contemporary Lactantius in attempting this syncretism between the classical and the Christian. He argued that it is not only Christians who are able to see the Gospel truth that lies beneath Virgil's poetical fiction. Constantine asserted that this 'prince of Latin poets' (cap. 19 (p. 575)) had himself been privy to 'that blessed mystery which gave to our Lord the name of Saviour', but he argued that Virgil 'intentionally obscures the truth' in his fourth *Eclogue*, 'lest any of the powerful in the imperial city might be able to accuse the poet of writing anything contrary to the laws of the country, and subverting the religious sentiments which had prevailed from ancient times' (cap. 19 (p. 576)). Constantine here portrays Virgil as a proto-Christian, in an Empire antagonistic to the Saviour who would shortly be born in its midst. Eusebius of Caesarea offers a more positive evaluation of this Empire in the encomium he delivered before Constantine upon the occasion of his tricennalia in AD 335.³⁶ Within this oration, Eusebius did to Roman political thought what Lactantius had done to pagan mythology. Lactantius had Christianised the figure of Astraea by approaching her as a type prefigurative of the advent of Christ. Eusebius also attempted to syncretise the Christian with the classical, by assimilating to the Christian theology of the 'one God' the pagan ideology of Empire. Eusebius noted how the origins of the Roman Empire under Augustus had coincided with the advent of Christ. 'At the same time', he wrote,

one universal power, the Roman empire, arose and flourished, while the enduring and implacable hatred of nation against nation was now removed: and as the knowledge of one God, and one way of religion and salvation, even the doctrine of Christ, was made known to all mankind; so at the self-same period, the entire dominion of the Roman empire being vested in a single sovereign, profound peace reigned throughout the world. And thus, by the express appointment of the same God, two roots of blessing, the Roman empire, and the doctrine of Christian piety, sprang up together for the benefit of men. (cap. 16, para. 4 (p. 606))

Eusebius departed from Constantine in his attitude towards the pagan Empire under Augustus. The Roman Empire had been for Constantine synonymous with the paganism of his predecessors, but for Eusebius it ranked with Christian doctrine as one of the two roots of blessing to have sprung up simultaneously by the express appointment of God. It was not only significant for Eusebius that Christianity had emerged at the same

³⁶ 'The Oration of Eusebius Pamphili in Praise of the Emperor Constantine: Pronounced on the Thirtieth Anniversary of his Reign', in *A Select Library*, I, 581-610. Later references to this translation cite chapter and paragraph.

time as the origins of Empire under Augustus. Eusebius had argued that the Roman imperial ideology mimics Christian monotheism, because the Roman Empire invests power within a 'single sovereign', just as Christianity teaches 'the knowledge of one God, and one way of religion and salvation'. God is 'the Author of empire itself' (cap. 3, para. 8 (p. 585)), Eusebius had written, and it was in imitation of his own 'heavenly sovereignty' (cap. 3, para. 5 (p. 584)) that God had ordained a 'single sovereign' for the Roman Empire. Lactantius had assimilated Christian justice to the justice embodied in Astraea, and Eusebius here identifies Christian justice with the justice embodied in the Roman Emperor. In his encomium, Eusebius depicts Constantine as God's deputy upon earth. 'Our emperor', writes Eusebius, acts 'as interpreter to the Word of God', and aims at 'declaring with powerful voice the laws of truth and godliness to all who dwell on the earth' (cap. 2, para. 4 (p. 583)). In the *Divine Institutes*, Lactantius had likewise portrayed Constantine as the intermediary between God and humankind. As the first Christian Emperor, he had argued that Constantine was surpassing his pagan predecessors in his exercise of justice. 'They were in their nature, perhaps, only like the just', he writes,

for one who knows not God, the Master of the universe, can attain a likeness of justice, but not justice itself. But you [*ie. Constantine*], both by the innate sanctity of your manners, and by the knowledge of the truth of God, are fulfilling the works of justice in every action. (bk. VII, cap. 27 (p. 538))

Lactantius had interpreted Astraea and her son as types of the Virgin and Christ-child, and he here approaches Constantine as an embodiment of the justice that he identifies with Christ and the Christian Church. The justice that pagan poets had embodied in Astraea was for Lactantius being fulfilled in every action of the Christian Emperor Constantine.

It is with Constantine's Christian Empire that England is compared in the 1533 *Entry*. Virgil had prophesied that a pagan Golden Age would be established under the leadership of Astraea's son, and Constantine had interpreted this as an allegory for Christ, Mary, and the Immaculate Conception. Lactantius had identified Constantine's Empire as the proper setting for the Golden Age that Christ's birth was believed to have brought about, and it is as the site of this Christian Golden Age that Henry's England is likewise identified in the 1533 *Entry*. Its pageants emphasise Anne Boleyn's role as queen-consort and mother-to-be, and it is within this role that the *Entry* identifies Anne with Astraea and

Mary, as the heaven-sent mediatrix destined to follow in the footsteps of her classical and Christian forebears, and to give birth to the child who would re-establish the Golden Age on earth. Lactantius had identified this Golden Age with the Empire under Constantine, but it is with Anne, England, and the empire enshrined in the Appeals Act that this Golden Age is associated in the pageants of the 1533 *Entry*. It is in relation to Astraea and the Virgin Mary that Anne is presented in the *Entry*, and this blending of the classical with the Christian follows the interpretative strategies of fourth-century apologists, who had assimilated pagan mythology and pagan political ideology to the Christian world-view. Anne's apotheosis in the 1533 *Entry* departs in this respect from either of the 'wholly biblical' or entirely secular styles of epiphany that Roy Strong has associated with the 'medieval' and 'Renaissance manner' of royal entry.³⁷ The *Entry* instead combines Christian theology with pagan mythology, in a rhetoric that borrows from the apologetics of the fourth-century Church, to identify Anne with Astraea and Mary, and compare Henry's English empire to the Golden Age that Lactantius had associated with the Christian Empire under Constantine. 'Quam fausta illuxit, terra Brita[n]na, tibi! [How lucky for you, Britain!]', chorus the nine Muses at the conclusion of the first pageant on the corner of Gracechurch Street.

O te felicem tua si iam commoda nesses,
 Quae cum Regina lux ferat ista simul.
 Hac Domina ciues praesentia numina spondent
 Tempora praeteritis commodiora dare.
 Hac Domina haud vnq[uam] vanus promittit Apollo.
 Perpetuo vobis tempora laeta fore.
 Aeterni iam veris honor, iam secla redibunt
 Qualia Saturni regna tenentis erant.
 Quaeque sub Henrico fuit vrbs liberrima semper,
 Anna erit adiuncta coniuge liberior.
 Mox ea concipiet regni solatia vestri.
 Filiolum, tanto qui patre dignus erit.
 Sumere et imperij qui scepra ac iura paterni,
 Sed post Henrici tempora, sera queat.

[O a favourable day already begins to dawn with your queen, if only you know the good things that she brings with her! Here Lady, citizens, the gods in person pledge to give more fully than to past times. At no time here, Lady, does Apollo make empty promises. The glad times for you are going to be forever. True honour now eternal, now the ages return such as had been kept in the reigns of

³⁷ Strong, pp. 10-11.

Saturn. That which in Henry's reign has always been the freest city, in Anne's reign shall be yet freer. Soon she shall bear that solace of the realm and of you both – a little son, who shall be as great as the worthy father – and who moreover, after the times of Henry, shall be able to take up the rights and powers of his father's empire.]³⁸

According to Eusebius, it was by the express appointment of the one God that the origins of the Roman Empire had coincided with the advent of Christianity. In the verse he composed for the Gracechurch Street Muses, Udall here invests Henry's England with this same providential significance. Anne's advent as Henry's spouse is as heaven-sent for Udall as was Constantine's Empire in the encomium of Eusebius, for as Eusebius had upheld this Empire as the divinely-intended setting for the Christian Golden Age, so Udall writes that the reigns of Saturn will return during Anne's reign as queen-consort. Udall presents Anne as instrumental to the re-establishment of the Golden Age on earth, and he further implies identification between Anne and Astraea by emphasising Anne's child-bearing role, as mother of 'a little son' and heir to Henry's imperial crown. Anne's role as royal child-bearer is also central to her presentation in the verse that Udall composed for each of the nine Muses. 'Anna venit [Anne comes]', sings Cleio. 'Connubia hæc, superi, qui statuere, probent [May the heavenly ones who judge bless these nuptials]' (fol. 4^r), so that soon Anne will prove herself 'sobolem parias mater f[æ]cunda virilem [a fertile mother to bring forth manly offspring]' (fol. 4^v). It is Anne herself who is urged by Polyhymnia 'patriam mox prole beare [to soon bless the land with an heir]' (fol. 7^v), whilst her sister Thaleia again invokes heaven's blessings on 'Felicesque toros, et qui post s[æ]cula vestra | Regnum capessant liberos [a happy marriage, and that after your lifetimes your children shall seize the kingdom]' (fol. 5^r). Calliope asks the London citizens to pray that Henry and Anne beget 'pignora [...] digna parentibus [offspring worthy of their parents]' (fol. 4^v), whilst Melpomene and Erato hope that 'breui tam patriam, quam principem, | Fœcunda prole mascula | Beet [in a short time this fruitful one shall bless her country and her prince with a son]' (fol. 5^r), and that 'Henrico et Annæ' may intertwine 'Prole cum pari suis [with their fair heir]' as the elm and clinging vine (fol. 6^r). As in the chorus of the Muses, Anne's advent is identified as heaven-sent in the verse that Udall assigns to Vrania – 'Hanc o fausta Britannia, | Ortam syderibus [...] tibi [She has sprung from the heavens for you, O happy Britain!]' (fol. 6^v). Hers is the only verse at this

³⁸ BL, Royal MSS, 18. A LXIV, fols. 7^v-8^r.

pageant to make specific allusion to the fact that Anne was already six months pregnant at the time of the *Entry*.³⁹ Already ‘Annæ vterus tumens [Anna’s womb is swelling]’, sings Vrania.

Hæc mox iam meditabitur,
Fœcundo sobolem gignere masculam
Partu, quæ imperium regat,
Vna cum senibus rite parentibus

[Soon now a son shall be borne of this fruitful one, to rule the empire aright alongside his aged parents]. (fol. 6^v)

Only in the verse that Udall composed for Terpsichore and Euterpe is there no allusion to either Anne’s child-bearing role, or to the better times that the birth of a royal heir could be expected to bring about.

Anne is presented by Udall as a mother-to-be, a mediatrix who brings better times with her, and who does so because she bears within her the child by whose birth these better times will be brought to fruition. His verse for the pageant *Of Apollo with the Muses* identifies Anne with her classical forebear, the goddess Astraea, and the stagecraft of this pageant is also influenced by Virgil’s fourth *Eclogue*, and its prophecy that Astraea will return to re-establish the Golden Age on earth. The *Coronacyon* describes how Apollo and the nine Muses were arrayed on stage with ‘instrumentes & apparayle acordyng to the discrypcion of poetes/ and namely of Uirgyll’ (sig. A4^v). The ascription here to Virgil of verse describing the appearance of Apollo and the nine Muses is misplaced. The description is in fact contained in the fourth-century mnemonic *Catonis de Musis Versus* by pseudo-Ausonius, wherein each muse is identified as patron of, and receives costume appropriate to, one of the nine modes of classical poetry.⁴⁰ What does have its basis in Virgil’s fourth *Eclogue* is the decision of the devisers of the Gracechurch Street pageant to position Calliope at the feet of Apollo. Upon its stage, writes Hall, had ‘satte Appollo and at his feete satte Calliope’. Her eight sisters, Hall continues, were seated below them, ‘on euery syde of the mountain’, and were playing ‘on seueral swete instrumentes’ (sig.

³⁹ Princess Elizabeth was born on 7 September 1533. Anne must have therefore conceived in early December 1532. See Retha M. Warnicke, *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn: Family Politics at the Court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 117-122.

⁴⁰ *The Works of Ausonius*, ed. by R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 676-77.

NNN4^v). Although Apollo's association with the Muses can be traced back to the Homeric Hymn 'To the Muses and Apollo', which identifies Apollo and the Muses as the children of Zeus, it was Virgil who had implied that there was more than mere companionship between Calliope and Apollo.⁴¹ The poet alludes in passing to their sexual relationship with one another when at the conclusion of his fourth *Eclogue* he anticipates the verse that Astraea's son will inspire within him. 'Non me carminibus vincet nec Thracius Orpheus', Virgil writes, 'Nec Linus, huic mater quavis, atque huic pater adsit, | Orphei Calliopea, Lino formosus Apollo [Neither Thracian Orpheus nor Linus beats my songs, although the mother gives help to one and the father to the other, Calliope to Orpheus, handsome Apollo to Linus]' (sig. B4^v).

Virgil's fourth *Eclogue* hints at an intimacy between Calliope and Apollo, and it is this intimacy to which the devisers *Of Apollo with the Muses* gave expression when they decided to position Calliope at Apollo's feet on stage. The text of the *Eclogue* contains a second allusion to the figure of Apollo that may have influenced the stagecraft of the *Entry* on a more fundamental level. Having prophesied that Astraea and the other immortals would descend from the heavens, Virgil turns his attention in the *Eclogue* to the child who was destined to re-establish the Golden Age on earth. 'Tu modo nascenti puero', he writes, 'quo ferrea primum | Desinet, ac toto surget gens aurea mundo: | Casta faue Lucina: tuus iam regnat Apollo [Only you smile, chaste Lucina, on the new-born boy under whom the age of iron shall subside and a golden race arise throughout the world: your Apollo now reigns]' (sig. B3^v). Lucina, the Roman goddess of childbirth, can be associated with either Juno or Diana. The epithet *casta* suggests that by Lucina Virgil had here intended the chaste Diana. His use of the possessive *tuus* to describe the relationship between Lucina and Apollo further identifies Lucina with Diana, since Diana was Apollo's twin sister by Latona and Jupiter. It is of course appropriate that it should here be Diana – the goddess of chastity and childbirth alike – who condones the birth of this immaculately-conceived infant by the virgin Astraea. Diana does not only smile upon this future king because of the circumstances of his birth alone, however, but apparently also because of his resemblance to her twin brother Apollo.

⁴¹ *The Homeric Hymns*, no. 25, ed. by Thomas W. Allen and E. E. Sikes (London: MacMillan, 1904), pp. 280-81.

It is to Apollo that Astraea's child is compared in Virgil's fourth *Eclogue*, and it is this comparison that may well have inspired the subject-matter *Of Apollo with the Muses*. As Apollo is identified with Astraea's son in the *Eclogue*, so Apollo stands in for this child at Gracechurch Street. His presence on stage symbolises the dawn in England of the Golden Age that this child was destined to re-establish on earth. Apollo's descent with the Muses to the streets of London also derives significance from Virgil's allusion in the *Eclogue* to the 'noua progenies cælo demittitur alto [new race being sent down from the high heaven]', to accompany Astraea upon her return to earth (sig. B2^v). The participation of these gods and goddesses in the *Entry* identifies Anne as Astraea, and England as the site of Virgil's Golden Age. 'Æthereasque domos en magnus Apollo reliquit, | Vt te hic nobilis Anna salutet [Behold! Apollo has left the mighty ethereal house in order here to salute you, noble Anne]', Polyhymnia sings.

Iuno, Venus, Pallas, nos Musae, et Gratia triplex,
 Turba Deumque frequens aliorum,
 Debita cantantes Ph[œ]beo carmina iussu
 Huc tibi gratatu[m] Anna venimus.

[Juno, Venus, Pallas, we Muses and the three Graces come hither by Phoebus's command to rejoice. A general multitude of other gods sing songs in tribute to you Anne.]⁴²

By drawing attention to the presence in the *Entry* of gods and goddesses, Polyhymnia casts Anne in the role of Astraea. Virgil had prophesied that gods and goddesses would accompany Astraea upon her descent to earth, and Polyhymnia points out that Apollo and the nine Muses have congregated at Gracechurch Street in order to welcome Anne into London as queen. Polyhymnia not only draws Anne's attention to the presence by Apollo's command of her sister Muses at Gracechurch Street. Her verse also looks beyond the groves of Parnassus, to the goddesses gathered at Apollo's behest at the conduits in Cornhill and Cheapside. Juno, Venus, Athena, and the three Graces all join with the Muses to welcome Anne as Astraea. Both the pageants *Of the Judgement of Paris* and *Of the three Graces* bear witness by their casts of goddesses to the Golden Age that Anne brings with her upon her *Entry* into London.

⁴² BL, Royal MSS, 18. A LXIV, fol. 7^r.

It is as Anne's celestial companions that the three Graces are presented at the Cornhill Conduit. 'Thei attend with their contynuaall presence', Udall writes in English verse that had been 'p[ro]nounced' by a child at the Conduit 'vnto the Queenes grace'. 'While your grace is here, thei also here dwell. | About the pleasaunte brinks of this liue well' (fols. 11^{r-v}). The three sister Graces, Aglaia, Thaleia, and Euphrosyne, pledge to endow Anne with the virtues that they each represent: 'Hartie gladnes', 'stable honour' (fol. 11^v), and 'contynuaall successe' (fol. 12^r). It is with the gifts of the gods that Anne is likewise rewarded at the pageant *Of the Judgement of Paris*. Hall writes that Anne had here received 'a balle of gold' from Mercury, 'in the name of the iii. goddesses' Juno, Venus, and Pallas Athene (sig. NNN4^v). This ball had apparently been 'deuyded in thre' to signify the 'thre giftes [the] which thre Goddesses gaue to her, that is to saye, wysedome, ryches and felicitie' (sig. NNN5^r). It is with a crown, not a ball, that Anne is rewarded by Paris in Udall's play-text for this pageant. This play-text is preserved in the 'copie of diuers and sundry verses', and comprises just twenty-one lines of English verse. The first half of the play forms a summary of the narrative contained in Lucian's *Dialogues*. Jupiter's messenger, Mercury, delivers a golden apple to Paris, with the command 'to Iuge whiche is fairest of these ladies three'. Juno and Pallas each attempt to purloin the apple from Paris by inducing him with 'riches, and kingdomes', and 'incomparable wisdom' respectively. It is to Venus's offer of 'the fairest ladie that on the erthe is' that Paris finally consents, however.

Therefore ladie Venus, before bothe these twain
your beautie moche exceding, by my sentence,
Shall win and haue this aple.

So far, so Lucian. 'Yet to bee plain', Paris continues,

Here is the fouerthe ladie now in presence,
Moste worthie to haue it of due congruence,
As pereles in riches, wit, and beautee,
Whiche ar but sundrie qualities in you three.
But for hir worthynes, this aple of gold
Is to symple a reward a thousand fold. (fol. 13^r)

The golden ball that Paris awards to Anne in Hall's account of this pageant was emblematic of the three gifts of 'wysedome, ryches and felicitie'. In Udall's play-text,

Anne is already ‘pereles in riches, wit, and beautee’, however. Some other prize more appropriate than the ‘symple reward’ of the golden apple is in fact required. ‘Noo, noo’, writes Udall,

an other rewarde there is
Ordeined for the worthynes of hir grace,
And not to bee disposed by you Paris,
Nor to bee geven here in this place.
Queene Anne, moste excellent that eu[er] was,
ffor you is redy a Croun Imperiall,
To your ioye, honour, and glorie ymmortall. (fol. 13^v)

Anne entered London as queen-consort of Henry’s English empire, and Udall here alludes to the imperial crown with which Anne was to be invested at her coronation the following day. The gods and goddesses in the *Entry* function to identify Anne with Astraea, and England with the Golden Age that Astraea was to have re-established on earth. By alluding to Anne’s imperial crown, Udall identifies the Golden Age that he hopes to see established in England during Anne’s reign as queen with the English empire that two months beforehand had been enshrined in the preamble to the Appeals Act. A replica of this imperial crown appears on the stage of the Leadenhall pageant *Of St. Anne*. Its English play-text, complete with two stage-directions, was also composed by Udall, as was the English ballad that Udall directed to be sung upon Anne’s departure from this pageant. Udall additionally composed three stanzas of Latin verse in praise of ‘progeniem Diu[æ] Annæ [the progeny of St Anne]’, ‘Falcone e nube delabente in rosas [the falcon descending from the cloud to the roses]’ (fol. 10^v), and ‘Angelo Falconem coronante’ [the Angel crowning the Falcon]’, with Leland contributing a fourth stanza in Latin ‘de eodem pegmate [on the same pageant]’ (fol. 10^v). Udall’s script, which consists of three speeches ‘pronounced vnto the quenes grace’ by three children, forms a comment on the action that unfolds on stage (fol. 8^f). Both Hall and the author of the *Coronacyon* agree upon the scene that greeted Anne at this pageant. Beneath a painted cupola depicting the heavens sat ‘saint Anne’, the apocryphal mother of the Virgin Mary, and of her two sisters Mary Cleophas and Mary Salome, herself mother to the apostles James and John. ‘The thre Marys’ sat beneath Anne, and beneath them sat Christ, James, John, and the four children of Mary Cleophas.⁴³ Hall recounts that one of the four children of Mary Cleophas then

⁴³ *The tryumphaut coronacyon*, sig. A4^r.

arose to make ‘a goodly Oracion to the quene of the fruitfulness of saint Anne and of her generacion, trustyng that like fruite should come of her’.⁴⁴

Anne was identified with her classical forebear Astraea in the pageant *Of Apollo with the nine Muses*. In the pageant *Of St Anne*, she is also urged to follow in the footsteps of St Anne, and of her daughter, the Virgin Mary. ‘For æs like as from this deuout Saint Anne, | Issued this holy generacion’, Udall writes.

First Christ, to redeme the soll of man,
Then James thapostle, and theuangelist Jhon,
[...]
Wee the Citizens, by you, in shorte space,
hope suche issue, and descente to purchase,
Whereby the same faith shalbee defended,
And this Citie from all daung[er]s preserued. (fol. 8^v)

St Anne takes the place of Astraea in the Leadenhall pageant, as the type of the heaven-sent mediatrix in whose footsteps Anne is being urged to follow. As mother of the Virgin Mary, the figure of St Anne functions in the *Entry* alongside Astraea, as an appropriate vehicle through which to emphasise to Anne Boleyn the importance of her own role as child-bearer to Henry VIII. As mediatrix of the Christian era to which the Virgin Mary gave birth, St Anne’s presence at the Leadenhall complements the presence of the pagan goddesses stationed elsewhere in the *Entry*. Anne’s anticipated son was figured as Phoebus Apollo at Gracechurch Street, but it is with the light of Christian faith, and with the rights of Christian justice, that he is identified at the Leadenhall pageant *Of St Anne*.

Paris had promised Anne an imperial crown in Udall’s play-text for the pageant *Of the Judgement of Paris*, and it is a replica of this crown that Anne indirectly receives at the Leadenhall pageant *Of St Anne*. In his play-text, Udall directed that ‘a white ffalcon’ should descend from a ‘cloud’ in the cupola to alight upon a root on stage (fol. 8^v). This ‘rote of golde’, Hall recounts, was ‘set on a litle mountaine’, and surrounded ‘with red roses & white’ (sig. NNN4^v). Scarcely had the falcon set foot on the root, writes Udall, when

⁴⁴ Hall, *Vnion*, sig. NNN4^v.

out of the same cloud descended an Aungell, & crowned the same ffalcon with a
croun Imperiall, at whiche dooing was p[ro]nounced by an other child as
foloweth.

Vdallus. Honour and grace bee to our queene Anne.
ffor whose cause an Aungell Celestiall
Descendeth, the ffalcon as white as swanne
to croun with a Diademe Imperiall. (fol. 9^v)

The closed crown only acquired its imperial connotations after it had been adopted as the crown of the Holy Roman Empire in the fifteenth century. Chapter One has explored how this symbolism was imported into England with the design of the closed crown during the reign of Henry VII. Like his father, the young King Henry VIII was also careful to define England in relation to the Holy Roman Empire as ‘an Empire off hitself’, and it was this English ideology of empire that had been upheld in the 1522 *Entry*, when Charlemagne had conferred imperial crowns upon both the Emperor and King of England.⁴⁵ Dale Hoak has interpreted the reappearance of the imperial crown in the 1533 *Entry*, at the Leadenhall pageant *Of St Anne*, as evidence of an attempt to use this well-established imperial iconography in order to express Henry’s newfound pretensions to empire in the English Church. The 1533 *Entry* not only echoes the rhetoric of the 1522 *Entry* in its use of the iconography of the imperial crown; its pageantry also borrows from the use that is made in the 1522 *Entry* of the Golden Age motif. The 1522 *Entry* had cast Charles and Henry as the sons of Astraea. It had presented both the Emperor and King of England as crusaders in a holy war with France, and it had likened the *pax Christiana* that their holy war was expected to establish on earth with the Golden Age that Virgil had prophesied in his fourth *Eclogue*. The 1533 *Entry* identifies Anne with Astraea, Anne’s son with the child destined to establish a Golden Age on earth. Both the *Entries* of 1522 and 1533 use this Golden Age motif as a metaphor for empire, but both have different ideologies of empire in mind when they do so. The term ‘empire’ had been used in England at the time of the 1522 *Entry* to describe England’s autonomy from the Holy Roman Empire. The semantics of empire had shifted by 1533, however. The ‘Imperial Crowne’ reappeared in the Appeals Act as shorthand for Henry’s pretensions to

⁴⁵ *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, ed. by Henry Ellis, 1st ser., 3 vols (London: Harding, Triphook, and Lepard, 1824), I, 134-138 (p. 136).

supremacy over the English Church.⁴⁶ It was to this Cesaropapist ideology that the imperial symbolism of the 1533 *Entry* referred.

Anne was not only identified with Astraea in her *Entry*, but with St Anne, and with her daughter, the Virgin Mary. This blending in the *Entry* of classical and Christian motifs follows the interpretative strategies of Christian apologists like Lactantius. Lactantius argued that Christ had established a Christian Golden Age on earth, and he asserted that this Golden Age was destined to be brought to fruition under the leadership of the Christian Emperor Constantine. The *Entry* casts Anne's son into the role that Lactantius had identified with Constantine, and in so doing it likens to Constantine's Christian Empire the English empire enshrined in the Act of Appeals. England shares in the destiny of Constantine's Empire, the *Entry* implies. It too is apotheosised as the divinely-intended setting for the establishment of the Golden Age on earth.

The 1533 *Entry* was not the only piece of royalist propaganda to have identified the empire enshrined in the Act of Appeals with Constantine's Christian Empire. Constantine also figures prominently in tracts written around this time in support of the campaign to annul Henry's marriage to Catherine of Aragon. His presidency over the councils and synods of the fourth-century Church is cited by royalist propagandists as a precedent for Henry's own pretensions to empire in the English Church. Henry's conviction by 1527 that his eighteen-year marriage to Catherine of Aragon was immoral in the eyes of God came to constitute a challenge to papal supremacy in the universal Church. Catherine had been widowed in 1502 after only five months of marriage to Henry's elder brother, Arthur. Assuming that Catherine's marriage to Arthur had been consummated, and recognising that this related Henry to Catherine in the first degree of affinity, Julius II had in December 1503 granted a bull that dispensed with this impediment to Catherine and Henry's marriage. Henry and his team of theologians and canonists alleged that this bull contained errors that invalidated its dispensation of the impediment of affinity. This at least constitutes part of the argument of the treatise exhibited in Henry's name to the legatine court assembled at Blackfriars from May to July

⁴⁶ *Statutes*, III (1817), 427.

1529 to hear the case for the annulment.⁴⁷ The bulk of this treatise, however, is concerned with the second of the two arguments with which the validity of Henry's marriage to Catherine was disputed, the contention that this union contravened the Levitical prohibitions proscribing marriage to a deceased brother's wife (Leviticus 18.6 and 20.21). This second proposal constituted a challenge to papal supremacy itself, because it argued that these Levitical prohibitions were part of the eternal precepts of God, that they were applicable to the specific case of Henry's marriage with Catherine, and that no pope had the power to dispense with the divine law that forbade Henry's union with his brother's wife. It was not only the validity of Julius's bull that was being questioned at Blackfriars. On trial also at this legatine court was the wider question of whether divine law could be dispensed with by the pope at all.

This legatine treatise, the 'Henricvs octauus', became even more uncompromising in its argument for the indispensability of the Levitical prohibitions as it evolved through several subsequent redactions into the form of the treatise that was printed with the determinations of the seven universities favourable to the annulment in April 1531 as *Gravissimae [...] Academiaram censurae*.⁴⁸ Thomas Cranmer's English translation, *The Determinations*, was printed in November of the same year.⁴⁹ *Censurae/ Determinations* presents itself as an abstract treatise upon the subject of whether marriage to a brother's wife was permissible in the eyes of God, and whether the divine impediments to such a union were dispensable by the pope's authority. Never once throughout its seven chapters does it mention Henry VIII, Catherine of Aragon, or the 1503 bull that had dispensed with the impediments to their marriage. The focus of *Censurae/ Determinations* is exclusively upon the Levitical passages around which Henry had hung his case for annulment before

⁴⁷ For Henry's case at the legatine court, see *Vnion*, sig. HHH2^r. The treatise itself is preserved in Trinity College, Cambridge, MSS B.15.19. For discussion, see *The Divorce Tracts of Henry VIII*, ed. by Edward Surtz and Virginia Murphy (Angers: Moreana, 1988), pp. v–xviii.

⁴⁸ *Gravissimae, atque exactissimae illustrissimarum totius Italiae, et Galliae Academiaram censurae* (London: Thomas Berthelet, [1531]; STC 14286). The text in fact prints eight favourable determinations, but two came from the University of Paris, where both the faculties of theology and law submitted their opinions. Virginia Murphy identifies three extant variants of the legatine treatise – evidence, she argues, that the 'Henricvs octauus' evolved into *Censurae* through three stages of redaction. See *Divorce Tracts*, pp. xxiv–xxxiii.

⁴⁹ *The Determinations of the moste famous and mooste excellent vniuersities of Italy and Fraunce, that it is so ynlefull for a man to marie his brothers wife/ that the pope hath no power to dispence therwith* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1531; STC 14287). *Censurae* and *Determinations* have been printed in parallel in *Divorce Tracts*. All references are to this edition.

the court at Blackfriars, and the treatise cites a range of conciliar, patristic and scholastic authorities to support Henry's contention that the pope had no authority to dispense with the divine laws of Leviticus. *Determinations* concludes that it should 'be the dutie' of bishops (cap. 8 (p. 265)), and of 'al other christian men/ be thei neuer so meane or of lowe degre', to 'withstande and resyste valiantly the Pope', by breaking off 'suche mariages, as be incest' in the eyes of God (cap. 8 (p. 267)).

For els howe shal these prelates do the dutie of bysshoppes and ouerseers, as they ought to do, if that for the cruelte, & thretes of the popes, they shall not dare call backe theyr shepe in to the way of truthe, that be out of the wey and lost, for whom they shal gyue a compte in the terrible and dredefull iudgement of god? (cap. 8 (p. 265))

Censurae/ Determinations urges that bishops subordinate canon to divine law, and that they defy those papal dispensations that contravene the dictates of God. Its standpoint is supported in the text by appeal to precedents from the annals of ecclesiastical history. This challenge to papal supremacy in the universal Church had become considerably more developed by the time Edward Foxe set out in 1534 to identify *The true dyffere[n]s betwen [the] regall power and the Ecclesiasticall power*, as his Latin treatise *De Vera Differentia* was entitled in the 1548 translation by Henry, Lord Stafford.⁵⁰ Composed in the immediate aftermath of the passage of the Appeals Act through parliament, its enquiry into ecclesiastical authority has been read by John Guy as an attempt 'to give the legislation of 1533 spurious historical force'.⁵¹ Foxe has been identified as author, in collaboration with John Stokesley and Nicholas de Burgo, of the 'Henricvs octauus', and therefore of *Censurae* itself, and the text of his *De Vera/ dyffere[n]s* certainly follows that of *Censurae* in its use of the precedents of Church history to corroborate its contentions concerning the abuses of papal power over the Tudor Church in England.⁵² When in *De Vera/ dyffere[n]s* Foxe alludes to the recent passage of the 'statute of apelles' through parliament (sig. L8^r), it is in order to stress the significance of this new legislation for the

⁵⁰ Edward Foxe, *Opvs Eximivm. De Vera Differentia Regiæ Potestatis et Ecclesiasticæ, et Qvæ Sit Ipsa Veritas ac Virtvs Vtrivsqve* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1534; STC 11218). *The true dyffere[n]s betwen [the] regall power and the Ecclesiasticall power*, trans. by Henry, Lord Stafford (London: William Copeland, [1548]; STC 11220). All references are to the 1548 edition.

⁵¹ John Guy, 'Thomas Cromwell and the Intellectual Origins of the Henrician Revolution', in *Reassessing the Henrician Age: Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500-1550*, ed. by Alistair Fox and John Guy (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), pp. 151-178 (p. 171).

⁵² For authorship of the 'Henricvs octauus', see *Divorce Tracts*, p. ix.

provincial self-government of the English Church, and to highlight its implications for the supremacy that the pope had hitherto enjoyed over the provinces of Canterbury and York. 'If appellacions chau[n]ce to be had', writes Foxe, 'they shal appeale from the Archdeacons to the bysshoppes and from the bisshoppes to the archbisshops' (sig. L8^r). The Act of Appeals had cited the Second Statute of Præmunire (16 Rich. II, c. 5) as a precedent for its attempt to safeguard 'the p[re]rogatyves lib[er]ties and p[re]emynences of the said Imperiall Crowne of this Realme' from 'the anoyauce aswell of the See of Rome as fromme the auctoritie of other foreyne potentates'. It is not only in the statute of præmunire that precedent can be found for the provincial self-government of the English Church, however. The Act of Appeals had made generalised allusion to 'dyvers sundrie olde autentike histories and cronicles' to corroborate its claim that England was an empire, independent of the See of Rome, and of the authority of all other foreign potentates.⁵³ The text of *De Vera/ dyffere[n]s* turns instead to the specific precedent of the first Council of Nicæa for its own argument concerning the independence of the provincial Church in England. '[The] councel of Nycene hath ratyfyed [that] causes shulde not be determyned out of [the] proui[n]ces where they began', Foxe asserts (sig. E5^v). A marginal comment on the same page points the reader to the source of this assertion – 'Conci niceno cap. v', that is the fifth Nicæan canon, within which it is agreed that an excommunicate must receive communion in the province wherein sentence was first pronounced against him before being received in the province of another prelate.⁵⁴ This canon was not the only precedent from the Council of Nicæa to have been cited by Foxe in support of his argument against papal abuses of power. Papal pretensions to supremacy in the universal Church are similarly confounded by Foxe's contention that the Council of Nicæa had 'counted of euey ma[n]' there present 'to be most holiest, and moost lawefully congregate' (sig. E1^r).

Yf the bisshope of Rome ought bi [the] lawe of god to be taken hedde of [the] church, Foundacion of [the] churche, Chiffe of [the] churche, The onlye & supreme vicarre of christe it is not credible those holye fathers to be so ingnorant [*sic*], [that] they knowe not what they ought to do Nor so vngodly [that] they wold not do that they ought to do. (sigs. D8^v-E1^r)

⁵³ *Statutes*, III (1817), 427.

⁵⁴ See William Bright, *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882), pp. 12-16.

The canons that came out of Nicæa, and the equality observed amongst the congregation of bishops there present, are used by Foxe as evidence to support the claims contained in the Appeals Act concerning the provincial self-government of the English Church. It is in line with this legislation that Foxe exhorts archdeacons to appeal to bishops, and bishops to the archbishops of Canterbury and York, for the determination of causes originating within these two provinces. If, however, the 'Archbisshoppe be slowe or necligent in mynistring Iustyce then ye shal Apele to the Kynge', writes Foxe. For 'it shal not be lawful for Archebysshops, Byshops, nor othere persons of the realme, to goo oute of the Realme without licence of the Kynge' (sig. L8^{r-v}). Alongside the contention in the Appeals Act that England and its Church is an empire, independent of the See of Rome, is the assertion that it is an empire 'gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King', to whom both laity and clergy alike owe obedience.⁵⁵ As Foxe had cited from the Council of Nicæa in support of the self-government of the English Church, so he alludes in *De Vera/ dyffere[n]s* to the presidency of the Emperor Constantine, at Nicæa, and at other councils and synods of the fourth-century Church, as a precedent for Henry's own pretensions to supremacy in the provinces of Canterbury and York. 'The churche of god was co[m]mytted by Christ to the princes or lordes that [they] shulde saue and defende it', writes Foxe (sig. L4^v-5^r). As such, it is 'the princes of the worlde' who 'are bounde to make Acounte to god for [the] churche which they toke of Chryst to gouerne and defend [...] thys is the proper and chefe cure of pri[n]ces' (sig. L5^{r-v}).

Censurae/ Determinations had been concerned to limit papal powers by arguing that each bishop had ultimate responsibility for the spiritual welfare of their see. This accountability has shifted in the text of *De Vera/ dyffere[n]s* to be identified with the secular prince, the supreme head of the Church in his realm. It is with the responsibility to defend the orthodoxy of the Christian religion that Foxe identifies the Emperor Constantine. Foxe quotes from an epistle written by 'Constantine to the bisshoppes assembled together in the Citie of Tiro [*ie. Tyre*]' (sig. L5^v), and admonishing them 'with al spede' to 'come before my magestye that ye maye certyfy & showe me your selues [the] verite of those thnges that ye haue done' (sig. L6^r).⁵⁶ According to Foxe, Constantine

⁵⁵ *Statutes*, III (1817), 427.

⁵⁶ Foxe refers to the Council of Tyre [now Sûr, Lebanon], convoked in AD 335 to depose Athanasius of Alexandria as part of the anti-Nicene reaction in the Eastern Church. See

wrote to the Council of Tyre in response to rumours that ‘in your troubles & hastie councell [...] the trweth is opprest and troden downe’ (sig. L5^v). In commanding that these bishops appear before him, he assures them that he acts in accordance with his role as champion of the Christian truth. ‘I wyl labour with al my power that those thinges that be in [the] lawe of god maye be chefely obserued’, Foxe has Constantine declare. ‘And that al Enemyes of the lawe of god maye vterli be dyspised destroyed and banished’ (sig. L7^v).

Not only do the canons of the Council of Nicæa provide justification in the text of *De Vera/ dyffere[n]s* for the claims of the Appeals Act concerning the independence of the English Church. Parliament’s contention that Henry constituted the supreme head of the clergy in England was also corroborated by allusion to Constantine, and to his presidency over Nicæa and other councils of the fourth-century Church. Christ had entrusted his Church to each and every bishop, and not merely to the Bishop of Rome, Foxe contends, and it was secular rulers, and not the Apostolic See, to whom these bishops were ultimately answerable for their actions. Emperor Justinian, writes Foxe, ‘dyd make lawes & ordinau[n]ces of faith of Heritikes, of holye churches & of bysshoppes and clarkes of religiose men’, after the example of his predecessor Constantine (sigs. L7^v-8^v). Foxe asserts that Henry VIII, and other ‘kinges of England’ before him, have likewise ‘ordered [the] Realme by the Imperiall power’ that Constantine had wielded over his fourth-century Church (sig. M1^v). These allusions in the text of *De Vera/ dyffere[n]s* to the prerogatives of Constantine and the precedents of Nicæa appear alongside other historical material supportive of the Royal Supremacy in the *Collectanea satis copiosa*, a ‘sufficiently abundant collection’ of sources compiled under the leadership of Foxe himself, following the adjournment of the Blackfriars hearing on 30 July 1529.⁵⁷ The production of the *Collectanea* appears to have prompted Henry’s burgeoning pretensions at this time to empire in the English Church. Several years before the promulgation of the Appeals Act in 1533, the contention in its preamble that this ‘Realme of Englonde is an Impire [...] gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King’ was already being proclaimed

Encyclopedia of the Early Church, ed. by Angelo Di Berardino, trans. by Adrian Walford, 2 vols (Cambridge: Clarke, 1992), II, 854-55.

⁵⁷ ‘Collectanea satis copiosa, ex sacris scripturis et authoribus catholicis, de regia ex ecclesiastica potestate: praemittuntur argumentorum tituli’, BL, Cotton MSS, Cleopatra E VI, fols. 16-139.

at court.⁵⁸ Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, apparently made use of material from the *Collectanea* in a conversation on 13 January 1531 with Eustace Chapuys, the Emperor's ambassador in England. Chapuys reported the exchange later on that day in a letter to Charles V. Howard, Chapuys writes, had said to him

that the Popes in former times had tried to usurp authority, and that the people would not suffer it, – still less would they do so now; that the King had a right of empire in his kingdom, and recognised no superior; [...] that Constantine reigned here, and the mother of Constantine was English, &c. [*That*] he had lately shown the ambassadors of France the seal or the tomb of King Arthur [...] in which there was a writing, which I would see in a bill of parchment [...]. This bill contained only the words '*Patricius Arcturus, Britanniae, Galliae, Germaniae, Daciae Imperator*'. I said I was sorry he was not also called Emperor of Asia [...] and if from this he argued that they might still make conquests like the said Arthur, let him consider what had become of the Assyrians, Macedonians, Persians, &c.⁵⁹

'Empire, Constantine, Arthur', writes Richard Koebner on the historical precedents that Norfolk here rehearses. 'These were the fragments which presented, if put together, a coherent texture of historical claims.' According to Koebner, 'Imperial greatness had been brought to England by Constantine being the son of a British mother. It had devolved on Arthur', and, through Arthur, upon Arthur's dynastic successor, Henry VIII.⁶⁰ In his discussion of this encounter between Norfolk and Chapuys, however, Koebner fails to recognise the significance of Chapuys's apparent inability to apprehend the precise political contours of the empire over which Norfolk's master, Henry VIII, was laying claim. It is an empire confined to the contours of England that Norfolk here claims for the King. His assertion that Henry 'had a right of empire in his kingdom, and recognised no superior' anticipates the absolutist ideology of empire enshrined in the Act of Appeals, and expounded in Foxe's *De Vera dyffere[n]s*. According to John Guy, Foxe had attempted in this treatise to give 'spurious historical force' to his support for the Royal Supremacy, by citing from material in *Collectanea* concerning Constantine and the Council of Nicæa. Norfolk had likewise drawn from historical material during his conversation with Chapuys. He had attempted to underscore Henry's claims to empire in

⁵⁸ *Statutes*, III (1817), 427.

⁵⁹ *LP*, V (1880), 19-20.

⁶⁰ Richard Koebner, "'The Imperial Crown of this Realm": Henry VIII, Constantine the Great and Polydore Vergil', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 26 (1953), 29-52 (p. 41).

the English Church, and he had done so through allusion to the empires over which Constantine and Arthur had also apparently proclaimed themselves absolute.

At the same time, however, Chapuys misunderstands the imperial idea that is encoded in Norfolk's allusion to the precedents of Constantine and Arthur. For Chapuys, these same historical figures imply, not Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church, but his aspirations to conquest beyond the shores of his sceptred isle – to empire as it was understood at the court of Chapuys's addressee, the Emperor Charles V. Chapuys had been handpicked in 1529 for the role of resident ambassador in England by the architect of the imperial ideology that was upheld in the 1522 *Entry*, Charles's Grand Chancellor Mercurino de Gattinara. Gattinara had anticipated that Charles would undertake to establish an era of Christian peace on earth through crusades against the Infidel, and he had identified this era of Christian peace with Constantine's Christian Empire. 'God the creator has given you this grace of raising you in dignity above all Christian kings and princes', Gattinara writes to Charles in 1519, 'by constituting you the greatest emperor and king who has been since the division of the empire'. Not since Constantine, Gattinara here implies, has the Christian Empire that he divided into its Eastern and Western Provinces witnessed so superlative an Emperor as now appears in the person of Charles.⁶¹

Gattinara anticipates that Charles will establish a global empire here on earth, and he envisions that in scale this imagined empire will be conterminous with the scale of the Empire that Constantine had subsequently divided into its Eastern and Western Provinces. It was not only with Constantine that Charles V was identified. Charles had also found himself compared to Arthur in the iconography of his alliance with Henry VIII against Francis I. When in July 1520 Charles had dined with Henry at Calais to discuss the details of this Anglo-Imperial alliance, he would have entered the banqueting house that had been constructed for the occasion by passing under a triumphal arch, upon which had been placed a life-size statue of Arthur with the arms and accoutrements of England and the

⁶¹ 'Historia vite et gestorum per dominum magnum cancellarium', ed. by Carlo Bornate, *Miscellanea di storia Italiana*, 48 (1915), 233-568 (pp. 405-06). Translated in John M. Headley, 'The Habsburg World Empire and the Revival of Ghibellinism', in *Theories of Empire, 1450-1800*, ed. by David Armitage, *An Expanding World, The European Impact on World History 1450-1800*, 20 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), pp. 45-79 (p. 50).

Empire.⁶² It was with Arthur again that Charles was compared two years later, in the 1522 *Entry*. According to the *Descrypcion of the pageantes*, the ‘emprow[er] kynge Arthur’ had sat ‘w[i]t[h] the rownde table before hyme’ atop a mock castle at the Cornhill Conduit. A child had then ‘saluted the emprow[er]’, and compared ‘hym in noblenes to the seyde Arthur’.⁶³

When Norfolk alluded to ‘Empire, Constantine, Arthur’ in his conversation with Chapuys in January 1531, it was Henry, not Charles, who was being likened to these historical emperors; Henry’s pretensions to the Royal Supremacy, not Charles’s to world supremacy, that these historical emperors were here being used to uphold. Norfolk uses Constantine and Arthur as precedents for Henry’s pretensions after 1527 to empire in the English Church. His purpose is nevertheless frustrated by the fact that, in his response, Chapuys misconstrues the form of empire to which Norfolk was here attempting to give expression. For Chapuys, these same figures were emblematic of empire as it was understood at the court of Charles V. Gattinara and the devisers of the 1522 *Entry* had likened the global empire that Charles was expected to establish on earth with the empires over which Constantine and Arthur had held sway, and it is as evidence of Henry’s own pretensions to world rule that Chapuys likewise interprets Norfolk’s allusion to the epitaph on Arthur’s tomb. Chapuys admonishes that Norfolk take heed of the failed empires of the Assyrians, Macedonians, and Persians, because he assumes that Norfolk’s use of Arthurian precedent is emblematic of Henry’s own aspirations to conquest beyond the Columns of Hercules. The original intention behind Norfolk’s use of Constantine and Arthur therefore disappears in the act of translation across the cultural barrier between Norfolk and Chapuys. Norfolk had used the fragments of ‘Empire, Constantine, Arthur’ in order to uphold Henry’s pretensions to empire in the English Church. Chapuys had reconstructed these fragments, in line with their use by Habsburg apologists as a precedent for the global empire that Charles was expected to establish on earth. Chapuys had interpreted Norfolk’s comments as evidence that Henry, like Charles, was planning to establish a global empire here on earth. It is for this reason that he had warned the English

⁶² For discussion, see Martin Biddle, ‘The Painting of the Round Table’, in *King Arthur’s Round Table: An Archaeological Investigation*, ed. by Martin Biddle (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), pp. 425-473.

⁶³ ‘The descrypcion of the pageantes made in the Cyte of London att the recevying of the most excellent pryncys Charlys the fyfte Emperour, & Henry the viij. kyng off englonde’, CCCC, MS 298, II, 8, pp. 132-142 (p. 138).

to heed the example of the Assyrians and Macedonians, before they set out to 'make conquests like the said Arthur'.

Constantine had been used by Norfolk as a precedent for Henry's own pretensions to empire in the English Church, and the way that Constantine's Empire had been presented in the apologetics of Lactantius and Eusebius had also influenced how Henry's English empire was presented in the rhetoric of the 1533 *Entry*. Eusebius had identified Constantine's Empire as the divinely-intended setting for the establishment of the Golden Age on earth, and the rhetoric of the 1533 *Entry* had imitated the language of Eusebius's panegyric, to cast Anne as Astraea, and identify England with Virgil's Golden Age. The *Entry* had implied that England shares in the destiny of Constantine's Empire. In so doing, it had identified Henry with the role that Eusebius had reserved for Constantine, as God's deputy on earth. Eusebius had argued that Constantine 'acts as interpreter to the Word of God', and that his edicts aim at 'declaring with powerful voice the laws of truth and godliness to all who dwell on earth'. Constantine had been upheld as supreme head of the Church in his Empire, and it was in this same role that Henry had been cast in the Act of Appeals. Henry's understanding of 'empire' had evolved between 1522 and 1533, but this semantic shift had gone unsignalled in the rhetoric of the 1533 *Entry*, for it had been through tropes familiar to spectators of the 1522 *Entry* that Henry's revised imperialist pretensions had found articulation in pageants performed before Anne Boleyn. England had been transfigured as the Golden Age in both *Entries*; Anne was in her *Entry* awarded the same imperial crown that eleven years earlier had been conferred upon the Emperor and King of England. Astraea and the iconography of the imperial crown are used in the 1522 and 1533 *Entries* to emblematised different ideologies of empire, but it must have proved difficult for spectators of the 1533 *Entry* to differentiate its semantics from that of the 1522 *Entry*, since the clarity of its ideological standpoint must have been obscured by these similarities in the stagecraft of the 1522 and 1533 *Entries*.

In his accounts of the 1533 *Entry*, the Imperial ambassador Chapuys had exploited this slippage between the semantics and symbolism of its stagecraft. In letters to Charles V, Chapuys had presented the pageant *Of Apollo with the Muses* as supportive of Charles's Habsburg Empire, rather than of the English empire that had been enshrined in the Act of Appeals. Two years before the 1533 *Entry*, the Duke of Norfolk had cited

Constantine as a precedent for Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church. In his response, Chapuys had instead interpreted Constantine as a precedent for Henry's aspirations to world rule. It was as a precedent for conquest and crusade that Constantine's Empire had been cited by apologists for Charles V, and Chapuys had invested Constantine with this same semantic currency in his conversation with Norfolk. Chapuys's response to the pageant *Of Apollo with the Muses* follows his interpretation of the precedent of Constantine. Like Constantine's Empire, the Golden Age described by Virgil had been incorporated into the rhetoric of Charles's Habsburg Empire, where it functioned as a metaphor for the era of Christian peace that Charles had been expected to establish on earth. Charles had been identified as Astraea's son in Guevara's *Diall of Princes*, and he and Henry had both been cast in this role in the 1522 *Entry*. Chapuys had not been ambassador in England when Charles and Henry had entered London in 1522, but his response to the 1533 *Entry* was nevertheless to read the semantics of the 1522 *Entry* into the stagecraft *Of Apollo with the Muses*. Chapuys had interpreted this pageant as propaganda, not for Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church, but for the Habsburg Empire of Charles V, and for the Emperor's standpoint on Henry's marriage to Anne Boleyn. He had been able to do so because the stagecraft *Of Apollo with the Muses* had echoed Guevara and the 1522 *Entry* in its use of the Golden Age as a metaphor for empire.

* * *

In his letters to Charles V, Chapuys had intimated that the English were sympathetic to the Emperor's own standpoint on Henry's marriage to Anne. 'The King in vain forbids' the people to 'be so bold as to murmur at his marriage', Chapuys had written to Charles on 27 April 1533, 'as it only makes the people speak more against it in private, and these prohibitions only serve to envenom the heart of the people'.⁶⁴ Chapuys had claimed that the English were unhappy about Henry's marriage to Anne, and it was to add grist to these claims that he had read *Apollo with the Muses* as a pageant supportive of the Emperor, and of his consternation over what Cranmer had termed the King's 'great cause of matrimony'.⁶⁵ 'The time did not suffer, and still less the quality of the bearer of my letters

⁶⁴ *LP*, VI (1882), 179.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

of the 7th, to write at great length of the occurrences here', Chapuys complains to Charles V in his letter of 16 June 1533.

This prevented me from making any mention of the entry of the King's lady into this city and of her coronation, which was a cold, meagre, and uncomfortable thing, to the great dissatisfaction, not only of the common people, but also of the rest. And it seems that the indignation of everybody about this affair has increased by a half since the coronation. As it would be disagreeable to your Majesty to read the account of the said entry and coronation, I have written to Granvelle, to whom your Majesty can refer if you have leisure to waste.⁶⁶

Chapuys here refers Charles to his account of the *Entry*, and a fragment of an account opprobrious to the 1533 *Entry* is calendered in *Letters and Papers*. Although anonymous and undated, its description of how Anne had been insulted on the day of her *Entry* appears attributable to Chapuys, since it affirms what Chapuys had himself alleged about the 'indignation' of the English in the matter of Henry's marriage to Anne. The writer of this fragment relates that

though it was customary to kneel, uncover, and cry 'God save the King, God save the Queen', whenever they appeared in public, no one in London or the suburbs, not even women and children, did so on this occasion. One of the Queen's servants told the mayor to command the people to make the customary shouts, and was answered that he could not command people's hearts, and that even the King could not make them do so. [...] The letters H. A. were painted in several places, for Henry and Anne, but were laughed at by many.⁶⁷

It is more than probable that Chapuys had not even been present at the *Entry* to witness the 'cold, meagre, and uncomfortable' affair that he describes in his letters to the Emperor. Neither Hall nor the writer of the *Coronacyon* mentions his participation alongside the other ambassadors in the train of Anne's procession through London.⁶⁸ Chapuys had been reluctant to attend court in the month leading up to Anne's coronation on 1 June, and he had even 'thought it right to decline' dinner at the Duke of Norfolk's on Tuesday 14 May. Three days earlier, the court assembled at Dunstable Priory to hear the case for annulment had declared Catherine of Aragon contumacious by her non-

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 295.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 266.

⁶⁸ *Coronacyon*, sigs. A3^v-A4^r; cp. *Vnion*, sigs. NNN4^{r-v}. Both accounts mention the participation of the French and Venetian ambassadors.

appearance before them, and Chapuys had declined his dinner invitation in protest at this decision – so as ‘not to increase the suspicion that your Majesty has consented to this detestable proceeding’, he later explained to Charles V.⁶⁹ Chapuys had confessed himself ‘most devoted to the right of the Queen’ Catherine in a letter to the Emperor of Thursday 29 May.⁷⁰ Catherine’s successor, Anne Boleyn, had been crowned queen three days later, and if Chapuys had declined Norfolk’s invitation out of sympathy for Catherine, he must surely have also abstained from the opportunity to accompany Anne upon her *Entry* that weekend. In this letter of 29 May, Chapuys alludes to Anne’s procession by barge from Greenwich to the Tower, which according to Hall had occurred ‘at one of the clocke’ that afternoon (sig. NNN2^v). Chapuys writes that Norfolk had invited him ‘secretly to see him in his chamber’ that morning, and he reports that they had there discussed matters relating to Henry’s matrimonial policy, in anticipation of Norfolk’s departure for Nice the same afternoon.⁷¹ ‘The Duke left’ for Dover ‘two hours after I had returned’, writes Chapuys, ‘so that neither he nor his company [...] have delayed one day to see the triumph in which the Lady has today come from Greenwich to the Tower’.⁷² Norfolk and his train had been unable – or perhaps unwilling – to attend Anne’s triumph due to the timing of their departure for France. Chapuys, by his own admission, had returned to his London lodgings a full two hours before Norfolk’s departure, and he therefore would have had ample opportunity to reach the Tower in time to witness the multitude of people, who according to Hall had ‘stode on euery shore to beholde the sight’ of Anne’s arrival there by barge (sig. NNN3^v). The tone in which Chapuys reports Norfolk’s failure to delay even ‘one day to see the triumph’ – his readiness to read this as an absence arising out of volition rather than of necessity – argues that Chapuys had himself followed Norfolk in failing to join the throng of people at the Tower. Chapuys may not have been present at the Tower that Thursday, but nor was he willing to believe royalist accounts of just how many had turned out to witness Anne’s entry into London by barge. ‘It passeth al mennes iudgementes to esteme the infinyte nombre of them’ who had ‘stode on the shore on bothe sydes of the ryuer’, wrote the author of the *Coronacyon* (sig. A2^v). ‘He that sawe it not would not beleue it’, Hall had claimed (sig. NNN3^v). Chapuys had not seen it, and nor did he believe it. ‘The said triumph consisted entirely in the multitude of those who took part

⁶⁹ *LP*, VI (1882), 223. For the Dunstable court, see MacCulloch, pp. 92-94.

⁷⁰ *LP*, VI (1882), 243.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 243-44.

in it', Chapuys wrote to Charles V on 29 May, 'but all the people showed themselves as sorry as though it had been a funeral. I am told their indignation increases daily, and that they live in hope your Majesty will interfere'.⁷³

When Chapuys spoke of 'interference', he spoke of war. In his letter to Charles of 26 May, Chapuys had suggested that 'the king of Scots might, without breach of faith, be the true instrument to redress matters here', and that in this war the Scots 'might be aided by money from the Pope, whom the matter touches, and also from your Majesty'. 'No doubt it would be better if all this could be avoided', Chapuys concedes,

but there is no hope of a remedy by gentleness; and even this people, who would suffer much if matters came to extremity, desire nothing better than that your Majesty should send an army hither. Your Majesty will doubtless judge of this by your immense prudence.⁷⁴

Chapuys counsels Charles to intervene in English affairs, and he explains that his calls for 'an enterprise against this kingdom' merely echo the will of the English themselves, whose hearts, writes Chapuys, have been envenomed against the King by the 'obstinacy' of his decision to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon.⁷⁵ Catherine had herself written to Charles to enjoin that he help 'his Holiness [...] slay the second Turk, which is the business of the King, my lord and my own'. Like Chapuys, she too had claimed to speak for 'all this kingdom and myself' in expressing her indignation over the King's great matter.⁷⁶

When Chapuys wrote to Charles about Anne's frosty, funeral-like *Entry* into London, he did so in order to substantiate his and Catherine's claims to echo the murmuring of the English over the matter of Henry's marriage to Anne. According to Chapuys, the London citizens had been asked to contribute a total of 'about 5,000 ducats' towards the cost of the *Entry*, 'of which 3,000 are for a present to the Lady, and the rest for the ceremonial'. 'Formerly there was no opposition to the said contribution', Chapuys concedes to Charles in his letter of 18 May, but he explains that the increasing indignation

⁷³ Ibid., p. 244.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 236.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 150.

⁷⁶ *LP*, V (1880), 641.

of Londoners has meant that 'now they compel even foreigners to contribute'. 'The Easterlings, as being subjects of your Majesty, would like to be excused, but the great privileges they enjoy here prevent them from objecting'.⁷⁷ Chapuys alleges that the London citizens had refused to contribute towards the costs of crowning Catherine's successor, but he explains that the Easterlings, or merchants of the Steelyard, had felt compelled to support Anne's *Entry*, as foreigners trading in England by royal consent. Foreigners had indeed been compelled to contribute towards the cost of the *Entry*. Hall and other aldermen had asked the duke of Norfolk whether the 'estrangers enhabytyng w[ith]in thys Citie' could be induced to 'make of them selff[es] any pagent[es] or be contrybitares to the pageint[es] of the Citie', and in his account of the *Entry*, Hall writes that the pageant *Of Apollo with the Muses* had been 'made by the marchautes of the Stylliarde'.⁷⁸ Eric Ives has suggested that Hall's term 'made' should here 'be read as no more than "paid for"', since authorship of the Gracechurch Street pageant can at least in part be attributed to Udall, as the sole composer of its surviving Latin verse (p. 276). In his letters to Charles V, Chapuys himself assigned much more artistic licence than had Hall to the Easterlings, or merchants of the Steelyard. His letter of 11 July informs Charles of how Anne 'complains daily of the Easterlings, who on the day of her entry had set the Imperial eagle predominant over the King's arms and hers'.⁷⁹ Three weeks later, on the 30 July, Chapuys is again alluding to 'the regret she [*ie. Anne*] felt for the eagle which the Easterlings carried in triumph the day of her entry here'.⁸⁰

The eagle to which Chapuys here refers is the two-headed eagle of the Habsburg coat of arms, arms that Charles V had inherited from his grandfather Maximilian I upon his election to the Empire in 1519. As Peter Burke has observed,

Charles apparaissait aussi comme l'aigle mentionné par le prophète Ezéchiel, 'un grand aigle aux grandes ailes [...] couvert d'un plumage aux couleurs variées' (Ezéchiel 17, 3) [...] Ce parallèle était d'autant plus logique que les armoiries des Habsbourg avaient pour symbole un aigle bicéphale.

[Charles was also compared with the eagle referred to by the prophet Ezechiel, 'a large eagle with great wings [...] covered with a multi-coloured plumage'

⁷⁷ *LP*, VI (1882), 226.

⁷⁸ BL, Egerton MSS, 2623, fol. 5; *Vnion*, sig. NNN4^v.

⁷⁹ *LP*, VI (1882), 356.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 397.

(Ezechiel 17.3) [...] This parallel was all the more appropriate because the arms of the Habsburgs took as their symbol a two-headed eagle.]⁸¹

For the citizens who gathered to witness Anne's *Entry*, the two-headed eagle would have been synonymous, not only with the Habsburg Empire of Charles V, but also with the merchants of the Steelyard who, as Chapuys pointed out to the Emperor, professed themselves 'subjects of your Majesty'. Chamberlain has indicated that the Habsburg two-headed eagle even appeared in the early sixteenth century 'carved in stone over the principal entrance to the Steelyard'.⁸² An eagle is included in a surviving sketch in pen and wash of the pageant *Of Apollo with the Muses*.⁸³ The sketch, which has been attributed to Hans Holbein, depicts Apollo surrounded by the nine Muses, and seated in a bower surmounted by an eagle. Below the eagle, the scene is framed on either side by two candelabra, each bearing the royal arms and both surmounted by two imperial crowns, the same crowns that are displayed elsewhere in the *Entry* at the pageants *Of St Anne* and *Of the Judgment of Paris*. Anglo writes that this sketch 'closely tallies with Hall's description and Udall's verses', and Kipling argues that the drawing 'probably represents a preliminary design for a pageant suited to Leland's and Udall's iconographical scheme'.⁸⁴ The parallels between Holbein's design and Hall's description of the Gracechurch Street pageant certainly implies that *Apollo with the Muses* was the product of a close collaboration between Holbein, Udall, and the merchants of the Steelyard – although it is unclear from this whether 'Holbein himself, no doubt, superintended the erection' of the pageant on the day of Anne's *Entry*, as Chamberlain has argued (II, 31). Ives merely identifies Holbein as the artist 'called in by the merchants to execute a design to a detailed English specification' (p. 276).

Neither Hall nor the author of the *Coronacyon* mention the appearance of the eagle in this pageant, but its inclusion on stage, atop Apollo's bower, is implied by the parallels in all other respects between Holbein's design and Hall's description. Chapuys alleged that the Easterlings had set 'the Imperial eagle predominant over the King's arms', and it is in this exact iconographical configuration that the eagle and royal arms appear in

⁸¹ Peter Burke, 'L'image de Charles Quint: construction et interprétations', in *Charles Quint 1500-1558: L'empereur et son temps*, ed. by Hugo Soly (Arles: Actes Sud, 2000), pp. 393-475 (p. 422).

⁸² Arthur Chamberlain, *Hans Holbein the Younger*, 2 vols (London: Allen, 1913), II, 33.

⁸³ The sketch is reproduced in Chamberlain, II, plate 8.

⁸⁴ Anglo, p. 250; Kipling, 'Anne Boleyn's Royal Entry', pp. 63-64.

Holbein's sketch. If this sketch describes the design of the pageant as it appeared in the *Entry*, then it is easy to see why Anne had interpreted the stagecraft *Of Apollo with the Muses* as an affront to her and her husband. This is certainly what Chapuys alleged had happened. He identifies the Easterlings as authors of this insult to Anne, and he approaches their pageant at Gracechurch Street as evidence of their indignation over the King's great matter. For Chapuys, the pageant *Of Apollo with the Muses* had echoed the snubs that Anne elsewhere received from Londoners during her frosty, funeral-like *Entry*. Chapuys interprets the stagecraft *Of Apollo with the Muses* as sympathetic to the Emperor's standpoint on Henry's marriage to Anne. He insinuates protest into the pageantry of the *Entry*, and he does so in order to encourage Charles to wage war with the King of England.

Chamberlain takes the content of Chapuys's letters to Charles V at face value. He argues that 'no doubt exists as to the use of the eagle on this particular occasion', and he bases this on the evidence that Chapuys had written to Charles on 11 July, to report that the eagle had been 'viewed with extreme distaste by the new Queen' (II, 32). More recent criticism has approached the historical accuracy of Chapuys's narrative with considerable scepticism, not least because Holbein's drawing, as Anglo points out, 'clearly shows a one-headed bird' (p. 250, n. 2). Chamberlain admits that 'the drawing is rubbed at the top', but he argues that 'there seem to be indications that the split or two-headed bird, which was then customary, was intended' (II, 32). Ives agrees with Anglo that 'the eagle in Holbein's drawing is not the two-headed bird of the Habsburgs'. He argues that it was improbable that the Easterlings should have planned 'so offensive a gesture' to Anne as to incorporate the Habsburg eagle into the stagecraft *Of Apollo with the Muses*, because he points out that these merchants were economic migrants in England, who 'depended on the favour of the English crown'. Even if they had intended to snub Anne, however, Ives asserts that it would have been inappropriate for the Easterlings to have incorporated the Habsburg eagle into the iconography of a pageant concerned with Apollo. Ives approaches the imperial eagle as a gesture offensive, not only to Anne's political, but also to her aesthetic sensibilities, and he argues that the stagecraft *Of Apollo with the Muses* was therefore its own guarantee against contamination by merchants hostile to Henry's marriage with Anne. 'The iconography of the tableau demands that the eagle be the one associated with Apollo', he writes. 'To have incorporated the imperial bird associated

with Zeus, and without any justification in the text, would have been illiteracy of the first order' (p. 277).

Chapuys alleges that the Easterlings had snubbed Anne by incorporating the Habsburg eagle into their pageant *Of Apollo with the Muses*, but Ives argues that, as economic migrants, the Easterlings were unlikely to have affronted Anne in this way. The ideological agenda that underlies Chapuys's accounts of the *Entry* demands that we follow Ives in approaching with scepticism his reading *Of Apollo with the Muses* as a site of cultural contest. Nevertheless, it would seem that Ives rather misses the point in his reading of the imperial eagle as a symbol inappropriate to the iconography of this pageant. Ives approaches as a purely aesthetic event the depiction at Gracechurch Street of the groves of Parnassus, and it is aesthetic reasons that he offers for why the eagle associated with Zeus would have been inappropriate to its dramatisation of Apollo. This chapter has instead offered a reading of the 1533 *Entry* that interprets ideological objectives behind the stagecraft *Of Apollo with the Muses*. It has argued that this pageant identifies Anne with Astraea, and England with the Golden Age, and it has approached the Golden Age as a metaphor for Henry's pretensions, as enshrined in the Appeals Act, to empire in the English Church. The Golden Age had also been used in the 1522 *Entry* to define England in relation to the Habsburg Empire as an 'Empire off himself', and it is these confluences between the symbolism, but not the semantics, of the 1522 and 1533 *Entries* that Chapuys exploits in his account of how the Easterlings had set the Habsburg eagle over the arms and imperial crowns of Henry and Anne. It may have been implausible that the Easterlings would have wanted to insult Anne in this way, but it would not have been inappropriate for them to have incorporated the iconography of the Habsburg Empire into the landscape of Parnassus and the language of the Golden Age. The bower within which Apollo sits surrounded by the Muses at Gracechurch Street could have been surmounted by either the one-headed eagle of Apollo, or the two-headed eagle of the Habsburg Empire – because this landscape was emblematic in the early sixteenth century of both the Habsburg and Tudor imperial ideas. It is this symbolic economy that Chapuys exploits when he interprets *Apollo with the Muses* as a pageant sympathetic to the Emperor's standpoint on Henry's marriage to Anne. Chapuys reads the semantics of the Habsburg Empire into the symbolism of the 1533 *Entry*. In so doing, he exposes the shortfalls in the function of the 1533 *Entry* as propaganda for the Royal Supremacy. A new rhetoric was needed to

popularise Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church, to encourage Henry's subjects to reimagine England as an 'Impire [...] gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King'.

* * *

Part II

ENGLAND

If England coude speake might it not say thus?
I am one, why doo you make me twayne?

Richard Morison, *A Lamentation* (London, 1536)

Chapter 3

'If England coude speake': Rebellion and the Rhetoric of Nationhood in Richard Morison's Pamphlets against the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536)

In his letters to Charles V, Eustace Chapuys had dismissed Anne Boleyn's *Entry* into London as 'a cold, meagre, and uncomfortable thing'.¹ Chapuys had wanted to convince the Emperor of the strength of opposition in England towards Henry's marriage to Anne. His letters to the Emperor describe the 'indignation' that had been aroused by Anne's *Entry*, and they do so in order to reassure Charles of the warmer welcome that awaited the Imperial army in England, should the Emperor decide to follow his ambassador's advice and conduct 'an enterprise' against the King.² 'Even this people, who would suffer much if matters came to extremity', Chapuys had written to Charles on 26 May 1533, 'desire nothing better than that your Majesty should send an army hither'.³

Chapuys renewed his call for an enterprise against the King over three years later, in October 1536. In so doing, he again claimed only to be echoing opinion in England. None of Chapuys's claims about the insults that Anne had received during her *Entry* are corroborated in either of the other two accounts of these coronation festivities – Edward Hall's *Vnion* and the anonymous *Coronacyon*. When in October 1536 Chapuys again wanted to find evidence of unrest in England, he was at this time able to allude to the well-documented spate of popular uprisings in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire. The scale of the northern rebellions was such that even the royalist Edward Hall could not dismiss these events without comment. In his *Vnion*, Hall condemns the 'trayterous rebelles' who had gathered in 'the North partes' to do battle with the decision of the King in parliament to dissolve the lesser monasteries in England.⁴ 'Five days ago in Lincolnshire', Chapuys writes in his letter to Charles V of 7 October 1536, 'a great multitude of people rose against the King's commissioners, who levied the taxes lately imposed by parliament and

¹ *LP*, VI (1882), 295.

² *Ibid.*, p. 266; p. 150.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 236.

⁴ Edward Hall, *The vnion of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre & Yorke* (London: Richard Grafton, 1548; STC 12721), sigs. PPP8^v-QQQ1^r.

put down the abbeys'.⁵ Some five days later, the ambassador had sent his nephew as emissary to Mary, Queen of Hungary and sister of Charles V, to inform her of these affairs in England, and of her obligation, as niece of the late Catherine of Aragon, to support the Lincolnshire rebels in their war against Catherine's estranged husband, Henry VIII. In his despatch to the Queen of Hungary, Chapuys's nephew observes how

it appears to him [*ie Chapuys*] who has sent me to your Majesty, that [...] the time is come (and no such opportunity could be looked for in 100 years) to take revenge upon the Schismatic for all his intrigues with the French against the Emperor, and the indignities he inflicted upon your aunt [*ie. Catherine of Aragon*], and the innumerable iniquities he has committed against the patient Princess [*Mary*], to restore whom to her rightful estate would require but part of the army which was prepared in Zealand, and that it should land in the river which goes up to York with 2,000 arquebusiers and some ammunition, which is what they are most in need of.⁶

Chapuys was correct to have associated the origins of the Lincolnshire Uprising with the putting down of abbeys in the region as part of the enforcement of the Act for the Dissolution of Lesser Monasteries (27 Hen. VIII, c. 28).⁷ Passed in May 1536, the act legislated for the suppression of all monasteries with an annual income of less than two hundred pounds. According to the testimony of their own depositions, the Lincolnshire rebels had reacted with alarm to news of the forfeiture by royal commissioners of local monastic lands, assuming that these same commissioners also intended to impoverish parish churches in the nearby area. 'A month before the insurrection', alleged one Philip Trotter under examination in the Tower of London, 'it was commonly bruited that all the abbeys in England should be suppressed except Westminster; that the jewels of the churches should be taken away, and chalices, crosses, and censers of tin put in their places, and that two or three parish churches should be put in one'.⁸ It was widespread belief in these rumours that prompted parishioners in Louth, Lincolnshire, to take matters into their own hands on Sunday 1 October, the day before John Raynes, the chancellor of

⁵ *LP*, XI (1888), 229.

⁶ Chapuys's nephew arrived in Brussels on Sunday 14 October with news from England of the uprising in Lincolnshire. It is unclear whether he or an envoy from Brussels then made the journey overland to Vienna. See *LP*, XI (1888), 274. The despatch, contained in the Vienna Archives, is calendared in *LP*, XI (1888), 275-76. A translation from a variant copy in the Brussels Archives is in William Thomas's *The Pilgrim: A Dialogue on the Life and Actions of King Henry the Eighth*, ed. by John A. Froude (London: Parker, 1861), pp. 113-115. Froude attributes this despatch to 'an emissary of the Flemish Court', but he assigns London as its place of composition.

⁷ *Statutes*, III (1817), 575-78.

⁸ *LP*, XII.i (1890), 37.

Bishop John Longland of Lincoln, was expected in the parish to conduct the episcopal visitation.⁹ Hearing of the recent suppression of the nearby nunnery of Legbourne, and fearing for the removal by Raynes of their own church's treasures, the parishioners promptly took possession of the keys to the strongbox wherein the parish plate was contained, and then seized those agents of Raynes who arrived the next day. By Tuesday, the rising had spread to nearby Horncastle, where according to Chapuys's nephew 'more than 10, 000 persons met together well armed'.¹⁰ It was from Horncastle that the rebels first dispatched their petitions to the King. Henry's response was to send letters to the Earls of Shrewsbury and Rutland, directing them to muster an army and march on Lincolnshire, under the command of Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk.¹¹

Against the backdrop of this stormy political climate, it was to the word rather than the sword that the royalist pamphleteer Richard Morison resorted in an attempt to extricate England's divided political body from the jurisdictional quagmire into which it had fallen. Morison responded to news of the uprising in Lincolnshire by composing, apparently at Cromwell's command, his *Lamentation [...] of seditious rebellyon*, advocating obedience to Henry and his recent acts of parliament.¹² The rhetoric of

⁹ The origins of the Lincolnshire Uprising and the Yorkshire Pilgrimage of Grace have been the subject of several surveys in recent years. See Geoffrey Moorhouse, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: The Rebellion that Shook Henry VIII's Throne* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2002); R. W. Hoyle, *The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Politics of the 1530s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); and Michael Bush, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: A Study of the Rebel Armies of October 1536* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

¹⁰ *LP*, XI (1888), 275.

¹¹ For Henry's response, see Charles Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England During the Reign of the Tudors, from AD 1485-1559*, ed. by William D. Hamilton, 2 vols, Camden Society Publications, n.s., 11, 20 (Westminster: Camden Society, 1875-77), I, 56-57. The Earls of Shrewsbury and Rutland issued a proclamation addressed to the Lincolnshire rebels and admonishing their obedience to the King. See *SP (Henry VIII)*, I (1830), 462-63.

¹² *A Lamentation in VVhiche is Shevved what Ruyne and destruction cometh of seditious rebellyon* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; STC 18113.3). All references to the *Lamentation* cite from this edition. The tract was printed anonymously, but Morison identifies himself as its author in an undated but holograph letter written to Henry Philips. The extant letter, bound in Public Record Office, SP 1/113, fol. 212, is calendared in *LP*, XI (1888), 584, and quoted in C. R. Baskervill's 'Sir Richard Morison as the Author of Two Anonymous Tracts on Sedition', *The Library*, 4th ser., 17 (1936-37), 84-85. John Bale was the first to attribute the *Lamentation* to Morison, in his bibliographical *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum [...] summarium* ([Wesel]: [D. van der Straten for] Ioannem Ouerton, 1548; STC 1295), fols. 233-34. Under the entry for 'Ricardus Moryson', Bale includes the tract *De ruinis ex rebellione*, with incipit 'Si mihi tantum eloquentiae perper[erat]' (cp. *Lamentation*, sig. A2^r: 'If stvdy had gotten me as moch eloquence'). The authorship of the *Lamentation* is discussed in *Humanist Scholarship and Public Order: Two Tracts against the Pilgrimage of Grace by Sir Richard Morison, with Historical Annotations and*

Morison's prose is punctuated by yet another form of enactment, however. It is the character England who Morison imagines intervening between the armies of rebels and royalists at Lincolnshire. 'If England coude speake' to the Lincolnshire rebels, writes Morison,

might it not say thus? I am one, why doo you make me twayne? Ye are all myne, howe canne any of you, where none ought so to do, seke the distruction of me, my mooste noble and prudente prynce kynge HENRY the, VIII. and his trewe subiectes? It is a shrewde hande that scratcheth out the eyen, a shreude fote, that for his faute puttih [*sic*] the necke in ieoperdy. Lincolnshire thou art a me[m]bre of myn [...] Thus Englande myght say, and moche more, which I wyl say for her. (sigs. A4^{r-v})

This chapter explores how Morison makes use of the character England in his two pamphlets against the northern rebellions of 1536, the *Lamentation* and *Remedy for Sediton*. Morison wrote to appease rebels who had demanded that Henry desist from his policy of dissolving religious houses in England. These attacks on the Dissolution Act implied wider criticism of the Royal Supremacy in general, because the rebels also undermined Henry's position as head of the English Church when they questioned his prerogative to legislate against religious houses in England. It is to papist undercurrents of disaffection that Morison attributes the cause of the Lincolnshire Uprising. His *Lamentation* identifies 'monkes, friers, and priestes' (sig. C2^v) as the ringleaders of this rebellion, and he assumes that the uprising had arisen out of sectarian support for papal supremacy in the English Church. 'Theyr pope, their puppet, their idole, their romayn god wyll not out of their hartis', Morison writes of the Lincolnshire rebels (sig. B2^v).

Morison makes the clash of swords in Lincolnshire echo the wider constitutional debate in England over the legitimacy of Henry's claims to be styled 'Sup[re]me heede' of the English Church. This chapter will approach Morison's two pamphlets against the northern rebellions of 1536 as propaganda for the Royal Supremacy, and it is with reference to the function of these pamphlets as royalist propaganda that I want to explore Morison's use of the character England within them. I argue that England emerges in

Contemporary Documents, ed. by David Sandler Berkowitz (Washington DC: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1984), pp. 29-31. For Morison's career as court propagandist for Thomas Cromwell, see Berkowitz, pp. 23-32.

these two pamphlets as a consciously-adopted rhetorical response to the political unrest of 1536, and that Morison uses this prosopopœia as a means to ventriloquise his own support for the Royal Supremacy. The Appeals Act had asserted that England was an 'Empire', divided 'in termes and by names of Sp[irit]ualtie and Temporaltie', but nevertheless 'gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King'.¹³ The northern rebellions of 1536 had threatened the stability of this synthesis between Church and state. In the *Lamentation*, Morison uses England to intercede between Lincolnshire and the 'prudente prynce' Henry, and he does so in order to reconstruct the empire enshrined in the Appeals Act. The England of the *Lamentation* identifies herself as mother of traitor and 'trew subiecte' alike – 'ye are all myne', she says – and she exhorts the Lincolnshire rebels to obey their mother's wishes by pledging allegiance to the King. England speaks in the *Lamentation* in order to insist that the Lincolnshire rebels obey Henry and his legislation against religious houses in England, but I also want to argue that her textual presence in Morison's two pamphlets is itself an acknowledgment of how existing Royal Supremacy propaganda had failed to popularise Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church. Since the Act of Appeals, printed propaganda in English and Latin – the *Noble Tryumphaut Coronacyon of Quene Anne* (1533), Foxe's *De vera differentia* (1534) – had sought to identify Henry with Constantine the Great, and Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church with the Emperor Constantine's presidency over the Councils of the early Church. This rhetoric of empire had failed to convert Chapuys to the cause of the Royal Supremacy, and the northern rebels had evidently remained equally unconvinced by the historical arguments for Henry's Cesaropapist ideology of empire. In his pamphlets against the northern rebellions of 1536, Morison appears to have responded to these shortfalls in the rhetoric of empire by finding in mother England an alternative means of reconciling the people of Lincolnshire and Yorkshire to the Royal Supremacy.

* * *

Chapuys's efforts to muster support for the Lincolnshire rebellion came too late, for the uprising in that region was suppressed as swiftly as it had begun, with Lincoln and Louth

¹³ 'An Acte that the Appeles in suche Cases as have ben used to be pursued to the See of Rome shall not be from hensforth had ne used but wythin this Realme' (24 Hen. VIII, c. 12), in *Statutes*, III (1817), 427-29 (p. 427).

capitulating in the face of the royal army on 13 October 1536.¹⁴ The speed with which the rebellion collapsed also rendered superfluous the admonitory prose of Morison's address to the Lincolnshire rebels in his *Lamentation [...] of seditious rebellyon*. 'I co[m]playned of Lincolne, but to late,' Morison confessed. 'I felt an other parte of my[ne] busy with me, or ever my Lamentacon cowd ever a brode'.¹⁵ The Lincolnshire Uprising had scarcely been suppressed before the spirit of its opposition to recent ecclesiastical reforms had spread to Yorkshire. The York civic authorities wrote to Henry on 14 October to report their city besieged by 'the commons of Beverley, Cottyngham, Holdenshire, Marcheland, Richmondshire'. These rebels had assembled outside the city, Sir Robert Aske, their ringleader, wrote to the Mayor of York, 'because evil-disposed persons in the King's Council intend to destroy the Church and rob the whole body of the realm'. A version of this contention constitutes the fourth of the five articles that Aske had formulated for circulation amongst the rebels at this time. This fourth article identifies 'lord Cromwell and Sir Ric[hard] Riche, Chancellor of the Augmentations' as 'persons of low birth and small reputation' ill-disposed to counsel the King, and it accuses them of having 'procured [...] for their own advantage' the recent Act for the Dissolution of Lesser Monasteries.¹⁶ The repeal of this hated legislation heads the demands that the rebels subsequently conveyed to the Duke of Norfolk at the so-called Doncaster Bridge conference of 27 October. It was at Doncaster that a truce was negotiated which allowed for two representatives of the rebels to accompany Norfolk to Windsor, to communicate their collective grievances to the King in person.¹⁷

Henry conveyed his formal response to each of the demands of the Doncaster articles in a hand-written document delivered to the rebels on 5 November, and shortly thereafter published by the royal printer Thomas Berthelet as the *Ansvvere Made by the Kynges Hyghnes to the Petitions of the rebelles in Yorkeshire*.¹⁸ Only one of the several pamphlets written to echo Henry's *Answer* and its rejection of the Doncaster articles also

¹⁴ News of the capitulation reached the King at Windsor on Sunday 15 October. See Wriothesley's letter to Cromwell, in *SP (Henry VIII)*, I, 471-73.

¹⁵ Public Record Office, SP 6/13, fol. 39. Calendared in *LP*, XI (1888), 559-60, quoted in Gordon W. Zeeveld, *Foundations of Tudor Policy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948), p. 175, n. 49. See also Berkowitz, p. 37.

¹⁶ *LP*, XI (1888), 271-72.

¹⁷ See Hoyle, pp. 282-305.

¹⁸ (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; STC 13077). An extant manuscript copy in the hand of Ralph Sadler is calendared in *LP*, XI (1888), 384-85.

found its way into print at this time, and it was Berthelet who was again entrusted with its publication. This was Morison's *Remedy for Sedition*.¹⁹ Like the *Answer* it accompanies, Morison's *Remedy* appears to have been written in response to the receipt at court of the Doncaster articles on 2 November. The entire argument of the *Answer* is organised around these articles, but their influence upon the *Remedy* is more understated. The *Remedy* presents itself as an abstract treatise on rebellion that teaches obedience to the King through the lessons of past rebellion. Morison's response to the immediate crisis of the Pilgrimage of Grace is diffused through discussion of political crises in ancient Judea, Greece, and Rome, and it is to the political philosophy of Plato's *Republic* that he turns to find answers to the articles of the Doncaster rebels.

In the *Republic*, Plato has Socrates structure the architecture of his ideal state around the principle that a just society must utilise the talents of its members in ways best suited to the welfare of all.²⁰ As the individual should subordinate to reason the impulses of their spirit and appetite, so Socrates argues that in the political constitution of the ideal state, the wisest individuals should exercise sovereignty over the two subordinate classes – the soldiers who embody the courage or spirit of the commonwealth, and the producers whose goods serve the needs and appetites of its people. Since one man is more reasonable, another more impulsive, than his neighbour, so the distribution of roles in society should reflect the uneven distribution of reason, spirit, and appetite amongst its members. Plato deemed philosophers the sagest members of society, and argued that it

¹⁹ *A Remedy for Sedition, VVherin are Conteyned many thynges, concernyng the true and loyall obeysance, that comme[n]s owe vnto their prince and soueraygne lorde the kyng* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; STC 18113.7). All references to the *Remedy* cite from this edition. Like his *Lamentation*, Morison's *Remedy* was published anonymously. It is attributed to Morison in Bale's *Summarium* (1548), fol. 234, where it is entered under the title *Remedium erga seditionem*, with incipit 'Quisquis apud se sapienter consi[derat]' (cp. *Remedy*, sig. A2^r: 'VVho so ever well considereth with hym selfe'). Two other anonymous pamphlets against the Pilgrimage of Grace went unpublished at the time of the crisis. The first, beginning 'The prince of orators, Marcus Tullius Cicero', is catalogued as Public Record Office, SP 6/9, fols. 173-210, and calendared in *LP*, XI (1888), 567. The second, 'A letter sent to the commons that rebell', is catalogued as Public Record Office, SP 1/113, fols. 250^r-55^v, and calendared in *LP*, XI (1888), 595. This might well have been the tract that Henry sent to Norfolk on 21 October 1536, together with a proclamation 'to be sent to all parts of the realm'. With the tract and proclamation, Henry had enclosed instructions to 'set forth the said book and proclamation as you may think most expedient to induce the traitors to submit and encourage your soldiers to the greater detestation of this abominable rebellion attempted by them of Yorkshire'. See *LP*, XI (1888), 315. For discussion, see Zeeveld, p. 176; and Berkowitz, pp. 41-42.

²⁰ See Plato, *The Republic*, trans. by Paul Shorey, rev. edn, 2 vols (London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), 369B-370B and 519E-520A.

was therefore their duty to exercise political government within it.²¹

In the *Remedy*, Morison adapts the architecture of Plato's ideal society to the requirements of his argument that a sovereign should have the right to seek political counsel from whomsoever he chooses. The Doncaster rebels had demanded that the King remove Cromwell and other 'persons of low birth' from his council. In the *Remedy*, Morison had answered the rebels by emphasising the prerogatives of the King in matters concerning the make-up of his council. 'If we woll this to be our prince, heed, & gouernour', he wrote, 'than we must also lette his grace gouern vs, by suche officers, as he shall knowe to be beste for vs, and not we to appoynte hym, suche as we shall thynke metest' (sig. B3^r). Morison agrees with Plato that 'a comune welthe is lyke a body' (sig. B3^v), because in the same way as individual appetite should be subordinate to reason, so in the political constitution 'the heed muste rule, if the body woll do well, and not euey man make hym selfe ruler' (sigs. B2^v-3^r). The ruling classes, Morison argues, should consist of those most able to subordinate their own appetite to the exercise of reason, for it is expedient that a commonwealth give 'the chiefe and prime honour' to 'qualites of the mynde, the seconde to the bodye, the thyrde to external thynges, as nobilitie, possessions, and ryches' (sig. B2^r). 'Trewen nobilitie is neuer, but where vertue is', Morison writes (sig. B1^v). He argues that it is therefore 'moste necessary in a common welthe' to assign rank according to reason, and to 'set in hyghe dignitie' those 'that nature hath endewed with synguler vertues' before those upon whom birth alone has bestowed the title of nobleman (sig. A2^v). 'An order muste be hadde, and a waye founde, that they rule that best can', he writes, whilst 'those that are of the worsor sort [*should*] be content, that the wyser reule and gouerne them' (sig. A2^v).

Morison's meritocracy is structured around the hierarchy that the 'diuine Plato' had proposed in his *Republic* (sig. A2^r), but Morison writes that we must 'suppose this done by the great prouydence of god' that the sagest members of society be 'set in hyghe dignitie' in this respect (sig. A2^v). 'God' also 'maketh kynges, specyally where they reigne by successyon', Morison continues, and 'woll we be wyser than god?', he asks. 'Wol we take vpon vs, to know who ought to gouerne vs, better than god?' (sig. B3^r). Into the power relation of an English commonwealth ruled by reason, Morison here inserts at

²¹ *Republic*, 519C-520D.

its apex the figure of the divinely-ordained monarch. 'Let vs co[n]tent ourselfes, that he rule, whom god made our kynge' (sig. B3^r), Morison counsels, for monarchical government, he implies, is the proper, because divinely-intended, vehicle by which the empire of England can assimilate itself to the architecture of the Platonic republic. Since 'God toke away prynce Arthure, & wold king Henry the eyght, to be our heed', so 'we must also lette his grace gouern vs, by suche officers, as he shall knowe to be beste for vs' (sig. B3^r). 'They must best be esteemed', Morison asserts, 'that haue moost gyftes of the mynde, that is, they that do excell in wysedome, Iustice, temperauncy, and suche other vertues' (sig. B2^v).

In the *Remedy*, Morison assimilates monarchical government to the Platonic ideal of rule according to reason, and he does so to repudiate the demands of the Doncaster rebels that Cromwell and other 'persons of low birth' be removed from the King's council. Plato had envisaged a meritocracy wherein the wise govern regardless of social background, and Morison had combined this vision with the doctrine of divinely-ordained kingship to uphold Henry's right as king to seek counsel from any individual, nobleman or otherwise, who puts his wisdom in the service of the public good. Morison may have felt compelled by the specific nature of the rebels' complaint against Cromwell and others to bring Platonic philosophy to bear upon his argument against sedition, but his *Remedy* was not the first product of Tudor political thought to synthesise England's monarchy with Plato's meritocracy in this respect. Morison's political philosophy had been anticipated by Thomas Elyot, who five years earlier had confessed himself unworthy 'to write of the office or duetie of a soueraigne' such as Henry VIII in his *Boke named the Governour*.²² 'This present boke', he explains in his prohome to that 'victorious prince', instead 'treateth of the education of them/ that hereafter may be demed worthy to be gouernours of the publike weale vnder your hyghnesse' (sigs. a2^{r-v}). Elyot affirms Henry's right as king to seek counsel from whomsoever he may deem worthy to govern beneath him, and he upholds the rule of 'one kynge or prince' as 'the best and most sure gouerna[n]ce' for a commonwealth (sig. A7^r). 'For who can denie', Elyot asks, 'but that all thyng in heuen and erthe is gouerned by one god/ by one perpetuall ordre/ by one puiden[ce]?' (sig. A7^v). Having professed his allegiance to the rule of one king, Elyot then goes on to synthesise

²² *The boke named the Governour, deuised by [Sir] Thomas Elyot knight* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1531; STC 7635), sig. B4^v. All references are to this edition.

monarchy with meritocracy. 'God gyueth nat to euery man like gyftes of grace/ or of nature', Elyot asserts, 'but to some more/ some lesse/ as it liketh his diuine maiestie' (sig. A4^r). In 'as moche as vnderstandyng/ is the most excellent gyfte that man can receiue in his creation' (sig. A4^r), he counsels, so 'it is onely a publike weale/ where like as god hath disposed the saide influence of vnderstandyng/ is also appoynted degrees and places accordyng to the excellencie therof' (sig. A5^v).

Like Plato, Elyot compares the architecture of 'a publike weale' to the physiognomy of the body. Plato had prescribed the rule of reason for the political as well as the physical body, and the 'sondry astates and degrees of men' that together constitute Elyot's England also find themselves 'gouerned by the rule and moderation of reason' (sig. A1^r). Plato had observed how some men are more able than others to subordinate their appetite to the rule of reason, and from this he had argued that one's suitability to govern others should be measured by one's ability to govern the self. Elyot also argues that 'the powars and qualities of the soule and body/ with the disposition of reason/ be nat in euery man equall' (sigs. y7^{r-v}), and that the architecture of state should reflect this fact. It is 'god' who has 'ordayned a diuersitie or preeminence in degrees to be amo[n]ge men', he contends, and it is God who has directed that kings stand at the apex of this political hierarchy (sig. y7^v). Nature, Elyot writes, 'ministreth to vs examples abundantly' of animals among whom 'is a gouernour or leader'.

If we thinke that this naturall instinction of creatures vnreasonable is necessary & also commendable/ howe farre out of reason shall we iudge them to be/ that wolde exterminate all superiorite/ extincite all gouernaunce and lawes/ and vnder the coloure of holy scripture/ whiche they do violently wraste to their purpose, do endeuour them selves to bryng the life of man in to a confusion ineuitable/ & to be in moche wars astate than the afore named beestes. (sig. y7^v)

Elyot's vision in the *Gouernour* is of a monarch-led meritocracy that mirrors the anatomy of the physical body in its subordination of appetite to the rule of reason. He seeks examples from nature to confirm his contention that the architecture of his 'publike weale' conforms to God's providential design, and he rails against those who 'wraste' scripture from its intended meaning, and who against all reason 'wolde exterminate all superiorite' to uphold an egalitarian society in its stead. The hierarchical structure of the society he proposes is after all implicit in the Latin term *respublica*, Elyot writes, which

derives from *populus*, meaning people, a term that comprehends 'all the inhabitantes of a realme or citie/ of what astate or condition so euer they be' (sig. A1^v2^r). 'Wherfore hit semeth that men haue ben lo[n]ge abused in calling *Rempublika* a co[m]mune weale', he asserts, for this instead implies 'that euery thinge shulde be to all men in co[m]mune without discrepance of any astate or condition' (sig. A1^v). People abuse the 'p[ro]pre & trewe signification' (sig. A1^v) of *respublica* when they translate this word as 'commonwealth', and from this argue that 'al me[n] must be of one degre & sort' (sig. A2^r).

Elyot equates this egalitarian agenda with the evangelical movement in England, for he argues that it is 'euangelicall persones' (sig. y8^r) who wrest the meaning of scripture to 'exterminate all superiorite'. In the year his *Gouernour* appeared in print, the King appears to have afforded Elyot the opportunity to hunt down one of the most notorious evangelicals of his day. Elyot was sent to Brussels in autumn 1531, to serve as Henry's ordinary ambassador at the court of Charles V. It was an office he was evidently reluctant to perform, and he was almost immediately recalled, for his replacement, the future Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, had already left England by the end of January 1532.²³ 'The King says the other ambassador was revoked at his wife's request', Chapuys writes to Charles V on 5 February 1532.²⁴ In a letter to Cromwell of 18 November 1532, Elyot confesses how he had been originally 'loth to go' abroad as ambassador, and complains of the debts that he incurred in the course of his duty to the King.²⁵ Eight months earlier, on 14 March 1532, Elyot was with Cranmer in Regensburg, from where Elyot conveyed his thanks to the Duke of Norfolk for having spoken with the King about his desire to return to England. Despite the Duke's best efforts, however, Elyot admits little hope of being able to return to England in the near future, for in his letter to Norfolk he explains that he had recently received orders from the King to stay in Brussels 'for the apprehension of Tyndall', who, Elyot quips, 'is as uncertain to come by as he is moveable

²³ Elyot had received his ambassadorial commission by 10 September 1531, when Chapuys wrote to inform Charles V that the new 'ambassador to be sent to your Majesty is Master Vuyllyot' (*LP*, V (1880), 205). He was with the Emperor at Tournai in early December (*LP*, V (1880), 267), and at the Emperor's court in Brussels by the end of the year (*LP*, V (1880), 282). On 21 January 1532, Chapuys was already writing to Charles V about Elyot's recall (*LP*, V (1880), 351).

²⁴ *LP*, V (1880), 370.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 652.

in wit'.²⁶ Elyot evidently had as much respect for William Tyndale's wit as he had had time in the *Gouernour* for 'euangelicall persones', whose egalitarian agenda, he had argued, was similarly 'moued more by sensualite/ than by any good reason or inclinatio[n] to humanite' (sig. A1^v).

Had Elyot been inclined to read a copy of Tyndale's *Obedie[n]ce of a Christen man* before June 1530, when possession of it and all 'other bokes in englisse tonge printed beyonde the see' were condemned by royal proclamation, he would have noted that within it, far from wresting scripture to uphold sedition, Tyndale was in fact concerned to cite from scripture in support of Henry's pretensions to an empire more absolute than Elyot himself was prepared to allow.²⁷ In the *Gouernour*, Elyot commends as an aid to government the 'thre noble counsayles of reason: societie & knowlege' (sig. y4^f). Reason bids us 'do the same thinge to an other/ that thou woldest haue done to the', society says 'loue thou thy neighbour/ as thou doest thy selfe' (sig. y4^v), and knowledge teaches us to 'know thy selfe' (sig. y5^f). Self-knowledge induces humility in a governor, and Elyot writes that humility teaches those who 'haste ouer other soueraygntie' to recognise the 'weighty' responsibilities that comes with their cloak of office (sigs. y5^v-6^f). Elyot argues that 'the name of a soueraigne or ruler without actuall gouernaunce is but a shadowe' (sig. y6^f). Even princes should 'knowe the bou[n]des of your autorite', and that 'as obedience is due vnto you/ so is your studie/ your labour/ your industrie with vertuous example due to them that be subiecte to your autoritie' (sig. y6^v).

Elyot had accused 'euangelicall persones' of wresting scripture to support sedition and 'exterminate all superiorite', but although his *Gouernour* had advocated monarchical rule, it had nevertheless defined a theory of responsible government that sought implicitly to question the ethics of Tudor absolutism. Henry had been encouraged in his absolutist standpoint on government by the precedents contained in the *Collectanea satis copiosa*, completed in autumn 1530, and it was to this new political climate at court that Elyot had responded, when in the *Gouernour* he had invited Henry to 'knowe the bou[n]des of your

²⁶ Ibid., p. 409.

²⁷ *A proclamation made and diuysed by the kyngis highnes, with the aduise of his honorable cou[n]saile, for dampning of erronious bokes and heresies, and prohibitinge the hauinge of holy scripture, translated into the vulgar tonges of englisse, frenche, or duche, in such maner, as within this proclamation is expressed* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1530; STC 7775), fol. 1^r. TRP, no. 129.

autorite'. Two years before the compilation of the *Collectanea*, Tyndale was on the other hand already enthusiastically advocating absolute rule in his *Obedie[n]ce of a Christen man*, first printed in October 1528 by the Antwerp printer 'Hans Luft', a pseudonym for either Johannes Hoochstraten or Martin de Keyser.²⁸ The same Antwerp press had five months earlier printed Tyndale's *Parable of the Wicked Mammon*, and the *Obedie[n]ce* complements and amplifies the argument of this earlier tract.²⁹ The *Obedie[n]ce* uses scripture, particularly Tyndale's own English translation of Erasmus's Greek New Testament, completed by early 1526, to undermine the authority of the Apostolic See, and in its place to uphold the King as head of the English Church.³⁰ Tyndale reminds readers of the *Obedie[n]ce* of St Paul's admonition in Romans 13.1 that 'every soule submit hi[m]sylfe vnto the auctorite off the hyer powers' (sig. D5^r), and he asserts that 'no person nether anye degre maye be exempte fro[m] this ordinaunce of God' (sig. D8^v). 'Nether ca[n] the profession of monkes and freres or anye thinge that the Pope or Bisshoppes ca[n] laie for the[m] selves/ excepte them from the swerde of the Emperoure or kinges/ yf they breake the lawes', he contends (sig. D8^v). Since 'there is no power but of God', Tyndale argues, so God himself must have ordained the higher powers, to whose absolute authority St Paul here exhorts us all to submit (sig. D5^r). Tyndale writes that it is within 'ki[n]ges/ governors and rulers' (sig. D6^r) that God has invested this absolute authority, for he points out that Christ himself had commanded the Pharisees to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's in Matthew 22.21 (see sigs. D8^{r-v}). He argues that scripture clearly identifies the 'te[m]porall kinges and princes' as the 'hier powers' unto whom every soul should submit (sig. E1^r), but he asserts that there simply exists no scriptural foundation 'for the

²⁸ William Tyndale, *The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man and howe Christe[n] rulers ought to governe/ where in also (yf thou marke diligently) thou shalt fynde eyes to perceave the crafty conveyance of all iugglers* ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser(?)], 1528; STC 24446). All references are to this edition. Werner Schwarz identifies 'Hans Luft' as the Antwerp printer Johannes Hoochstraten. See his *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and their Background* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1955), p. 159, n. 1. David Daniell has more recently attributed the pseudonym to Martin de Keyser (Martin L'Empereur). See William Tyndale, *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, ed. by David Daniell (London: Penguin, 2000), pp. xxii-xxiii. The case for de Keyser rests on his other associations with Tyndale, as the printer in 1530 of Tyndale's English Pentateuch (STC 2350), and in 1534 of the second edition of his English New Testament (STC 2826).

²⁹ William Tyndale, *That fayth the mother of all good workes iustifieth us before we ca[n] bringe forth anye good worke [Parable of the Wicked Mammon]* ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser(?)], 1528; STC 24454).

³⁰ The first edition of Tyndale's English New Testament was printed in Worms in early 1526 by Peter Schoeffer. Copies were already on sale in London by early February 1526. See David Daniell, *William Tyndale: A Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 134.

popis false power' (sig. E7^v) – only admonitions that the pope follow the example of his apostolic predecessor, St Peter, whom Christ commanded to put away his sword in Matthew 26.51-52. 'Yf Peter sinned in defendinge Christ agenste the temperall sworde', Tyndale writes, then 'who can excuse oure prelates of sinne which will obeye no man/ nether kinge nor Emperoure?' (sigs. E7^v-8^r).

In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale uses scripture to justify Henry's rights to absolute rule. From this it is clear that Elyot would have been doing Tyndale a gross injustice, had he intended to number him amongst the other unnamed 'euangelicall persones' whom he accuses of wresting scripture to 'exterminate all superiorite'. The *Gouernour* would not have been the only text from this period to have accused Tyndale of inciting sedition, when in the *Obedie[n]ce* he in fact cites from scripture to admonish allegiance to kings. In his prologue to the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale had explained that 'it is no new thinge unto the worde of god to be rayled apon', and that nowadays 'oure holy prelates', who 'ought to defende Gods worde', instead 'speake evyll of it', and say that 'it causeth insurrection and teacheth the people to disobeye their heedes and governers' (sig. C5^r). Henry would later cite this equation between scripture and sedition as reason for banning Tyndale's English Bible, when two years later in 1530 he issued his aforementioned proclamation against erroneous books and Bible translations. In this proclamation, Henry explained how his 'primates' and other 'well lerned personages in diuinite' had advised him to condemn certain 'pestiferous englisshe bokes' that had been lately 'printed in other regions, and sent into this realme'. Amongst these, Henry not only numbers Tyndale's translations of the 'olde and newe testame[n]t', but also his 'boke named the Obedience of a Christen man,' and his 'boke entitled the wicked Mammona' – all of which, he asserts, seek to 'stirre and increase [the people] to sedicion, and disobedience agaynst their princes, soueraignes, and heedes'.³¹

It is because 'our holy prelates and oure gostly religious' (sig. C5^r) equate scripture with sedition that his own translations of scripture are proscribed and their readers persecuted, Tyndale writes in his prologue to the *Obedie[n]ce*. This condemnation extends to the *Obedie[n]ce*, because it is upon the authority of English scripture that Tyndale grounds his admonition therein that all souls submit to the absolute authority of

³¹ A proclamation [...] for dampning of erroneous bokes, fol. 1^r.

kings. It is in the best interests of the prelates to rail against God's word and accuse its readers of sedition, Tyndale writes, for 'Gods worde is hatefull and contrarie vnto them', that 'contrarie vnto all conscience and agenst all the doctrine of Christe' have 'usurped the righte of [the] emperoure', and made of kings 'but shadowes/ vayn names and thinges ydle/ havynge no thinge to doo in the worlde/ but when our holy father neadeth their helpe' (sigs. E6^rv). To maintain the usurped power of the pope, Tyndale asserts that the Roman Church sponsors a programme of university education, in which one's reading of scripture is directed by the readings of commentaries sympathetic to papal claims to absolute power. 'Every man taketh a sondry doctoure', he writes, and 'to mayntene his doctoure with all/ corrupteth the scripture & facioneth it after his awne imaginacion as a Potter doeth his claye' (sigs. C2^v-3^r). Tyndale reminds us that 'God is not mans imaginacion', however – 'God is but his worde', he asserts (sig. C3^v). The 'playne scriptures' alone can function as a touchstone by which to try the truth of 'all mens exposicion' (sig. C2^r), Tyndale contends. Those who rail against Bible-reading, who 'saye that it wold make them' who read it 'ryse ageynst the kinge', are merely anxious to safeguard their own, pro-papist interpretations of scripture – 'leste the temporall rulars shuld see their falsehod/ if the scripture cam to light'.³² It was precisely this desire to subject the glosses of 'mens exposicion' to the scrutiny of scriptural truth that had prompted Tyndale to English the New Testament in 1526. In his prologue to the 1530 edition of his translation of the Pentateuch, Tyndale berates the 'malicious and wyllye hypocrytes' (sig. [A]1^v) who have condemned his translations to date, and who would rather have 'a thousand bokes' written 'agenste their abhominable doynge and doctrine/ then that the scripture shulde come to light'. 'For as longe as they may kepe that doune', he continues,

they will so darken the ryght way with the miste of their sophistrye/ and so tangle the[m] that ether rebuke or despyse their abhommations with argumentes of philosophye [...]. And with wrestinge the scripture vnto their awne purpose clene contrarye vnto [the] processe/ order and meaninge of the texte [...]. Which thinge onlye moved me to translate the new testament. Because I had perceaved by experience/ how that it was impossible to stablysh the laye people in any truth/ excepte [the] scripture were playnly layde before their eyes in their mother tonge/ that they might se the processe/ ordre and meaninge of the texte. (sigs. [A]2^rv)

³² William Tyndale, [*The Pentateuch*] ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser(?)], 1530; STC 2350), sig. [A]1^v. All references are to this edition.

Tyndale turns on its head the basic tenet of the argument against translating the Bible into English – that such a translation would encourage sedition amongst its readers. It was on the grounds that they ‘stirre and increase [*the people*] to sedicion’ that Henry had seen fit to ban Tyndale’s Bible translations in 1530, and the following year Elyot had likewise found cause to rail against those ‘euangelicall persones’ who ‘waste’ holy scripture to ‘exterminate all superiorite’. For Tyndale, these arguments against the Englishing of scripture stem from churchmen whose outward support for the King belies their actual allegiance to ‘the popis false power’. They suppress the English Bible in order to safeguard their pro-papist interpretations of scripture from the censure of what Tyndale calls the ‘processe/ order and meaninge of the texte’. ‘Why shall I not se the scripture and the circumsta[n]ces and what goeth before and after’, Tyndale protests in his preface to the *Obedie[n]ce*, ‘that I maye know whether thyne interpretacio[n] be the right sence/ or whether thou iuglest and drawest the scripture violently vnto thy carnall and fleshly purpose?’ (sig. B6^v). Far from it being seditious to translate the Bible into English, Tyndale argues that its suppression is itself an act of sedition, committed by prelates anxious to maintain their ecclesiastical liberties by glossing over biblical passages that invest the King with authority over the English Church. Elyot had accused ‘euangelicall persones’ like Tyndale of wresting scripture to support sedition, but Tyndale claims that one has only to turn to the syntax of scripture – the process, order, and meaning thereof – in order to see those precepts that command our obedience to kings. It is his own accusers who are in fact culpable of sedition, Tyndale asserts, for by ‘wrestinge the scripture vnto their awne purpose’ they seek to harbour rights that the papal Church has unlawfully wrested from the King.

If Tyndale’s detractors had argued that his translation of scripture would incite sedition, Tyndale himself directs readers of the Bible to those passages that command obedience to kings. ‘Sec[h]e therefore in the scripture as thou readest it first the law/ what god co[m]maundeth vs to doo’ (sig. [A]5^v), he counsels readers of his 1530 *Pentateuch*. In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale argues that God has commanded every soul to submit unto the higher powers, and that God has invested this power in princes alone. It was on the Word of God that Tyndale grounded his Cesaropapism, and his standpoint was enthusiastically echoed in the writings of his former amanuensis, Miles Coverdale. In 1529, Coverdale was in Hamburg helping Tyndale rewrite his English translation of the Pentateuch, the

original version having perished with the wreck of the ship upon which Tyndale had earlier that year attempted to travel from Antwerp to Hamburg.³³ Coverdale probably accompanied Tyndale when he returned to Antwerp early in 1530 to supervise the printing of his completed manuscript. It was in Antwerp, in 1534, that Coverdale was commissioned by the reformist merchant Jacob van Meteren to himself translate the Bible into English. Completed in 1535, Coverdale's Bible was by August of that year being printed in Cologne, from whence Meteren exported its unbound pages to England, where they were bound in Southwark by his agent James Nicolson and placed in bookshops by early 1536.³⁴ It was Nicolson who wrote to Cromwell at the end of August 1535, enclosing for his perusal 'as moche' of the 'hole byble' 'as ys yet come into englonde', and petitioning him in particular to 'visit the copie of the epistle dedicatorie for the bible to the kynge', in the hope that Henry might grant to Coverdale's translation a license to 'go forth unther the kynges prevelge'.³⁵ Coverdale writes in his dedicatory epistle to Henry VIII that he has 'faythfully translated' his Bible 'out of fyue sundry interpreters' (sig. †4^r). His text relies wherever possible upon editions of Tyndale's English translations

³³ See J. F. Mozley, *Coverdale and his Bibles* (London: Lutterworth, 1953), pp. 4-5.

³⁴ [Miles Coverdale], *Biblia: The Bible, that is, the holy Scrypture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe* ([Cologne]: [Eucharius Cervicorn and John Soter], 1535; STC 2063). For Meteren's role as patron of Coverdale's 1535 Bible, see Mozley, pp. 72-74; also pp. 74-77, for the identification of Cologne as the place of printing, and of Cervicorn and Soter as the printers. In 1534, parliament had passed a law for the protection of English bookbinders that forbade the import into England of bound books from abroad (25 Hen. VIII, c. 15, see *Statutes*, III (1817), 456). The enforcement of this law from Christmas 1534 explains why the pages of the Coverdale Bible were exported unbound to England in 1535. The text of Coverdale's translation is in the 1535 edition printed in a German black letter identifiable with the printers Cervicorn and Soter. Only two of the surviving fifty or so copies of the 1535 edition also have their preliminaries printed in this German black letter, and the preliminaries of both these copies survive today in an imperfect state. The preliminaries of the majority of copies are instead printed in an English black letter identifiable with James Nicolson of Southwark. It is unclear why Nicolson chose to reprint the preliminaries of the 1535 edition after his receipt from Meteren of the pages of the Coverdale Bible, although he did take this opportunity to alter the arrangement of the preliminaries, and to excise words from the title page of the original Cologne edition. This new title page, extant in only two copies, reads *Biblia: The Byble, that is, the holy Scrypture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully translated in to Englyshe* ([Southwark]: [James Nicolson], 1535; STC 2063.3). All references to Coverdale's dedicatory epistle to Henry VIII will cite from the text of the Nicolson edition (STC 2063.3).

³⁵ Nicolson's letter is calendared in *LP*, IX (1886), 75. It is in part reproduced in Mozley, p. 111, from which I quote. Mozley dates this letter to the end of August 1535 on the basis of Nicolson's allusion in the letter to his having just received a copy of Melanchthon's *Common places*. Melanchthon himself sent a copy of his *Common places* to its dedicatee, Henry VIII, by the hands of Alexander Alesius the Scot. Alesius had reached London by the end of the month, for there exists in Cromwell's papers a memorandum, dateable upon internal evidence to the end of August 1535, which mentions Melanchthon's *Common places* as one of several topics to be discussed at that time with the King. See Mozley, pp. 111-12.

of the Pentateuch (1530), Jonah (1531), and the New Testament (1534), collating these with readings from the Latin Vulgate, from the humanist Latin Bible of the Hebraist Sanctes Paginus (1528), and (most often) from the various editions of other contemporary vernacular translations undertaken by Luther and at Zurich.³⁶ Signed 'youre graces humble subiecte and daylye oratour, Myles Couerdale', Coverdale takes pains in his dedicatory epistle to acknowledge Henry his 'naturall soueraigne liege Lorde & chefe heade of [the] church of Englo[n]de' (sig. †4^r). His own profession of loyalty to the King, Coverdale implies, has been learned from his experience as translator of the very Bible that he here deems it his 'duty' as a subject to dedicate 'vnto youre hyghnesse' (sig. †4^r).

For the scripture (both in the olde testament and in the new) declareth most abou[n]tdauntly that the office, auctorite and power geuen of God vnto kynges/ is in earth aboue all other powers: let them call the[m] selues Popes, Cardynalles, or what so euer they will [...] who coulde than stonde agaynst the godly obedience of his prynce (excepte he wolde be at defyaunce with God and all his holy ordinaunces) that were well acquaynted with the holy scripture, which so earnestly co[m]mendeth vnto euery one of vs the auctorite and power geuen of God vnto kynges and temporall rulers? (sigs. †2^v-3^r)

Coverdale is here petitioning Henry to countenance the sale of his Bible, and he does so by alluding to the value of his translation as a weapon in the propaganda war that, in the aftermath of the Royal Supremacy, was being waged by royalists in England against the false power of the Bishop of Rome. Applauding Henry's new-found pretensions to empire in the English Church, Coverdale goes on to enumerate the 'vntollerable iniuries' committed in England by 'that Antychrist of Rome', who until recently 'dyd thrust his heade into [the] imperiall crowne of your hyghnes', demanding payment of his 'Peter pens', deceiving the souls of the English 'with his deuelyshe doctrynes', and encouraging the disobedience of English bishops towards 'your graces noble predecessours in tymes past' (sigs. †3^{r-v}). 'What is now the cause of all these vntollerable and nomore to be suffred abhominacions?', Coverdale asks. 'Truely euen the ignoraunce of the scripture of God' (sig. †3^v). License the Bible in English, Coverdale implies, and you license the means by which Henry's imperialist pretensions can achieve popularity amongst the English people. Of course, Tyndale had similarly argued that the lessons of the Bible teach loyalty to kings, and had found his works condemned for inciting 'disobedience

³⁶ See Mozley, pp. 78-100. Also, Benson Bobrick, *The Making of the English Bible* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 2001), p. 143.

agaynst [...] princes' in Henry's proclamation against erroneous books. This, however, had been before Henry had found pressing need to find in propaganda a means of popularising his new-found pretensions to be styled 'the onely supreme heed in erthe of the Church of England callyd Anglicana Ecclesia', and if he did not grant to Coverdale's Bible the formal licence that its agent in England, James Nicolson, seems to have so desperately sought, he did not in 1535 find cause to condemn its publication, as he had five years earlier condemned the translations of Tyndale, upon which Coverdale's Bible is in large part based.³⁷ Writing in 1583, William Fulke recollects how, before Coverdale's death in January 1569, he and 'many hundreds beside' had gathered to hear Coverdale deliver a sermon at Paul's Cross within which he had defended 'his translation' against the slanders of others by pointing out how Henry himself had found cause to countenance its publication. Henry, having committed the Coverdale Bible 'to diuerse bishops of that time to peruse' and pass judgment on its translation, had been informed that 'there were many faultes therein'.

Well said the King, but are there anye heresies maintayned thereby: They answered there was no heresies that they could finde, maintained thereby. If there be no heresies sayd the King, then in Gods name let it goe abroad among our people.³⁸

Whether or not we take Fulke's anecdote at face value, it is clear that Nicolson must have received some sort of favourable response to his petition to Cromwell that the Coverdale Bible be allowed to 'go forth unther the kynges prevelge', even if he did not in fact obtain formal licence to print such a legend on its title-page. Nicolson had been wise to seek Cromwell's 'helpynge handes' in this matter.³⁹ In his 1530 proclamation against erroneous books, Henry had ordained punishment 'to the terrible example of other lyke transgressours' for persons thereafter found to possess any 'boke or bokes in the englisse tonge, printed beyonde the see'.⁴⁰ Having been scrupulous enough to have sought a

³⁷ 'An Acte conc[er]nyng the Kynges Highnes to be supreme heed of the Church of Englande & to have auctoryte to refourme & redresse all errors heresyces & abuses yn the same' (26 Hen. VIII, c. 1), in *Statutes*, III (1817), 492.

³⁸ William Fulke, *A Defense of the sincere and true Translations of the holie Scriptures into the English tong, against the manifolde cauils, friuolous quarels, and impudent slaunders of Gregorie Martin, one of the readers of Popish diuinitie in the trayterous Seminarie of Rhemes* (London: Henrie Bynneman, for George Bishop, 1583; STC 11430.5), sig. A2^v.

³⁹ Quoted in Mozley, p. 111.

⁴⁰ *A proclamation [...] for dampning of erroneous bokes*, fol. 1^r.

licence for the Coverdale Bible, whose sheets had been printed 'beyonde the see' in Cologne, it seems improbable that Nicolson should have proceeded to put the book on the market without having first learned of Henry's willingness to tolerate such an enterprise. The circulation of the Coverdale Bible in England by early 1536 must therefore mark a watershed in Henry's attitude towards the translation of scripture into English. Now he was prepared to countenance what he hitherto had been only too quick to condemn. Richard Morison appears to have been emboldened by Henry's more tolerant approach to the English Bible, when in November 1536 he set out to answer the petitions of the rebels involved in the Pilgrimage of Grace. Coverdale had argued that the cause of rebellion was 'truely euen the ignoraunce of the scripture of God', and Morison echoes these sentiments in his *Remedy for Seditiōn*. 'And can not the knowlege of the worde of god', he asks readers of the *Remedy*, 'kepe christen men from contempning the iudgemente and lawes of god, from vndoinge theyr cou[n]trei, from fyghtyng against theyr prince?' (sig. E1^v).

Like Elyot, Morison twins England's monarchy with Plato's meritocracy in the *Remedy*. Both he and Elyot order the commonwealth around the rule of reason, and both argue that the rule of reason is best exemplified in monarchical government. Writing to exhort the obedience of Northerners unhappy with Henry's government of the English Church, however, Morison's use of Platonic political philosophy in the *Remedy* is decidedly more polemical than was Elyot's in the *Gouernour*. For Morison, it was no longer sufficient to acknowledge the King as head of state, as we acknowledge the headship of reason in the self. With both Church and state subsumed under the supreme headship of Henry VIII, Morison, like Tyndale and Coverdale before him, also had to teach his readers to recognise the false headship of the Pope. 'This foreyne heed, that is in Rome', Morison laments in the *Remedy*, 'hath brought the sely braynes of many a poore manne, into depe errors'.

Alas what greater ignorauncye can there be, then to take hym for hede, that neuer was with the body? Hym for the heed, that hitherto hath done nothyng, but consumed the membres? The kyng is our heed, though popyshe say nay. (sig. D3^v)

It is again to the Platonic analogy between the physical and political bodies that Morison here resorts in his attempt to reconcile his readership with Henry's pretensions,

as enshrined in the Appeals Act, to be 'Sup[re]me heede' of an empire 'compacte of all sortes and degrees of people, devided in termes and by names of Sp[irit]ualtie and Temporaltie'.⁴¹ As reason should be sovereign over the constitution of the self and state alike, so Morison here asserts that it would be as unreasonable to recognise the authority in England of a 'foreyne heed' like Pope Paul III as it would be unnatural for the body of one person to take guidance from the head of another. Morison, however, evidently felt that this appeal to Platonic political philosophy was on its own insufficient to the task of reconciling the rebels in Yorkshire with the obedience they owed to the King. Reason alone dictates that 'the kyng is our heed, though popyshe say nay', Morison asserts in the above passage, and yet, he continues in the same sentence, 'lette vs beleue the prophete Samuel', who said 'vnto kynge Saul, God hathe anoynted the, and made the prince of all his inheritance'.⁴² 'Think you that priestes, monkes, friers, and byshops, be not a parte of goddis inheritaunce?', Morison asks his readers (sig. D3^v). If reason alone does not permit our 'sely braynes' to discern our natural king from the 'foreyne heede, that is in Rome', then 'might not we lerne so moche of Christis lawe', Morison argues, 'as were able to kepe vs from rebellion?' (sig. D4^v). 'The preceptes of philosophie' prompted 'many of the Grecians, mo of the Romans' to 'dye for their cou[n]trey' (sig. E1^v), he writes. Why then, Morison asks, might we not also use 'goddis lawes', which in comparison to Plato's precepts 'be but easily preached', to teach us Christians to 'abhorre sedycyon and rebellion' (sig. E1^v) against our lawful kings? 'Goddis lawes', he contends,

shal neuer be so set by, as they ought, before they be well knowen. Howe shall poore men knowe them, except they be syncerely preached? We must fyrst lerne to kepe goddis lawes, or euer we earnestly passe of the kynges statutes. All be it he that kepeth thone, wyll also kepe thother. He that can fynde a better way, to auoyde sedition, than fyrst to brynge in the worde of god [...] shall do ryght wel to shew it. (sig. E3^v)

Where Elyot found the blueprint for monarchical government in the patterns of nature, it is in passages of scripture that admonish obedience to kings that Morison ultimately finds his own remedy for sedition. Plato alone is insufficient to the task of teaching the 'sely braynes' of rebellious people to recognise that the state, like the self, best serves reason when all its members submit to one head. In its place, Morison

⁴¹ *Statutes*, III (1817), 427.

⁴² I Kings 10.1.

proposes sweeping educational reforms that emphasise the importance of preaching ‘Christis lawes’, in sermons delivered before the masses (sig. E2^r). ‘Maye not poore mennes chyldren come to the sermons?’, he asks. ‘Maye they not here preachers?’ (sigs. D4^v-E1^r). Elyot, like Henry himself, had in 1531 identified ‘euangelicall persones’ with the maintenance of sedition. Five years later, Morison would actively seek to echo English evangelists like Tyndale and Coverdale, in a treatise that prescribes the reading of scripture as the remedy for sedition, and which was not only printed with royal consent, but as propaganda against the Pilgrimage of Grace. In his *Lamentation* against the Lincolnshire Uprising, Morison reflects in the make-up of ‘mother England’ the Platonic analogy, to which Elyot had referred in the *Gouernour*, between the physical and political constitutions. England speaks in the *Lamentation* to ventriloquise Morison’s own admonition that the Lincolnshire rebels learn obedience to kings. Her words anticipate what Morison would later contend in the *Remedy* – that in the state, as in the self, ‘the heed muste rule, if the body woll do welle’. Reason dictates that we recognise Henry as the head of a political body compact of Church and state, Morison argues in the *Remedy*, and it is as a political body under Henry’s headship that England appears in the *Lamentation*. England addresses ‘Lyncolneshire’ as ‘a me[m]bre of myn’ in this earlier treatise, and by making this analogy between self and state, she goes on to imply that sedition is as monstrous in the political body as a ‘hande that scratcheth out the eyen’ is unnatural in the physical. When the character of England reappears in the *Remedy*, it is to register Morison’s own conclusion in this later treatise – that ultimately it was the precepts of scripture, not of Platonic political philosophy, that provided the most effective remedy for sedition. Morison turns in the *Remedy* to the teachings of the prophet Samuel, in order to corroborate his assertion that ‘the kyng is our heed, though popyshe say nay’. When England enters the *Remedy* to also speak out against sedition, she likewise grounds her assertions upon the lessons of scripture.

He is none of myne saythe Christe, nor worthy to be my seruaunt, that can not, if iuste cawse require hym so to do, forsake his father & mother to do me seruyce. He is none of myne saythe Englande, that canne not hate his father and mother, that canne not kyll them bothe, sooner than ones consente to my destruction. (sig. C2^r)

In his dedicatory epistle to the King, Coverdale had contended that the Bible ‘declareth most abou[n]tdauntly that the office, auctorite and power geuen of God vnto

kynges/ is in earth aboue all other powers'. It is to these sentiments that England also speaks in the above passage, as she constructs an argument against sedition that explicitly echoes the words of Christ in scripture. It is Christ whom England echoes in this admonition that we place our loyalty to the motherland above love for our fathers and mothers. Christ disowns those who will not forsake their father and mother to do him service, and England forsakes those who ignore Christ's admonition that we 'abhorre sedycyon and rebellion' against the King. The England of the *Lamentation* had identified herself with rebel and royalist alike – 'ye are all myne', she had professed. The England of the *Remedy* rejects as 'none of myne' any reader of the English Bible who refuses to pledge obedience to king and country. 'Can not the knowlege of the worde of god kepe christen men from [...] vndoinge theyr cou[n]trey, from fyghtyng against theyr prince?', Morison had asked readers of the *Remedy*. Tyndale had answered in the affirmative, and had answered prelates who accused him of Englishing scripture to incite sedition by pointing to the clarity of those parts of the Bible that admonish our obedience to kings. In his 1530 *Pentateuch*, Tyndale had alleged that scripture is the 'twichstone [that] tryeth all doctrynes' (sig. [A]5^r). It was, he had argued in the *Obedie[n]ce*, against the transparency of the Bible message that the truth of 'all mens exposicion' can be measured (sig. C2^r). According to his *Pentateuch*, the 'playne texte and literall sense' of scripture (sig. [A]6^r) would alone confound the 'miste of [...] sophistrye', which sought in 'sotle rydles' to wrest from the 'processe/ order and meaninge' of Christ's Word its clear admonition concerning the obedience we owe unto kings (sig. [A]2^v). Morison, like Tyndale and Coverdale before him, also finds his remedy for sedition in the plain syntax of Christ's Word well preached – it being well preached, he asserts in the *Remedy*, 'whan the preacher sayth as the gospel is, and doth as the gospell saith' (sig. E2^r). By having England echo this syntax in her address to the northern rebels, Morison makes use of scripture to command obedience to kings, and he also invites the readers of his *Remedy* to derive a collective sense of Englishness from their dutiful obedience to the Word.

In the *Remedy*, England speaks to a sense of Englishness that is based upon obedience to what the 'playne texte and literall sense' of scripture commands of a king's subjects. The words that England echoes in the above passage constitute a paraphrase of Christ's teaching in Matthew 19.16-30, where Christ assures his disciples that they who have forsaken family, lands, and property to follow him will receive the reward of

everlasting life. In the above passage, however, England can be seen to misread what in scripture is an admonition to put one's faith in Christ before one's love of land and family, for England here expects us to kill our father and mother, should they be found guilty of sedition, not out of love for Christ, but out of loyalty to the motherland that Christ is in fact here commanding his followers to forsake. This misreading of Matthew 19 questions the clarity of Christ's teachings on the subject of obedience. In so doing, it can be seen to compromise the construction of Englishness in the *Remedy* – since Englishness is predicated in the *Remedy* upon the assumption that scripture is unambiguous, and its message of obedience easy to understand. It is with Bible-readers that England identifies herself in the *Remedy*, but she does so in words that wrest the 'processe/ order and meaning' of the scriptural passage to which she alludes. England's words seek to remedy sedition, but their inability to do so without wresting the meaning of Matthew 19.16-30 inevitably question our capacity to learn proper obedience to the King from the syntax of scripture alone. This threatens to undermine, not only the remedy for sedition that Morison proposes – the preaching in sermons of the plain syntax of scripture – but also the sense of Englishness that mother England attempts to instil into readers of the *Remedy*, an Englishness based upon knowledge of God's Word, and upon obedience to what the Word commands of a king's subjects.

* * *

In each of Morison's two pamphlets against the northern rebellions of 1536, mother England enters to echo Morison's own admonition that the rebels acknowledge the legitimacy of Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church. The England of the *Lamentation* structures her appeal to the Lincolnshire rebels around the rationale of Plato's Republic. She echoes Morison's use in these treatises of the Platonic analogy between the physical and political bodies, for she anatomises Lincolnshire as 'a me[m]bre of myn', and asserts that rebellion is as monstrous in the state as a 'hande that scratcheth out the eyen' is unnatural in the self. The England of the *Remedy* on the other hand enters to echo the syntax of scriptural passages that admonish obedience to kings, and she does so in order to endorse Morison's own contention in this pamphlet that 'we must fyrst lerne to kepe goddis lawes, or euer we earnestly passe of the kynges statutes'. It is an interpretation, rather than an echo of Christ's words in Matthew 19 that England offers to

readers of the *Remedy*, however – a fact that serves to undermine Morison's claim in this pamphlet to have found a remedy for sedition in the syntax of Christ's Word well-preached.

* * *

Chapter 4

'Enter Ynglond': Staging Nationhood in John Bale's *King Johan* (c. 1538)

England functioned in Morison's pamphlets as an apologist for Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church. Two years after the northern rebellions of 1536, mother England again appeared in Royal Supremacy literature, this time on the stage of John Bale's *King Johan*. Bale's England echoes the England of Morison's *Remedy*, insofar as she also makes Bible-reading the basis of her remedy for sedition, and the cornerstone for her construction of English national identity. This chapter will explore the development in *King Johan* of this relationship between Bible-reading, obedience, and English national identity construction. I argue that Bale follows Morison in predicating Englishness upon obedience to the plain syntax of scripture, but that, like Morison, Bale also unwittingly reveals complexities in the interpretation of Biblical passages – complexities that compromise this construction of English national identity, because they question the clarity of those scriptural passages that command our obedience to the King.

* * *

Morison himself may have confined his support for the Royal Supremacy to prose propaganda, but there exists in manuscript a treatise attributed to his authorship, and concerned primarily with promoting the reformation and Latinisation of English common law, that digresses at one point to propose the mobilisation in England of a more comprehensive anti-papal propaganda campaign.¹ Alongside sermons and printed tracts that teach 'the usurped power of the bisshoppe of Rome', Morison endorses the institution

¹ 'A discourse touching the reformation of the laws of England', BL, Cotton MSS, Faustina C II, fols. 5-22, calendared in *LP*, XVII (1900), 707. The anti-papal propaganda campaign is proposed on folios 15^v-18^v. A fair copy, 'A Perswasion to the Kyng that the laws of the realme shulde be in Latin', is contained in BL, Royal MSS, 18 A L. Both MSS are written in a scribal hand, but the 'Discourse' also has interlineations in Morison's own hand. Sydney Anglo argues that Morison's interlineation 'tends to confirm his authorship' of the treatise, 'as does the matter and manner of the argument'. See 'An Early Tudor Programme for Plays and other Demonstrations against the Pope', *Journal of the Warburg and Courthauld Institutes*, 20 (1957), 176-79 (p. 177). Anglo prints on pp. 177-79 of this article the extract from Cotton MSS, Faustina C II concerning anti-papal propaganda. All references to the 'Discourse' cite from Anglo's edition.

of annual bonfires and processions to celebrate 'the distruction of the bisshop of Rome out of this Realme'.² He commends to Henry VIII in particular the production of 'plaies' that 'set forthe and declare lyvely before the peoples eies the abhomynation and wickednes of the bisshop of Rome, monkes, ffreers, nonnes, and suche like', and which 'open to them thobedience that your subiectes by goddes and mans lawes owe unto your magestie'.³ Though willing in his *Policy and Police* to entertain the logic behind these ideas, Geoffrey Elton confesses himself relieved that Morison's proposals went unheeded by the machinery of government, and 'that the pre-history of the Elizabethan stage was not littered with pope-hunting plays commissioned by Thomas Cromwell'.⁴ Some critics have on the other hand argued that Cromwell did in fact implement Morison's proposals as part of his anti-papal propaganda campaign, and they have been quick to identify the plays of John Bale as exactly the sort of pope-hunting plays that the Cromwellian regime was keen to commission. 'Morison's own pamphlets', writes Sydney Anglo, 'were but part of a scheme organized by Cromwell who employed numerous other writers [...] for similar purposes, and who even appears to have comprehended the value of drama as a weapon for propaganda and to have encouraged the virulent productions of John Bale'.⁵ Paul Whitfield White goes further. Cromwell's accounts record payment of forty shillings to 'Bale and his fellows' on 8 September 1538 for 'playing before my Lord' at 'St Stephen's beside Canterbury', and payment of thirty shillings on 31 January 1539 for a second command performance before Cromwell at an unspecified location.⁶ White extrapolates from this evidence of Cromwell's interest in Bale's plays to argue for Cromwell's direct involvement as patron of Bale's company of players between early 1537 to early 1540. He identifies 'Bale and his fellows' with the troupe described in civic and other surviving records from this period as 'Lord Cromwell's Players' and 'the Lord Privy Seal's Men', and on the basis of this identification he reconstructs routes for four provincial tours in England, which he asserts that Bale and his company could have feasibly undertaken with Cromwell's backing between these dates.⁷

² 'A Discourse', in Anglo, 'An Early Tudor Programme', p. 178.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

⁴ G. R. Elton, *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), p. 186.

⁵ Anglo, 'An Early Tudor Programme', p. 177.

⁶ *LP*, XIV.ii (1895), 337; 339.

⁷ See Paul Whitfield White, *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage, and Playing in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 12-27.

Whether Cromwell confined his interest in Bale's plays to the two command performances of 1538-39, or whether, as White suggests, these two performances themselves formed part of provincial tours commissioned by Cromwell, it is clear from the concrete evidence of Cromwell's two payments to 'Bale and his fellows' that he, like Morison, was at least willing to endorse the mobilisation of drama as a medium for anti-papal propaganda. 'Into the comen people thynges sooner enter by the eies, then by the eares', Morison writes in the 'Discourse', 'remembryng more better that they see then that they heere'.⁸ Just how effective at popularising the Royal Supremacy proved the sort of anti-papal plays proposed by Morison and composed by Bale can be ascertained from the depositions of John Alforde and Thomas Brown against a certain London shipman named Henry Totehill.⁹ Both these deponents accuse Totehill of 'naughty communication [...] concerning the bishop of Rome and Thomas Beckett', and they claim that Totehill spoke these offending words in the course of a conversation with them about a play that Alforde, Brown, and perhaps Totehill himself, had recently attended.¹⁰ Both deponents had been 'at my Lorde of Canterbury's' house during Christmas 1538-39 to hear 'an enterlude concernyng King John', and at some point thereafter, on the evening of either the second or third day of January 1539, they had talked with Totehill about the play performed. It was, Brown confessed, 'one of the best matiers that ever he sawe, towching King John', and though he had in the past heard 'preistes and clerkes' speak ill of King John, he 'knew now that yt was nothing treu'. The play had taught him that 'King John was as noble a prince as ever was in England', and 'that he was the begynner of the puttyng down of the

⁸ 'A Discourse', in Anglo, 'An Early Tudor Programme', p. 179.

⁹ The depositions were enclosed in Thomas Cranmer's letter to Cromwell of 11 January 1539. Both it and the depositions are reproduced in *The Works of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556*, ed. by John Edmund Cox, 2 vols, Parker Society Publications 12, 24 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844-46), II (1846: Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer), 387-88. All references to the depositions cite from this edition.

¹⁰ *Works of Cranmer*, II, 387. At no point in their depositions do either Alforde or Brown state that Henry Totehill had actually attended this play, but only that the accused had later taken part in a conversation with them about the performance, and that his comments in defence of the papal supremacy in the Church in England had been occasioned by their own wholehearted approval of the sort of anti-papal antics that they had witnessed on stage. Some critics, notably Barry Adams, have nevertheless assumed that Henry Totehill was in fact witness to the play with Alforde and Brown, and indeed nowhere in the depositions is it stated that he definitely did not attend. See the introduction to *John Bale's King Johan*, ed. by Barry B. Adams (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library Publications, 1969) p. 6. All line references to the play cite from Adam's edition. Greg Walker argues the opposite point of view in his *Plays of Persuasion: Drama and Politics at the Court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 174-75.

Bisshop of Rome' – for which, he asserts, 'we myght be all gladd'. Alforde had wholeheartedly agreed. It was, Alforde claimed, 'a petie that the Bisshop of Rome should reigne any lenger, for if he should, the said Bisshop would do with our King as he did with King John'. Totehill had apparently answered these pro-Supremacist sentiments with the observation 'that it was petie and nawghtely don, to put down the Pope and Saincte Thomas'. 'The Pope was a good man', he had argued, and he had moreover been 'made Pope by the clergie and by the consent of all the Kinges Christen'.¹¹

Recent critics have found the similarities in subject matter between Bale's *King Johan* and this 'enterlude concernyng King John' just too compelling a coincidence, and have argued that these two plays are one and the same, and that Bale was the author of the play performed 'at my Lorde of Canterbury's' house during Christmas 1538-39. 'For there to have been two anti-papal plays of King John circulating simultaneously would seem too unlikely a coincidence', Greg Walker argues.¹² White, who identifies 'my Lorde of Canterbury's' house as the Canterbury residence, at Ford, of Archbishop Cranmer, even incorporates this Christmas performance of Bale's *King Johan* into the itinerary of one of the four provincial tours that he suggests 'Bale and his fellows' may have undertaken with Cromwell's backing in the later 1530s.¹³ Both Walker and White entertain the possibility that Cromwell's second payment to Bale at the end of January 1539 represents remuneration for his Christmas performance before Cranmer at Canterbury, although both admit that this is entirely conjectural.¹⁴ Whether or not Cromwell paid for this Canterbury performance of the 'enterlude concernyng King John', it does at least seem sensible to entertain the idea that 'Bale and his fellows' were involved in the production of this play, and that the interlude to which Alforde and Brown were witness was in fact a version of Bale's *King Johan*. It was perhaps the money he received from his several command performances before Cranmer and Cromwell that enabled Bale to pay for a scribe to make a fair copy of *King Johan*.¹⁵ That manuscript is today housed in the Huntington Library, California, and is the only extant copy of the play, for *King Johan* remained unprinted

¹¹ *Works of Cranmer*, II, 387.

¹² *Plays of Persuasion*, p. 173.

¹³ See *Theatre and Reformation*, p. 17; p. 26.

¹⁴ See *Plays of Persuasion*, p. 173, and *Theatre and Reformation*, p. 194, n. 17.

¹⁵ Peter Happé advances this idea in the introduction to his edition of *The Complete Plays of John Bale*, Tudor Interludes 4-5, 2 vols (Cambridge: Brewer, 1985-86), I, 10.

until 1838, when the Camden Society published an edition of the manuscript prepared by John Payne Collier.¹⁶

The composite nature of this manuscript presents problems for contextualised analysis of the play, for whilst the Alforde deposition allows us with some certainty to pinpoint a performance context for *King Johan* at the Canterbury residence of Archbishop Cranmer during Christmas 1538-39, the peculiar nature of the manuscript revisions and excisions nevertheless deprive us of a definitive play-text upon which to base our discussion of this performance. Two hands appear in Huntington MSS, HM3, which comprises twenty folio-sized leaves interfoliated with fourteen of quarto size and a single smaller slip. All of the folio, and all but two of the quarto leaves, have text on both recto and verso. The versos of two quarto leaves and the single smaller slip are blank.¹⁷ The first

¹⁶ John Bale, *Kynge Johan: A Play in Two Parts*, ed. by John Payne Collier (London: Camden Society, 1838). The manuscript was at this time in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire. It appears to have been purchased as part of the sale to Mr Huntington of around four thousand items from the Devonshire collection in March 1914, and is now catalogued as Huntington Library, MSS HM 3. Collier's text, or selections from it, was used as the basis for three other late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century editions of *King Johan*. The play was included in J. M. Manly's *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, 2 vols (Boston: Athenæum Press, 1897), and in J. S. Farmer's modernised version of *The Dramatic Writings of John Bale, Bishop of Ossory* (London: Early English Drama Society, 1907, repr. 1966). Two extracts were also included in A. W. Pollard's *English Miracle Plays, Moralities, and Interludes*, rev. edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927). In 1931, J. H. Pafford and W. W. Greg prepared for the Malone Society Reprints a new edition of the play, based on the photographic facsimile published by Willy Bang (*Bales Kynge Johan nach der Handschrift in der Chatsworth Collection in Faksimile, Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas*, 25 (Louvain: [n. pub], 1909)). Two anthologies containing versions of *King Johan* – William A. Armstrong's *Elizabethan History Plays*, World's Classics, 606 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), and Edmund Creeth's *Tudor Plays: An Anthology of Early English Drama* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1966) – have based all or part of their text on the Malone Society edition prepared by Pafford and Greg. Barry B. Adams' 1969 edition was the first since John Payne Collier's to be based on the text of the manuscript itself. It has since been followed, but not surpassed, by the editions that Peter Happé has prepared for his *Four Morality Plays* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979), and most recently for the first volume of his *Complete Plays of John Bale*, published in 1985. Adams gives the fullest survey of previous editions in the introduction to his *John Bale's King Johan*, pp. 17-19. See also, Happé, *Complete Plays*, I, 100-101.

¹⁷ Making a total of thirty-five leaves, and sixty-seven pages. The folio component of the manuscript originally comprised eleven sheets. Only twenty of the original twenty-two folio leaves are extant. A total of four folio leaves had become detached from the manuscript at some point before 1838, for these were missing from the manuscript when John Payne Collier prepared his edition of the play. Two of these were later recovered in Collier's own lifetime, although they remained unpublished until 1931, when Pafford and Greg prepared their new edition of the play for the Malone Society Reprints series. At some point before 1838, when all four folio leaves were still missing, the pages of the folio and quarto components of the manuscript were numbered sequentially in ink from 1 to 63. The folio component gives pages 1-22, 24-25, and 27-38; the

hand, which is scribal, and which has been dated to shortly after May 1538 from allusion in that part of the play written in this hand to a burning at Smithfield on 30 May 1538, occurs only on the folio component of the manuscript (the 'A-text').¹⁸ The second hand is Bale's own. Bale makes several interlinear revisions to the A-text (in the margins of pp. 11, 29, 32, 35, and 37 in particular), and he is solely responsible for the text on the quarto leaves and slip (the 'B-text'). These quarto leaves contain an unidentified watermark that bears the date '1558', and the B-text is therefore dateable from the beginning of this year until the year of Bale's own death in 1563, although an apparent reference towards the end of the B-text to Elizabeth I's proclamation against Anabaptists of 22 September 1560 acts as a terminus a quo for the composition of at least part of the B-text.¹⁹

It appears that Bale commissioned a scribe to make a fair copy of his play at some point after May 1538, and that the A-text produced represents an originally complete, if shorter, version of the play that survives today. Bale then revised the A-text in his own

quarto component pages 26 and 39-63. The single slip is page 23. The two found folio leaves (folios 19 and 20) have since been designated pp. *1-*4. The majority of these four pages have been cancelled, although thirty-four lines remain on p. *1. Collier's edition lacks these thirty-four lines of the play, as do all subsequent editions based on Collier, up to the publication in 1931 of the new edition prepared by Pafford and Greg. Collier surmised from Bale's explicit on p. 63, 'Thus endeth the .ij. playes of kynge Iohan', that the text of the manuscript was originally separable into two distinct plays, and the absence in 1838 of pp. *1-*4 fed Collier's speculation in this respect. Noting that 'some confusion or omission' occurs in the manuscript after the eighteenth leaf of the folio component (ie. p. 38), Collier concluded that this missing material had contained 'additions made by Bale, and intended by him to separate the two parts of the drama' (see Collier, p. 68; p. xi). The later discovery of two of these missing folio leaves has enabled editors after Collier to reinterpret the composite nature of the manuscript as evidence of redaction, but not of its separation into 'ij. playes', as Collier had originally proposed. The fullest physical description of the manuscript is given in Adams, pp. 1-17.

¹⁸ See Adams, p. 20 and Happé, *Complete Plays*, I, 10; 124. The internal allusion occurs in line 1229 of the play, which refers to 'a ioynt of darvell gathyron'. Adams notes on p. 172 of his edition that the image of Darfel Gedern was burned at the execution of a certain Friar Forest at Smithfield on 30 May 1538. Adams asserts that Bale is 'here assuming on the part of his audience a familiarity with a recent, local event', and he contends that 'the passage could not have been written before (and not very long after) May 1538'.

¹⁹ Adams describes this watermark on p. 13 of his edition. The possible allusion to Elizabeth's proclamation deporting Anabaptists (*TRP* 2, no. 470) occurs in lines 2680-81: 'And now of late dayes the secte of Anabaptistes | She seketh to suppressse for their pestiferous facyon'. For discussion, see Adams, pp. 23-24 and p. 196. Adams assigns to after September 1560, the composition not only of lines 2680-81, but also of the entire 'epilogue' (lines 2650-91) within which these lines occur. He notes, however, that lines 2626-31 also refer to the Anabaptists, but in language that seems to anticipate their future suppression, rather than to celebrate the dire implications for the Anabaptists of Elizabeth's September 1560 proclamation against them. Adams concludes on p. 24 of his edition that the 'epilogue' was added after September 1560, but that 'the bulk of the fresh B-text material was composed before Elizabeth's proclamation'. Happé agrees, see *Complete Plays*, I, 139.

hand at some point after 1558, making excisions and interlinear revisions on the folio leaves, and inserting additional text on the rectos of a slip of paper and single quarto leaf, which Bale then interleaved between A-text folios 11-12 (pp. 22 and 24) and 12-13 (pp. 25 and 27) respectively. By the time Bale reached the nineteenth folio of the A-text (pp. *1-*2), his revisions had become so cumbersome that he decided to make a fair copy of his revised ending on thirteen additional quarto leaves (pp. 39-63). He retained thirty-four lines of the A-text on the recto of folio 19 (p. *1), and added new passages on the recto and verso of the first of these thirteen quarto leaves (pp. 39-40), which he marked with symbols for insertion into the dialogue of A-text folios 18-19 (pp. 37, 38, *1, *2). The remaining seven lines of the recto of A-text folio 19 (p. *1) have been cancelled, as has the text on its verso (p. *2), and the text on both sides of A-text folio 20 (pp. *3-*4). Two companion folio leaves containing the conclusion of the A-text ending were evidently discarded at the time, and still remain unfound.

Whilst there is therefore good evidence to suggest that Bale's *King Johan* was performed at Canterbury over Christmas 1538-39, only part of the play-text that may have been written for this performance is today extant. The play-text in Huntington MSS, HM3 is the product of more than one cultural moment, and whilst many of Bale's later excisions from the A-text are still legible beneath his crossings-out, the entire A-text remains unrecoverable because of the loss of the last two cancelled folio leaves. The extant A-text breaks off four lines into King John's dying speech, at the foot of the cancelled verso of the twentieth folio leaf (p. *4). Although it would theoretically have been feasible for the A-text version to have concluded some lines later with John's death, Adams has argued for a closer resemblance between the A- and B-text endings. He points to the fact that there exists on the verso of the cancelled nineteenth folio leaf (p. *2) a stage direction instructing Cardinal Pandulphus to 'go owt and dresse for Nobelyte' (l. A45sd).²⁰ Nobility does not thereafter appear on stage in the surviving A-text, but he does reappear after John's death in the B-text version. On the strength of this observation, Adams argues that the original A-text ending must have contained a truncated version of the scene involving Nobility with which the B-text ending is brought to a close, a supposition more fully advanced by Greg Walker, who argues that 'the final pages of the

²⁰ See Adams, pp. 5-6. It is to be noted that line references to cancelled material from pp. *1-*4 of the manuscript are in Adam's edition prefixed with an 'A'.

A text must have resembled a condensed version of the final scenes of the B text, with little of substance having been added in the final revision save the references to the new Queen [*ie. Elizabeth*].²¹ This observation is consonant with what we can glean about Bale's method of rewriting the play's conclusion by comparing the hundred and forty excised lines of the cancelled A-text folios with their corresponding lines in the B-text ending. 'In rewriting the final 140 lines of the surviving A-text', writes Adams, 'Bale revised and expanded freely but never suppressed an entire line, with the result that each of these 140 A-text lines can be traced in the corresponding 356-line section of the B-text'.²² From the consonance of subject-matter between the A- and B-text endings, it seems safe to assume that the missing A-text material resembled a compact version of the conclusion that Bale later re-wrote.

Despite the absence of a definitive play-text upon which to base discussion of the Christmas 1538-39 performance of *King Johan*, there does, therefore, seem good authority for assuming a structural resemblance between the endings of the A- and B-texts. It is of course impossible to fully disentangle the A- from the B-text due to the truncated nature of the manuscript's scribal component, but these suppositions concerning the subject-matter of the lost conclusion at least allow us to piece together the recoverable portions of the A-text with some idea of how this play may have ended when staged 'at my Lorde of Canterbury's' before John Alforde and Thomas Brown. This approach to the manuscript is contrary to the practice of its modern editors, who all follow Pafford and Greg's lead in using the B-text version as the basis for their text. As Happé notes, Bale 'worked on the text for over twenty years', and it is therefore 'reasonable to suppose that everything he allowed to stand has his approval'.²³ Adams likewise gives priority to the author's final intentions as represented in the B-text, but good editorial practice in this respect does not necessarily do justice to Bale's original conception of the play at the time of its performance in 1538-39.²⁴ To return to the A-text is to turn to the play-text transcribed at some point after May 1538, perhaps even in preparation for, or as a consequence of, the command performance which took place that Christmas at the Canterbury residence of Archbishop Cranmer. The following discussion of *King Johan* therefore confines its

²¹ *Plays of Persuasion*, p. 177. For the references to Elizabeth, see footnote 19 above.

²² Adams, p. 15.

²³ *Complete Plays*, I, 101.

²⁴ See Adams, p. 66.

analysis of the play to the A-text version recoverable beneath Bale's revisions and excisions, and it does so in order to restore the play-text preserved in manuscript to something that more nearly approaches the version of the play performed at Christmas 1538-39. Both play-text and performance can be approached as the products of a particular cultural moment in 1538, for this year witnessed the publication of injunctions ordering provision of an English Bible in every parish church, and I argue that the 1538 performance of *King Johan* responds to the implications of these injunctions. When I do move analysis to the conclusion of the B-text, it will be with reference to the later cultural moment in which Bale undertook to re-write the play's ending – for I argue that it is in the light of what occurred in the years after 1538 that the words of Bale's revised conclusion might best be interpreted.

* * *

King Johan, like Morison's *Remedy*, concerns itself with the subject of sedition, and, like the *Remedy*, it responds to the recent rebellions of the Lincolnshire Uprising and Pilgrimage of Grace. Although addressed to the Yorkshire rebels, the *Remedy* presents itself as an abstract treatise on the topic of sedition, and within it Morison proposes Bible-reading as a universal solution to this age-old problem. Bale's play is ostensibly concerned with the history of King John, but, like Morison, Bale also takes the long view on the subject of sedition, for Bale presents John's well-documented quarrel with the papal Church, and his death in 1216 at the hands of a Cistercian monk, as but an example of sedition at work in the commonwealths of past and present. Bale's dramatisation of John's dealings with the Church is drawn chiefly from the chronicle account of his reign contained in the English prose *Brut*, a fourteenth-century translation, first printed by Caxton in 1480, of a revised version of the original French *Brut*, composed shortly after 1332.²⁵ John's struggles with the papacy stem in the *Brut* from the consequences of his

²⁵ Bale's other possible borrowings are discussed in Adams, pp. 25-38, and Happé, I, 14-16. Subsequent quotations from the English translation of the *Brut d'Engleterre* will cite from the text of the modern edition, *The Brut, or the Chronicles of England*, ed. by Friedrich W. D. Brie, 2 vols, EETS, o.s., 131 and 136 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1906-1908) I, 154-70. All references are to this edition. Brie bases his edition upon the earliest extant manuscript copy of the English translation, Bodleian MSS, Rawlinson B. 171, transcribed around 1400. Caxton's first English edition is catalogued as STC 9991. For other late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century editions, see Adams, pp. 33-34.

defeats in France.²⁶ Forced by 1205 to surrender Normandy and Anjou to Philip II of France, John demanded that the English clergy contribute a tenth of their livings to help finance a campaign to re-conquer these lands. When this met with the clergy's refusal, John himself refused to recognise their appointment of Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury. Upon hearing that the clergy had against his own wishes sent to Rome to have Langton confirmed as Archbishop, John had responded by exiling from England the Prior and Convent of Canterbury, with the command 'þat no maner lettre þat come from þe court of Rome, ne no comandement, shulde be vnderfong ne pledede in Engelond' (*Brut*, I, 155). Upon hearing of this, Innocent III demanded that John recognise Langton as Archbishop, and restore the exiled clergy to their convent at Canterbury, upon pain of a general interdiction in England. When John refused, Innocent III directed the Bishops of London, Ely, Winchester, and Hereford to place England under interdict in 1208. John responded by expropriating the lands and properties of the Church in England, and of the Cistercian Order in particular. According to the English *Brut*, Innocent III then sent the legates 'Pandolf & Duraunt' to John, to demand that he desist upon pain of excommunication from his continued persecution of the Church (I, 161). When he still refused to consent to Langton's election as archbishop, the legates proceeded in 1209 to excommunicate John, assoil his subjects from their allegiance to the King, and command all of Christendom to do battle with him, 'as wiþ him þat is enemy to al holy cherche' (I, 160). John ultimately caved in to Innocent's demands, upon hearing news that Philip II of France was on his way to invade England. He was compelled by Pandolf to swear allegiance to Innocent III, to relinquish his crown for five days, and to render his and his heir's dominions escheatable in perpetuity to the See of Rome.

Bale's play borrows substantially from this account in the *Brut* of John's quarrels with Innocent III, but Bale also manipulates the *Brut* for his own ideological purposes. *King Johan* takes up the narrative of the *Brut* at the point where John is beginning to expropriate Church lands and property, although whereas this spoliation occurs in the *Brut* as part of John's retaliation for the interdict placed on England, it is in the play undertaken in response to the character England's complaint to John about her impoverishment at the

²⁶ The reign of King John is the subject of several recent historical surveys. See John Appleby, *John King of England* (New York: Knopf, 1959); Wilfred Lewis Warren, *King John* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1961); and Ralph Turner, *King John* (London: Longman, 1994).

hands of the clergy. ‘Alas, yowr clargy hath done very sore amys | In mysvsyng me, ageynst all ryght and iustyce’ (ll. 27-28), England laments to John at the start of the play, ‘For they take from me my cattell, howse and land, | My wodes and pasturs, with other commodityes’ (ll. 62-63). Astonished by England’s altered condition, and promising ‘daye and nyght’ (l. 139) to defend this ‘pore wydowes cause’ (l. 129), John summons together the chief estates of his realm – Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order – to admonish that they in future ‘loke to the state of Englonde’, and ‘leate non enemy holde her in myserable bond’ (ll. 527-28). John undertakes to reform the Church in order to restore England’s lands and liberties, and it is in this context that we first hear of his refusal to countenance Stephen Langton as archbishop (see ll. 937-41). Thereafter, the play follows closely the account in the *Brut* of John’s dealings with the Church, so closely that it at times repeats details in the *Brut* which contravene most other medieval accounts. According to the *Brut*, Innocent asked four bishops to interdict England, ‘þe ferst was Bisshop Willia[m] of London, & þat op[er] Eustace, Bisshop of Ely; þe þridde was Walt[er], þe Bisshop of Wynchestre; And þe ferþ was Giles, þe Bisshop of Herford’ (I, 155). Bale has these same four bishops publish, not the interdict, but the sentence of excommunication against John in lines 932-34 of *King Johan*, even though most other medieval chronicles depart from the *Brut* to instead identify the Bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester as the prelates responsible for publishing both interdict and excommunication.²⁷ Bale again echoes the *Brut* when he has the legate Pandulphus (Pandolf), who in the play is promoted to the position of cardinal, perform the excommunication for a second time. As in the *Brut*, it is news of an impending invasion by ‘þe french kyng’ (l. 1634) that forces Bale’s King John to surrender his crown to Pandulphus, and to swear allegiance to the papal Church.

After this point in the play, Bale becomes somewhat freer with his use of the *Brut*. He departs from its narrative sequence, postponing until after John’s capitulation to Pandulphus the episode, with which this scene is anticipated in the *Brut*, of the clerk accused of ‘coniuryng, calkyng, and coynyng of newe grotes’ (l. 1859). This episode is closely followed in the A-text of *King Johan* by the dramatisation of John’s death at the hands of a monk ‘callyd monastycall devocyon’ (l. A111). Bale omits the events that in the *Brut* occur between England’s release from interdict on 7 July 1214, and John’s own

²⁷ For discussion, see Adams, pp. 35-36.

death on 19 October 1216, and he does so in order to represent the regicide as a direct consequence of the papal conspiracy against John, which two years earlier had led to John's capitulation before Pandulphus.²⁸ Certainly Bale is more concerned to implicate the papacy in the plot to poison King John than is the writer of the *Brut*. Whereas the murderer is in the *Brut* assoiled in anticipation of his crime by the Abbot of Swineshead Abbey, in *King Johan* it is from no less a person than Archbishop Stephen Langton himself that 'monastycall devocyon' receives his blessing 'in nomine domini pape [in the lord pope's name]' (l. A79). The A-text breaks off abruptly four lines into John's dying speech, and it is with the account of the regicide that the narrative of the English *Brut* is also brought to a close. Into the B-text is introduced an episode of Bale's own devising, involving two new characters – Verity and Imperial Majesty. The former enters to chastise the estates of England for having sided with the papacy in its power struggle against King John, the latter to admonish that they henceforth profess obedience to the King – for 'he that a prynce resisteth doth dampne Gods ordynance' (l. 2352).

Bale recasts into a narrative of papal collusion against King John two apparently unrelated episodes in the *Brut* – John's power struggle with the Roman Church and, two years later, his death at the hands of a Cistercian monk. The writer of the *Brut* explains that John had wanted to raise the price of a loaf of bread from 'an halpeny' to twenty shillings (I, 169), and that the monk had resolved to kill John in order to prevent this from occurring. Bale incorporates this story into his play, but whereas the monk in the *Brut* is genuinely outraged at John's inflationary designs, the rumour that John would 'haue mad a loffe worthe xx shelyng' is in *King Johan* merely contrived to 'colure' the monk's crime, which in truth occurs as part of the wider power struggle in the play between England and the Apostolic See (ll. A62-63). 'Nay', answers Stephen Langton, 'pat is soch a lye as esly maye be felt'. 'Tushe, man', the monk replies, 'among folys yt shall neuer be owt smelt' (ll. A64-65). Bale's revisions to the *Brut* enable him to implicate the papal Church in the death of King John, but this manipulation of his source material is not the only means by which Bale's propagandist objectives are met in the play. Into his pseudo-historical narrative, Bale inserts characters and conventions drawn from the English

²⁸ The two dates are recorded in the first volume of the *Brut*. We are told on p. 166 that England was released from interdict on 'þe vij day of Iull[y]' 1214, and on p. 170 that John died two years later, 'þe morwe aft[er] Seynt Lukes day', which falls on 18 October.

morality play – that product of early Tudor England, of which *Mankind*, *Wisdom*, and *The Castle of Perseverance* are amongst the earliest surviving examples, which offered audiences occasion for self-examination by enacting an allegory on stage of the Christian soul's struggle against temptation. In each, a single protagonist, who stood for humanity in general, and for each member of the audience in particular, would be alternately plagued and preached to by characters representative of vices and virtues, and in each the protagonist would succumb to the temptations that were offered him by the vices, before ultimately repenting his sins and reforming his lifestyle, in what Joerg Fichte has recently termed the 'V' pattern of temptation, fall, and redemption.²⁹

This focus upon man's fallibility and ultimate dependence on divine grace was what presumably attracted reformist playwrights like John Bale to the form of the morality play, and much has been written in recent years on how the morality conventions were mobilised by Bale and other dramatists to meet the needs of royalist propaganda in the 1530s and beyond.³⁰ In *King Johan*, Bale retained the basic form of the morality play – the psychomachia, or struggle of the Christian soul against temptation – but by introducing King John as its central character, he sought to politicise the morality play by representing the conflict between the vices and virtues as a battle, not for the soul of man, but for the state of England. His vice characters represent, not personal sins, but the political aberrations of Sediton, Dissimulation, Usurped Power, and Private Wealth, and whereas the traditional moralities had but one actor playing the part of the mankind figure, King John appears in the play alongside the character of England, as together representative of the political body of the realm – whilst England herself is anatomised into the component estates Nobility, Clergy, Civil Order, and Commonalty. This politicisation, or 'secularization of the morality', as Howard Norland puts it, is for Pat McCune indicative of a Tudor preoccupation, in the aftermath of the statutory reformation of the early 1530s,

²⁹ See Joerg O. Fichte, 'The Estate Moralities as a Mirror of Tudor Concepts of Kingship', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 235 (1998), 267-84.

³⁰ For the politicisation of morality play motifs in *King Johan*, see White, *Theatre and Reformation* (1994), pp. 27-41; David Scott Kastan, "'Holy Wurdes" and "Slypper Wit": John Bale's *King Johan* and the Poetics of Propaganda', in *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts*, ed. by Peter C. Herman (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994), pp. 267-282; and Howard B. Norland, *Drama in Early Tudor Britain 1485-1558* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), pp. 188-198. For discussion of *King Johan* in relation to other political morality plays of the period, see Pat McCune, 'Order and Justice in Early Tudor Drama', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s., 25 (1994), 171-96.

with 'the cooperative nature of national reform', the recognition, in other words, that England was a commonwealth, and that it was with the wholehearted consent of the estates in parliament that Henry's absolutist pretensions to the Royal Supremacy had been enshrined in the English constitution.³¹

In *King Johan*, Bale endorses Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church by having John expound the scriptural origins of absolute kingship at the very start of the play. 'Bothe Peter and Pawle makyth plenteosse vtterauns', John asserts, 'How that all pepell shuld shew there trew alegyauns | To ther lawfull kyng' (ll. 4-6). As Norland notes, however, 'John's tragedy is that he cannot sustain this belief', and this is because both Nobility and Civil Order are in the play coerced by a recalcitrant Clergy to conspire with the Church against their King.³² 'All they are from me; I am now left alone', John at one point bemoans to the audience (l. 1542). John ultimately fails in the play to implement his proposed reform of the 'chyrches abusyons' (l. 1502), and he does so precisely because the play makes clear that his reforms could not have been carried through without the prior consent of his parliamentary estates, Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order. By anatomising England into the component political estates Nobility, Clergy, Civil Order, and Commonalty, Bale presents the kingdom as a commonwealth, and the king in parliament as the most appropriate forum for the carrying out of constitutional reforms. Bale then puts forth this parliamentarian agenda, in a play that juxtaposes concrete historical figures with abstract allegorical types. This juxtaposition serves to decontextualise the historical action on stage, and it invites its audience to make John's struggles with the papal Church analogous to Henry VIII's schism with Rome. Such at least was Thomas Brown's response to the 'enterlude concernyng King John' that he witnessed at Canterbury during Christmas 1538-39. 'King John', he had declared in his deposition against Henry Totehill, 'was the begynner of the puttyng down of the Bisshop of Rome, and thereof we myght be all gladd'. In the play, John's ability to exile the pope from England is made dependent upon the support of parliament. By inviting comparison between John and Henry VIII, the play invites Bale's contemporaries in the later 1530s to apply the lessons of John's reign to the context of the Royal Supremacy. The play emphasises the importance of collaboration in matters of constitutional reform, and in so

³¹ *Drama in Early Tudor Britain*, p. 147; 'Order and Justice', p. 190.

³² *Drama in Early Tudor Britain*, p. 196.

doing it seeks the support of its audience for Henry's own recent legislation against the See of Rome.

Bale uses morality play conventions to identify John with Henry VIII, and compare John's power struggle with the papal Church with Henry's pretensions to the Royal Supremacy. This integration of history with morality play motifs also works in the play more fully to implicate the papal Church in the monk of Swineshead's plot to poison King John. We have seen how Bale manipulates his source material to implicate the papal Church in the regicide. Bale has the monk invent as an excuse for his crime the rumour, recorded as factual in the *Brut*, that John intended to 'haue mad a loffe worthe xx shelyng' (l. A63), and in the play he has him receive the blessings of the Archbishop of Canterbury prior to the poisoning, whereas it is only the Abbot of Swineshead who assoils his counterpart in the *Brut*. Not content merely to implicate the Archbishop in John's murder, Bale outrightly condemns Stephen Langton as a regicide by associating him in the play with the vice Sediton. Sediton, the first of the five political vices to appear on stage, enters forty or so lines into the play to brag that 'the pope ableth me to subdewe bothe kyng and keyser' (l. 99) and, left alone with John after England's departure from the stage, he makes light of her complaints against the abuses of the Church in England, confessing that the English clergy, both regular and religious, pledge allegiance to the See of Rome, and bragging that, as ambassador of the pope, he has allied to 'his holy cawse' (l. 218) the other principal estates of England, Nobility and Civil Order. Sediton, Bale makes clear, originates in Rome, and so long as the Church in England remains answerable to that See, so long will king and country alike remain vulnerable to its pernicious influences. By counterfeiting the appearance of holiness, sediton has spread unnoticed throughout the entire English Church, the character Sediton confesses to John, so that now 'in euery relygyon and mvnkysh secte I rayne', he brags, 'havyng yow prynces in scorne, hate and dysdayne' (ll. 187-88). It is in order further to expose as a subterfuge the pious demeanour of the English clergy that Bale has Sediton meet with his 'old aquentaunce' Dissimulation (l. 667), a religious by appearance who admits that 'though I seme a shepe, I can play the suttle foxe' (l. 714). Dissimulation is an emissary of the English clergy, and when he and Sediton encounter the two other main vice characters in the play – Private Wealth and Usurped Power – he delivers their written complaints to Usurped Power concerning John's resolve to 'reforme þe tythes and

offrynges | And intermedleth with other spyrytuall thynges' (ll. 910-11). Sediton then counsels Usurped Power to interdict England, excommunicate John and, 'yf þat wyll not stand, | Cawse other prynces to revenge þe churchys wronge' (ll. 977-78). Having resolved to put this plan into action, three of the vices then retire after line 983 to dress for their parts in the history play that thereafter begins to unfold on stage. Usurped Power returns some forty lines later as Innocent III, Private Wealth as Cardinal Pandulphus, and Sediton as Stephen Langton. Dissimulation, who exits after line 1073, retains the costume of a 'relygyose mann' (l. A102), and it in this guise that he later appears to John as the murderous monk 'monastycall devocyon' (l. A111).

Bale has his morality vices dress up as historical villains, and he does so in order more fully to embroil the prelates of the papal Church in the plot to poison King John. Not only does Bale imply that it was seditious for Archbishop Langton to assoil the Swineshead monk in anticipation of his crime against the King; Stephen Langton himself embodies Sediton in *King Johan*. Morality play conventions are elsewhere used in the play to decontextualise the historical drama, and enable the play's audience to draw analogies between John and Henry VIII in terms of their mutual struggle with the pope. It is likewise to universalise their crimes against King John that Langton and his counterparts are in the play identified with the political vices Sediton, Usurped Power, Private Wealth, and Dissimulation. Bale implicates Stephen Langton in the historical plot to poison King John, but his alter-ego Sediton confesses that his allegiance with Rome, and his alliance with the Church in England, will continue 'vn to the daye of dome' (l. 184). Several topical allusions in the play to the suppression of religious houses under Henry VIII invite its audience not only to make analogous John and Henry's mutual struggle with the papal Church, but also to compare the Pope's response to John's confiscation of Church property with the papist response to the Royal Supremacy, and to the expropriation of monastic lands under the terms of the Dissolution Act of 1536 (27 Hen. VIII, c. 28). That this analogy was made by at least some in the audience who witnessed the Canterbury performance of *King Johan* is confirmed by the depositions of John Alforde and Thomas Brown against Henry Totehill. In the play, Dissimulation approaches Sediton with complaints from the clergy in England about John's confiscation of Church property. John's reforms appear to have stretched to the sort of systematic dissolution of monasteries that Henry himself undertook from 1536, for Dissimulation

grumbles that ‘bothe chyrchys and abbeys he oppresyth more and more’ (l. 659), whilst some lines later Seditio comments upon rumours that ‘yowr abbeys go downe, I here saye, every where’ (l. 736). Seditio advises King John’s immediate excommunication – ‘Owte with the popys bulles, than, and cursse hym downe to hell’ (l. 661) – and his advice is prescient, not only of the action that Innocent III undertook against John, but of Pope Paul III’s own proceedings against Henry VIII. Like John before him, Henry was himself excommunicated from the papal Church in the long-awaited bull *Paulus episcopus, servus servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam*, first drawn up on 30 August 1535, but suspended for over three years in the hope of Henry’s amendment before being finally exhibited, with revisions, on 17 December 1538.³³ Given the proximity to this date of the play’s performance at Canterbury during Christmas 1538-39, it seems safe enough to assume that Bale here intended to insert a topical allusion to Henry’s own recent excommunication into Seditio’s advice to Dissimulation about how best to handle the recalcitrant King John. By dressing up as Stephen Langton in the play, Seditio is at once positioned both in- and outside of the immediate historical moment that forms the subject of *King Johan*. In his advice to Dissimulation about John’s excommunication, he engages in a double-speak that allows his words to reverberate beyond their immediate reference to the historical King John – in order to echo events of topicality to the audience gathered in Canterbury at Christmas 1538-39.

Bale draws an analogy between John’s struggle with, and Henry’s schism from Rome by having Dissimulation complain in the play about John’s suppression of monasteries, and he likewise invites comparison between Innocent III and Paul III by having Seditio speak beyond the play’s immediate historical moment in advising that the Church condemn John’s programme of Church reforms. It is not only to Henry’s excommunication that Seditio makes allusion in the play. His comments to Dissimulation also echo the more populist response that the Dissolution Act inspired in northern England. Usurped Power, Seditio brags to Dissimulation, ‘dothe fauer me of all men’ (l. 750), and he claims that this is because ‘Whan prynces rebell agenste hys

³³ The first bull of excommunication (30 August 1535) is calendared in *LP*, IX (1886), 67, the final version (17 December 1538) in *LP*, XIII.ii (1893), 459. The text of the former version is reproduced in *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, ab Anno MCCCL ad Annum MDXLV*, ed. by David Wilkins, 3 vols (London: Gosling, Gyles, Woodward, and Davis, 1737), III, 792-797; and in Gilbert Burnet’s *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, ed. by Edward Nares, 4 vols (London: Dove, 1830), IV, 94-99. The text of the final version is in Wilkins, III, 840-41.

autoryte, | I make ther commons agenst them to be' (ll. 752-53). Two years before the Canterbury performance of *King Johan*, Henry's pro-royalist policies had come under attack from commoners in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire who were outraged to hear of the ransacking of religious houses in the region. In his *Remedy for Sediton*, Morison had proposed no 'better way, to auoyde sedition, than fyrst to brynge in the worde of god', and it is to these same sentiments that King John gives expression in the opening lines of Bale's play.³⁴

To declare the powres and the strenght to enlarge
 The scriptur of God to flow in most abowndaunce;
 And of sophyteres the fantesydes to dyscharge
 Bothe Peter and Pawle makyth plenteosse vtterauns;
 How that all pepell shuld shew there trew alegyauns
 To ther lawfull kyng Christ Iesu dothe consent,
 Whych to þe hygh powres were euer obedyent. (l. 1)

It was one thing for Morison to propose Bible-reading as a remedy for sedition. It was quite another for Bale to have his protagonist voice these same evangelical sentiments at the outset of a play that invites its audience to compare John with Henry VIII. In no part of the *Remedy* did Morison claim to speak for the King in claiming that 'knowlege of the worde of god' would 'kepe christen men [...] from fyghtyng against theyr prince' (sig. E1^v). Emboldened by Henry's toleration of the Coverdale Bible, Morison may have felt confident that the evangelistic tone of the *Remedy* would cause no offence at court, but he was nevertheless still cautious to present such sentiments as his own, for if Henry had indeed countenanced the sale of the Coverdale Bible in England, as William Fulke would later assert, he did not grant to it the formal licence to 'go forth unther the kynges prevelge' that its printer, James Nicolson, had been initially anxious to obtain.³⁵ For Bale to have had a king of England advocate Bible-reading on the stage of *King Johan* was therefore a significant advance on what had seemed admissible to Morison when, in November 1536, he had set out to write his *Remedy for Sediton*. Bale has King John commend Bible-reading as a remedy for sedition – a means by which subjects can learn 'there trew alegyauns | To ther lawfull kyng'. By comparing John with Henry VIII, Bale

³⁴ [Richard Morison], *A Remedy for Sediton, VVherin are Conteyned many thynges, concernyng the true and loyall obeysance, that comme[n]s owe vnto their prince and soueraygne lorde the kynge* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; STC 18113.7), sig. E3^r.

³⁵ Quoted in J. F. Mozley, *Coverdale and his Bibles* (London: Lutterworth, 1953), p. 111.

makes John a mouthpiece for the English evangelical movement in the 1530s, and on more than one occasion in the play, he even has John appear as apologist for the doctrines of that movement's most infamous member, William Tyndale. John alludes in his opening speech to how those same New Testament passages that admonish our 'trew alegyauns' to kings also function as a touchstone with which to try 'the fantesyes' of 'sophyteres'. By contrasting scripture with sophistry in this respect, John implies the straightforwardness of the Bible's stance on obedience. In so doing, he implicates sophisters, or schoolmen, in a conspiracy to conceal with their own fantasies the 'abowndaunce' of scriptural passages that urge obedience to kings. In the prologue to his 1530 *Pentateuch*, Tyndale had himself accused schoolmen of deliberately obscuring with a 'miste of [...] sophistrye' the 'processe/ order and meaninge' of the biblical text. Their objective, he had claimed, was to 'delude' us in our understanding of scripture, by 'descantyng vppon it with alligoryes/ and [by] expoundinge it in manye senses before the vnlernd laye people (when it hath but one symple litterall sense whose light the owles ca[n] not abyde)'.³⁶ It is to the simple, literal sense of scripture that John also cleaves in the play. 'Yt was neuer well', he tells Clergy,

syns þe clargy wrowght by practyse
And left þe scriptur for menns ymagynacyons,
Dyvydyng them selvys in so many congyracyons
Of monkes, chanons and fryers, of dyvers colors and facyons. (l. 334)

In the *Obedie[n]ce of a Christen man*, Tyndale also holds the Church's aberrant interpretations of scripture responsible for the diversification of its religious orders. No student of divinity actually studies scripture itself, he had claimed, but every man instead 'taketh a sondry doctoure/ which doctours are as sondry and as dyvers [...] as there are divers facions and monstrous shappes/ none lyke another/ amo[n]ge oure sectes of religio[n]'. 'Of what texte', he continues, 'the grayefrere proveth [that] oure lady was without originall sinne/ of the same shall the blacke frere prove [that] she was conceyved in originall synne'.³⁷ In the play, Clergy claims to find scriptural foundation for the

³⁶ William Tyndale, [*The Pentateuch*] ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser?], 1530; STC 2350), sig. [A]2^v. All references are to this edition.

³⁷ *The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man and howe Christe[n] rulers ought to governe/ where in also (yf thou marke diligently) thou shalt fynde eyes to perceave the crafty conveyance of all iugglers* ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser(?)], 1528; STC 24446), sigs. C2^v-3^r. All references are to this edition.

proliferation of religious orders in Psalm 44.11 of the Vulgate, which he translates ‘A quene [...] on thy ryht hond, lord, I se, | Apparrellyd with golde and compassyd with dyversyte’ (ll. 436-37). When John demands that he better elucidate this passage for the benefit of the audience, Clergy explains how ‘This quene ys þe chyrch, which thorow all Cristen regions | Ys beawtyfull, deckyd with many holy relygyons’ (ll. 439-40). John counters that this interpretation is contrary to the simple, literal sense of the scriptural passage within which it occurs. As he explains,

Davyd meanyth vertuys by þe same diversyte,
As in the sayd psalme yt is evydent to se,
And not mvnkysh sectes; but yt is euer yowr cast
For yowr advauncement þe scriptur for to wrast. (l. 463)

John here stresses the sufficiency for our understanding of scripture of the simple, literal sense – the sense that comes from reading a biblical passage in the context, Tyndale writes in the *Obedie[n]ce*, of ‘what goeth before and after’ (sig. B6^r). Like Tyndale, Martin Luther also prioritised the literal sense of scripture. Speaking in October 1540, Luther recollected that in his youth he had ‘dealt with allegories, tropologies, and analogies’, and that he had done ‘clever tricks with them’. ‘Now I’ve let them go’, he said, ‘and this is my last and best art, to translate the Scriptures in their plain sense’.³⁸ The emphasis that reformers laid upon the straightforwardness of the scriptural message was itself contributory to their self-presentation as readers of the Word. ‘Man’s wisdom’, Tyndale writes in the *Obedie[n]ce*, ‘scatereth/ divideth and maketh sectes’, for in nothing is man so liable to err from the truth ‘then to imagen of God after mans wisdom’. It is ‘folish wisdom’ that has led to the proliferation of religious orders in the papal Church, for ‘God is not mans imaginacion’, Tyndale asserts, ‘God is but his worde’ (sigs. C3^{r-v}). For Tyndale, foolish wisdom is not only identifiable with papist methods of exegesis, but with papists themselves, and with the ‘divers facions and monstrous shappes’ of their many religious orders. It follows that each reformer must not only cleave to the Word when reading scripture, but that he must also make its most simple and most literal sense the basis of his own identity, as witness to the truth. Reformers questioned their own wisdom when as Bible-readers they prioritised the literality of the Word, and with the

³⁸ Martin Luther, *Luther’s Works*, ed. by Jaroslav Pelikan and others, 55 vols (St Louis: Concordia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press (formerly Muhlenberg Press), 1955-86), LIV, *Table Talk*, ed. and trans. by Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 406.

abasement of this ability to apply one's reason to an interpretation of scripture came an inevitable effacement, not only of one's identity as a papist, but of one's very subjectivity as an individual. For reformers like Bale and Tyndale, writes Andrew Hadfield, 'scriptural authority constitutes the subjectivity of the individual; there should only be a repetition of this original text, not a simulacrum which would constitute a demonic, Catholic parody of "truth"'. 'The literal, bared self' of the reformer, Hadfield continues, 'exists as a concomitant [...] of the expunction of metaphoricity' from his method of exegesis.³⁹

Michel Foucault has studied the centrality for Christianity of this act of self-renunciation. As a salvation religion concerned with the paradox of life after death, Christianity is predicated upon belief in our fallibility as humans, our fallen condition and propensity to sin. Its rituals of self-purification – penance, abstention, and mortification – are designed to exalt the spirit through abasement of the self. For Foucault, penance obliges that one 'bear public or private witness against oneself'.⁴⁰ 'It's a way to show that you are able to renounce life and self', he argues, and it serves 'to mark the refusal of the self'. Martyrdom represents the most extreme form of self-abasement: 'The way the martyr faces death is the model for the penitent', Foucault observes.⁴¹ Foucault's approach to martyrdom as a form of self-renunciation is borne out by Tyndale's own comments on adversity in the *Obedie[n]ce*. For Tyndale, it is inevitable that readers of the Word will in this world suffer persecution at the hands of papists who 'beare a rule in [the] worlde, and persecuteth [the] worde of God'. 'The worlde loveth [that] which is his', Tyndale writes, 'and hateth that which is chosen out of the worlde to sarve God in [the] sprite' (sig. A2^v). Be strong in adversity, he counsels, for adversity is but 'an evidente token' that one understands 'the true worde of God' (sig. A2^v). Bible-readers should interpret tribulation in life as a sign of their election to the kingdom of heaven, for according to Tyndale 'the spirite thorow tribulacion purgeth vs and killeth oure fleshly witte/ oure wor[l]dly vnderstandinge and bely wisdom/ and filleth vs full of the wisdom of God' (sig. A7^v). To mortify the body is to glorify the soul, Tyndale argues, for only by suffering persecution can we purge ourselves of worldly wisdom, and embrace the Word of God.

³⁹ Andrew Hadfield, 'Translating the Reformation: John Bale's Irish *Vocacyon*', in *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*, ed. by Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 46.

⁴⁰ *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, ed. by Luther H. Martin, Hick Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), p. 40.

⁴¹ *Technologies of the Self*, p. 43.

Take comfort then in persecution, Tyndale exhorts readers of his *Obedie[n]ce*, but neither despair if we, like Peter, at first find it all too easy to outwardly deny Christ and forsake our faith.

For God oftymes taketh his strength eve[n] from his very electe/ whe[n] they other trust in their awne strength or are negligente to call to hym for his strength. And that doeth he to teach them and to make them feale that in [the] fyre of tribulacion for hys wordes sake nothyng ca[n] endure & abyde/ save his wor[d] & [that] strength only which he hath promysed for which stre[n]gth he will have vs to praye vnto hym nyght and daye withall instau[n]ce. (sig. B4^r)

Tyndale sets worldly wisdom against the Word of God, and he encourages us not only to interpret scripture in its simple, literal sense, but to actually internalise its precepts through self-renunciation, to inscribe its syntax upon the palimpsest of our former selves. Man's 'bely wisdom' is fallible, and his flesh corruptible, Tyndale asserts, but the Word of God is immutable for it alone will endure the fires of our tribulation. It is with the experience of martyrdom that Tyndale particularly aligns this process of self-renunciation, but as the *Obedie[n]ce* makes clear, the principle of denying one's individuality for a subjectivity guided by scriptural precept is as much a part of the day-to-day life of reformers as it is characteristic of the moment of their death. There are 'thre natures of men', Tyndale writes in the *Obedie[n]ce* (sig. E2^r). The first are 'all to gether beestly', will 'rise agenst princes & rulers when so ever they are able', and will 'in no wise receave the lawe in their hertes', but rebel against what scripture commands of them concerning obedience to kings (sigs. E2^{r-v}). The second receive the law but 'vnderstonde not [that] the lawe is spirituall a[n]d requireth the herte'. 'They loke on the pleasure/ profit and promocion that foloweth the kepinge of the lawe/ and in respecte of the rewarde kepe they the lawe outwardly with workes/ but not in the herte' (sig. E2^v). Only the third nature of man is identifiable with those elect readers of the Word, who for their faith are destined in life to suffer persecution at the hands of papists.

The thred are spirituall and loke Moyses in the open face & are (as Paul saith the seconde to the Romans) a lawe vnto them selves and have the lawe writte[n] in their hertes by the spirite of God. Thes neade nether of kinge ner officers to drive the[m]/ nether that any ma[n] profer the[m] any rewarde for to kepe the lawe, for they do it naturally. (sig. E2^v)

So whereas 'the first worke for feare of the swerde' and 'the seconde for rewarde', the third need neither incentive nor compulsion to comply with those precepts in scripture that demand obedience to kings (sig. E2^v). 'They co[n]sente vnto the lawe', writes Tyndale, for no other reason but because 'it is holy and iust', and because 'all men ought to doo what soever God commau[n]deth for no other cause/ but because God commaundeth it' (sig. E3^f). These spiritual types obey kings because this is what scripture demands of its readers, and this unerring obedience to scriptural admonition represents a stage in that process of self-renunciation, which for Tyndale finds its apotheosis in the happy endurance of adversity. It is the Word alone that endures the fires of tribulation, he writes, for in resolving to die for their belief in the truth of God's Word, the Protestant martyr renounces life and self, only to cleave unto the simple, literal sense of scripture. It is towards this internalisation of scriptural precept, towards the proper inscription of God's law in their hearts, that the third nature of mankind likewise tends – through conformity in life to the commands of scripture. Each act of conformity to scripture is contributory to this gradual process of self-effacement, and yet, as Tyndale explains in the *Obedie[n]ce*, our desire wholeheartedly to embrace the Word must always do battle in life with our susceptibility to worldly temptations.

Thes of the last sworte kepe [the] lawe of their awne accorde and that in the herte/ and have professed perpetuall warre agaynste the lustes and appetites of the fleshe/ tyll they be vtterly subdued: yet not thorow their awne strength/ but knowynge and knowlegynge their wekenes crye ever for strength to God which hath promysed assistence vnto all that call vpon him. (sig. E3^f)

The observance of God's laws that command obedience to kings is thus for Tyndale part of a 'perpetuall warre' in life to replace one's sinful self with a subjectivity determinable by scriptural precept. It is in the endurance of adversity that this process of self-renunciation reaches its apotheosis, for Tyndale writes that the fire of tribulation 'purgeth vs and killeth oure fleshly witte', to leave in its stead the syntax of God's Word written on our hearts. Whether it be in one's attitude to life or in one's approach to death, this process of self-renunciation always for Tyndale begins with the reading of scripture in its simple, literal sense – for only by first rejecting 'folish wisdom' as an aid to exegesis can one begin to do battle more generally with the lusts and appetites of the flesh.

It is with the readership of the Word of God that Tyndale's third nature of mankind is identifiable, therefore. This equation in the *Obedie[n]ce* between Bible-reading and self-renunciation is likewise apparent on the stage of *King Johan*. We have seen that Bale is in the play concerned to present King John as an apologist for the evangelical movement in England, and for the no-nonsense brand of Bible-reading advocated by the majority of its members. In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale had differentiated 'mans imaginacion' from the Word of God, stressing as he did so the sufficiency for exegesis of the simple, literal sense of scripture. John voices these sentiments in the play, when he condemns the English clergy for having 'left þe scriptur for menns ymagynacyons' (l. 335). 'Yt is euer yowr cast | For yowr advauncement þe scriptur for to wrast', he later observes (ll. 465-66). John's attack on allegorical interpretations of scripture is in the play echoed by the character England, who enters with the King at the start of the play to complain to him about her maltreatment at the hands of his clergy. 'They are thy chylderne', John remarks 'þou owghtest to say them good' (l. 68). In her response, however, England strenuously denies responsibility for parenting the English clergy – 'Nay, bastardes they are, vnnatvrall by þe rood!', she asserts (l. 69). 'Sens ther begynnyng they ware neuer good to me' (l. 70), she continues, because 'lyke pyggys' (l. 72) they have always followed 'the wyld bore of Rome' (l. 71). Asked why she compares the pope to a pig, England answers that it is because 'he and his to such bestlynes inclyne' (l. 78).

They forsake Godes word, whych is most puer and cleane,
 And vnto the lawys of synfull men they leane.
 Lyke as the vyle swyne þe most vyle metes dessyer
 And hath gret plesure to walowe them seluys in myre,
 So hath this wyld bore, with his church vnyversall –
 His sowe with hyr pygys and monstres bestyall –
 Dilyght in mennys draffe and covytus lucre all. (l. 79)

Tyndale had equated to a 'perpetuall warre agaynste the lustes and appetites of the fleshe' the process through which one renounces the self for a subjectivity based on scriptural precept. It follows that to abandon the Word of God is to embrace the world of man, to anathematise the soul through the enjoyment in this life of all things carnal. By depicting as 'pygys and monstres bestyall' those papists who forsake God's word 'most puer and cleane', England here goes further than did Tyndale in her condemnation of

those who deviate from the simple, literal sense of scripture. Tyndale blames only the weakness of human nature for this aberration, but England is here intent on dehumanising the ‘wyld bore of Rome’, who ‘with his church vnyversall’ has rejected the laws of God in scripture to lean instead upon ‘the lawys of synfull men’. By ignoring the simple, literal sense of scripture, the Bishop of Rome and his bestial brood have ‘clene exyled’ God from England (l. 107), England explains to John, for as ‘God is his word’ (l. 117), so God ‘abydyth not where his word ys refusyd’ (l. 116). ‘The popys pyggys’, she continues,

may not abyd this word to be hard
 Nor knowyn of pepyll or had in anye regard.
 Ther eyes are so sore they maye not abyd þe lyght (l. 119)

In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale had likewise asserted that ‘God is but his worde’ (sig. C3v). By echoing Tyndale’s words in her condemnation of clerical abuses, England aligns herself in the play with those Bible-readers who, through ‘perpetuall warre agaynste the lustes and appetites of the fleshe’, have sought to inscribe the simple, literal sense of scripture upon their hearts. This third nature of man, Tyndale had claimed, needed neither incentive nor compulsion to obey the higher powers on earth. He did so automatically, out of obedience to what God commands in scripture. It is with this brand of biblically-inspired obedience to kings that the character England identifies herself in the play, and in so doing she is careful to contrast her own profession of obedience to God and the King with the standpoint otherwise adopted by the English clergy. Not only are the clergy beast-like in England’s eyes for their wilful ignorance of God’s Word. She asserts that they are bastards – the ‘vnnatvrall’ progeny of the papal Church, not the offspring of England’s own union with ‘God hym selfe, the spowse of euery sort | Pat seke hym in fayth to þer sowlys helth and comfort’ (ll. 109-110). England distances herself from the domestic clergy because of their disregard for scripture, and the feeling is mutual – for it is obvious from those churchmen who appear in the play that the allegiance of the English clergy lie, not here in England, but abroad in Rome. The sentiments of Sediton, who brags early on in the play that ‘in euery estate of þe clargye I playe a part’ (l. 194), may be taken as representative in this respect. John reproaches Sediton for his slights against England: ‘I mervell thow arte to Englund so vnnaturall’, John remarks, ‘Beyng her owne chyld, þou art worse than best brutall’. ‘I am not her chyld!’, Sediton replies, ‘I defye hyr, by þe messe!’ (ll. 177-79).

I her sonne, quoth he? I had rather she were hedlesse.
 Thowgh I sumtyme be in Englonde for my pastaunce,
 Yet was I nowther borne here, in Spayne nor in Fraunce,
 But vnder the pope in the holy cyte of Rome. (l. 180)

England identifies the English clergy as the bastard offspring of the Bishop of Rome, and the clergy themselves concede that this is true. The bastardisation of the clergy begs the question of who in the play can be identified as the legitimate offspring of England's union with God. Not surprisingly, considering the premium that England herself places on Bible-reading and the straightforwardness of scripture, Englishness in the play is identifiable with those readers of the Word who renounce the flesh for a subjectivity based on scriptural precept. England exits after line 154, and does not reappear on stage until after line 1533. John's three principal estates, Clergy, Nobility, and Civil Order, have by this time abandoned the King, whom Cardinal Pandulphus has accursed for his battle with the Church, and England enters with the character Commonalty onto a stage occupied by the solitary figure of King John. 'How sayst thou, Commynalte?', John asks, 'Wylt not þou take my parte?' (l. 1556). A key impediment stands in the way of Commonalty's allegiance to the King, however, for it becomes apparent that Commonalty suffers from a form of 'spirituall blyndnes' (l. 1554), brought on by 'want of knowlage in Christes owne veryte' (l. 1553). As England explains to John:

His owtward blyndnes ys but a syngnyficacyon
 Of blyndnes in sowle for lacke of informacyon
 In the word of God, which is the orygynall grownd
 Of dyssobedyence, which all realmies doth confund.
 Yf yowr grace wold cawse Godes word to be tawght syncerly
 And subdew those pristes that wyll not preche yt trewly,
 The peple shuld know to ther prynce þer lawfull dewty;
 But yf ye permytt contynvance of ypocresye
 In monkes, chanons and pristes, and mynysters of the clargy,
 Yowr realme shall neuer be without moch traytery. (l. 1582)

It is the suppression of scripture that causes sedition, for England argues that people would learn their lawful duty to their prince, if only they were able to listen to its precepts in sermons. In the *Remedy*, Morison too had made the English Bible the basis of his remedy for sedition. The England of the *Remedy* echoes Christ's words in Matthew 19.16-30, when she exhorts the northern rebels to put loyalty to the motherland before

love for their own fathers and mothers. As Morison literally constructs his England around the syntax of scripture, so Englishness is in the *Remedy* predicated upon compliance with what scripture commands of us concerning obedience to kings – for Morison’s England rejects as ‘none of myne’ any Englishman who refuses to serve their monarch. This contingency likewise controls the relationship between England and Commonalty in *King Johan*, for as England had bastardised the English clergy, so she likewise threatens to disown Commonalty, should he follow in the footsteps of Clergy, Nobility, and Civil Order, and renounce his allegiance to the King. John barely has time to respond to England’s petition that he permit ‘Godes word to be taught syncerly’ before Cardinal Pandulphus enters to find Commonalty in company with the King. ‘What, Commynalte, ys this þe connaut kepyng?’, he remarks. ‘Thow toldyst me þou woldest take hym no more for þi kyng’ (ll. 1598-99). Pandulphus commands Commonalty to go and await the arrival in England of the ‘frenche kyng Phelype’ (l. 1605), who with the ‘powr of Fraunce’ is coming to help Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order wage their holy war against the ‘herytyke’ King John (l. 1606). Commonalty then begins to exit the stage, for as he explains to John, he ‘mvst nedes obbay whan holy chirch commandyth me’ (l. 1609). It is then that England turns to chastise her son Commonalty: ‘Yf thow leve thy kyng, take me neuer for thy mother’, she warns (l. 1610). The threat falls on deaf ears, however, for Commonalty has by this point already left the stage, never again to return. His defection is directly attributable to his spiritual blindness, his ignorance of the Word of God, for this blindness means that he ‘myght take with þe pope | Soner than with yow’, Commonalty explains to King John. ‘For, alas, I can but grope,’ he continues, ‘and ye know full well ther are many nowghty gydes’ (ll. 1560-62).

Englishness in *King Johan* is predicated upon allegiance to the King. Bale’s England makes this clear in the play by threatening to disown Commonalty, should he depart from King John. England’s ultimatum fails, however, to reconcile Commonalty with the King, for Commonalty abandons John anyway, in full knowledge of how his actions will affect his relationship as England’s son. Sedition denied his own kinship with mother England earlier on in the play, and Commonalty likewise forsakes king and country, when he resolves to side with the other estates of England in their crusade against King John. The play may make allegiance to the Crown the criterion for its construction of Englishness, but it at the same time takes pains to emphasise that this English national

community is only ever an imaginary construct, for never does it become an actuality on stage. Both king and country take part in the play, but only as characters and constructs to abandon, overthrow, and define oneself against. Commonalty walks out of a play that is pessimistic about the prospect of being able to establish obedience to the king as the benchmark for English national identity. It is with regicide and rebellion that the A-text version of the play is concerned, and with the death of King John comes the nadir of Bale's particular brand of national identity.

But the play's outlook is not only pessimistic, for it makes clear that Commonalty could have been prevented from leaving the King, had John followed England's advice and permitted 'Godes word to be tawght syncerly' in sermons before the people. In England's evangelical agenda is encapsulated Bale's own vision of England as a nation of Bible-readers, a community definable by the fact that its members comply with the precepts of scripture – a community in fact identifiable with Tyndale's third nature of mankind. In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale writes that only he 'that is renewed in Christe/ kepeth the lawe' without 'compulsion of any ruler or officer'. He explains that the 'naturall man is entised and moved to kepe the lawe carnally/ with carnall reasons and worldly persuasions', and he asserts that 'the last remedie of all when all other fayle/ is feare. Beate one & the rest wyll absteyne for feare' (sig. E5^v). *King Johan* enacts the failure of exacting obedience through enticement or fear, for in spite of England's ultimatum that he either obey the King or find a new mother, Commonalty nevertheless decides to forsake king and country in the play. Only by licensing the English Bible, Bale here implies, will people learn obedience to kings, for obedience cannot be compelled but comes through knowledge of what God commands of us in scripture. It is upon Bible-reading and obedience to the Crown that Commonalty's Englishness, his kinship with mother England, is in the play contingent.

Commonalty walks out of the play, we are told, because of his 'lacke of informacyon | In the word of God'. Had he been able to listen to scriptural precepts being taught in sermons, England explains, then might he have learnt to pledge proper allegiance to his prince. England here makes the English Bible the basis of her remedy for sedition, but her vision of biblically-inspired obedience to the King only exists in the world of the play as a hypothetical alternative to the outcome enacted on stage. We simply do not get

to know whether or not Commonalty would have remained loyal to the King, had John earlier in the play licensed the preaching of scripture in English. The play has been seen to position itself at once in- and outside of its immediate historical moment, however, and England's speech to John on the relation between the preaching of scripture and the prevention of sedition would also have had relevance to the audience gathered beyond the stage, at the Canterbury residence of Archbishop Cranmer. To the likes of John Alforde and Thomas Brown, who watched *King Johan* at Christmas 1538-39, England's petition that the King 'cawse Godes word to be tawght syncerly' would have been of particular topical significance, and the promotion of loyalty to the King a far from merely hypothetical consequence of this proposed evangelical agenda. Only three months before this Christmastide performance, on 5 September 1538, Cromwell had exhibited a set of injunctions to the English clergy, in his capacity as vicegerent of the King's spiritual jurisdiction.⁴² These injunctions were issued on 'the authorite and commission of the mooste excellent Prince Henry', and they ordered incumbents of parish churches to provide their parishioners with 'one boke of the hole byble of the largyest volume in Englyshe'. This, moreover, was to be 'set vp in sum conuenient place wythin the said church that ye haue cure of', for the purpose of allowing parishioners to 'moste comodiously resorte to the same and reade it'. Cromwell directed that the cost of this Bible was to be split between the priest and his parishioners, with the priest contributing half the sum himself. 'You shall discourage no man priuely or apertly from the readyng, or heryng of the sayde bible', Cromwell continues. Indeed, he writes, incumbents should 'expressely prouoke, stere and exhorte euey persone to rede the same, as that whiche is the very lyuely worde of god'. Incumbents should actively encourage parishioners to read the Bible, or to listen to others reading from it, and Cromwell even enjoins each member of the clergy to 'make or cause to be made in the sayde churche' at least one sermon every quarter, and within it to 'purely, and syncerely declare the very gospel of christe'.

Here at last, then, in the historical moment of the play's composition, was what the character England had so expressly asked of King John in the world of the play – official approval, if not from the King then from the King's vicegerent, of the Bible in

⁴² *Iniunctions for the clerge Exhibite [blank] die mensis [blank] Anno d[omi]ni M.CCCC.xxxviii* (London: [Thomas Berthelet], 1538; STC 10086), fol 1^r. The date of exhibition is left blank in STC 10086. The date of 5 September comes from a manuscript copy, calendared in *LP*, XIII.ii (1893), 114. All references cite from STC 10086, fol. 1^r.

English. In the play, England had counselled John to ‘cawse Godes word to be tawght syncerly’, and she had petitioned that he also ‘subdew those pristes that wyll not preche yt trewly’ (ll. 1586-87). Three months prior to the play’s performance at Canterbury, Cromwell had also enjoined that Christ’s gospel be purely and sincerely declared in sermons delivered before the people, and he too had taken pains to enforce his injunctions to the clergy with threats of ‘punyshment’ for their non-observance. As well as ordering incumbents to preach Christ’s gospel four times a year, Cromwell had directed each parish church to display a copy ‘of the hole byble of the largyest volume in Englyshe’. In the play, England stops short of advising that the English Bible be set up in churches, and this is because her speech to John occurs in the historical moment of the scene enacted on stage. It would have been anachronistic of England, in a play about King John, to counsel that the King enjoin priests to purchase an edition of the printed English Bible for use by their parishioners in church. The Coverdale Bible had already been circulating in England for over two years by the time Cromwell issued his injunctions to the clergy in September 1538, however. His order that the clergy purchase a copy of the largest edition of the English Bible was evidently made in the knowledge that there existed sufficient copies of this folio-sized edition to cope with these new demands.

It was not the Coverdale Bible that Cromwell had had in mind when he referred in his injunctions to a Bible ‘of the largyest volume in Englyshe’, although a folio edition of the Coverdale Bible was in fact in circulation at this time. James Nicolson, the binder and distributor of the original, quarto edition of the Coverdale Bible, printed in 1535, had brought out his folio-sized edition in 1537.⁴³ By the summer of the same year, it was nevertheless being rivalled by the second folio edition of the English Bible to appear on the market. This was the Matthew Bible, printed in Antwerp by Matthew Crom for Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, and so-called because it claimed on its title-page to have been ‘truly and purely translated into Englysh by Thomas Matthew’.⁴⁴ The claim is misleading, for the edition is in fact a collation, with minor revisions, of

⁴³ *Biblia: The Byble, that is the holy Scrypture of the Olde and New Testament, faythfully translated in Englysh, and newly ouersene & corrected. M.D.XXXVII* (Southwark: for James Nicolson, 1537; STC 2064).

⁴⁴ *The Byble which is all the holy Scripture: in whych are contayned the Olde and Newe Testament truly and purely translated into Englysh by Thomas Matthew. M, D, XXXVII, Set forth with the Kinges most gracyous lyce[n]ce* (Antwerp: Matthew Crom for Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, 1537; STC 2066)

translations by Tyndale and, to a lesser extent, Coverdale. Its editor prints for the first time Tyndale's previously unpublished translations of the Old Testament historical books from Joshua to the end of 2 Chronicles, supplying his own translation, from the French of Olivetan's 1535 edition of the Bible, of the Apocryphal Prayer of Manasses, which both Tyndale and Coverdale had left untranslated.⁴⁵ Thomas Matthew is identified by John Bale and John Foxe as the pseudonym of John Rogers, chaplain of the English house in Antwerp from 1534-1540.⁴⁶ Both Grafton and Whitchurch were merchant adventurers of Antwerp, and most likely met with Rogers during their frequent visits to the city.⁴⁷ The Matthew Bible was itself superseded shortly thereafter by the so-called Great Bible, a revision by Coverdale of the Matthew Bible, with new readings taken from the Hebrew-Latin Old Testament diglot of Sebastian Munster (1535), and from Erasmus's *Novum Testamentum*.⁴⁸ It was commissioned by Thomas Cromwell, who appears to have contributed at least four hundred pounds towards the project.⁴⁹ It was its printers – Grafton and Whitchurch again – who according to John Foxe bore the bulk of the cost of its printing, however.⁵⁰ Printing was underway in Paris by June 1538, but met with considerable delay in December, when its sheets were confiscated by the Inquisitor General of France. Printing was eventually resumed in London during March 1539, and the colophon of the first folio edition bears the date April 1539.⁵¹ On 14 November 1539, Cromwell obtained a royal patent, which stated that no printer should for the next five years produce an edition of the English Bible unless deputed thereto by himself.⁵² This he used to protect the business interests of the printers Grafton and Whitchurch, who were

⁴⁵ See Mozley, pp. 148-156; also *Tyndale's Old Testament: Being the Pentateuch of 1530, Joshua to 2 Chronicles of 1537 and Jonah*, ed. by David Daniell (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. xxiv-xxvi.

⁴⁶ John Bale, *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum [...] summarium* ([Wesel]: [D. van der Straten for] Joannem Overton, 1548; STC 1295), fol. 242^r. John Foxe, *The First Volume of the Ecclesiasticall history contaynyng the Actes and Monumentes of thynges passed in euery kynges tyme in this Realme [...] from the primitiue tyme till the reigne of K. Henry viij.* (London: John Day, 1570; STC 11223), p. 1363; p. 1656.

⁴⁷ See Mozley, p. 131.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 221-241.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

⁵⁰ Foxe, *Actes and Monumentes* (1570), pp. 1362-63.

⁵¹ *The Byble in Englyshe that is to saye the content of all the holy scrypture, both of ye olde and newe testament, truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by ye dylygent studye of dyuerse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tonges* ([Paris]: [Francis Regnault]; [London]: Richard Grafton & Edward Whitchurch, 1539; STC 2068). The colophon reads 'Fynished in Apryll, Anno. M.CCCCC.xxxix'.

⁵² *LP*, XIV.ii (1895), 182; 223.

effectively able to monopolise the Bible-buying market for the next two years, and who capitalised on their advantage in this respect by producing six further folio editions of the Great Bible in rapid succession between April 1540 and December 1541.

It was to the Great Bible that Cromwell was referring when in September 1538 he enjoined incumbents to purchase a Bible of ‘the largyest volume in Englyshe’ for use by their parishioners. This was the Bible that Cromwell himself had commissioned, and which he had helped finance. A legend inserted into the title-page of the second and subsequent editions of the Great Bible informs its readers that ‘this is the Byble apoynted to the vse of the churches’.⁵³ True, delays in printing the Great Bible from December 1538 had ultimately postponed its date of completion until April the following year, but these had been unforeseen at the time Cromwell had issued his injunctions to the clergy, ordering the Great Bible to be set up in parish churches by 1 November 1538.⁵⁴ For some months after this date, incumbents who wished to comply with Cromwell’s injunctions would have been forced to purchase a folio edition of either the Matthew or Coverdale Bible – and there exists evidence in churchwarden’s accounts that these Bible editions were indeed purchased for use by the laity before the publication of the Great Bible itself in April 1539.⁵⁵

The Canterbury performance of *King Johan* occurred in this interim period, between the date by which every parish was supposed to be in possession of a copy of the Bible, and the date, some months later, when the Great Bible itself was available for purchase. Those who attended the play, like John Alforde and Thomas Brown, were therefore attendant upon what promised to be a truly revolutionary occurrence for the laity in England – unprecedented access, for the first time ever in English ecclesiastical history, to the entirety of the scriptures in English. ‘Yf any thyng be necessarye to be learned: of ye holye scripture we maye learne it’, Thomas Cranmer writes in his preface to the Great

⁵³ *The Byble in Englyshe, that is to saye the conte[n]t of al the holye scrypture, both of ye olde, and newe testame[n]t, with a prologe therinto, made by the reuerende father in God, Thomas archbysshop of Cantorbury, This is the Byble apoynted to the vse of the churches* ([London]: Rychard Grafton, 1540; STC 2071).

⁵⁴ The date of 1 November 1538 comes from the manuscript copy of the injunctions calendared in *LP*, XII.ii (1893), 114. These command that incumbents provide a Bible for their parishioners by this side of the feast of All Saints next coming, ie. 1 November 1538. The name of the feast is left blank in STC 10086.

⁵⁵ See Mozley, p. 173.

Bible, first printed in the second edition of April 1540. 'Herin', he continues, 'maye princes learne howe to gouerne their subiectes: Subiectes obedie[n]ce, loue & dreade to their princes' (sig. †2^r). It was to these same sentiments that England gives expression in *King Johan*. Her words may have come too late on in the play to have prevented Commonalty from abandoning the King, but for the audience at the Canterbury residence of Archbishop Cranmer, her vision of biblically-inspired obedience to kings would doubtless have been taken as a reference to the era of the Church Bible, which at Christmas 1538-39 was still in the process of unfolding, and which if nothing else promised to test the truth of the relation – so trumpeted by English evangelists – between Bible-reading and obedience. By the time of the play's performance at Christmas 1538-39, Bible-reading had been endorsed in the name of the King, and quarterly sermons on Christ's gospel enforced upon his clergy. England's assumptions about the impact of preaching on obedience were about to be put to the test, and as England attributes the fact that Commonalty abandons the King to his ignorance of the Word of God, so she clearly anticipates that an attitude of obedience to kings will accompany the introduction of the Church Bible into the world of the play's composition. Having disowned her son Commonalty for his disobedience to King John, it is the commonality beyond the stage – the John Alfordes and Thomas Browns in the Canterbury audience – with whom England identifies herself in the play. Speaking in anticipation of the publication of the Great Bible, England speaks on stage to an audience who at last have the opportunity to make Bible-reading the basis of their obedience to Henry VIII – for true obedience cannot be compelled, as was Commonalty's, but comes instead through knowledge of what God commands in scripture. Only by writing God's laws in our heart, the play makes clear, by renouncing the self for a subjectivity controlled by scriptural precept, can we remain loyal to king and country – can we become the true sons of England by virtue of our obedience to the Crown.

* * *

England enters the stage of *King Johan* to urge the people of England to obey their lawful king – the same role that she had played two years earlier when introduced as a rhetorical trope into the prose of Morison's two pamphlets against the northern rebellions of 1536. England intercedes in the *Lamentation* between Lincolnshire and the 'prudente prynce'

Henry.⁵⁶ It is, Jacqueline Vanhoutte has observed, 'a secularized version of England' that Morison is here concerned to present; one which 'demands allegiance independently of issues of religion and royal rule', and which 'relies as much on increasingly emotional appeals to nationalism as on the traditional governmental arguments'.⁵⁷ Vanhoutte's identification of Englishness as a secular construct fails, however, to account for the specifically confessional posture that England adopts upon her next appearance in Morison's *Remedy for Sediton*. Morison's appeal in this later treatise is less emotive than evangelistic, for Morison here makes Bible-reading the basis of his remedy for sedition. Englishness is in the *Remedy* also made directly contingent upon obedience to the king, for in this treatise England asserts how 'he is none of myne' who will not put loyalty to the king before love for his father and mother (sig. C2^r).

This same contingency also governs the relationship between England and Commonalty on the stage of *King Johan*, although in this play Commonalty deserts the King anyway, in spite of England's warning that she would disown him if he did so. The play suggests that this sort of admonitory rhetoric is insufficient to the task of winning support for the Crown, for true obedience comes, not by compulsion, but through the inscription of God's laws in our hearts. Only by listening to God's law inscribed in scripture, England argues, will subjects learn the lawful duty that they owe unto their prince. In making this observation, England speaks beyond the character Commonalty to the commonality who gathered to watch *King Johan* at Christmas 1538-39. It was they who were to gain unprecedented access to scripture as soon as the printing of the Great Bible was completed and a copy of it set up in every parish church, they who were to have the opportunity to learn obedience from the lessons of scripture, and who by professing obedience to the Crown could claim kinship with mother England.

In the play, England anticipates the introduction of the Bible into parish churches, and she looks forward to the establishment in this era of a national consciousness based upon obedience to the precepts in scripture that prescribe our obedience to kings. This

⁵⁶ *A Lamentation in VVhiche is Shevved what Ruyne and destruction cometh of seditious rebellyon* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; STC 18113.3), sig. A4^r.

⁵⁷ Jacqueline A. Vanhoutte, 'Engendering England: The Restructuring of Allegiance in the Writings of Richard Morison and John Bale', *Renaissance and Reformation*, n.s., 20 (1996), 49-77 (p. 55).

idea of Englishness inevitably questions England's own role in the era of the Church Bible, however. It replaces the character England with a consciousness directed by scriptural precept, and by making superfluous England's own admonitions that we obey the Crown, it makes superfluous England's very existence on the page and stage of subsequent royalist propaganda. *King Johan* replaces as its criterion for national consciousness the admonitory rhetoric of the character of England with the admonitory prose of the Bible in English. This process is anticipated in Morison's *Remedy*, where England's emotive appeal to the Lincolnshire rebels in the *Lamentation* is replaced with words that self-consciously echo the syntax of Matthew 19. It is as though England herself is here undergoing that process of self-renunciation which Tyndale recommends to readers of his *Obedie[n]ce* – that effacement of the self for a subjectivity based on scriptural precept. The completion of this process of self-effacement, whereby England's own admonitions that we obey the king are replaced by those in scripture, is enacted in the B-text ending of *King Johan*. As we have seen, the extant A-text breaks off four lines into King John's dying speech at the foot of the cancelled verso of the twentieth folio leaf (p. *4). This speech is enlarged by nineteen lines in the B-text ending, and John's death comes five lines later, following a brief interjection from England, to which John replies with his dying breath. After a short speech lamenting the death of 'so noble a kynge' (l. 2187), England then bows out of the play for the final time, bearing with her the body of the King. Onto the empty stage enters a new character, Verity, who reproaches Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order for their disobedience to King John. A new king called Imperial Majesty also enters the stage at this point. He thanks Verity for 'refourmyng these men' (l. 2336), and he asks him to also 'call our commynalte | To true obedyence, as ye are Gods Veryte' (ll. 2337-38). Verity duly resolves to 'go preache Gods wurde your commens amonge' (l. 2342), and to 'shewe them their dewtye, in Gods name' (l. 2363). Before he goes out, Verity reminds those other renegade estates, Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order, of the scriptural precepts that prescribe their own obedience to kings.

For Gods sake obeye lyke as doth yow befall,
 For in hys owne realme a kynge is iudge ouer all
 By Gods appoyntment, and none maye hym iudge agayne
 But the lorde hymself. In thys the scripture is playne.
 He that condempneth a kynge condempneth God without dought;
 He that harmeth a kynge to harme God goeth about;
 He that a prynce resisteth doth dampne Gods ordynaunce

And resisteth God in withdrawynge hys affyaunce.
 All subiectes offendynge are vndre the kynges iudgement;
 A kyng is reserued to the lorde omnypotent.
 He is a mynyster immedyate vndre God,
 Of hys ryghteousnesse to execute the rod. (l. 2346)

In the play, England counsels John to ‘cawse Godes word to be tawght syncerly’. Only then, she argues, will the people ‘know to ther prynce per lawfull dewty’. Cromwell had heeded England’s advice in the months before the play’s performance at Christmas 1538-39. In his revisions to *King Johan*, dateable to 1558 or shortly thereafter, Bale reflects upon the era that Cromwell’s injunctions had inaugurated some twenty years before. The character of Verity is in effect the embodiment of this era. His resolve to ‘go preache Gods wurde your commens amonge’ promises to give concrete realisation to the sort of scriptural sermons that England had anticipated. The passage quoted above is itself an example of such a sermon, for within it Verity paraphrases the plain scripture of Romans 13.1-4. Not only does Verity speak God’s Word in the play, he is God’s Word – the Word imprinted in the Bible set up in churches, and inscribed in the hearts of those who came to read from the Great Bible, or to hear it being read out in sermons before the people. Verity represents the end-product of the process of self-renunciation that England had begun in the *Remedy*, when she had replaced the admonitory rhetoric of the *Lamentation* with the admonitory prose of scripture. Commonalty had had to abide the admonitions of the character England in the era of King John, but in the era of the Church Bible, Bale makes clear that Englishness is predicated upon a consciousness guided by God’s Word – by the Word, in other words, that Verity represents on stage. ‘Now that ye are sworne vnto me, your pryncypall’ (l. 2437), Imperial Majesty remarks to Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order after Verity’s departure,

I charge ye to regarde the wurde of God ouer all,
 And in that alone to rule, to speake and to iudge,
 As ye wyll haue me your socour and refuge. (l. 2438)

As England urges us to obey the Crown, so Verity embodies the admonitory prose of scripture inscribed on our heart. Verity stands in for England in the B-text, and his relationship with Imperial Majesty likewise mirrors the relationship in the A-text between England and King John. England had regarded John as ‘a rygthfull kyng, | Apoyntyd of God’ (ll. 127-28), and it is this awareness of the scriptural basis of John’s

sovereignty that prompts her to submit to his authority in the play. Verity is of course only too well aware of those precepts in scripture that prescribe obedience to kings – ‘In thys the scripture is playne’, he reminds Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order (l. 2349). If John represents a type of Henry VIII in the play, Imperial Majesty is the embodiment of Henry VIII, and of his pretensions, as enshrined in the Appeals Act, to empire in the English Church. Bale identifies Henry VIII with Imperial Majesty, and he does so in order to uphold the scriptural basis for Henry’s imperialist pretensions by having Verity pledge obedience to Imperial Majesty. ‘I charge yow, therfor, as God hath charged me, | To gyue to your kynge hys due supremacye’ (ll. 2358-59), Verity commands Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order. Just as Verity compels others, and is himself compelled by God, to submit to the ‘supremyete’ of Imperial Majesty, so Bale implies that Henry’s own claims to supremacy in the English Church are also supported by God’s Word.

The straightforwardness of the scriptural precepts that command obedience to kings was crucial to the utility of the English Bible as propaganda for the Royal Supremacy. Tyndale had emphasised the lucidity of the simple, literal sense of scripture, and in the prologue to his *Pentateuch* he had been quick to contrast its transparency with the ‘miste of [...] sophistrye’, which sought in ‘sotle rydles’ to confound scripture’s clear admonition that we obey our sovereign (sig. [A]2^v). In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale asks us to renounce our ‘bely wisdom’ (sig. A7^v) for a subjectivity guided by the literal sense of scripture – a subjectivity that Verity embodies in *King Johan*, and which in the play is made the basis of national consciousness, of our kinship with mother England. To question the lucidity of the simple, literal sense of scripture is therefore to compromise the construction of Englishness with which the audience are presented at the end of the play – an Englishness based upon obedience, not to England the character, but to the precepts of the English Bible. It is with this question of lucidity that the B-text is concerned, however, for Verity undermines the straightforwardness of scripture when he reproaches Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order for their desertion of King John. In the following speech, Verity uses scripture to argue that subjects should show obedience to kings. In so doing, however, he combines Old Testament tales with the classical authorities of Plato and Seneca.

Plato thought alwayes that no hyghar loue could be

Than a man to peyne hymself for hys own countreye.
 David for their sake the proude Phelistyan slewe,
 Aioth mad Eglon hys wyckednesse to rewe,
 Esdras from Persye for his owne contreys sake
 Came to hierusalem, their stronge holdes vp to make;
 But yow, lyke wretches, cast ouer both contreye and kynge.
 All manhode shameth to see your vnnaturall doynge.
 Ye wycked rulers, God doth abhorre ye all. [...]

Anneus Seneca hath thys most prouable sentence:
 The gentyll free hart goeth neuer from obedyence. (l. 2259, l. 2279)

It is in order more convincingly to chastise Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order for having 'cast ouer both contreye and kynge' that Verity here alludes, first to Plato's dictum that it is proper to devote oneself to one's country, and secondly to Seneca's aphorism on the desirability of obedience to kings.⁵⁸ These classical citations frame three allusions to episodes in the Old Testament – to David's defeat of Goliath (I Kings 17); to the regicide by the Israelite Aioth, or Ehud, of Eglon, King of Moab and conqueror of Israel (Judges 3.12-31); and to Ezra's return to Jerusalem in the aftermath of the Babylonian Captivity (I Esdras 7ff). The actions of David, Ehud and Ezra function as exempla illustrative of the sort of patriotic behaviour that Plato endorses in *De officiis*, but their relationship to the Senecan sententia on obedience to kings is more problematic. It is clear that Verity intended these biblical allusions to be taken as exempla of obedience to king as well as country, for why else would he have juxtaposed the actions of David, Ehud, and Ezra with his condemnation of the fact that Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order have 'cast ouer both contreye and kynge'? Verity asserts that these wretches have abandoned king and country, and by contrasting their actions in this respect with those of David, Ehud, and Ezra, he implicitly upholds these Old Testament heroes as paragons, both of patriotism and of allegiance to kings. The simple, literal sense of these biblical exempla fails, however, to support the interpretation that Verity here imposes upon them. The story of Ehud is particularly problematic as an exemplum of obedience to kings, for in order to emancipate Israel from eighteen years of thraldom to the Moabites, Ehud had to assassinate the Moabite King. King Eglon is represented as a tyrant in the Bible, but this fact alone did

⁵⁸ Cicero attributes this dictum to Plato in his *De officiis*, bk. I, cap. 25, para. 86, trans. by Walter Miller (London: Heinemann; New York: MacMillan, 1913), pp. 86-89. For Seneca's aphorism, see *Moral Essays [Epistulae Morales]*, bk. VII, cap. 15, para. 7: 'In regno nati sumus; deo parere libertas est [We have been born under a monarchy; to obey God is freedom]', trans. by John W. Basore, 3 vols (London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam's Sons; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928-35), II (1932), 140-41.

not exonerate regicide in the eyes of sixteenth-century evangelicals. Tyndale writes that even tyrant-kings must be obeyed, for he explains that their actions exact God's vengeance upon the sins of a community. In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale asserts that tyrants 'are but Gods scourge and his rodde to chastise vs'. As the 'father hath allwaye in tyme of correccio[n] the rodde faste in his hande', so 'hath God all Tyrauntes in hys ha[n]de a[n]d letteth them not doo what so ever thei wolde/ but as moch only as he appointeth them to doo and as ferforth as it is necessary for vs' (sig. B1^v). For Tyndale, tyrant-kings represent the will of God, and he argues that subjects should endure their tyranny without protest – for to rebel against a tyrant is to rise up against God himself. It is as an act of divine providence that we are asked to interpret Eglon's conquest of Israel, for it is written in Judges 3.12 that 'the Lorde hardened Eglon [...] agaynst the chyldren of Israell/ because they had comitted wyckednesse before the Lorde'.⁵⁹ Eglon's conquest of Israel, we are told, had been divinely-ordained. For this reason, readers of Tyndale might have interpreted Ehud's actions against Eglon as committed in defiance of God, rather than in obedience to his will.

It is in order to guide us away from the unsettling implications of the literal sense of this passage that Verity accompanies his citations from scripture with Plato and Seneca's *sententiae* on the subject of patriotism and obedience to kings. As these *sententiae* literally frame Verity's allusion to the exempla of David, Ehud, and Ezra, so they also frame our reading of the simple, literal sense of these three Old Testament episodes. Verity's use of classical *sententiae* as a supplement to the simple sense of scripture is an admission that some scriptural passages were more open to interpretation than Tyndale himself was willing to admit. In his *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale had approached the literal sense of God's Word as the touchstone with which to try the truth of man's wisdom. 'By the principles of the fayth', he asserts, 'and by the playne scriptures and by the [^]circu[m]stances of the [^]texte/ shulde we iudge all mens exposition and all mens doctrine/ and shulde receive the best and refuse the worst' (sig. C2^f). Writing over a decade later, in his prologue to the 1540 Great Bible, Cranmer too had been quick to contrast the lucidity of God's Word with the obscurity of man's wisdom. In scripture, Cranmer writes, 'aswell publicanes, fysshers, & shepherders maye fynde theyr

⁵⁹ *The Byble [...] translated into Englysh by Thomas Matthew* (STC 2066), sig. m5^v.

edificacion, as greate doctoures their erudicion' (sig. †1^v). This, he explains, is because the books of the Bible

were not made to vayne glorie, lyke as were the wryttinges of the gentyle philosophers & rethoricyans, to the entent the makers shulde be had in admiracion for their hie styles and obscure maner of wrytynge, wherof nothyng can be vndersta[n]de without a master or an expositoure. (sigs. †1^v-2^f)

Scripture itself needs no master, he asserts, since the 'aspostelles and prophetes wrote theyr bokes so, that theyr speciall ente[n]t & purpose myght be vnderstanded & perceaued of euery reader' (sig. †2^f). Later on in this same paragraph, however, Cranmer seems much less certain about the straightforwardness of the simple, literal sense of scripture. Cranmer exhorts readers to 'take the bookes' of the Bible 'into thyne ha[n]des', and to 'reade the hole storye, and that [thou] vnderstandest [to] kepe it well in memorye'. He is nevertheless quick to concede that the meaning of certain parts of scripture may prove less self-evident than that of others. If a reader 'vndersta[n]dest not' a passage of scripture, then Cranmer urges him to 'reade it agayne, & agayne'. If after repeated readings its meaning still remains unclear, then Cranmer recommends that he resort 'to thy curate and preacher', and 'shewe thy selfe to be desirous to knowe and learne'.

And I doubte not, but God seinge thy diligence & redynesse (yf no man elles teache [thee]) wyll hym selfe vouchsaffe with his holy sprete to illuminate the, and to open vnto the that which was locked from the. (sig. †2^f)

Other reformers were less willing to leave to the agency of the Holy Spirit the business of illuminating the minds of those who were unable on their own to grasp the simple, literal sense of scripture. The reader of the Matthew Bible would have found his understanding of the plain scriptures assisted on more than two thousand occasions by marginal comments of a linguistic, expository, and at times downright polemical nature. Like the biblical text it annotates, the majority of material in these marginalia comes secondhand, mainly from annotations included in the 1535 and 1534 editions of the French Bibles of Olivetan and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples respectively, although some can be attributed to Tyndale, some to Erasmus, and some twelve are taken from annotations in the Coverdale Bible. John Rogers, the editor of the Matthew Bible, has at times inserted

his own observations into this borrowed material, although he makes a substantial contribution to no more than around ten per cent of all marginal comments.⁶⁰

Verity has been seen to combine the classical with the scriptural in order to force our reading of Ehud's assassination of King Eglon into the framework provided by Seneca's aphorism on the desirability of obedience. The aphorism supplements our interpretation of this scriptural passage, and it invites us to approach Ehud's regicide as an example of obedience to God, rather than of disobedience to King Eglon. Rogers also combined the text of the Matthew Bible with marginalia that aimed to supplement the simple, literal sense of scripture, to shepherd the unlearned reader, and guide him away from the unsettling implications of those more ambiguous passages of the Bible. Rogers has inserted a lengthy comment in the left-hand margin of Judges 3, at exactly the point in the text where Ehud is about to assassinate King Eglon:

And Ahud came in vnto [*Eglon*] into a somer parler [...] and sayde: I haue a message vnto the fro[m] God. And he arose out of his seate. And Ahud put forth hys lefte hande and toke the dagger from hys ryght thyghe and thrust it into hys belye.

A letter 'c' appears before the word 'message' in the text of the Matthew Bible. It refers to the following marginal note:

To do this feate was Ahud appoynted of God/ & therefore had a message to him from god. Eglo[n] was fatte and stronge/ had his garde at hande. Ahud lyft handed and vnapt for fightinge. But yet go he boldely vnto his chambre to hym/ knowyng perfectly that God wolde strengthen hi[m] & heelp him/ & performe hys worde vnto hym.⁶¹

Rogers is careful here to exonerate Ehud, and he does so by pointing to subtleties in the text which imply that Ehud was enacting the will of God when he assassinated King Eglon. This reading detracts from the unsettling implication that Ehud's act of regicide contravened the will of God. Like Verity's use of classical allusion in *King Johan*, its inclusion in the margin of the Matthew Bible constitutes an admission that some scriptural passages are less straightforward than Tyndale would have us suppose. These marginalia

⁶⁰ For discussion, see Mozley, pp. 157-66.

⁶¹ *The Byble [...] translated into Englysh by Thomas Matthew* (STC 2066), sig. m6^r.

were outlawed in the Act for the Advancement of True Religion (34 and 35 Hen. VIII, c. 1), passed with royal assent on 12 May 1543. The act exhorted 'everye p[er]sone or p[er]sones having any Bibles or newe Testament[es] with any suche annotac[i]ons or preambles [to] cut out or blot the same in suche wyse as they cannot be p[er]ceyved nor red'.⁶²

The preamble to the act contains assertions reminiscent of Tyndale's own observations in the *Obedie[n]ce* upon the clarity of the 'playne scriptures' (sig. C2^v), and upon its corruption by those schoolmen who 'facioneth' scripture 'after his awne imaginacion as a Potter doeth his claye' (sig. C3^v). The act condemns those 'many sedicious people', who 'subverte the veraye true and p[er]fecte exposic[i]on doctryne and declarac[i]on of the saide Scripture, after theyre p[er]vers fantasies', and 'contrarye to the veraye sincere and godlye meaning of the same'. These seditious types, it continues, have been 'instructing his Hieghnes people [...] otherwyse thanne the scripture ought or shoulde be taught declared or expounded' (III, 894). In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale had attributed the diversification of opinions amongst the schoolmen to their deviation from the simple, literal sense of scripture. The act also attributes the 'diversitie of opinions' that have 'sprung and arisen among his [*ie. Henry's*] saide Subject[es]' to the fact that seditious types have departed from the plain scriptures, not only in 'sermons disputac[i]ons and argument[es]', but also in 'printed bokes printed balades playes rymes songes and other fantasies'. The only remedy, its preamble concludes, is 'to take awaie purge and clense this his Highnes Realme' of 'all suche bokes wryting[es] sermons', and to establish in their place 'a certaine forme of pure and sincere teaching, agreable with Godd[es] woorde' (III, 894).

Like Tyndale before him, Henry here seems to want scripture to speak for itself. For all the high-flown rhetoric of the Act for the Advancement of True Religion, however, the legislation in fact did little to further the evangelical cause in England. As well as commanding the excision of annotations and preambles from Bibles, the act also outlawed ownership of 'bookes and wryting[es] in the English tongue teaching or comprysing any matiers of Christen religion articles of the faithe or holye scripture [...] contrarye to that

⁶² 'An Acte for thadvancement of true Religion and for thabbolishment of the contrarie', in *Statutes*, III (1817), 894-97 (p. 895).

doctryne whiche sithens the yere of our Lorde a thousande fyve hundred and fourtie is' (p. 894). This 'doctryne' had been formulated in the so-called 'King's Book', an overwhelmingly conservative doctrinal statement that rejected the central Protestant tenet of justification by faith alone. Entitled *A Necessary Doctrine and erudicion for any chrysten man*, it was ready for publication by the beginning of May 1543, some twelve days before the passage of the Act for the Advancement of True Religion itself.⁶³

The act attempted to encourage the uptake in England of this conservative statement of belief, and it did so by outlawing those evangelical plays and printed works that contradicted the tenets of the 'King's Book' – Bale's *King Johan* and Tyndale's *Obedie[n]ce* among them. The act may echo the rhetoric of Tyndale's *Obedie[n]ce* in its denunciation of teachings 'contrarye to the veraye sincere and godlye meaning' of scripture, but its own ideas of what constituted 'godlye meaning' differed greatly from the message that Tyndale himself derived from his reading of scripture. Like Verity's words on the stage of *King Johan*, and Roger's comments in the margins of the Matthew Bible, the Act for the Advancement of True Religion sought to control interpretation of scripture. Its attempt to silence Verity and censor Rogers's marginalia is yet another admission of just how ambiguous the meaning of scripture could prove to be. In licensing the English Bible, Henry had opened a veritable Pandora's Box of 'variaunc[es] argument[es] tumult[es] and scismes' (III, 894), and in the Act for the Advancement of True Religion he was determined to silence diversity once and for all. Henry, the act states, had 'set foorthe the Byble and New Testament in the Englishe tongue', so that his 'loving Subject[es]' might 'the better knowe theyre duetie to Almightye God and to his Majestie' (III, 896). It goes on to observe, however, that 'a greate multitude of his saide subject[es], moste spe[c]iallie of the lower sorte', had by their reading 'fallen into greate dyvision and discenc[i]on' (III, 896). Henry had been left with no other alternative but to prohibit Bible-reading – whether 'pryvatelie or openlie' – to all men 'of the degrees of yeomen or undre', and to all women other than gentle- and noble women, who 'maie reade to themselves alone and not to others'. Henry may 'thinke good' in future to 'enlardge and give libertie for the reading of the same', but not until he sees significant 'reformac[i]on and amendement' in the lives of the lower sort – 'by the diligent and discrete reading and

⁶³ *A Necessary Doctrine and erudicion for any chrysten man, set furth by the kynges maiestye of Englande. &c* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1543; STC 5176).

imprynting in theyre hartes of the moste blessed doctryne set foorthe or hereafter to be set foorthe by his saide Majestie' (III, 896).

By depriving the majority of his subjects of the English Bible, Henry deprived them of the English identity that in *King Johan* is represented by the character Verity. In the Act for the Advancement of True Religion, Henry makes future access to the Bible contingent upon the proviso that his subjects first imprint in their hearts the 'blessed doctryne' of the King's Book. In so doing, Henry preempts the actualisation amongst his subjects of the sort of English national identity that Bale envisions in *King Johan* – an Englishness based on a consciousness guided by God's laws, on the inscription of God's Word in one's heart. The idea of a subjectivity directed by scriptural precept had nevertheless been undermined long before the Act for the Advancement of True Religion deprived England of its Bible. April 1539 saw the publication of the first edition of the Great Bible, but it also saw the preparation of a proclamation designed to suppress the great diversity of opinions and disputes that had arisen over the meaning of scripture. The proclamation, which was probably never published, is preserved in a manuscript copy that contains Henry's holograph corrections.⁶⁴ Readers of the proclamation are reminded that Henry had not been 'compelled by God's word to set forth the Scripture in English to all ^{his} lay subjects' (p. 286), but that he had licensed the Bible for their benefit. Some of those subjects, however, had been using the Bible to 'restore into this realm the old devotion to the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome', still others 'to subvert and overturn as well the sacraments of Holy Church as the power and authority of princes and magistrates' (p. 284). Henry announced his intention to proceed 'to a full ~~power~~ ^{order} and resolution to extinct all such diversities of opinions by ~~terrible~~ ^{good and just} laws' in parliament (p. 285). In the meantime, he warned that no person should 'openly read the Bible or New Testament in the English tongue in any churches or chapels ^{or elsewhere} with any loud or high voices', but that they should 'quietly and reverently read the Bible and New Testament ^{quietly and with silence} by themselves ^{secretly} at all times and places convenient for their own instruction and edification, to increase thereby godliness and virtuous living' (p. 285).

⁶⁴ BL, Cotton MSS, Cleopatra, E V, fol. 311, calendared in *LP*, XIV.i (1894), 403. The text is reproduced in *TRP*, no. 191 (pp. 284-86). All references are to this edition. For discussion, see R. W. Heinze, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Kings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 139-141. Also Mozley, p. 177.

The reading of scripture had caused such contention amongst the populace that, on the eve of the publication of the Great Bible, Henry had already felt compelled to issue a proclamation restricting its use. The proclamation stands as testament to the outbreak in England of exactly the sort of religious division that the marginalia of the Matthew Bible had tried to prevent. Rogers had sought to avoid such contentions by guiding readers of the Matthew Bible towards a given interpretation of the text, but the fact that his marginalia had failed to produce agreement of opinion amongst Bible-readers is indicative of the ambiguity of scripture – of its ability to uphold any number of confessional identities, and to support both the royal and papal claims to exercise authority over the English Church. In *King Johan*, Verity represents the sort of consciousness controlled by scripture that Bale had expected Bible-readers to fashion for themselves in the era of the Church Bible. Verity nevertheless compromises the construction of this scriptural consciousness when he supplements citations from scripture with classical sententiae. Like the marginalia of the Matthew Bible, Verity's use of Plato and Seneca serves to question the straightforwardness of the scriptural precepts that both Bale and Tyndale ask us to obey, and upon which Bale predicates his criterion of Englishness in *King Johan*. Bale's play is optimistic in its vision of a nation of Bible-readers who base their allegiance to the Royal Supremacy upon their obedience to scriptural precepts. In its characterisation of Verity, however, *King Johan* is pessimistic about whether these same precepts are straightforward enough to compel the obedience of a nation. In the play, the character Imperial Majesty guides us towards the correct interpretation of Verity's speech admonishing obedience to kings:

Of Verytees wurdcs the syncere meanyngc I grope;
 He sayth that a kynge is of God immedyatlye.
 Than shall neuer pope rule more in thys monarchie' (l. 2384).

It was contention over the 'syncere meanyngc' of scripture that compromised the popularity of the Royal Supremacy in the era of the Church Bible – that questioned England's ability to exit the stage of *King Johan* after its performance at Christmas 1538-39, and to enter the consciousness of the Canterbury audience beyond.

Chapter 5

Commonwealth in Crisis: Riot, Rebellion, and Nicholas Udall's *Respublica* (1553)

The death of Henry VIII, in the early hours of 28 January 1547, brought the demise also of his legislation prohibiting Bible-reading to all but the most privileged of his subjects. When the first parliament under Edward VI met in November 1547, it was in order to reverse the late King's concessions to traditional religion by repealing all 'Act[es] of p[ar]liament' passed in Henry's reign 'concerninge doctryne and matters of Religion'. Alongside the conservative Six Articles Act, the Repeals Act of 1547 singled out for particular mention the Act for the Advancement of True Religion. Its proscriptions against the 'reading preaching teaching or expounding of Scripture', the 1547 parliament asserted, 'shall fromhensfurthe be repealed and utterlie voyde and of none effecte'.¹

The Act for the Advancement of True Religion had blamed disputes over the interpretation of scripture for the great 'diversitie of opinions' which had of late sprung up in England. By depriving his subjects of the English Bible, the act explained, Henry sought to direct them away from 'variaunc[es] argument[es] tumult[es] and scismes', and towards 'the veraye true and p[er]fecte exposic[i]on doctryne and declarac[i]on of the saide Scripture', which according to Henry was enshrined in his *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*. Insofar as it condemns exegeses that contradict 'the veraye sincere and godlye meaning' of scripture, the act appears to uphold the idea, first espoused by Tyndale, that the meaning of scripture was self-evident, and its prose accessible to all. This apparent faith in the straightforwardness of scripture is nevertheless undermined by the fact that, within the act, Henry had deemed it prudent to ban the reading of the English Bible before proceeding with his plan to establish a 'pure and sincere teaching, agreable with Godd[es] woorde'. Henry was attempting to direct interpretation of the Bible by depriving his subjects of the Bible itself – an admission of just how ambiguous that apparently self-evident message of scripture was proving to be in practice for Henry and his people. In his prologue to the 1540 edition of the Great Bible,

¹ 'An Acte for the Repeale of certaine Statutes concerninge Treasons, Felonyes, &c.' (1 Edw. VI, c. 12), in *Statutes*, IV.i (1819), 18-22 (p. 19).

Cranmer had commended scripture for its simplicity of expression. By 1543, however, the same scripture was being blamed by his royal master for the 'ignoraunce fonde opynions errours, and blindenes of divers and soondrye' in his realm.²

The repeal of the Act for the Advancement of True Religion re-established the reading of the English Bible as a legitimate preoccupation for the laity at large. By rejecting the prejudices of this conservative legislation – its belief that the English Bible was responsible for the errors and blindness of divers and sundry of its readers – the 1547 parliament also re-established optimism in what Cranmer, in his prologue to the Great Bible, had called the 'largenes & vtilytie of the scripture', its usefulness, not only as a means by which to gain faith in God, but as a manual for godly living here on earth.³ 'Almaner of persons of what estate or co[n]dicyon soeuer they be', Cranmer had written in 1540, 'maye i[n] thys booke learne all thynges what they ought to beleue, what they ought to do, & what they shulde not do, aswell concernyng almyghtye God as also co[n]cernyng themselues & all other' (sigs. †2^{r-v}). Four months before parliament met in November 1547, the Edwardian protectorate had already made clear its intention to return the legislation on lay Bible-reading to the conditions within which Cranmer's prologue had been received when it was first published seven years earlier. On 31 July 1547, Richard Grafton, printer to the boy-King Edward VI, had issued a series of royal injunctions 'to all and singuler' Edward's 'louinge subiectes, aswel of the clergie, as off the laietie'.⁴ Each of these thirty-six injunctions seeks to redress a range of perceived doctrinal, liturgical, and pedagogical abuses brought about by the religious conservatism of the later Henrician period. The injunctions variously speak of the need for quarterly sermons in support of the Royal Supremacy, and against the 'bishop of Romes vsurped power & iurisdiccion' (sig. a2^v). They order that no preacher 'set furth or extoll any ymages, reliques, or miracles' (sig. a3^f), and they direct that images 'abused with

² 'An Acte for thadvancement of true Religion and for thabbolishment of the contrarie' (34 and 35 Hen. VIII, c. 1), in *Statutes*, III (1817), 894-97 (p. 894).

³ *The Byble in Englyshe, that is to saye the conte[n]t of al the holy scrypture, both of ye olde, and newe testame[n]t, with a prologe therinto, made by the reuerende father in God, Thomas archbyssshop of Cantorbury, This is the Byble apoynted to the vse of the churches* ([London]: Rychard Grafton, 1540, STC 2071), sig. †2^f.

⁴ *Inivncions geuen by the moste excellente Prince, Edwarde the. VI. by the grace of God, kynge of Englande, Fraunce, and Irelande: Defendour of the Faith, & in earthe vnder Christe, of the Churche of Englande & of Irelande the supreme head: To all and singuler hys Louinge Subiectes, aswel of the Clergie, as off the Laietie* (London: Richard Grafton, 1547; STC 10088; TRP, no. 287).

Pilgremage or offerynges' be removed (sig. a3^v), and that processions 'about the Church or Church yarde, or other place' be from henceforth banned 'to auoide al contencion and strief which heretofore hath risen, emong the kinges Maiesties subiectes' (sig. c1^r). The injunctions contain provision for the education of laity and clergy alike, and they express an especial concern with the demeanour of the clergy, admonishing them to avoid 'tauernes' and 'alehouses' (sig. b1^r), to always 'applie theimselfes' on the Sabbath and holy days 'to the common administracion of the whole parishe', and to 'auoide the detestable synne of symony' (sig. c4^r). The wording of one admonition to the clergy almost exactly repeats the wording of Cromwell's injunctions of September 1538, which had ordered incumbents of parish churches to provide for their parishioners 'one boke of the hole byble of the largyest volume in Englyshe'.⁵ In this seventh injunction, Edward asks his clergy to

prouide, within three monethes, next after this visitacion, one boke of the whole Bible, of the largest volume in Englishe. And within one .xii. monethes, nexte after [the] sayd visitacio[n], the Paraphrasis of Erasmus also in Englishe vpon the Gospelles, and the same set vp, in some conuenient place within the sayd church, that they haue cure of, wheras their parishyoners may moste co[m]modiously resorte vnto thesame, & reade the same. [...] Wherby they may the better know their dueties to God, to their soueraine lorde the kyng, and their neighbour. (sigs. a4^v-b1^r)

In his 1540 prologue, Cranmer had praised the usefulness of scripture as a manual for godly living, and it is this same utility that Edward's injunctions cite as reason for re-establishing the Great Bible in churches across the country. This seventh injunction implies that the laity may learn from the Great Bible to love their neighbour and obey the King, and this presupposes optimism in the clarity of those biblical passages that teach obedience to God and to kings. Although admitting in his 1540 Prologue that some parts of scripture present more problems for interpretation than others, Cranmer had nevertheless encouraged his readership to persevere with the reading of these more difficult passages, in the hope that 'God seinge thy diligence & redynesse (yf no man elles teache [thee]) wyll hym selfe vouchsaffe with his holy sprete to illuminate the' (sig. †2^r). Seven years later, these same sentiments were being echoed in a sermon written to encourage the laity again to read the Bible that now under Edward was being restored to

⁵ *Iniunctions for the clerge Exhibite [blank] die mensis [blank] Anno d[omi]ni M.CCCCC.xxxviii* (London: [Thomas Berthelet], 1538; STC 10086), fol. 1^r.

every church. This homily on Bible-reading has been attributed to Cranmer, on the basis of its similarity in style and content to his 1540 prologue.⁶ It constitutes the first of the twelve *Sermons* that were printed at the same time as the *Inivncions* at the end of July 1547.⁷ The sermon echoes Cranmer's earlier enthusiasm, conveyed in his prologue to the Bible, for the utility of scripture and its clarity of expression. 'Those thinges in the scripture that be plaine to vnderstande, and necessarie for saluacion, euerye mannes duetie is to learne them, to printe them in memorye, and effectually to exercise them', Cranmer commands. As for 'the obscure misteries', his sermon continues, 'if we reade once, twyse, or thrise, and vnderstande not, let vs not cease so, but still continue readyng, praying, askyng of other'. 'The readyng of the whole, ought not to be set a parte' because of 'the difficultie of suche places' (sig. B4^r) – for 'whosoeuer geueth his mynd to holy scriptures [...] it cannot be [...] that he should be destitute of helpe'. God himself will 'geue light vnto our mindes' if else we 'lacke a learned man' to teach us 'the true sense of the scripture' (sig. B3^v).

Cranmer concedes that scripture may not have been written entirely in the plain and simple prose so celebrated by Tyndale, but in this sermon on Bible-reading, Cranmer, like Tyndale, is nevertheless confident that scripture contains sufficient passages 'plaine to vnderstande' as to enable the diligent reader 'in hys hearte to printe' those precepts by which 'hearte and lyfe [*be*] altered and transformed into that thyng, whiche he readeth' (sigs. B1^{r-v}). Writing to exhort the reading of scripture, Cranmer here resurrects the idea of the godly readership identifiable with Tyndale's third, or spiritual, type of person – a readership embodied in the character England as she appears on the page and stage of Morison's *Remedy for Sediton* and Bale's *King Johan*. These spiritual types, Tyndale had written, were 'a lawe vnto them selves', because by constant reading of the Word they have had 'the lawe writte[n] in their hertes by the spirite of God'.⁸ In his sermon on Bible-reading, Cranmer had related the re-establishment of the English Bible in churches to the

⁶ See Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), p. 372.

⁷ *Certayne sermo[n]s appoynted by [the] kinges Maiestie, to be declared and reade, by al persons, vicars or Curates, euery Sondag and holy daye in theyr Churches, where they haue Cure* (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1549; STC 13644). References to Cranmer's homily on Bible-reading are to the text of this edition.

⁸ *The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man and howe Christe[n] rulers ought to governe/ where in also (yf thou marke diligently) thou shalt fynde eyes to perceave the crafty conveyance of all iugglers* ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser(?)], 1528; STC 24446), sig. E2^v.

initiation of this same process by which selfhood is renounced for a subjectivity controlled by scriptural precept. For Cranmer, the straightforwardness of scripture enabled us all to ‘sate vp (in the cheste of our hartes)’ those ‘holy rules, iniunccions, and statutes of oure christian religion’ (sig. B4^v).

The era of the Church Bible under Henry VIII had given the lie to Tyndale’s initially optimistic assessment of the clarity of scripture and the universality of its appeal, for far from its plain and simple prose being imprinted in the hearts of readers, disputes over the interpretation of scriptural passages had instead fostered a great ‘diversitie of opinions’ in England. Writing some months before the repeal of the Henrician prohibitions upon lay Bible-reading, Cranmer had felt it necessary in his sermon to concede that scripture contained ‘high hilles and mountaynes, which few men can ascende vnto’, as well as ‘playn wayes’ that had proved ‘easie for euerye man to vse’ (sig. B3^v). He had nevertheless remained optimistic enough about the straightforwardness of scripture to talk in language reminiscent of Tyndale about the godly readership that he foresaw would establish itself in England under Edward VI. Cranmer was not the only reformist in Edwardian England to have expressed optimism about the outcome of having the Great Bible again set up in churches. The same injunction that in 1547 had ordered provision of an English Bible in each parish had also directed incumbents to purchase one copy of ‘the Paraphrasis of Erasmus also in Englishe vpon the Gospelles’. The Englishing of Erasmus’s *Paraphrase* had begun in 1543, and was still underway when the *Inivncions* were printed in July 1547. A collaborative translation funded by Queen Catherine Parr, the *Paraphrase* was printed at the end of January 1548, with a preface to the Christian reader, and dedicatory epistles to Edward VI and the Queen Dowager – all three of which had been written by Nicholas Udall, in his role as general editor of the enterprise.⁹

In his epistle to Edward, Udall also talks with enthusiasm about how ‘there is none so good, so sure, ne so readie a waie [...] to engraue in men true loue & obedience towards their Princes and rewlors’, and to induce them to ‘deteste and abhorre all kynde

⁹ *The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the newe testamente* (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1548; STC 2854). For discussion, see Stephen Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 122-23.

of naughtinesse', than by feeding 'their gredie houngre & thirst of Christes iustice with the Bible' (sig. B5^r). Like Cranmer before him, Udall here upholds the utility of scripture as a tool for teaching subjects about their duties to King Edward and to each other. Cranmer had nevertheless conceded that 'obscure misteries' lurk within the predominantly plain and simple prose of scripture. In his dedicatory epistle to Edward, Udall is intent instead on making what Tyndale had termed the 'miste of [...] sophistrye' the scapegoat for the obscurity of some of scripture's more complex passages.¹⁰ In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale had argued that schoolmen collude with the papacy to promote a hermeneutics that 'corrupteth the scripture', and which does so in order to obscure those passages in the Bible that uphold the absolute authority of kings (sig. C3^r). In his preface to the *Paraphrase*, Udall likewise accuses 'the Romishe Nabugodonozor' of 'wrestyng & peruerting [the] holy scriptures of God to [the] establishyng & mainteinaunce of his vsurped supremitee' (sig. a3^r). Henry – that 'Englishe Dauid' – had 'out of the slyng of his Regall autoritee cast the corner stone of Goddes woorde', Udall explains to Edward, 'whiche lightyng vpon the forehead of the said Goliah, felled his papacie stone dead [...] neuer to bee habile any more to noye or to face Englishe Israel' (sig. a3^v). Henry had then 'prouided the Bible to bee sette foorth in the Englishe tounge, and to bee sette vp in euerie churche where it might bee read of his people', but Udall goes on to explain that the pope had 'devised all meanes possible to kepe his autoritee still in Englande', so as to 'staigh and lette the abolishyng of his vsurped power' (sig. a4^v). The pope 'and his adhere[n]tes, moonkes, fryers and other cloistreers' had found means 'so ferre to abuse the credulitee of the simple ignoraunt people' in England that they

brought them half in a detestation and hatered of Goddes woorde, and seduced them to auenture with a litell blast of sedicion, to distourbe the cogitacions of suche a noble and a good kyng beeyng tha[n] moste earnestely, yea (I maie saie) onely sette in studyng for the establisshement and continuacion of peace & tra[n]quillitee in this Royalme for euer. (sigs. a4^v-5^r)

By 'peruerting the sense of scripture' (sig. a4^v), Udall argues in the *Paraphrase*, the papists in England had conspired to cause those 'variaunc[es] argument[es] tumult[es] and scismes' which the Act for the Advancement of True Religion attributes to the ambiguity of the English Bible itself. Udall here avoids mention altogether of the

¹⁰ William Tyndale, [*The Pentateuch*] ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser(?)], 1530; STC 2350), sig. [A]2^v.

strictures that this Act had imposed upon lay Bible-reading, and in so doing he avoids implicating the late King in that onslaught against the English Bible for which he is on the other hand all too ready to blame those adherents of the Bishop of Rome. Udall's narrative certainly exonerates Henry from collusion in those conservative conspiracies against the English Bible that had dogged the last years of the late King's reign, but it also exonerates the Bible itself from the charge of being too complex for the simple, ignorant people to comprehend. Udall argues that it was papists, and not the plain prose of scripture, who had fostered 'diversitie of opinions' amongst Henry's subjects, papists who had attempted to abuse 'the simple people with all kyndes of delusion and iugleyng [...] euen vnto [the] third heauen of sophisticall learnyng' (sig. a4^v). Henry had been that Moses who had delivered us 'out of the ha[n]des of the Romishe Pharao', Udall asserts, and like Moses, Henry had written 'the booke of Deuteronomie, whan he caused the holy Bible to bee turned into Englishe' for the use of the laity.

But [...] some of the priestes the soonnes of Leui had now in these last yeres through their iugleyng, their false packyng, and their plain sorcerie bewitched kyng Henry with a wrong persuasion, and had so craftily coumpaced and co[n]ueighed the matier, that vnder the pretense and colour of religion thei kept the woorde of God from the yies and eares of the people, beatyng his moste feithfull louyng subiectes from the knowelage therof [...]. (sig. a6^v)

Henry and his subjects had fallen victim in the latter years of his reign to papists, who had suppressed God's Word and its simple command that the clergy and laity profess obedience to kings. With 'Englishe Israel' at the time of Henry's death left languishing in the wilderness without God's Word, Udall approaches as an act of divine providence the happy accession of the boy-King Edward, and his recent injunctions ordering the English Bible to be again set up in churches across the country. He writes that God has appointed Edward 'to bee the feithfull Josias, in whose tyme the booke of the lawe is fou[n]d out i[n] the house of the Lorde, & by your moste godly iniunccions reade in the hearyng of all your people'. 'Ye are the Iosue', Udall writes to Edward,

whom God hath appuincted to bryng vs into the lande of promission, flowyng and rennyng with mylke and honey, and to sette vs Englishe me[n] in the lande of Canaan whiche is the syncere knowelage and the free exercise of Goddes moste holy woorde. (sig. a6^v)

Like Cranmer, therefore, Udall expresses enthusiasm for the re-establishment under Edward of the English Bible in churches, but whereas Cranmer seasons his appraisal of the utility of scripture with the admission that some passages in the Bible are more straightforward than others to comprehend, Udall himself seems unwilling to allow this realisation to encroach upon his Utopian vision of an English Israel, flowing with the sincere knowledge and free exercise of God's most holy Word. Udall blames papists entirely for the contentions caused by Bible-reading in the latter years of Henry's reign. It was they who with their mists of sophistry were responsible for obscuring scripture's plain and simple prose, Udall asserts, they who had used 'plain sorcerie' to persuade Henry to suppress the English Bible. Now that lay Bible-reading has been re-established under Edward, Udall explains, there is surely nothing to prevent the English people from making 'a couenaunte [...] with the Lorde that thei shall walke after the Lorde, & [...] kepe his co[m]mau[n]dementes' (sig. a6^v). Writing but a few months after the proclamation of the injunctions ordering provision of the English Bible in churches, Udall notes that already 'blasphemie, periurie, mourdre, thefte, whooredome, makyng of affraies, & other abominacio[n]s are more detested, then thei wer in the blynd worlde verai late yeres gon: whiche is a toke[n], that Christe begynneth to dwell emong vs' (sig. B5^r). Some such progress towards the land of milk and honey has indeed in these latter months already been made, Udall concedes, although since the Bible is 'now almoste in euerie bodyes hande and mouthe', he continues, 'all good and godly folke dooe now woo[n]dre' that there is indeed 'any creature in whom any of the enormities afore me[n]cioned should reigne'. It is, however, to be hoped, Udall writes, that

through this salue of Goddes woorde, and other deuout weorkes for declaracion of thesame sette foorth to the people, if any shepe either bee scabbie, orels dooe yet renne a straigh: thesame shall by the right ledyng of the head belleweather their Prince, and by the whystle and voice of their good Pastours, bee reduced to suche a concorde and uniformitee, that thei will full and wholle goe[n] the streight pathwaie of Christes doctrine. (sig. B5^r)

This same pastoral image is voiced five years later on the stage of *Respublica*, a political morality play attributed to Nicholas Udall, and intended, its prologue makes clear, as a 'Christmas devise' to 'recreate' (l. 6) a 'moste noble presence' (l. 2).¹¹ It is

¹¹ *Respublica: An Interlude for Christmas 1553*, ed. by W. W. Greg, EETS, o.s., 226 (London: Oxford University Press, 1952 for 1946). All references are to this edition. Greg's editorial practice

described in the title of the only surviving manuscript copy as ‘a merye entrelude [...] made in the yeare of oure Lorde .1553. and the first yeare of the moost p[ro]sperous Reigne of o[ur] moste gracious Soverainge Quene Marye the first’, and there exists some admittedly circumstantial evidence external to the manuscript itself which implies that the play was indeed performed at the Marian court during Christmas 1553-54. A royal warrant issued to the Revels Office on 26 September 1553 refers to the postponement until Christmas of a play that had been prepared for Mary’s coronation on 1 October by the gentleman and children of the Chapel Royal. A second, slightly later warrant, signed by Mary and dated 30 September 1553, directs the Master of the Great Wardrobe to provide costumes ‘for a play to be playde before vs for the feastes of oure coronacion’. This second warrant names some of the characters for whom costumes are to be provided, and it is clear from those characters mentioned that this play to be performed before the Queen at her coronation is distinct from the ‘Christmas devise’ *Respublica*.¹² In the introduction to his edition of the play, Walter Greg takes these two warrants to refer to two distinct plays, the first of 26 September to the ‘Christmas devise’ *Respublica*, the second of 30 September to the unnamed coronation play (pp. ix-x). He identifies *Respublica* with the play to be postponed until Christmas 1553-54 on the basis of the evidence that exists in the play-text to support this identification. The postponed play was identified with the children of the Chapel Royal in the warrant of 26 September, and *Respublica* too was composed as a ‘Christmas devise’ in 1553, and intended for performance, its prologue makes clear, by ‘we children to youe olde folke’ (l. 47). Greg Walker has recently questioned Walter Greg’s interpretation of the available evidence. Is it not more plausible, Walker asks, that both warrants referred to the unnamed coronation play? Walker conjectures that the later warrant for provision of costumes may have been written prior to the decision, communicated on 26 September, to postpone this coronation play until the Christmas season, but that it was perhaps post-dated to, or sealed in error on, 30 September 1553. The possibility that it was the unnamed coronation play, not *Respublica*, which was postponed until the festive season does not, for Walker, rule out the probability that *Respublica* too was performed during Christmas 1553-54. ‘What we

is to italicise expanded contractions in the play-text, and to enclose conjectural readings of mutilated passages within angle brackets. In the interests of clarity and consistency, I have freely replaced Greg’s conventions with my own.

¹² Albert Feuillerat, *Documents Relating to the Revels at Court in the Time of King Edward VI and Queen Mary* (Louvain: [n. pub.], 1914), p. 149; p. 289. Cited in *Respublica*, pp. ix-x.

know of Christmas revels in other years suggests that a number of productions were usually offered', Walker argues. That this was also the case at Christmas 1553-54 is implied, he asserts, by the occurrence of the plural 'playes' in an entry in the Revels accounts that records payments 'to furnysshew owt certen playes settfoorth by the gentlemen of the Chapell' between 22 September 1553 and 6 January 1554.¹³

Walker questions whether these royal warrants can really be used as evidence for the performance of *Respublica* at the Marian court during Christmas 1553-54. If Walker is correct to suggest that neither the warrants of 26 or 30 September refer to *Respublica*, then we must make a case for this performance context on the balance of probability, and on the basis of evidence in the manuscript itself. There is, however, a further document to support the contention that this 'Christmas devise', dateable from the manuscript to 1553, was indeed performed at the Marian court in the year of its composition. This consists of a third royal warrant, dated 13 December 1554, and directing the Revels Office to deliver costumes to Nicholas Udall, who, writes Mary, 'haith at sondry seasons convenient hertofore shewid and myndeth hereafter to shewe his diligence in settinge forthe of dialogwes and Entreludes before vs'.¹⁴ Udall, it seems, had been diligently devising plays for performance before Mary prior to Christmas 1554-55. Were we able to attribute *Respublica* to Udall's authorship, we might with some certainty claim this 'Christmas devise' for a court performance before Mary at Christmas 1553-54, as one of those 'entreludes' set forth by Udall in the first year of the new Queen's reign, and thanks to which he had evidently by early December 1554 acquired for himself something of a reputation as a dramatist at court. The manuscript itself does not identify the author of *Respublica*, but the case for Udall's authorship has been convincingly made by Walter Greg in the introduction to his edition of the play.¹⁵ Greg cites numerous stylistic and linguistic similarities between the texts of *Respublica* and some of Udall's other plays and prose translations, including *Roister Doister* and his translations of Erasmus's *Apophthegms* (1542) and *Paraphrase* (1548), for which, we have seen, Udall acted as general editor, and to which he appears to have contributed the translation of the paraphrase on Luke in particular. One linguistic parallel unnoted by Greg is the recurrence

¹³ Greg Walker, *The Politics of Performance in Early Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 170-171 (p. 170). Feuillerat, p. 290; cited in *Respublica*, p. x.

¹⁴ Feuillerat, p. 159; cited in *Respublica*, p. viii.

¹⁵ See *Respublica*, pp. xi-xviii.

in the final scene of *Respublica* of the pastoral trope found in Udall's preface to the 1548 edition of the *Paraphrase*, and quoted above. In his preface to the *Paraphrase*, Udall likens Edward's ungodly subjects to 'scabbie' sheep who 'yet renne a straigh', and whilst the recurrence in *Respublica* of this common pastoral trope does not in itself prove that a single author was responsible for preface and play, the coincidence in both of the adjective 'scabbie' is more striking and, when taken together with the numerous other parallels noted by Greg, strongly seductive as evidence for Udall's authorship of *Respublica*.

The relevant passage below is spoken by Misericordia, and it occurs in the final scene of *Respublica*, in the context of the trial by the goddess Nemesis of the play's four political vices. 'Ladie Nemesis', Misericordia argues,

now have yee Occasion,
 And matier to shewe youre commiseracion.
 [?It] is m[?uche m]ore glorie [and] standith w[i]th more skylle,
 Lo[?st]e shepe to recover, then the scabye to spill. (l. 1856)

This echo in *Respublica* of the language and sentiment of Udall's preface to the *Paraphrase* is strongly suggestive of single authorship, and yet a closer examination of the politics of this play would seem to argue against its attribution to Udall, for whereas Udall had in the *Paraphrase* expressed optimism in the utility of the English Bible as an instrument of social reform, the author of *Respublica* expresses open contempt for the achievements of Edwardian social policy, in a play that approaches Mary's accession as an act of divine providence, and Mary herself as the instrument ordained by God for the redress of abuses inflicted upon the Edwardian commonwealth. By identifying the play's political vices – Avarice, Insolence, Oppression, and Adulation – with members of the governing elite in Edwardian England, the dramatist has Nemesis decry the policies of Edwardian government, at the same time as this character condemns as crimes against the commonwealth the actions of the four vices on stage. Misericordia may echo Udall's words in the *Paraphrase* when she pleads that Nemesis show mercy to the vices in the hope that they might yet be made obedient subjects of the Crown, but Nemesis herself does not seem to share Udall's belief in the relation between Bible-reading and social reform. Having asserted that the vices shall 'receyve oure mercie or o[ur] Ire, | As the wealthe of Respublica shall best require' (ll. 1876-77), Nemesis goes on to recognise the

makings of 'a worthie subiecte' (l. 1884) in *Adulation* alone, for she commands that Avarice be delivered to an officer who 'hathe Authoritee Iustice to mynister' (l. 1909), and condemns their companion vices for faults 'hainous [and] greate' (l. 1912). Not only does the severity of this condemnation of abuses against the commonwealth damn those Edwardian social policies with which the actions of the vices are associated on stage, it also sounds the death knell for that optimism in the ability of criminals to mend their ways which for Udall stems from trust in the utility of the English Bible as an instrument for social reform. The playwright identifies Mary with that character in the play responsible for meting out justice upon those scabby sheep who stray from 'the streight pathwaie of Christes doctrine'. In so doing, he upholds the English sovereign rather than English scripture as the instrument for the reform and redress of abuses in the commonwealth. May actors and audience 'Ioyne all together to thanke god [and] Reioyce' (l. 48), the speaker of the prologue to the play declares:

That he hath sent Marye o[ur] Soveraigne [and] Quene
to reforme thabuses which hitherto hath been,
And that yls whiche long tyme have reigned vncorrecte
shall nowe foreu[er] bee redressed w[i]th effecte.
She is oure most wise/ [and] most worthie Nemesis
Of whome o[ur] plaie meneth tamende [that] is amysse. (l. 49)

On the one hand, then, we have Udall the editor of the *Paraphrase* and architect of the Utopian vision of an English Israel under the Josiah-like King Edward. On the other, we have Udall the possible author of *Respublica*, a play that expresses contempt for that same Edwardian regime, and which characterises Mary as the divinely-ordained instrument for the redress of abuses 'which long tyme have reigned vncorrecte'. The author of the preface to the *Paraphrase* blamed papists entirely for the 'tumult[es] and scismes' that in the era of the Church Bible under Henry VIII had caused the scripture to be suppressed by act of parliament. Now that lay Bible-reading had been re-established under Edward, Udall writes, it would be but a matter of time before the Bible banishes abuses from the commonwealth. The author of *Respublica* on the other hand accuses the Edwardian government of impoverishing the commonwealth, and he looks, not to the English Bible, but to the avowedly pro-papist Queen Mary for the redress of wrongs committed in the name of the late boy-King.

How do we reconcile the very different sentiments expressed in these texts with the stylistic evidence for their single authorship? Some critics have simply avoided the issue, either by avoiding mention of Udall's earlier work when arguing for his authorship of *Respublica*, or else by avoiding the question of authorship altogether. Pat McCune has approached *Respublica* as an example of the 'Counter-Reformation propaganda [...] written for Mary and performed for her court', but McCune nevertheless attributes its authorship to Udall without offering any reason why this former apologist for Edwardian evangelical reforms should after the death of Edward VI have written a play condemning the abuses of the King's council.¹⁶ Hans-Jürgen Diller is more forthright in his appraisal of *Respublica* as Counter-Reformation propaganda, but he is less forthcoming in his attribution of authorship to the play. *Respublica*, he asserts, is an anonymous 'political-denominational propaganda piece that celebrates, under the schema of a morality play, the Roman Catholic restoration under Mary Tudor'.¹⁷ Unlike McCune and Diller, Howard Norland has at least attempted to engage with the question of why Udall might have written a play so antagonistic to the regime he had previously upheld. Norland notes Udall's evangelical leanings, but he argues for his authorship of the play by playing down the idea that *Respublica* was written 'from a militant Catholic position'.¹⁸ Udall, he asserts, was a temporising Protestant who in this play paid lip service to the new regime, as part of his public relations campaign to curry favour at court.

My own reading of *Respublica* is also alive to the apparent incongruities of attributing to Udall a play that, in its attitude to Edwardian government, differs starkly from the optimism expressed in Udall's preface to the *Paraphrase*. In spite of this, I too intend to uphold Udall as author of the play, but I want to do so without simply dismissing *Respublica*, as does Norland, as being 'part of Udall's campaign to gain favour with Mary's court' (p. 209). The play's criticism of Edwardian social policy, and its contempt for the government of the Edwardian regime, is, I argue, perfectly consistent in tone with the accusations levelled at members of the governing elite in sermons preached at Edward's court by such luminaries of the Edwardian evangelical establishment as Hugh

¹⁶ Pat McCune, 'Order and Justice in Early Tudor Drama', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s., 25 (1994), 171-196 (p. 177).

¹⁷ Hans-Jürgen Diller, 'From Synthesis to Compromise: The Four Daughters of God in Early English Drama', *The Early Drama, Art, and Music Review*, 18 (1996), 88-103 (p. 98).

¹⁸ Howard B. Norland, *Drama in Early Tudor Britain 1485-1558* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), p. 207.

Latimer and Thomas Lever. Latimer used the court pulpit in Lent 1549 and 1550 as a site from which to launch scathing attacks on the covetousness of the leaders assembled before him, and I believe it is in the light of such sermons that the play can best be approached, as an offshoot of what MacCulloch calls the 'genre of criticizing magisterial conduct' at the Edwardian court, rather than of the Counter Reformation culture that by Christmas 1553 had begun to get underway at the court of the conservative Queen Mary.¹⁹

Udall's disillusionment in *Respublica* with the direction of government policy under Edward VI was therefore echoed by other members of the Edwardian evangelical establishment, both before and after the death of Edward, and the downfall of John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland. The contempt that Udall and others expressed for those entrusted with government during Edward's minority does not necessarily compromise their own confessional commitment to the cause of Church reform, but I argue that it does question their belief, so eloquently espoused by Udall in his preface to the *Paraphrase*, in the utility of the English Bible as an instrument for social reform. The likes of Udall and Latimer argued that covetousness plagued the political elite in Edwardian England, and that it had caused them to exploit the commonwealth for their own selfish ends. In so doing, Udall was undermining his own belief, expressed in the *Paraphrase*, that the English Bible would forever banish from the commonwealth the sins of 'blasphemie, periurie, mourdre, theft, whooredome, making of affraies, & other abominacio[n]s' (sig. B5^r). Approached from the perspective of the Edwardian court sermon, *Respublica* can be seen to stage the swansong, not only of Udall's own enthusiasm for the English Bible re-established under Edward, but of that optimism in the establishment in England of a godly readership that had led both Morison and Bale to construct in the character of England an idea of Englishness based upon obedience to the Word of God. Bale's England had spoken on the eve of the era of the Church Bible to express the hope that the Englishness she embodies on stage would soon emerge off-stage, in the consciousness of Bible-readers across the country. *Respublica* raises doubts about whether this godly readership envisioned by Bale's England would ever in fact be established in the realm of England

¹⁹ MacCulloch, p. 436. Much of the Edwardian religious legislation was repealed in autumn 1553. See 'An Acte for the Repeale of certayne Statutes made in the time of the Raigne of Kinge Edwarde the Syxthe' (1 Mary, st.2, c. 2), in *Statutes*, IV.i (1819), 202.

itself, and it does so by enacting God's anathema upon the abuses perpetrated by the leaders of the Edwardian evangelical regime.

* * *

The play opens with the entry of Avarice, who contrives to dissemble as Policy, which 'is of none suspected' and 'ner of any cryme detected' (ll. 83-4). He does so in order to gain opportunity 'to feather [*his*] neste' (l. 88) with the goods of 'our greate graund Ladie mother | Noble dame Respublica' (ll. 91-92). His accomplices – Oppression, Insolence, and Adulation – enter next, and agree that Insolence might 'Rewle all the whole lande' (l. 140) if guided by the 'Counsaile of o[ur] fownder Avaryce' (l. 150), who at this point re-enters complaining that he has 'fownde knaves abowte my howse readye me to Robbe' (l. 158). Avarice already knows about their plans to advance Insolence to high estate, for 'I laie in yo[ur] bosoms', he concedes 'when ye spake the worde' (l. 218). Guided by Avarice, the vices resolve 'dame Respublica tassaille | and so to crepe in to bee of hir Counsaile' (ll. 251-52), and each of them take on a counterfeit identity in order that they might better delude this 'ladie of Estate' (l. 237). Avarice directs that from henceforth Insolence shall be known as Authority, Oppression as Reformation, and Adulation as Honesty, whilst it is in his guise as Policy that Avarice first appears to Respublica, who agrees to put herself wholly into his hands – 'metall, graine, cataill, treasure, good[es] [and] land[es]' (l. 500) – and also to set up Honesty, Authority, and Reformation as rulers. A sixth character – People – then enters on stage, and he does so to petition that Respublica 'lette poore volke ha zome p[ar]te' in the commonwealth (l. 647), for People perceives that there is no dearth of 'corne [and] cattall' (l. 666), and so cannot understand why 'the price of everye thing is zo dere | as thoughe the grounde dyd bring vorth no suche thing no where' (l. 670-71). 'Ill ordering tis, hath made bothe youe and wee threde bare' (l. 675), People explains to Respublica, and he goes on to accuse the vices Adulation, Oppression, and Insolence of crimes against the commonwealth. All three, he continues, are ruled by the vice Avarice, who 'hathe suche a policate wytte, | That he teacheth them to rake and scrape vp eche whytt' (ll. 697-98).

That these vices contrive to steal from the commonwealth is more than adequately illustrated in the next three scenes, where first Avarice enters hauling heavy 'bags of

golde' (l. 751), and then Oppression, boasting about how he has obtained for himself 'so manye haulfe bisshoprikes' (l. 781) through the expropriation of episcopal estates that he now 'maie were myters fowre or fyve' (l. 780). Insolence, who has himself gained 'whole townes [and] castells' (l. 834), is last to enter, and, eyeing the 'bags of money' borne by Avarice (l. 829), he asks that Avarice explain how he has gained so much gold. There follows from Avarice a litany of crimes against the commonwealth, as he identifies the ill-gotten gold in each of his thirteen bags with the abuses of encroachment, usury, perjury, bribes, extortion, smuggling, the selling of benefices, seizing of church plate, and the unlawful enclosure of tenant's farms and common lands. It is unsurprising that Respublica enters thereafter to complain of her impoverished condition, and cast doubt upon the fidelity of those four men in whom she has put her trust. Far from feeling any redress from 'his former sors [and] [...] ruffull distresse' (l. 982), People too is feeling 'wurse [and] wurse' (l. 990). 'Vive or zixe yeare ago', he complains to Avarice, alias Policy, he had kept four cows, but he claims that 'att this p[re]zent houre cham scarce woorth a good cowe taile' (ll. 1021-22).

The scene is set for the entry in the fifth and final act, first of Misericordia, and then of Veritas, Iusticia, and Pax, four 'ladies from heaven' (l. 1924) who embrace each other on stage in fulfilment of Psalm 84.11: 'Misericordia et veritas obuiauuerunt sibi: iusticia & pax osculate sunt' [Mercie and truth haue met each other: iustice and peace haue kissed].²⁰ Veritas reveals how Respublica has 'been abused' (l. 1369) by 'vices to be refused' (l. 1370), and Respublica resolves to oust Avarice and his companion vices from office. Misericordia and the others then fetch for the 'goddesse Nemesis' (l. 1781), that 'mooste highe goddesse of correccion' (l. 1782), who 'hathe powre from godde all practise to repeale | w[hi]ch might bring Annoyaunce to ladie comonweale' (ll. 1786-7). She appears in the final scene, and outrightly condemns Avarice as 'the plague of Comonweales' (l. 1893), who 'muste bee plucked vpp een by the veraie roote' (l. 1895). He is delivered to the head officer to be pressed of his ill-gotten gains 'as men doo presse a sponge' (l. 1903), whilst Insolence and Oppression are incarcerated until 'the tyme maie serve/ texamine [and] trie their cause' (l. 1918). Only Adulation is pardoned, on

²⁰ Vulgate, sig. gg. 6^v; Douai, II, 159. Udall himself uses the text of the Vulgate when citing from Psalm 84.11 in the play. See l. 1284: 'Misericordia et veritas sibi obuiauuerunt', and ll. 1449-50: 'As mercye and trueth sibi obuiaverunt | So Iusticia et pax osculatæ sunt'.

condition that he henceforth practise 'p[er]feicte honestee' (l. 1889). With *Respublica* restored to 'tholde goode eastate' (l. 1922), and left in the capable hands of Misericordia, Veritas, Iusticia, and Pax, the play ends with a prayer that Mary's 'Reigne mooste graciouslye begonne' may for long years endure (l. 1934), and that 'hir Counsaile' also enjoy 'long life [and] healthe' (l. 1936), in order that they may serve their sovereign, and 'mainteine Comonwealthe' (l. 1937).

Like Avarice and his confederates, the political vices in *King Johan* had also seen fit to adopt a more politic guise before proceeding to interdict England and excommunicate its king. When in Bale's play *Usurped Power* dresses as Innocent III and *Private Wealth* as Cardinal Pandulphus, it works to reveal the hypocrisy of the papal Church, whose counterfeit holiness, we are told, merely dissembles its desire for material power and profit. Bale typecasts these characters, not just as political, but as specifically papist vices, and he does so to heap blame upon the Apostolic See, which he claims has suppressed scripture's message of monarchical obedience in order that it might move the estates of England to rise up against King John. In his preface to the *Paraphrase*, Udall likewise blames papists for conspiring to pervert the sense of scripture, and to seduce 'the simple ignoraunt people' to adventure 'a litell blast of sedicion' against Henry VIII (sig. a5^r). Both Bale and Udall identify papists as enemies of the English Bible, and as adversaries of the godly commonwealth that they imply would be established amongst its readers, were the English Bible itself established in churches. The papists on the stage of *King Johan* are presented as the sole cause of sedition and other abuses of commonwealth, because by suppressing Bible-reading, we are told, these papists suppress the very means by which abuses of commonwealth can achieve redress.

What is significant about Avarice and his confederates in *Respublica* is their neutrality of presentation, as political, but not papist vices. Where Udall had earlier on in his career presented papists as the scapegoats for the sins of the English commonwealth, in *Respublica* he constructs vice characters that stand outside this polemical tradition. So sharply delineated were the confessional identities of the vices in *King Johan* that the character England was left with no doubt about their animosity towards John and his pretensions to empire in the English Church. The vices in *Respublica* on the other hand delude the eponymous 'ladie of Estate' precisely because they do not play the papist roles

that within the semiotics of England under the Royal Supremacy would have immediately alerted Respublica to their malicious intentions. It is as Policy that Avarice first appears to Respublica in act II, scene 2, and he exits to fetch Honesty, Authority, and Reformation, leaving Respublica temporarily alone on stage. 'I like well this trade of Administrac[i]on' (l. 525), Respublica concedes to herself:

policie for to devise for my Comoditie
 no p[er]sonne to be advaunced but honestye,
 then Reformation good holsome lawes to make
 And Auctorytie see the same effecte maie take
 what comon weale shall then bee so happie as I? (l. 526)

As lay Bible-reading had held out the promise for Udall of a 'lande of promission', flowing with the knowledge and free exercise of God's most holy Word, so Avarice-as-Policy likewise promises to refashion Respublica as a Utopian commonwealth, wherein 'good holsome lawes' are advanced, and abuses suppressed. In the following scene, Respublica admonishes the vices to destroy Avarice, exile Insolence, and 'vanquishe Oppression and Adulacion' (l. 576). Her admonition is here addressed to the very vices that she exhorts their aliases to destroy, but this goes unnoticed by Respublica, because at this point in the play she has had no reason to distrust the veracity of the Utopian vision that Policy holds up before her and pledges to fulfil. By promising this Utopia to Respublica, the vices exploit her optimism in the belief that 'good governemente' of a commonwealth may 'att ons recover all' (l. 460), and the play goes on to stage the betrayal by the vices of that confidence which Respublica had initially placed within them. As its author, Udall uses this narrative of optimism abused to express his own disillusionment with the Edwardian regime that he had once so enthusiastically compared to the land of Canaan under a Josiah-like king. Not only is the timescale of the action in the play concomitant with the six-year duration of Edward's reign. Avarice and his companions are themselves identifiable with members of the Edwardian political elite, and their actions with the direction of Edwardian social policy under Seymour's protectorate and Dudley's Privy Council alike. Udall refused to typecast his vices in the papist roles familiar to audiences of *King Johan* because he intended to create for them an entirely different confessional guise – as those governors of the Edwardian commonwealth who by re-establishing lay Bible-reading in 1547 had shown themselves committed to the cause of evangelical reform, but who by their subsequent actions, the

play asserts, had revealed themselves to be vices dressed up as virtues, avarice dissembling as good policy. After Iusticia and her sisters in the play have restored Respublica to her former health, and revealed Avarice and his companions to be vices 'cloked [...] with a vertuous name' (l. 1378), Respublica goes on to ask People about whether or not he has himself found any financial redress. 'All beginneth now to come gailie well to passe' (l. 1596), he replies:

And Istanke god chawe in my purse a zilver grote.
I wis iche cowlde not zo zai these zixe yeares afore.
who ever cawsed yt, ill thanke have they therefore. (l. 1600)

Up until the intervention of these four 'ladies from heaven', People claims that he has not had a silver groat in his purse these past six years. As we have seen, the play's prologue invites parallels between this act of divine intervention and the accession of Queen Mary by identifying Mary with the actions of the goddess Nemesis on stage. This fact combines with the obvious parallel between the period of People's impoverishment and the duration of Edward's regime to imply that, as author, Udall intended his audience to identify the action of acts I-IV of the play with the six years of Edward's minority, and to associate the intervention of Misericordia at the start of the fifth act with the accession of Queen Mary in July 1553.

The fact that it was a silver groat in particular that People claims to have been unable to pocket these past six years might also imply a more specific allusion to the social policies of the Edwardian regime. Seymour's protectorate had found in successive debasements of the coinage so convenient a means to fund its wars in France and Scotland, that by the time the Treaty of Boulogne brought both wars to an end in March 1550, the groat then current contained only half as much silver as it had when introduced under a new stamp, in a proclamation dated 16 May 1544.²¹ The groat had under Henry VIII been valued at 4*d.*, but a proclamation dated 30 April 1551 announced that it would be devalued to 3*d.* from the end of August that year. This proclamation explains that Henry had devised in 1544 'to abace, and diminishe the goodnes of the Coyne' to support his war with Scotland, and how he had that year coined a groat of reduced silver content at

²¹*TRP*, no. 228. The relation between Seymour's fiscal and foreign policies is discussed in M. L. Bush, *The Government Policy of Protector Somerset* (London: Arnold, 1975), pp. 41-42.

a value commensurate with its fineness. Edward was minded to reform the coinage in order to reduce inflation, the proclamation continues, but he cannot begin to do so until the 'grotes coyned both by his maiesty, and by the king his father' be 'rated at a value, more nere vnto the goodnes and finenes of thesame, then now they be rated at'.²² By reducing its value from 4*d.* to 3*d.*, the proclamation implies that the silver content of the groat was in 1551 three quarters what it had been in 1544. However a second proclamation, dated 16 August 1551, claims to be more accurate in its assessment of the goodness of the groat at that time. This contains provision for 'the speedy reducing of the said coin more near his just fineness' than the devaluation of the groat from 4*d.* to 3*d.* would have otherwise allowed, and it announces that, with immediate effect, the groat be valued at 2*d.*²³ The fact that this proclamation finds it necessary to reduce the original value of the groat from 4*d.* to 2*d.* implies that its actual silver content had also by the early 1550s been reduced by as much as half what it had been when the new groat was introduced in 1544. Even if People had earned enough under the Edwardian regime to pocket a 'zilver grote', therefore, it would have been questionable whether 'silver' was quite the right adjective to describe the constitution of this coin. In the final scene of act IV, Oppression alludes to these proclamations for the reform of the coinage as an example of one of the beneficial acts that he claims he and his companion vices have devised for the good of the commonwealth. 'The coigne eke is chaunged', he protests. 'Yea from zillver to drosse' (l. 1075), People retorts:

(twas tolde vs) vor the beste: but poore wee bare the losse.
 whan chad w[i]th zwette of browes got vp a fewe smale crumes
 att paiing of my debt[es] ich coulde not make my sommes.
 my landlorde vor my corne/ paide me zuche sommes [and] zuche
 whan he should hate vor rent, yt was but haulfe zo muche.
 zix pence in eche shilling was I strike quite awaie
 zo vor one piece iche tooke, chawas vaine to paie him twaie. (l. 1076)

The wording of the proclamation of 16 August 1551 had emphasised that Edward was devaluing the coin out of esteem for 'the honor and estimation of the realm and the wealth and commodity of his highness' most loving subjects'. Disregarding 'the great

²² *A proclamation set furthe by the Kynges Maiesty, with the aduise of his most honorable priuey counsayll, for the valuacion of the Shillinges and grotes to a meaner and lower value and rate* ([London]: Richard Grafton, 1551; STC 7836; TRP, no. 372), fol. 1^r.

²³ TRP, no. 379, pp. 529-530 (p. 530).

profit which by the baseness of the coin did and should continually have grown unto his majesty', Edward and his council insisted that they were undertaking this coinage reform, not for their own financial benefit, but in order to help 'the poorer sort' (p. 530), who more than anyone else in society were feeling the 'intolerable burden' of prices that had lately 'increased and waxen more excessive, to the great hindrance of the commonwealth' (p. 529). Oppression likewise attempts to present the 'change', or reform of the coinage as a purely altruistic act on the part of himself and his companion vices. In his response, People accepts that this fiscal policy had been claimed as being 'vor the beste', but he asserts that its attempt to rectify the abasement of the coinage 'from zilver to drosse' had in fact left the poor more destitute than ever. People explains that he had sold his crop of corn before the date of the devaluation of the groat from 4*d.* to 2*d.*, and that he had received for it sufficient money to pay his rent to the landlord. His rent had not been demanded until after the date of devaluation, however, so that when People had gone to pay it, he had found that his profit was worth only half as much as it had been before. A full six pence had been shaved off the market value of every shilling, he asserts, and so for every shilling that his landlord had paid him for his corn, he had had to pay back to the same landlord the equivalent of two shillings in rent.

By identifying the actions of Oppression and his companions with the direction of fiscal policy under the Edwardian regime, the play invites us to identify the vice characters themselves with those members of the Edwardian ruling elite responsible for debasing and devaluing the coinage. No secret is made in the play of exactly which members of government are being held accountable for the policy decisions that People so condemns. As author, Udall associates the vice Avarice in particular with the two most powerful members of the Edwardian regime – the King's uncle, Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset and Lord Protector until ousted from office in the coup of October 1549, and John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and leader of the coup against Seymour, who by the end of November 1549 had himself assumed power over the Privy Council, and who was created Duke of Northumberland in October 1551. In act V, scene 4 of the play, Respublica confronts Avarice about his crimes against the commonwealth, and announces her determination to see him and his companions cast out of office. In his response, Avarice expresses sorrow that he will not now have opportunity to accomplish the 'wonderous

feat[es]' that he had had planned for Respublica (l. 1552). 'Youe shoulde have seen, how I woulde have youe compacte', he boasts to her (l. 1545).

I woulde have browght haulfe kent into Northumberlande
[and] Somersett shiere should have raught to Cumberlande,
Than woulde I have stretched the countie of warwicke
vppon tainter hook[es], [and] made ytt reache to Barwicke. (l. 1547)

Avarice here alludes to his planned enlargement of the very counties – Northumberland, Somerset, and Warwick – associated with the titles possessed by Seymour and Dudley. The implication is that these two leading figures of Edwardian government were just as motivated by avarice and self-interest when in office as were the characters of Avarice and his companions in the play.²⁴ Writing at the time of Seymour's protectorate, and for a courtly audience that included Edward and his uncle, Hugh Latimer had also accused Seymour of avarice. His court sermon of Friday 8 March 1549 took pains to single out the Protector's policy on coinage debasement for particular condemnation. 'We haue nowe a prety litle shillyng', preached Latimer. 'I haue but on I thynke in my pursse, and the laste daye I had put it awaye almoste for an olde grote, and so I truste sume wyll take them'.²⁵ The shilling was valued at 12*d.*, and had been introduced less than two months earlier on 24 January 1549 to replace the teston, a coin also valued at 12*d.*, and originally issued at the same time as the groat back in May 1544.²⁶ It had been withdrawn due to problems with counterfeiting on 10 April 1548.²⁷ By confusing the shilling with the groat, Latimer questions whether the new coin contains sufficient silver to warrant its current market value, implying that at 4*d.* the value of the groat may in fact be a more accurate approximation of what the metal in the new shilling is actually worth. 'The fynes of the siluer I can not se', he contends, 'but therein is prynted a fyne sentence: that is. *Timor domini fons Vite vel sapientie*. The feare of the Lorde is the fountayne of lyfe or Wysdome' (sig. C5^v). Latimer wishes that this sentence were always imprinted in the hearts of the King and his councillors. In truth, he argues, the debasement of the coinage is but one example of how the covetousness of the ruling

²⁴ See Walker, *Politics of Performance*, p. 184.

²⁵ *The fyrste Sermon of Mayster Hughe Latimer, whiche he preached before the Kynges Maiest. wythin his graces palayce at Westmynster M.D.XLIX. the viii. of Marche* (London: John Day and William Seres, 1549; STC 15272), sig. C5^v.

²⁶ See TRP, nos. 321 and 227.

²⁷ TRP, no. 302.

classes has caused market prices to rise so excessively 'that poore menne [...] can not wyth the swete of their face haue a liuinge, all kinde of viteles is so deare' (sig. D3^v). It is covetousness that has prompted some landlords to raise rents out of all proportion with inflation, Latimer contends, and covetousness also that has motivated others to enclose common land, evict tenant farmers, and cause ground used for growing grain to be converted into parks and pasture for the rearing of deer, sheep, and other animals. If 'it is [the] kinges honour that the commen welth be auansed', Latimer reasons,

then these grasiers, and inclosers, rentrearers, are hindrers of the kinges honour. For where as haue bene a great meany of householders and inhabitaunce, ther is nowe but a shepherd and his dogge, so thei hynder the kinges honour most of al. (sigs. D4^{r-v})

Latimer's words here echo the wording of a proclamation issued 1 June 1548, announcing Edward's appointment, 'by thaduse of his moste entierly beloued vncler, the Duke of Somerset', of a commission to investigate all who unlawfully 'hath made Enclosures and Pastures, of that whiche was arable ground', or who have 'let any House, Tenement, or Mese decaye, and fall doune'. Notwithstanding that Henry VII and Henry VIII had in 'diuerse and sundery lawes and actes of Parliaments' attempted to stem this decay of houses and husbandry, the proclamation asserts that many people in England have nevertheless of late 'been driuen to extreme pouertie', and that they have been 'compelled to leaue the places where thei were borne, and to seke [...] liuynges in other countreis'. So great, indeed, is this impoverishment of people and places that in some parts of the realm, where 'C. or CC. christian people' have hitherto 'kept houshold', there is now 'nothyng kepte, but shepe or bullockes'. 'All that lande', the proclamation continues,

is now gotten, by insaciablen gredines of mynde, into one or twoo mennes handes, and scarsely dwelled vpon with one poore Shephard: So that the realme thereby, is brought to a meruelous desolacion, houses decayed, parishes diminished [...] and Christian people by the gredy coueteousnes of some men, eaten vp and deuoured of brute beastes, and driuen from their houses by Shepe and Bullockes.²⁸

²⁸ *A Proclamacion, set furthe by the Kynges Maiestie, with thassent and consent of his moste dere Uncle Edwarde Duke of Somerset, Gouvernor of his moste royall persone, and of his dominions and Subiectes Protector, and others of his highnes priuie counsaill, against enclosures, lettynge of houses to decaie, and vnlawfull conuertynge of arable ground to pastures, the first daie of Iune in*

Somerset had no doubt shifted uncomfortably in his seat at court when Latimer had scrutinised the silver content of his new shilling, and implied that, just as covetousness was responsible for rent rises, enclosures, and the conversion of arable land into pasture, so too had this eagerness to debase the coinage proceeded from avarice and self-interest on the part of the Protector. Seymour was certainly to blame for the debasement of the coinage, but he surely had reason enough to believe himself excluded from Latimer's condemnation of 'grasiers, and inclosers, rentrearers'. Latimer's comments in March 1549 on the decay of husbandry had after all echoed the wording of the proclamation issued the previous June, announcing an inquiry into abuses of enclosure – an inquiry that Somerset had according to the proclamation expressly advised Edward to instigate, and which minded to take the poor man's part in his battle with 'the gredy coueteousnes of some men'. The commission's role, the proclamation of 1 June 1548 had asserted, was to enforce those 'diuerse and sundery lawes and actes' that had hitherto sought to stem the decay of husbandry (fol. 1^r), and to this end the proclamation encouraged that subjects 'geue informacion [...] to the kynges Maiesties Commissioners' on anyone who 'contrary to thesaied Actes and Godly ordinaunces, hath made Enclosures and Pastures, of that whiche was arable ground' (fol. 1^v). For all its high-flown rhetoric, however, the enclosure commission of June 1548 failed to redress any of the agrarian abuses identified in the proclamation. Since the commission was only ever carried out in the Midlands, it was unable to produce the sort of national survey of agrarian abuses that the proclamation had so enthusiastically called for, and although evidence was gathered against offenders in the Midlands, not one of the landlords there indicted was formally charged with crimes against the commonwealth. Seymour had done nothing to instigate the other regional commissions, despite the fact that John Hales, the chief commissioner, had expressly advised him to do so in July 1548.²⁹ Latimer knew of Seymour's negligence in this respect, and he used his Lenten sermon of 8 March 1549 to point out to the Protector that words alone were insufficient a weapon with which to redress what had been done to the commonwealth by the covetousness of some landlords. 'But let the

the second of his maiesties moste gracious reigne (London: Richard Grafton, [1548]; STC 7816; TRP, no. 309), fols. 1^{r-v}.

²⁹ See Bush, p. 45.

preacher preach til his tong be worne to the stompes, nothing is amended', Latimer observed.

We haue good statutes made for the co[m]me[n] welth, as touching comeners, enclosers, many metinges and Sessions, but in the end of the matter, their co[m]meth nothing forth. Wel, well, thys is one thyng I wyll saye vnto you, from whence it commeth I knowe, euen from the deuell. (sig. D6')

Like People in the play, Latimer had seen fit to condemn the Protector's debasements of the coinage as detrimental to the common good. His words evidently went unheeded by Somerset, however, for it was almost two years after the collapse of the protectorate in October 1549 when the Privy Council eventually proceeded with plans for coinage reform. Latimer's indictment of the lip service paid by Seymour to the problems caused by unlawful enclosures and emparkments had by contrast an almost immediate effect upon the Protector's social conscience. Latimer spoke these words exhorting the Protector to take proper action against abusers of enclosure on 8 March, and Somerset duly issued a second proclamation denouncing enclosure a little over a month later, on 11 April 1549. In so doing, this proclamation claims to respond to the findings of the 1548 enclosure commission, which, it alleges, had reported widespread agrarian abuses to the King's council. The proclamation reminds subjects that enclosure offences had been excluded from the general pardon passed by Edward's first parliament in December 1547 (1 Edw. VI, c. 15), but that the King had up until now abstained from prosecuting perpetrators, 'not that thereby they should be animated to do evil still, and to hurt the King's majesty's realm, people, and commonwealth', the proclamation is at pains to point out, but in the hope that 'men so gently thereunto provoked should obediently again follow so noble, godly, and wholesome laws'. The allegations of the enclosure commission had nevertheless provoked the King to abandon this course of clemency, to 'put in ure all the said penal laws heretofore made for the repressing of such offenses', and 'to see them executed against all such as shall be found culpable, without pardon or remission'.³⁰

The proclamation of 11 April 1549 had ordered the King's officers, and all 'to whom by statute or otherwise the redress or repressing of such offenses may appertain' (p.

³⁰ *TRP*, no. 327, pp. 451-53 (p. 453).

453), to inquire into and indict those landlords guilty of enclosing, emparking, or of otherwise converting from tillage to pasture any land hitherto owned by the commons or leased to tenants. Exactly who had been empowered by this proclamation to redress and repress enclosure offences proved a matter of some contention, however, so much so that Somerset felt compelled to clarify the meaning of the April proclamation in a further proclamation issued on 23 May 1549. This alleged that the April proclamation had only intended to give warning 'to the offenders to redress and amend their offenses in that behalf before a certain day'. However, it explained, it has since come to the attention of King and council that

certain numbers of disobedient and sedicious persones, assemblyng theimselfes together vnlawfully, in some partes of the realme, haue moste arrogantly and disloyally vnder pretence of thesaied Proclamacio[n], taken vpon them his Maiesties auctoritie, presumed to plucke his highnes sworde, out of his hande, and so gone about to chastice and correct whom thei haue thought good: in pluckyng doune Pales, Hedges, and Ditches, at their will and pleasure, contrary to their dueties of allegeaunce, and to the daunger of his maiestie, and al other his highnes good and louyng subiectes.³¹

In March 1549, Latimer had condemned the Protector for his reluctance to redress agrarian abuses. Now in May it was the turn of Somerset himself to condemn those who presumed to pluck down pales, hedges, and ditches at their pleasure, clean contrary to the spirit of the proclamation of 11 April. The King, Somerset assures readers of his proclamation of 23 May 1549, would at a time convenient proceed to redress agrarian abuses 'accordyng to his maiesties lawes and statutes'. First and foremost, however, Edward must address the 'riottes' and 'vnlawful asse[m]bles' being carried out by those who presumed to take his law into their own hands. These must be suppressed at all costs, the proclamation continued, and 'thesaied sedicious and leude persones, staied, corrected, and punished' (fol. 1^r).

A letter of 11 June from Seymour to the Leicestershire noblemen Henry Grey and Francis Hastings gives some indication of just how widespread were the enclosure

³¹ *A Proclamacion, set furth by the Kynges Maiestie, with thassent of his derest vncler, Edward Duke of Somerset Gouvernor of his moste royall persone, and of his realmes, dominions and subiectes Protector, and others of his moste honorable counsaill, for the repressyng of certain Sedicious and Disobedient persones* (London: Richard Grafton, 1549; STC 7820; TRP, no. 333), fol 1^r.

assemblies condemned in the proclamation of 23 May. Somerset admits that 'in most parts lewd men have attempted to assemble', and he urges his addressees to 'be ready with the Leicestershire gentleman to repress any attempts in the beginning'. His letter is endorsed three times with the words 'Haste, for life', and it advises that Grey and Hastings 'have the enclosure proclamation published by the sheriff' of Leicestershire, Sir Ambrose Cave, in the hope that this might silence 'evil rumours', and so discourage the commons of Leicestershire from 'seeking redress of enclosures' by means of riot and rebellion.³² Wriothsley chronicles riots in Somerset, Lincolnshire, Bristol, 'and diuers other shires' during the month of May, and this is in part corroborated by Seymour's letter of 15 May to the Sheriff and justices of Hampshire, which alludes to attempts made by 'sondry light folke of the counties of som[er]set and willshire' to 'stire in great c[o]mpanies vpon p[re]tence of lib[er]tie by proclamac[i]o[n]s against enclosures'.³³ The county of Surrey remained 'in a quavering quiet', Henry Fitz Alan, Earl of Arundel, wrote from Guildford on 29 June, but early July saw a spate of uprisings across the home counties in Essex, Kent, Hampshire, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, and Buckinghamshire.³⁴ Rebels at Wymondham in Norfolk began to break down enclosures on 8 July, and the following day they had encamped at Mousehold Heath outside Norwich, where they remained until routed at Dussin's Dale on 27 August, by a royal army under the command of the Earl of Warwick. By 14 July, three other rebel camps had been established elsewhere in East Anglia, at Downham Market, Ipswich, and Bury St Edmunds.³⁵ 'The revolt of the peasants has increased and spread', the Imperial ambassador in England François Van der Delft noted in his letter to Charles V dated 19 July 1549.

³² *CSP Edward VI*, no. 273 (p. 110).

³³ Charles Wriothsley, *A Chronicle of England During the Reign of the Tudors, from AD 1485-1559*, ed. by William D. Hamilton, 2 vols, Camden Society Publications, n.s., 11, 20 (Westminster: Camden Society, 1875-77), II, 13. *Letters of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: From the Archives of Southampton*, ed. by R. C. Anderson (Southampton: Southampton Record Society, 1921), no. 34 (p. 66).

³⁴ *CSP Edward VI*, no. 292 (p. 117). For the uprisings in the South-East, see John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, 2 vols in 4 parts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822), II.i, 260-61. For those in the south Midlands, see *CSP Edward VI*, nos. 301 and 306, and also *Troubles Connected with the Prayer Book of 1549*, ed. by Nicholas Pocock, Camden Society Publications, n.s., 37 (Westminster: Camden Society, 1884), nos. 14 and 15.

³⁵ For the timing of the East Anglia risings, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Kett's Rebellion in Context', in *Rebellion, Popular Protest and the Social Order in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paul Slack (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 39-62 (pp. 42-43). The battle at Dussin's Dale is described in Frederic William Russell, *Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk* (London: Longman, 1859), pp. 143-49.

So that now they have risen in every part of England, asking for things both just and unjust: that they may enjoy the land that used to be public property once, that all victuals shall be sold at reasonable prices, and that the land hired out to them on leases shall be considered to be of the same value now as in the time of King Henry VII. [...] In Kent and Essex the risings had subsided because victuals had been taxed at a reasonable price, and the King's proclamation to that effect printed and posted up, with a pardon for past offences; but they have risen again now [...] and they seem more dangerous than before.³⁶

The rebels, writes Van der Delft, demand an end to unlawful enclosures, to unreasonably high prices, and to rent rises out of all proportion with inflation, and it is noticeable that all three of these complaints found echo in Latimer's first Lenten sermon of 8 March 1549. Latimer had at that time contended that the growth in inflation was directly attributable to the covetousness of the ruling classes, for he argued that falling crop yields had forced up food prices, but that man, not God, was responsible for these 'monstrous and portentous darthis'. 'God doeth sende vs plentifullye the fruites of the earth', Latimer asserts, but landlords who raise rents and convert arable land to pasture 'causeth suche dearth', he insists, that 'all kinde of viteles is so deare' (sig. D3^r). Rent rises and unlawful enclosures forced tenants off arable land, forcing up food prices by causing crop yields to fall. Latimer had in March blamed the covetousness of the ruling classes for the agrarian abuses that had increased food prices, and when the commons rose up to demand redress some months later in May 1549, it is perhaps not surprising that some at court, whilst condemning the rebellion, were at least prepared to concede that the rebels had cause for complaint. Indeed, Van der Delft wrote to Charles V on 13 June, whisperers at court were alleging that the Protector himself was prepared to accede to the rebels' requests, for he had reportedly

declared to the Council as his opinion, that the peasant's demands were fair and just; for the poor people who had no land to graze their cattle ought to retain the commons and the lands that had always been public property, and the noble and the rich ought not to seize and add them to their parks and possessions.³⁷

One might have reason to question the credibility of the hearsay that Van der Delft picked up at court, but other evidence would seem to confirm the fact that a clear shift in Somerset's attitude towards the enclosure rioters occurred around mid-June. On 14

³⁶ *CSP (Spanish)*, IX (1912), 405.

³⁷ *CSP (Spanish)*, IX (1912), 395.

June 1549, the day after Van der Delft wrote to the Emperor, Somerset issued a proclamation pardoning all who 'of their awne hed and authoritie' had 'assembled theimselfes, plucked doune mennes Hedges, disparked their Parkes', and generally taken into their own hands 'the Kynges royall power and sworde' for the redress of agrarian abuses.³⁸ The proclamation of a pardon does not in itself imply Somerset's sympathy with the cause of rebellion – Bush writes that royal pardons were in Tudor England 'the traditional means of bringing the peasantry to order' – but the Protector is certainly more magnanimous towards the rebels in this particular pardon, the first of three issued over the forthcoming month, than he had been in his proclamation against the enclosure rioters of 23 May.³⁹ The May proclamation had condemned the rioters as 'disobedient and sedicious persones', who 'vnder pretence' of the April proclamation against unlawful enclosure had 'presumed to plucke his highnes sworde, out of his hande'. By June, however, the bulk of the rebels were being dismissed as merely 'rude and ignoraunt people', their riots excused as 'doone, rather of foly and of mistakyng thesaid Proclamacion [...] then of malice or any euill will' borne towards 'his highnes or to the quiet of this realme' (fol. 1').

If by the middle of June Somerset was no longer condemning the riots as acts of treason, by early July he had begun to concede to the rioters' demands, instructing John Hales, the chief commissioner of the 1548 enclosure commission, to resume his inquiry into agrarian abuses in the Midlands.⁴⁰ Commissioners for other regions in England also appear to have been appointed at this time. The Essex gentlemen Sir Thomas Darcy and Sir John Gates certainly received the set of instructions that Somerset circulated to commissioners on 8 July, for a letter from them dated two days later confirmed that they had 'perused the commission and instructions to us and others concerning decay of houses and husbandry, enclosures, parks and other articles'.⁴¹ With these instructions, Somerset circulated a letter urging commissioners to make haste with their inquiries. It also admonished 'those of you who are within any of the cases to be reformed' to 'begin with

³⁸ *A Proclamacion, set furth by the kynges Maiestie, with thassent of his derest vncler, Edward Duke of Somerset, Gouernor of his moste royall person, and of his Realmes, Dominions and Subiectes Protector, and others of his moste honorable Counsaill, concernyng certain Riotes and vnlawfull assembles, for the breakyng vp of Enclosures* (London: Richard Grafton, [1549]; STC 7822; TRP, no. 334), fol. 1^r.

³⁹ Bush, p. 87. Other pardons were issued on 12 and 16 July 1549 (TRP, nos. 340 and 341).

⁴⁰ See Bush, p. 46.

⁴¹ For the instructions issued to enclosure commissioners, see *CSP Edward VI*, no. 307. For Darcy and Gates's letter to William Cecil, see *CSP Edward VI*, no. 321 (pp. 125-26).

reformation of yourselves, as an example'.⁴² With peasants across the country presuming to pluck down hedges and pull down parks in the name of agrarian reform, Somerset no longer needed Latimer to preach to him against unlawful enclosures, and condemn him for his own failure in 1548 to establish a country-wide commission for the redress of abuses. Now in July 1549, Somerset attempted to appease the rioters by reviving the commission which had been disbanded the previous summer. In directing the commissioners to reform unlawful enclosures of their own, he even showed willingness to concede to Latimer that it was indeed the ruling classes who were to blame for those agrarian abuses that the commons now sought with violence to redress. It was in order to reform 'vnlawfull enclosures, and suche like enormities' that the King had of late 'directed his seuerall Commissions with large instructions for thesame into euery his cou[n]ties', Somerset confirmed in a further proclamation of 16 July 1549. This proclamation explained that the appointed commissioners had not only been given power 'to redresse and reforme al maner of thynges so farfurth as the lawes, could any wise be construed or expounded', but that they had moreover been charged 'to redresse & ame[n]de their owne proper faultes' before proceeding to inquire into the abuses of others. The commissioners were now ready to begin their work for the common good, the proclamation asserts, and were 'delayed onely by the folly of the people, seking their owne redresse vnlawfully'. What more, it asks, could a subject require of his prince, than that which 'by his Maiestie his sayd vncl & counsail hath been deuised, ordered and co[m]maunded'?⁴³

Somerset does not condone rebellion, but neither does he dismiss the cause for which the rebels claim to fight. By directing the commissioners to amend unlawful enclosures of their own, Somerset is at pains to point out to the rebels that the new enclosure commission is no piecemeal concession to their demands for agrarian reform, but rather a comprehensive indictment of the very abuses that they were themselves attempting with violence to amend. It is not the injustice of unlawful enclosures that is in question, Somerset asserts, but the lawfulness of the means by which the rebels seek redress, and this concern to condemn the act, but not the cause of rebellion was also

⁴² CSP (Edward VI), no. 308 (p. 125).

⁴³ *A proclamacion, set furth by the kynges Maiestye, with thassent of his derest vncl Edward duke of Somerset, Gouvernour of his most royall persone, and of his realmes, dominions and subiectes Protector, and others of his most honorable Counsayle, for the executyng of a lawe Martiall for payne of death against rebellors and their vpstyrrors* (London: Richard Grafton, [1549]; STC 7827; TRP, no. 341), fol. 1^r.

uppermost in the mind of Archbishop Cranmer, when on Sunday 21 July 1549 he delivered a sermon against the enclosure riots at St Paul's.⁴⁴ After Cranmer had celebrated communion in the cathedral, his chaplain, John Joseph, went outside to preach part of the same sermon to the people gathered at Paul's Cross.⁴⁵ In his sermon, Cranmer identifies sin as the cause of all the commotions that have lately 'so troubled, so vexed, so tossed and deformed' the English commonwealth (p. 190). The 'scourge of sedition', he argues, is the rod with which God has chosen to chastise us for the 'perjury, blasphemy, and adultery, slandering and lying, gluttony and drunkenness' that has for far too long gone unpunished in England (p. 191). God sends his 'grievous scourge' to punish the sins of the people, Cranmer asserts, but he argues that the governors are also at fault for being 'too remiss in punishing offenders' (p. 191). Cranmer contends that 'we have offended God both high and low', and he points out that one sin common to governor and governed alike is the sin of covetousness, for it is covetousness that has led landlords to join 'land to land, and inclosures to inclosures', and covetousness also that has caused the people 'wronged and oppressed' by unlawful enclosures to muster themselves 'in unlawful assemblies and tumults', and 'spoil and rob and take from others' (p. 192). Cranmer concedes that 'the gentlemen have done the commons great wrong, and things must needs be redressed', but he contends that it is also wrong for the commons to have taken the law into their own hands, and with violence attempted 'to redress one injury with another' (p. 193). 'Is it the office of subjects, to take upon them the reformation of the commonwealth?', Cranmer asks his audience. 'To whom hath God given the ordering and reformation of realms? To kings or to subjects?' (p. 193). Covetousness is crime enough, he contends, but sedition is to be condemned above all, and by plucking down hedges in the name of reform, these 'unlawful assemblers' (p. 196) have earned for themselves greater indignation in the eyes of God and the King than have those landlords, who for their own profit go about to enclose common land:

But let us now compare these two destructions of the commonweal together, the covetous men, which (as they say) do inclose and possess unjustly the commons, and these mutineers, which rashly and without all reason will be both the hearers, judgers, and reformers of their own causes [...]. Which of these two is the greater

⁴⁴ The sermon is reproduced in *The Works of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556*, ed. by John Edmund Cox, 2 vols, Parker Society Publications, 12, 24 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844-46), II, 190-202. All references are to this edition.

⁴⁵ See *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, II, 17-18.

injury? [...] Foolishness is not healed by madness, theft is not amended with spoil and [*sic*] ravine; neither is the commonwealth stayed or made strong by the breach of laws, orders, and states. (p. 196)

Like Somerset, Cranmer condemns the act of rebellion, but not the cause for which these rioters had taken up arms against the King. Neither ruler nor rebel is innocent in the eyes of God, Cranmer asserts, for whilst the covetousness of the former had given the commons just cause for redress, the commons combine avarice with sedition when with 'spoil and robbery' they seek amends outside the law (p. 194). Cranmer may have been willing here to implicate the covetousness of the ruling classes in the enclosure riots, but he singled out a much more familiar scapegoat when assigning blame for that other popular uprising of summer 1549, the so-called Prayer Book Rebellion. This had been instigated back in early June by parishioners of the Devonshire village of Sampford Courtenay, who had objected to the introduction on Whitsunday (9 June 1549) of the reformed liturgy prescribed in the first English Book of Common Prayer. What had begun as rearguard action against Edwardian religious innovation would over the following weeks come to threaten the stability of the Edwardian regime itself, as traditionalists throughout Devon and Cornwall joined forces with the villagers of Sampford to march on Exeter, laying siege to the city on 2 July, where they remained until forced to retreat five weeks later by government troops under Lord Russell's leadership.⁴⁶ It was during the first week of this siege of Exeter that the rebels drew up and dispatched their demands to the King.⁴⁷ A copy of fifteen demands was printed with a letter written by a Devonshire loyalist, and dateable on internal evidence to around 16 July 1549.⁴⁸ All but two of these

⁴⁶ For discussion, see MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, pp. 429-31. According to Wriothesley, Russell finally routed the West Country rebels at Exeter on 5 August 1549. See *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, II, 20. Correspondence between Russell and the Privy Council at the time of the rebellion is reproduced in Pocock, *Troubles*, nos. 6-7, 10, 14-20, 22-23, and 25-39.

⁴⁷ Edward's answer to the demands of the West Country rebels is assigned a conjectural date of 8 July 1549 in *CSP (Edward VI)*, no. 302.

⁴⁸ *A Copie of a Letter contayning certayne newes, & the Articles or requestes of the Deuonshyre & Cornyshe rebelles* (London: [John Day and William Seres], 1549; STC 15109.3). All references are to the signature numbers of this edition. The letter must have been written at some point after the proclamation of 16 July 1549, ordering that martial law be used against future rioters (*TRP*, no. 341). The writer of the letter argues that 'if the martiall law were executed [...] there wolde be as fewe runners abrode, as now there be many', and he has heard rumour that 'there is a Proclamation for thesame (which I haue not yet sene, but by youre nexte letters trust to receiue)' (sig. B2^v). An earlier proclamation for the execution of martial law was issued on 14 June 1549 (*TRP*, no. 334), but it is more likely that the writer is here referring to the proclamation of 16 July, since allusions elsewhere in his letter to the fact that the rebels 'lye stil nere Exceter' (sig. A8^r) imply that the letter was composed after the beginning of the siege of Exeter on 2 July 1549.

articles demand that the protectorate reinstate those traditional religious beliefs and practices that since Edward's accession had been rescinded in the name of evangelical reform. The first article demands observation of 'all the general counsell & holy decrees of our for[e] fathers' (sig. B6^r), the second and third restoration of the Act of Six Articles and Latin mass, and the fourth that the host be reserved 'as it was wount to be', in the pyx above the altar in church (sig. B6^v). The fifth and sixth articles concern ministration of the Eucharist and of baptism, the seventh and ninth demand reinstatement of images and prayers for the dead, whilst the eighth and tenth require that the protectorate rescind the English Bible and English Book of Common Prayer. The three other religious articles demand that the King grant livings to traditionalist priests, that he pardon Cardinal Pole and promote him to the Privy Council, and, finally, that he re-establish religious houses and endowments across England.

Although concurrent with the outbreak of enclosure riots elsewhere in England during summer 1549, contemporary observers were careful to distinguish the aim of these uprisings from the predominantly religious nature of the demands being made by the rebels at Exeter. 'The moneth of Julie', Wriothesley wrote in his *Chronicle*, witnessed 'ensurrections against enclosures' by 'the commons of Essex and Kent, Sufforke and Norfolke'. He noted that 'the Devonshire men and Cornish men' had also 'made insurrections' that month, but that where the enclosure rioters had sought the redress of agrarian abuses, the rebels who had 'camped about the citie of Exceter' had minded instead 'to mayntayne the masse and other ceremonies of the Popes law'.⁴⁹ The acceptance of this distinction between the aims of the two uprisings can be seen to have influenced the government's attitude towards the enclosure rioters on the one hand, and the West Country rebels on the other, for whilst government spokesmen like Cranmer had imputed blame to the ruling classes for the abuses which the enclosure rioters had sought to amend, he held the more familiar scapegoat of the papist priest entirely responsible for the cause of the Prayer Book Rebellion. In his surviving notes for the address he delivered against enclosure assemblies at St Paul's, Cranmer has in his own hand penned certain observations upon the subject of rebellion, apparently to serve as an aide-mémoire in the composition of the sermon itself.⁵⁰ Many of the commonplaces recorded in the notes

⁴⁹ Wriothesley's *Chronicle*, II, 15.

⁵⁰ These notes are reproduced in the *Works of Thomas Cranmer*, II, 188-189.

reappear in the structure of the final sermon – for example, that ‘civil war is the greatest scourge that can be, and most certain argument of God’s indignation against us’ – but one contention to occur in the notes, but not in the address itself, concerns the origins of the enclosure assemblies. ‘And these tumults’, Cranmer proposed to argue, ‘first were excited by the papists and others which came from western camp, to the intent, that by sowing division among ourselves we should not be able to impeach them’ (p. 189).

When Cranmer came to compose his sermon against rebellion, he evidently thought better of imputing the cause of the enclosure assemblies to those same papist priests whom he here makes culpable for the Prayer Book Rebellion, and his sermon is as we have seen concerned instead to blame covetous landlords for the agrarian abuses that the enclosure rioters had sought to amend. This distribution of responsibility for the two uprisings of summer 1549, with the cause of the enclosure assemblies imputed to covetous landlords, the cause of the Western Rebellion to papist priests, is more developed in the letter that was printed with the Exeter articles of July 1549.⁵¹ Its writer had at first presumed that the ‘vprores of the Deuonshyremen’ proceeded from the same ‘wyldenes’ and ‘ignorance’ that had instigated the enclosure assemblies elsewhere in England, and that the West Country rebels might have been ‘tamed wyth authoryte, and reformed wyth instruction’, as he hears ‘hath wel happened of al the disquiet assemblyes, in the other partes of the Realme’. ‘But the matters of Deuonshyre nowe shewes furthe the rotes of treason’, he continues, ‘the buddes of rebellion, and the fructe of fylthye poperye’ (sig. A2^v). The devil himself, he contends, has ‘taughte the Priestes and theyr Captaynes’ at Exeter ‘to cal the people together to defende theyr olde fayth’ (sig. A3^r), and the writer observes how these same priests had also at first tried to deceive those who ‘gathered them selues together in other partes of the Realme, for pluckyng downe enlosures, & enlargyng of comme[n]s’ (sig. A4^r). ‘The Kentysh Essex, Suffolke, and speciallye Hampshire’ men, however, had

vtterly dyffyed and abhorred the Deuonshyreme[n], protestyng euen in theyr moste disorder, that they wolde spende theyr lyues agai[n]st all suche rancke rebelles traytours & papistes. (sig. A4^v)

⁵¹ *A Copye of a Letter contayning certayne newes* (STC 15109.3).

The writer of this letter is, like Cranmer, concerned to differentiate the cause of the Prayer Book Rebellion from the concerns shared by rioters elsewhere in England in 1549. The West Country rebels, he asserted, were papists and traitors who sought to overthrow 'the kynges holsome doctrine' by demanding that Edward restore the religion of their forefathers (sig. B2^v). The enclosure rioters, on the other hand, had been 'people forgetfull, not obstynate traytours by construccyon of Law' (sig. B2^f). Their requests 'could not reasonable be reiected' by the King, the writer asserts, because they had but sought the 'reformation of diuers abuses in the comu[n]e wealth', not 'the bri[n]ging in of the Romish aucthoryte agaynst the kyng, & hys Royall Croune' (sig. B1^f). Cranmer had in his sermon blamed the covetousness of the ruling classes, not papists, for the abuses that had caused the enclosure riots of 1549, and in this letter it is secular rather than religious grievances that are attributed to the rioters themselves. These rioters had assembled unlawfully to pluck down hedges, the writer of this letter admits, but they had done so, not to oppose government policy, as had those rank rebels and papists at Exeter, but rather to implement the agrarian reforms to which the government had shown itself committed in its April proclamation against unlawful enclosures.

It is with these enclosure rioters, rather than with the rebels assembled at Exeter, that the character People in *Respublica* can be identified. As the enclosure assemblies had sought to redress agrarian abuses caused by avarice in the ruling classes, so People's criticism of Avarice and his companion vices on stage is aimed, not at the Edwardian religious reforms to which the West Country rebels had so objected, but at the unlawful enclosures for which Avarice and his companions are in the play made responsible. In his court sermon of 8 March 1549, Latimer had blamed enclosure of arable land for the then excessive rate of inflation in England. The covetousness of landlords 'causeth suche dearth', he had asserted, that 'all kinde of viteles is so deare' (sig. D3^f). It is to the vice Avarice that unlawful enclosures are likewise imputed in the play. Avarice enters in act III, scene 4 bearing thirteen bags of gold, and, asked by his companion vices how he came by so much wealth, he boasts that 'this thirteenth' bag was 'filled throughe facing owte of dawes | bothe from landes and goodes by pretence of the lawes' (ll. 879-880). Avarice here claims to have bullied 'dawes', or simple folk, off their lands, but his actions have not gone unnoticed by People, who himself represents the 'ignoram people' (l. 665) so impoverished by these unlawful enclosures. In act IV, scene 4, immediately after accusing

Oppression of abasing coins 'from zilver to drosse' (l. 1075), People turns to the subject of agrarian abuses. The same landlords who had demanded that People pay rents amounting to double the price he had received for his corn have according to People also increased food prices by enclosing arable land. 'Their great grazing hath made fleshe so dere I wotte', People complains to Respublica, 'that poore volke att shambles cannot bestowe their grotte' (ll. 1097-98).

In the only sermon he preached at Westminster in Lent 1550, Latimer agreed with what Cranmer had asserted the previous summer in his sermon at St Paul's against the enclosure assemblies of 1549. Covetous landlords had that summer given the commons just cause for complaint, Latimer conceded, but this did not condone the actions of rioters who by stealing from their landlords had sought to redress the agrarian abuses for which these landlords were culpable. 'The Commons thought they had a right to the thynges that they inordinately sought to haue', Latimer contended:

But what then, they must not come to it that way. Nowe on the other side the gentlemen had a desyre to kepe that they had, and so they rebelled to agaynste the kynges commaundeme[n]t, and agaynst such good order as he and hys council woulde haue set in the realm. And thus both parties had couetousnes, and bothe parties dyd rebell.⁵²

The play also blames both landlords and tenants for the enclosure assemblies of 1549, rebuking landlords for the agrarian abuses that had incited the rebellion, but condemning tenants for the crime of rebellion itself. Udall has Avarice boast to his companion vices about the money he has made from unlawful enclosures, and he does so in order to implicate avarice in the actions of landlords whose 'great grazing', People later complains to Respublica, has made the price of 'fleshe so dere'. As parallels between the actions of Avarice on stage and the direction of fiscal policy in Edwardian England had implied condemnation of Seymour's abasements of the coinage, so the play's identification of Avarice with the unlawful enclosures committed by People's unscrupulous landlord on stage similarly condemns those landlords off stage who had impoverished Edward's people by enclosing arable land. Whilst the play is therefore

⁵² *A Moste faithfull Sermo[n] preached before the Kynges most excellent Maiestye, and hys most honorable Councell, in hys Courte at Westminster, by the reuerend Father Master Hughe Latimer* ([London]: [John Day], 1550; STC 15289), sig. B5^v.

concerned to make Avarice party to the agrarian abuses committed by landlords both on and off stage, it is careful also to condemn the riots and assemblies with which the commons had sought redress in summer 1549. After Nemesis has in the final scene of the play ordered that Avarice make restitution for his ill-gotten gains, she commands that People 'take this felowe' (l. 1902),

That he maie bee pressed, as men doo presse a spounge
that he maie droppe ought teverye man hys lotte,
to the ytmooste ferthing that he hath falslie gotte. (l. 1903)

People volunteers to himself 'squease hym as drie as A kyxe' (l. 1906), but Nemesis is quick to curb this reforming zeal. 'Naie', she commands him, 'thowe shalte deliver hym to the hedd Officer | which hath the Authoritee Justice to mynister' (ll. 1908-09). Cranmer had in his sermon against enclosure assemblies condemned rebels, who with robbery and riot sought to make themselves 'the hearers, judgers, and reformers of their own causes' (p. 196), and Nemesis too admonishes People to put away his sword and be content to see wrongs redressed by an officer of the law. Like Cranmer, the play condemns the vigilantism of the enclosure riots, but it too concedes that the rioters had just cause for complaint. When Peace confronts Avarice in the play's penultimate scene, he assures her that 'wee have been long in peace' (l. 1688). 'Cale ye it peace', she rejoins,

whan brother [and] brother,
cannot bee content to live one by an other,
whan one for his howse, for his lande, yea for his grote
is readie to strive, [and] plucke owte an others throte? (l. 1689)

Peace does not condemn Avarice for the riots themselves, but she implies that it was the abuses for which Avarice is condemned in the play that had provoked brother to fight brother, in a battle for house, land, and goat. By identifying the cause of this civil strife with Avarice – the avarice that had led landlords to enclose arable lands, and caused Seymour to debase the goat – Peace implies identification between this battle for land and livelihood, and the enclosure assemblies of 1549. It was likewise to remedy the damage done to houses and husbandry by the unlawful enclosure of arable and common lands that the commons had risen in 1549 to pull down pales and hedges. Of the twenty-nine articles drawn up at the rebel encampment outside Norwich at Mousehold Heath,

over half concerned the redress of unlawful enclosures and other agrarian abuses.⁵³ The third article, for example, demanded 'that no lord of no mannor shall comon upon the Comons' (p. 48), the fifth that rents for 'Redeground and medowe grounde' be 'at suche price as they wer in the first yere of Kyng henry the vijth' (p. 49). In the play, Peace makes no mention to Avarice of the religious grievances that had on the other hand so exercised the West Country rebels, and neither did the Mousehold rebels request that Edward revoke the English Bible and Prayer Book, as did the rebels who assembled at Exeter. Where the Mousehold Articles do mention religion, it is to encourage further evangelical reforms, not, as had been the case at Exeter, to demand a return to traditional religious beliefs and practices. The eighth Mousehold article, for example, petitions 'that [prests] or vicars' who 'be [not able] to preche and sett forth the woorde of god to hys parisheners' be 'putt from hys benyfice' (p. 49). Whether this complaint is directed at ill-educated or absentee incumbents is unclear, but in either case it can be seen to echo the government's own concern in the 1547 *Inivncions* to redress the problem of pluralism and ignorance in the clergy, for the fourteenth injunction had penalised absent incumbents by demanding that they give forty per cent of their livings to the poor of the parish, whilst the twentieth had directed all incumbents under the degree of Bachelor of Divinity to 'diligently studye' the English New Testament and *Paraphrase* of Erasmus (sig. B4^v).

Like the civil violence to which Peace alludes in the play, the enclosure assemblies of 1549 had sought redress for the agrarian and economic grievances caused by unlawful enclosures and coinage abasement. 'There is no mention of religion made among them', François Van der Delft informed the Emperor on 19 July 1549, 'except in Cornwall and Norfolk, where they are in greater numbers'.⁵⁴ The West Country rebels had demanded that Edward revoke the English Bible and Prayer Book, but when the Mousehold rebels mention religious grievances, their aim is to accelerate rather than decrease the pace of evangelical reform. In the play, People acts as spokesman for those 'ignorant people' who according to Peace have been striving to safeguard house, land, and groat, and whilst much of People's complaints to Avarice and his companion vices concern the abuses of enclosure and coinage abasement, People also airs religious

⁵³ The Mousehold articles are reproduced in Russell, *Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk*, pp. 48-56. All references are to this edition.

⁵⁴ *CSP (Spanish)*, IX (1912), 405.

grievances that echo the tone of the Mousehold articles, insofar as they question the Edwardian government's commitment to the cause of evangelical reform, rather than condemning these evangelical reforms themselves. When in act IV, scene 4 Oppression boasts that the 'coigne eke is chaunged' (l. 1075), it is not the only beneficial act which he alleges for himself and his companions that is met with derision by People. Asked by Respublica earlier on in this scene to explain the benefits he has brought to the commonwealth whilst in government, Oppression begins with the trump card of clerical reform. 'Firste youre priestes [and] bisshops have not as thei have had' (l. 1069), he claims. Throughout the 1540s and early 1550s, the government had systematically deprived bishops of their most lucrative episcopal estates, in a series of enforced 'exchanges' for ex-monastic property acquired in the Dissolution that were designed to profit secular leaders at the expense of their spiritual counterparts.⁵⁵ In his sermon of 8 March 1549, Latimer was quick to point out to courtiers that covetousness was behind these expropriations of episcopal estates, as it was also to blame for the unlawful enclosure of arable and common land. 'We of the cleargy had to much', Latimer conceded, 'but that is taken away, and nowe we haue to litle' (sig. D4^v). Latimer agrees that bishops were once too wealthy, but he attributes the extremity of the recent episcopal expropriations to the covetousness of council members rather than to their zealotry for clerical reform. 'It is the kynges honour [...] that all hys prelates and Cleargie be set about their worke in preaching & studieng, and not to be interrupted from their charge' (sigs. D3^v-4^r), Latimer asserts, and yet he knows of one incumbent whose income has been so reduced 'that of this pension he is not able to bie him bokes, nor geue hys neighbour dryncke, al the great gaine goeth another way' (sig. D5^r). 'Suche procedynges' are according to Latimer 'agaynste the Kynges honoure', and this is because they 'do intend plainly, to make the yoma[n]ry slauery, and the Cleargye shauery' (sig. D4^r). 'Grasiers, and inclosers' are 'hindrers of the kings honour' (sig. D4^r), Latimer argues, and so too are those secular rulers who seek to profit from 'these appropriacions', these 'greate reformacions' of the clergy (sig. D5^r).

As Latimer had denounced the excesses of clerical reform, so in the play both Respublica and People react with derision to the news that Oppression has been depriving

⁵⁵ For discussion, see Walker, *Politics of Performance*, pp. 181-82.

the clergy of their former wealth. To Oppression's boast that 'priestes [and] bisshops have not as thei have had' (l. 1069), Respublica rejoins,

[?whan they] had their lyving[es] men were bothe fedde and cladde.
 OPPRESSION yea, but they ought not by scripture to be calde lord[es].
 RESPUBLICA That thei rewle the churche w[i]th scripture well accord[es].
 OPPRESSION Thei were prowde and covetous/ [and] tooke muche vppon them.
 PEOPLE: but they were not covetous that tooke all from them. (l. 1070)

Oppression here claims scriptural authority for his expropriation of episcopal land, and whilst Respublica and People concede that bishops should 'rewle the churche w[i]th scripture', both contend that Oppression's enthusiasm for episcopal reform has merely redressed one injury with another, insofar as it has replaced the covetousness of the clergy with the avarice of secular leaders. Respublica and People do not condemn the idea of making the Bible the basis for clerical reform, but they do question the extent of Oppression's own commitment to the evangelical cause, and their comments can in this respect be seen to mirror the tone of the religious grievances expressed at Mousehold, and anticipated some months earlier in Latimer's Lenten sermon of 8 March 1549. The rebels at Mousehold may have criticised the Edwardian Church, but they did so in order to accelerate the government's programme of evangelical reforms. This sympathy with the evangelical agenda of the Edwardian protectorate was also noted amongst enclosure rioters elsewhere in England outside of Devon and Cornwall. Cranmer used this fact in his sermon at St Paul's to attempt to shame the rioters into submission, by claiming that their actions threatened the future of the reformed English Church to which both ruler and rioter had pledged themselves committed. 'Doth it [...] become the lower sort of the people to flock together against their heads and rulers?', he asks. Sedition, always abhorrent, is

specially now at this time in the king's majesty's tender age, when we be round about environed with other enemies; outward with Scots and Frenchmen, and among ourselves with subtle papists, who have persuaded the simple and ignorant Devonshire men, under pretence and colour of religion, to withstand all godly reformation. Shall we now destroy our realm, and make it a prey to our adversaries? [...] What joy is this to the bishop of Rome, to hear that the blood of Englishmen (for the which he hath so long thirsted) is now like to be shed by their own brethren and countrymen! (p. 193)

It is the 'subtle papists' gathered at Exeter who seek to 'withstand all godly reformation', Cranmer asserts, not the lower sort of people who had assembled elsewhere in the country to pluck down hedges in the name of agrarian reform, or demand that incumbents unable to preach God's Word be deprived of their benefice. In his sermon, Cranmer acknowledges that the enclosure rioters claim to share his own commitment to godly reformation, but he asserts that their recent acts of rebellion have caused him to question the strength of the beliefs that they outwardly confess. 'There be many among these unlawful assemblies that pretend knowledge of the gospel, and will needs be called gospellers', he writes, 'but if they will be true gospellers, let them be obedient, meek, patient in adversity and long-suffering, and in no wise rebel against the laws and magistrates' (p. 195). The covetousness of landlords has given the commons just cause for complaint, Cranmer concedes, but they are hypocrites who, pretending knowledge of the gospel, themselves go about to commit covetousness and sedition with robbery and riot in the name of agrarian reform. 'The gospel of God now set forth to the whole realm [...] sustaineth much injury and reproach' by those rioters who claim to 'have received the same, and [*who*] would be counted to be great favourers thereof', Cranmer laments.

For the great number of them, pretending a zeal thereto in their lips, and not in their hearts, counterfeiting godliness in name, but not in deed, live after their own pleasure, like epicures, and so ungodly as though there were no God. (p. 197)

This hypocrisy, or counterfeit godliness, is not only apparent amongst the 'lower sort' who gather in God's name to redress unlawful enclosures with unlawful rebellion. Cranmer admits in his sermon that 'we have offended God both high and low' (p. 192), for he asserts that it was the covetousness of landlords who had enclosed common land which had caused the commons to seek amends in acts of robbery and riot. The enclosure assemblies, he argued, was how God had chosen to punish the English commonwealth for the sins of rulers and rebels alike, and it was the sin of hypocrisy, of counterfeit godliness, for which both rebel and ruler were culpable. 'All these seditions and troubles, which we now suffer', he asserts, constitute 'the very plague of God', with which God intends to punish us 'for the rejecting or ungodly abusing of his most holy word, and to provoke and entice every man to true and fruitful repentance and to receive the gospel', not 'feignedly and faintly as many have done', Cranmer concedes, but 'with all humbleness and

reverence' (p. 199). For 'the word of God', he writes, 'if it be godly received, and with all the heart embraced', is 'most comfortable, of most efficacy, strength and virtue'. But

if it be trodden under foot, rejected, and despised, or craftily under the cloke of dissimulation and hypocrisy received, it is a compendious and a short way unto destruction, it is an instrument whereby the punishment and displeasure of God is both augmented and also more speedily and sooner brought upon us, as we have most justly deserved. (pp. 198-99)

Most Englishmen nowadays profess piety, writes Cranmer, but 'this christian profession' is for the majority but a cloak of dissimulation that belies their 'unchristian living' (p. 191). The English Bible is now under Edward 'every where set abroad' (p. 199), but its commands that Englishmen obey the King and love their neighbour are almost everywhere ignored. It is hypocrisy that has provoked God to send this epidemic of enclosure riots as punishment for our sins, Cranmer informs his congregation at St Paul's, but England can 'appease God's wrath', he contends, if as a nation we effect a 'true and godly repentance' (p. 200) for our 'great looseness of living' (p. 201), our great contempt for God's Word. Referring to the Word, Cranmer asked his congregation at St Paul's 'why [...] we with words approve it [...] repute and take it as a thing most true, wholesome, and godly, and in our living clearly reject it?' (p. 198). Cranmer had preached his sermon against enclosure assemblies in July 1549, two years to the month after the publication in the *Sermons* of his homily on Bible-reading. In this earlier homily, Cranmer had enjoined churchgoers to read the Bible, and in their lives to rehearse what was written therein. Two years later, Cranmer had been forced to acknowledge the minimal impact that Bible-reading had actually had on people's lives. The sermon against enclosure assemblies is an indictment upon the hypocrisy of English Bible-readers rather than upon the utility of the English Bible itself, but implicit within Cranmer's barrage of condemnations and calls for repentance is the tacit admission that scripture had not proved so useful a tool for social reform as he had in 1547 hoped it might. 'Herin maye princes learne howe to gouerne their subiectes', Cranmer had written in his preface to the 1540 Great Bible. 'Subiectes obedie[n]ce, loue & dreade to their princes' (sig. †2^r). The Great Bible had again been established in churches by July 1549, but with rioters across England seeking unlawful redress for unlawful enclosures, it was clear that neither ruler nor rebel could at that time have claimed to live by its precepts.

Cranmer condemns the hypocrisy of those counterfeit gospellers whose cloak of dissimulation belies a 'greedy desire and, as it were, worshipping of riches', and he contends that both 'the high and low sort' of people have been blinded by covetousness, the landowners by enclosing land unlawfully, the commons by stealing from landlords in the name of agrarian reform (p. 192). The same indictment can be extended to the actions of the vice characters in *Respublica*. Cranmer had accused the ruling classes of concealing covetousness under a cloak of godliness, and it is because they too dissemble their impiety with a 'counterfaite gravitee' (l. 418) that Avarice and his companion vices achieve political advancement by the hands of 'ladie Respublica' in the play (l. 614). Avarice advises that his companions wear 'other garment[es]' (l. 417), and he himself resolves to 'tourne my gowne in [and] owte' (l. 420), so that 'theise gaping purses maie in no wyse be seen' (l. 421). The guise that the vices adopt in the play is, moreover, that of the counterfeit godliness so condemned by Cranmer in his sermon. Oppression pleads scriptural precedent when his episcopal expropriations come under attack from People and Respublica, and Avarice in particular is in the play identifiable with Edward Seymour, who as protector had led the godly reformation during the first two years of Edward's reign, but who despite this pious exterior was condemned by Latimer for his fiscal policies, and for his failure to censure unlawful enclosures through the enclosure commission of 1548.

Seymour's inactivity over the summer of 1548 had according to Latimer allowed covetousness to destroy English agrarian life, and it was the destructiveness of unlawful enclosures that had caused the commons to revolt in summer 1549. The play identifies People with the peasants involved in the enclosure assemblies, and whilst we as audience are asked to sympathise with People's impoverishment at the hands of Avarice and his companion vices, we also hear an echo of Cranmer's condemnation of rebellion in Nemesis's admonition at the end of the play that People put down the sword of justice and deliver Avarice to 'the hedd Officer | which hath the Authoritee Iustice to mynister' (ll. 1908-09). Like Cranmer, Udall condemns the act of rebellion rather than the cause for which the enclosure rioters had sought redress. The play censures the counterfeit godliness of the ruling vices, but it only withholds censure from People on the proviso that he desist from the sort of vigilantism that Cranmer had denounced in his sermon against the enclosure rioters. It was with this plague of assemblies that God, according to Cranmer,

had chosen to punish hypocrisy in England. ‘And shall God’s judgement leave them unpunished’, Cranmer asks of his audience, ‘which always having in their mouth “the gospel, the gospel” [...] live after the world, the flesh, and the devil?’ (p. 197). Cranmer had ended his sermon with a call that both ruler and rebel repent their sins and receive the gospel, not feignedly and faintly as they had done in the past, but thankfully and with all humility and reverence. Writing to condemn the covetousness of the ruling classes prior to the outbreak of the enclosure assemblies themselves, Latimer had also warned those who assembled to hear his court sermon of 8 March 1549 that God would soon send a plague to punish their counterfeit godliness, and to redress their abuse of the English commonwealth. Latimer urges that the ruling classes repent before God visits this plague upon us, but the plague he envisions is not the epidemic of enclosure assemblies that some months later would form the subject of Cranmer’s sermon at St Paul’s, but the death of Edward and the accession of his sisters Mary and Elizabeth. ‘Oh what a plage were it, that a strange kyng of a strange land, and of a strange religion shulde rayne ouer vs’, Latimer asserts:

Where nowe we be gouerned in the true religion, he shuld extirpe and pluke away all to gether, and then plante again all abomynacion, and popery, God kepe suche a kyng from vs. Well the kynges grace hath systers, my Ladye Mary, and my Lady Elyzabeth, which by successio[n] and course are inheritours to the crowne. Who yf she shulde mary with a straunger, what shoulde ensue God knoweth. But god grau[n]t they neuer come vnto curssyng nor succedyng. Therefore to auoyd this plage, let vs amende oure lyues and put awaye al pryde [...], all coueteousnes where in the maiestates and riche men of this realme are ouerwhelmed. (sigs. B7^r-8^v)

Latimer foresaw Mary’s accession as God’s punishment for the covetousness of the Edwardian ruling classes, and it is as a divine punishment for the crimes committed by Avarice and his companions in the play that Mary’s accession is likewise presented on the stage of *Respublica*. Mary is identified in the prologue with the goddess Nemesis, who, we are told, ‘hathe powre from godde all practise to repeale | w[hi]ch might bring Annoyance to ladie comonweale’ (ll. 1786-87). She descends in the final scene to condemn Avarice as the ‘plague of Comonweales’ (l. 1893), which ‘muste bee plucked vpp een bye the veraie roote’ (l. 1895), and upon her departure she admonishes that *Respublica* give thanks ‘to godde and yo[ur] Sovereigne w[hi]ch doo youe thus relieve’ (l. 1929). The play ends by celebrating the new Queen’s accession, but as it is Nemesis, not

Mary, who appears on stage, so it is Mary the arbiter of God's will, not Mary the Catholic queen, who is here being upheld. People's criticism of Avarice and his companions throughout *Respublica* has been seen to echo the censure that the Edwardian protectorate received in Latimer's court sermons of 1549 and 1550, and it is Latimer's vision of the divine punishment which threatens to befall the Edwardian evangelical leadership that is here enacted in the final scene of the play. Latimer was not the only reformist to have prophesied that the vices of the Edwardian evangelical leadership would be punished by God, nor was Udall the only evangelical in 1553 to have upheld Mary as an instrument of the divine will in this respect. In his court sermon of 9 March 1550, Thomas Lever praises the King and council assembled before him for their attempt to reform the English Church, but he warns that they take heed when 'chasyng the wyld fox of papisticall supersticion, that the grede wolfe of couetous ambicion, do not creepe in at your backes'.⁵⁶ Amongst the ruling classes, he asserts, are some that be 'sheppeheardes in dede', and some others that 'haue shepe skynnes, and be raueninge wolues'. 'The one taketh paynes in doying of hys dutye', Lever quips, 'and the other seketh gaynes in professyng of hys duty' (sig. B7^v). Many of those assembled before him have secretly profited from the 'landes of Abbeys, Coliges and Chauntries', Lever contends, although they had openly pretended that 'the King should be enryched, learnynge mayntayned, pouertye relieued, and the co[m]mune wealthe eased' with the spoils of the Dissolution (sig. C8^r). These hypocrites are wolves clothed in 'shepe skynnes' (sig. E7^r), Lever asserts, and he urges that the Privy Council 'pulle the shepes skynnes ouer the wolfes eares, and hang theyr carcasses vpon the pales' (sig. E7^v). Should they fail, he warns, 'God wyll not longe suffer you to be [the] hedshepherds, & gouernours, & feders of hys la[m]bes', but 'wyll plucke you downe wyth some sodein mischiefe, rather then mainteine or suffer you in so hygh authoritye' (sigs. E7^v-8^r).

It was to the likes of Latimer and Lever that the putative 'Poore Pratte' was perhaps referring when he wrote to his friend Gilbard Potter in July 1553. 'For we haue had manye Prophetes & true preachers', Pratte notes,

⁵⁶ *A Sermon preached the thyrd Sondaye in Lente before the Kynges Maiestie, and his honorable Counsell, by Thomas Leauer* (London: John Day, 1550; STC 15548), sigs. A5^{r-v}.

whiche did declare vnto vs, [that] oure kinge shalbe taken awaye from vs, & a tirant shal reygne, the Gospel shal be plucked awaye, the right heyre shalbe dispossessed, & al for our vnthanckfulnes, & thinkest thou not (Gilbard) [the] world is now come? Yea truely. And what shal folow yf we repente not in tymes. The same God wil take fro[m] vs the vertuouse Lady Mary oure lawfull quene, & send such a cruel Pharao as the ragged beare, to rule vs, which shal pul & pol vs, spoyle vs, & vtterly destroy vs, & bring vs in great calamities and miseries. And this god will send vs, & all for our iniquities.⁵⁷

The copie of a pistel or letter sent to Gilbard Potter was printed on 1 August 1553, a week after John Dudley and his supporters had been brought to the Tower of London to await trial for high treason. Potter, a London drawer, had achieved notoriety in the short reign of Jane Grey when imprisoned ‘for words speaking at time of the proclamation of lady Iane’.⁵⁸ Pratte had apparently written the letter to comfort his friend in prison, and to support his standpoint upon the subject of the accession. ‘Rather then [...] consente to their false & trayterouse proclamation for Jane’ (sigs. A3^{r-v}), Pratte writes, Potter had ‘in the proclamation tyme’ (sig. A2^v) chosen to risk death ‘then to denye our vertuouse Mary to be quene’ (sig. A3^v). According to Stow, Potter had received public punishment for his offence on 11 July 1553, the day after Jane had been proclaimed Queen in London. Both his ears had been nailed to the pillory in Cheapside, and then ‘cleane cut off’ in the presence of one of the London sheriffs (p. 1031). The City authorities had evidently decided to make an example of the unfortunate Potter in order to deter others from voicing their own objections to the accession of the Lady Jane, for according to Pratte, his friend Potter had not been the only Londoner to have questioned the lawfulness of Jane’s pretensions to the throne. ‘Ther were thousandes more then thy selfe’, Pratte assures his friend, ‘yet durst they not (suche is [the] fragility & weakenes of the flesh) once moue their lippes to speake [that], whiche thou did speake’ (sig. A2^v).

Both the printer and the putative author of this letter were evangelicals who had evidently felt able to reconcile their sympathies for Mary’s claims to the throne with their support for the beliefs and practices of the Edwardian Church. Hugh Singleton was known as a reformist printer, and ‘Poore Pratte’ makes his own evangelical sympathies clear in

⁵⁷ ‘Poore Pratte’, *The copie of a pistel or letter sent to Gilbard Potter in the tyme when he was in prison, for speakinge on our most true quenes part the Lady Mary before he had his eares cut of* (London: Hugh Singleton, 1553; STC 20188), sigs. A4^v-5^r.

⁵⁸ John Stow, *The annales of England* (London: Ralfe Newbery, 1592; STC 23334), p. 1031. All references are to this edition.

the above quotation, when he alludes to the ‘true preachers’ who had prophesied that Edward would die and the Gospel ‘be plucked away’ as punishment for the sins of the English commonwealth. ‘For truely’, Pratte asserts, ‘god is displeased w[ith] vs many wayes’ (sig. A5^r). Edward’s death was a sign of God’s displeasure, he contends, and he feels sure that Mary is ‘more sorowful for [the] death of king Edwarde her brother, then she is glad [that] she is quene’ (sig. A5^v). The worst fears of Latimer, Lever, and other ‘true preachers’ at the Edwardian court have now been realised, Pratte argues, but worse is yet to come ‘yf we repente not in tymes’. As our collective sins have conspired to cause Edward’s death, so Pratte asserts that these same sins now threaten to dispossess ‘oure lawfull quene’ Mary – for in her place, he writes, ‘the great deuell Dudley ruleth, Duke I shuld haue sayde’ (sig. A7^v). Pratte condemns the ‘ragged beare’ – a reference to Dudley’s device as earl of Warwick – for his efforts to have Jane proclaimed queen, but he also concedes that Dudley, like Mary, is but an instrument for God’s judgment upon the sins of the English commonwealth. Englishmen, he argues, should follow in the footsteps of the Ninivites, who appeased God’s wrath by heeding Jonah’s call to repentance.⁵⁹ They ‘clothed them selues in sackcloth, caste duste vpon their heades, repe[n]ted, & bewailed their manifold sinnes and offences’, Pratte writes. ‘So shulde we now not cease praying to God to send vs quietnes, & that the lady Mary might enioye [the] kingdo[m]’ (sig. A4^v).

Both Latimer and Lever had forecast the collapse of the Edwardian regime as punishment for the sins of the Edwardian evangelical community. It was as the fulfilment of these prophecies that ‘Poore Pratte’ approached the accession crisis of July 1553, and it is as an act of divine providence that Mary’s accession is likewise presented on the stage of Udall’s *Respublica*. As Nemesis, ‘the mooste high goddesse of correccion’ (l. 1782), Mary descends in the final scene to condemn the vices of the Edwardian government, just as Latimer had in his sermons censured the sins of Edward Seymour, and Poore Pratte those of ‘the great deuell Dudley’. Like Poore Pratte, Udall was an evangelical, and, like Cranmer, he had at the beginning of Edward’s reign expressed optimism about the utility of the English Bible as an instrument for social reform. In his 1547 sermon on Bible-reading, Cranmer had exhorted churchgoers to learn, print in memory, and effectually exercise ‘those thinges in the scripture that be plaine to vnderstande’ (sig. B4^r). By the time he preached at St. Paul’s in July 1549, he had been forced to concede that England

⁵⁹ Jonah 3.

was full of counterfeit gossellers, who 'with words approve' the Bible message, but who in their 'living clearly reject it' (p. 198). *Respublica* is also an indictment upon the hypocrisy of the Edwardian evangelical community, and its concern to depict Seymour's protectorate in particular as Avarice dressed as Policy, vice cloaked with a virtuous name, echoes the censures that Seymour received, not only from evangelical preachers like Latimer and Lever at court, but also from the ordinary evangelical people who had risen in the summer of 1549 to redress the damage that avarice had inflicted upon English agrarian life. In his preface to the English *Paraphrase*, Udall had upheld Edward as the king whom God had appointed 'to sette vs Englishe me[n] in the lande of Canaan whiche is the syncere knowelage and the free exercise of Goddes moste holy woorde' (sig. a6^v). It is only counterfeit gossellers who inhabit the landscape of Udall's *Respublica*, however, and in the final scene of the play their hypocrisy receives the sort of divine punishment that Latimer and Lever had forewarned.

* * *

It was in response to the traditionalist backlash of the Lincolnshire Uprising and Pilgrimage of Grace that the character England first emerged in the royalist pamphlets of Richard Morison. In Morison's *Lamentation*, England demands that the Lincolnshire rebels acknowledge the lawfulness of the Royal Supremacy, and in Bale's *King Johan* she again argues that it is to the kings of England, not the bishops of Rome, that God has granted the headship of the English Church. Bale's England, like the England in Morison's *Remedy*, bases her support for Henry's imperialist pretensions upon the authority of the English Bible. In the A-text of *King Johan*, she looks forward to the establishment amongst readers of the Great Bible of an Englishness based upon obedience to the scriptural precepts that command obedience to kings.

The action of Udall's *Respublica* takes place after the accession of Edward VI, in the era of the Church Bible which Edward had licensed for use by the laity in his *Inivncions* of July 1547. England is absent from this play because her conventional role as spokeswoman for the Royal Supremacy had in effect been superseded by the availability of the English Bible in Edwardian England. In *King Johan*, England had contended that the character Commonalty was blind to the lawfulness of the Royal

Supremacy because of his ignorance in the Word of God. England had had to compel Commonalty to obey King John, because without access to the English Bible, Commonalty was unable to read those scriptural precepts that commanded his obedience to the King. With the Bible under Edward VI again established in parish churches across the country, the character England could in *Respublica* give way to an English national consciousness that was predicated on obedience to scriptural precepts. This indeed was 'the lande of promission' flowing with 'the free exercise of Goddes moste holy woorde' that Udall had envisioned in his preface to the English *Paraphrase*. In *Respublica*, however, Udall concedes that this vision of the English Israel had failed to materialise amongst Bible-readers in Edwardian England. It was papists whom both Morison and Bale had held accountable for political unrest in England, papists who according to Bale had been responsible for suppressing the English Bible and its commands that subjects submit to the Crown. In *Respublica*, Udall is careful instead to characterise Avarice and his companions as counterfeit gospellers, and to identify People with the evangelicals who in 1549 rose up to redress agrarian abuses – rather than with the papists who that same year had assembled at Exeter to command a return to traditional religious beliefs and practices. *Respublica* is, like *King Johan*, a play peopled with vice characters and their victims, and yet, unlike *King Johan*, it is a play where both vice and victim profess knowledge of the gospel. In condemning the hypocrisy of Avarice and his companions, Udall echoes the censure that counterfeit gospellers had received in sermons at the Edwardian court, and his play enacts the sort of divine punishment that the likes of Latimer and Lever had forecast for these wolves in sheep's clothes, these vices cloaked with virtuous names. For evangelicals like Latimer and Udall, Mary's accession represented God's anathema upon the hypocrisy of English evangelicals, upon their failure to realise the English Israel flowing with the free exercise of God's most holy Word, to exercise the sort of piety and obedience that scripture commanded of them, but which they in their lives rejected and with words alone upheld. Mary had renounced her pretensions to empire in the English Church by Christmas 1553. In his 'Christmas device' for that year, Udall is just as dismissive about the prospect of establishing in England a nation of Bible-readers, obedient to God and the Crown.

Conclusion

This thesis has sought to contest the assumptions of the social historians Foucault, Anderson, Gellner, and Habermas, all of whom date the origins of nationhood in Western Europe to the eighteenth century, and argue that nationhood superseded empire at this time. These social historians approach the eighteenth century as a period of cultural and political revolution. They argue that this century witnessed the dusk of empire and the dawn of democratic government, and they assert that this new political mindset was accompanied by new ways of imagining community. They write that democracies emerged to take the place of the old imperial, or monarchical systems of government, and that the citizens of these new nation-states no longer defined themselves in relation to an emperor-king, but in relation to each other – to their collective sense of themselves, not as subjects of a king, but as citizens of a nation.

For these social historians, the imagined communities of empire are antithetical to those of the nation-state. They approach nationalism and imperialism as mutually exclusive cultural and political categories, and they dismiss the idea that these two mindsets might coexist with one another – that the same person could at the same time imagine himself as subject of a king and as citizen of a nation. This thesis has explored how England was imagined as both an empire and a nation in the literature of the Royal Supremacy, and how nationhood was in the early Tudor period compatible with empire, insofar as both forms of community were constructed around the figure of the ‘Sup[re]me heede and King’. Both Bale and Morison make obedience to the Royal Supremacy the benchmark of their brand of English national identity; both imagine England as a nation of Bible-readers, obedient to God and to the Crown of England. I have suggested that this idea of Englishness first emerged in Morison’s two pamphlets against the Lincolnshire Uprising and Pilgrimage of Grace. Morison used prosopopœia to ventriloquise his own support for the Royal Supremacy – a tactic that departed from the strategies used by earlier apologists, but which did so in order more effectively to popularise Henry’s pretensions to empire in the English Church. These earlier apologists had sought to legitimise the Royal Supremacy by identifying Henry’s English empire with the historical empires of Constantine and Arthur. Bale and Morison also wanted to popularise the Royal

Supremacy, but it was through the mouthpiece of England that they articulated their royalist agenda. Both used the character England to urge Englishmen to obey God's commands concerning obedience to kings; in both *King Johan* and the *Remedy for Sediton*, England speaks for an English national community that in its political make-up is identical to the imperial community enshrined in the preamble to the Act of Appeals. The Appeals Act had imagined England as an 'Impire', compact of Church and state, and 'gov[er]ned by oon Sup[re]me heede and King'.¹ Bale and Morison had imagined England as a nation, but both had made obedience to the Royal Supremacy the cornerstone for their construction of English national identity.

This thesis has argued that national and imperial communities were compatible with one another in the early Tudor period. It has antedated the dawn of nationalism to at least two centuries before it appeared on the horizons of Foucault, Anderson, and others. By underlining mother England's role in writings by Bale and Morison as an advocate of the Royal Supremacy, it has also undermined the idea of nationalism and imperialism as mutually exclusive cultural and political categories. This study has not been the first to explore the ways in which England was imagined as a nation in the literature of the Tudor period. Writing in the past two decades, both Walter Cohen and Richard Helgerson have located the origins of English national identity in the Elizabethan age. Whilst Cohen and Helgerson depart from Foucault, Anderson, and others in dating the nation-event to the later sixteenth century, both nevertheless echo the assumptions of these social historians in their approach to the relationship between nationalism and imperialism. When it comes to explaining how Englishness emerged in the Elizabethan period, both claim that the later Tudors experienced disillusionment with the Royal Supremacy, and that they constructed their sense of English national identity in conscious opposition to the empire enshrined in the Act of Appeals. Upon the stage of the Elizabethan playhouse, Cohen suggests, an emergent 'ideology of nationalism' could be seen to rival 'the nonnationalist direction of absolutism'.² In the same way, the 'aegis of Tudor absolutism' is significant for Helgerson only insofar as it prompted the 'younger Elizabethans' to construct rival nationalist

¹ *Statutes*, III (1817), 427.

² Walter Cohen, *Drama of a Nation: Public Theater in Renaissance England and Spain* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), p. 150.

discourses 'that subverted the absolute claims of the crown', and so navigated the 'passage from dynasty to nation'.³

This thesis has confined its analysis of the interrelationship between ideas of empire and national identity in Tudor England to the Henrician and Edwardian periods. I would like to suggest by way of conclusion that empire was also compatible with English national identity in the Elizabethan period, and that as Morison and Bale had imagined England as a nation of Bible-readers, obedient to God and the Crown, so Elizabethan writers also spoke to a sense of Englishness that was based on obedience to God's Word in scripture. Chapter Five approached *Respublica* as a satire on the Edwardian regime, and argued that this play expresses Udall's disillusionment with the idea of establishing a nation of Bible-readers in England. I suggested that the play echoes court sermons by Latimer and Lever, who had criticised the Edwardian government for their manifold sins, their manifest contempt for God's Word. By the year of Mary's accession, evangelicals like Udall were beginning to question the utility of the English Bible as an instrument for social reform. Bale and Morison may have imagined England as a nation of Bible-readers, but whilst most Englishmen had ready access to the English Bible under Edward VI, most had failed to conform their lives to Christ's example in scripture.

One consequence of the persecution of evangelicals under Mary, however, was that it renewed optimism in the possibility of establishing a nation of Bible-readers on English soil. In the *Obedie[n]ce*, Tyndale had spoken of martyrdom as the apotheosis of the many persecutions which for their faith the godly are destined to suffer at the hands of papists. Tyndale approaches persecution as a part of that process of self-abasement that begins when the elect not only read the Word of God, but also write its syntax on the palimpsest of their former selves. For Tyndale, martyrdom is but a means to express that one has renounced life and self for a subjectivity guided wholly by scriptural precept, to show that one has read the Word of God, and is willing to live and die by its precepts. Morison and Bale had made Bible-reading the basis for English national identity, and I would argue that it is as a history of English Bible-readers that Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* can best be approached. In his preface to the first edition of 1563, Foxe

³ Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 9-10.

identifies Elizabeth with Constantine the Great. Constantine had stayed the persecution of Christians in his Empire when he extended tolerance to Christianity, and Foxe celebrates the fact that Elizabeth's religious settlement had likewise stemmed the blood of the Marian martyrs in England. It was with Constantine's Empire that England had been compared in the 1533 *Entry* of Elizabeth's mother, Anne Boleyn. Thirty years later, Foxe resurrects this rhetoric in his preface to the *Actes and Monuments*, and he does so in order to identify England under Anne's daughter with the Christian Empire under Constantine.

Foxe's preface to the Queen makes use of the same vocabulary that had been used by apologists for the Royal Supremacy to legitimise Henry's pretensions to empire in the English Church. Anne's 1533 *Entry* appears to have been influenced by the apologetics of Lactantius and Eusebius, who in the fourth century AD identified Constantine's Empire as the divinely-ordained setting for the establishment of the Christian Golden Age on earth. It is to Eusebius that Foxe compares himself in his preface to the *Actes and Monuments*. Eusebius had in Constantine's lifetime undertaken to 'searche out the names, sufferinges and actes, of all such as suffered in al that time of persecution before, for the testimonie and faith of Christ Iesus', and Foxe writes that he has followed 'the example of Eusebius [...] in collecting and setting forth the actes, fame and memorie of these our Martyrs of this latter tyme of the churche'.⁴ It is as Constantine's Empire that Foxe imagines Elizabeth's realm of England, and his own self-image as a second Eusebius can be approached in the light of this parallel between the early and Elizabethan Church. The testament of the martyrs whose lives and deaths Foxe compiles in the *Actes and Monuments* is in one respect a testament to Foxe's vision of England as a Christian empire – for Foxe compares his Book of Martyrs to Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*, and by comparing England with Constantine's Empire in this respect, he revisits the imperial idea enshrined in the Appeals Act, and expressed in the 1533 *Entry* of Anne Boleyn. At the same time, however, Foxe's martyrs bear witness by their deaths to the nation of Bible-readers that is imagined by Bale and Morison – for the *Actes and Monuments* is also a

⁴ *Actes and Monuments of these latter and perillous dayes, touching matters of the Church, wherein ar comprehended and described the great persecutions & horrible troubles, that haue bene wrought and practised by the Romishe Prelates, speciallye in this Realme of England and Scotlande, from the yeare of our Lorde a thousande, vnto the tyme nowe present. Gathered and collected according to the true copies & wrytinges certificatorie, as wel of the parties them selues that suffered, as also out of the Bishops Registers, which wer the doers therof, by Iohn Foxe* (London: John Day, 1563; STC 11222), sigs. B1^r; B2^v.

history of Englishness as it is constructed in Royal Supremacy literature, of an English national identity predicated upon obedience to the Word of God. National and imperial communities coincide in the writings of Bale and Morison, and in the Elizabethan period they also coincide in Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*. The English nation that was imagined in Royal Supremacy literature went unrealised in the era of the Church Bible under Edward VI. The idea of a Bible-reading nation obedient to the Crown was nevertheless revisited in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* – to form one of the benchmarks of English national identity in the Elizabethan age.

* * *

Bibliography

PRIMARY MATERIAL IN MANUSCRIPT

BL, Cotton MSS, Cleopatra E VI, fols. 16-139: 'Collectanea satis copiosa, ex sacris scripturis et authoribus catholicis, de regia ex ecclesiastica potestate: praemittuntur argumentorum tituli'

BL, Cotton MSS, Faustina C II, fols. 5-22: [Richard Morison], 'A discourse touching the reformation of the laws of England'

BL, Cotton MSS, Tiberius E VIII, fols. 100-110: 'The coronation of K. Henry VIII. with the king's oath prefixed; interlined by K. Henry VIII'

BL, Egerton MSS, 2623, fol. 5: 'Temp. Henry VIII. Instructions, request for, on the passing of Anne Bullen through the City, addressed to the Duke of Norfolk. Asking the aid of the Kings Minstrels for furnishing the Pageants &c'

BL, Royal MSS, 18 A L: [Richard Morison], 'A Perswasion to the Kyng that the laws of the realme shulde be in Latin'

BL, Royal MSS, 18 A LXIV: 'Here aftir ensueth a copie of diuers and sundry verses aswell in latin as in Englishe deuised and made partely by Ihon Leland and partely by Nicholas Vuedale - where of sum were sette vp and sum other were spoken and pronounced vnto the moste high and excellente Quene the ladie Anne wif unto our soueraine lorde king Henry the eight in many goodly and costely pageauntes exhibited and shewed by the mayre and Citizens of the famous Citie of London at suche tyme as hir grace rode from the Towre of London through the said citie to hir moste glorious Coronacion at the monasterie of Westmynster on whitson yeue in the xxvii yere of the Reigne of our said souerain lorde'

Corporation of London Record Office, *Repertory*, IX

CCCC, MS 298, II, 8, pp. 132-42: 'The descrypcion of the pageantes made in the Cyte of London att the recevyng of the most excellent pryncys Charlys the fyfte Emperour, & Henry the viij. kyng off englonde'

PRIMARY MATERIAL IN PRINT

ALLEN, THOMAS W., and E. E. Sikes, eds, *The Homeric Hymns* (London: MacMillan, 1904)

ANDERSON, R. C., ed., *Letters of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: From the Archives of Southampton* (Southampton: Southampton Record Society, 1921)

ARBER, EDWARD, ed., *An English Garner: Ingatherings from our History and Literature*, 8 vols (London: the editor, 1877-97)

ARMSTRONG, WILLIAM A, ed., *Elizabethan History Plays*, World's Classics, 606 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965)

Articles Devisid by the holle consent of the kynges moste honourable counsayle, his gracis licence opteined therto, not only to exhorte, but also to enfourme his louynge subiectis of the trouthe (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1533; STC 9177)

AUGUSTINE, *The City of God: Books XVII-XXII*, trans. by Gerald G. Walsh and Daniel J. Honan (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1954)

-----, *The City of God: Books VIII-XVI*, trans. by Gerald G. Walsh and Grace Monahan (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1952)

AUSONIUS, *The Works of Ausonius*, ed. by R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991)

BALE, JOHN, *Bales Kynge Johan nach der Handschrift in der Chatsworth Collection in Faksimile*, ed. by Willy Bang, *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas*, 25 (Louvain: [n. pub.], 1909)

-----, *The Complete Plays of John Bale*, ed. by Peter Happé, *Tudor Interludes 4-5*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Brewer, 1985-86)

-----, *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum, hoc est, Angliae, Cambriae, ac Scotiae summariu[m] in quasdā centurias diuisum, cum diuersitate doctrinaru[m]atq[ue] annoru[m] recta supputatione par omnes aetates a Iapheto sanctissimi Noah filio* ([Wesel] : [D. van der Straten for] Joannem Overton, 1548; STC 1295)

-----, *John Bale's King Johan*, ed. by Barry B. Adams (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library Publications, 1969)

-----, *King Johan*, ed. by J. H. P. Pafford and W. W. Greg, *Malone Society Reprints* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931)

-----, *Kynge Johan: A Play in Two Parts*, ed. by John Payne Collier (London: Camden Society, 1838)

-----, *Scriptorum illustriu[m] maioris Brytannie quam nunc Angliam & Scotiam uocant catalogus: a Iapheto per 3618 annos, usq[ue] ad annu[m] hunc Domini 1557. ex Beroso, Gennadio, Beda, Honorio, Bostono Buriensi, Frumentario, Capgrauo, Bostio, Burello, Trissa, Tritemio, Gesnero, Ioanne Lelando, atq[ue] alijs authoriibus collectus, & IX centurias continens: [...] Autore Ioanne Baleo Sudouolgio Anglo, Ossoriensi apus Hybernos iam pridem episcopo [..]*, 2 vols (Basil: Ioannem Oporinum, 1557-59; STC 1296 Variant)

-----, *The Vocacyon of Johan Bale*, ed. by Peter Happé and John N. King (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York, 1990)

BERGENROTH, GUSTAV ADOLPH, and others, eds, *Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere*, 13 vols in 20 parts (London: HMSO, 1862-1954)

BERKOWITZ, DAVID SANDLER., ed., *Humanist Scholarship and Public Order: Two Tracts against the Pilgrimage of Grace by Sir Richard Morison, with Historical Annotations and Contemporary Documents* (Washington DC: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1984)

BODRUGAN (Otherwise ADAMS), NICHOLAS, *An epitome of the title that the Kynges Maiestie of Englande, hath to the souereigntie of Scotlande, continued vpon the auncient writers of both nacions, from the beginnyng* (London: 1548; STC 3196)

BORNATE, CARLO, ed., 'Historia vite et gestorum per dominum magnum cancellarium', *Miscellanea di storia Italiana*, 48 (1915), 233-568

BREWER, JOHN. S., and others, eds, *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII: Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and Elsewhere in England*, 21 vols of 35 parts (London: Longman, 1862-1910)

BRIE, FRIEDRICH W. D., ed., *The Brut, or the Chronicles of England*, 2 vols, EETS, o.s., 131 and 136 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1906-1908)

BROWN, RAWDON, and others, eds, *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in other Libraries of Northern Italy*, 38 vols (London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1864-1947)

BURNET, GILBERT, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, ed. by Edward Nares, 4 vols (London: Dove, 1830)

Certayne sermo[n]s appoynted by [the] kinges Maiestie, to be declared and reade, by al persons, vicars or Curates, euery Sondag and holy daye in theyr Churches, where they haue Cure: Newly Imprinted in partes, accordyng as is me[n]cioned in the boke of commo[n] prayer (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1549; STC 13644)

CICERO, *Of Duties [De officiis]*, trans. by Walter Miller (London: Heineman; New York: MacMillan, 1913)

A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts, on the Most Interesting and Entertaining Subjects: But Chiefly Such as Relate to the History and Constitution of These Kingdoms. Selected from an Infinite Number in Print and Manuscript, in the Royal, Cotton, Sion, and other Public, as well as Private, Libraries; Particularly that of the Late Lord Somers, 2nd edn, rev. by Walter Scott, 13 vols (London: for T. Cadell and others, 1809-15)

A Coppe of a Letter contayning certayne newes, & the Articles or requestes of the Deuonshyre & Cornyshe rebelles (London: [John Day and William Seres], 1549; STC 15109.3)

'COVERDALE BIBLE', *Biblia: The Bible, that is, the holy Scrypture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe* ([Cologne]: [Eucharius Cervicorn and John Soter], 1535; STC 2063)

-----, *Biblia: The Byble, that is, the holy Scrypture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully translated in to Englyshe* ([Southwark]: [James Nicolson], 1535; STC 2063.3)

-----, *Biblia: The Byble, that is the holy Scrypture of the Olde and New Testament, faythfully translated in Englysh, and newly ouersene & corrected. M.D.XXXVII* (Southwark: for James Nicolson, 1537; STC 2064)

COVERDALE, MILES, trans., *The new testament: both in Latin and English after the vulgare texte which is red in the churche* (Paris: Frances Regnault for Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, 1538)

COX, JOHN EDMUND, ed., *The Works of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556*, 2 vols, Parker Society Publications 12, 24 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844-46)

CREETH, EDMUND, ed., *Tudor Plays: An Anthology of Early English Drama* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1966)

[CROMWELL, THOMAS], *Iniunctions for the clerge Exhibite [blank] die mensis [blank] Anno d[omi]ni M.CCCCC.xxxviii* (London: [Thomas Berthelet], 1538; STC 10086)

DANTE, ALIGHIERI, *Monarchia*, trans. by Prue Shaw, Cambridge Medieval Classics, 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

The Determinations of the moste famous and mooste excellent vniuersities of Italy and Fraunce, that it is so ynlefull for a man to marie his brothers wife/ that the pope hath no power to dispence therwith (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1531; STC 14287)

ELIOT, THOMAS, *The boke named the Gouvernour, deuised by [Sir] Thomas Elyot knight* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1531; STC 7635)

ELLIS, HENRY, ed., *Original Letters Illustrative of English History, Including Numerous Royal Letters: from Autographs in the British Museum, and One or Two Other Collections*, 1st ser., 3 vols (London: Harding, Triphook, and Lepard, 1824)

ELTON, G. R., ed., *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)

ERASMUS, DESIDERIUS, *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, ed. by R. J. Schoeck, B. M. Corrigan, and others, 86 vols (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974-)

-----, *The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the newe testamente*, ed. by Nicholas Udall (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1548; STC 2854)

FARMER, J. S. ed., *The Dramatic Writings of John Bale, Bishop of Ossory* (London: Early English Drama Society, 1907; repr. 1966)

FEULLERAT, ALBERT, *Documents Relating to the Revels at Court in the Time of King Edward VI and Queen Mary* (Louvain: [n. pub.], 1914)

FOXÉ, EDWARD, *Opvs Eximivm. De Vera Differentia Regiæ Potestatis et Ecclesiasticæ, et Qvæ Sit Ipsa Veritas ac Virtvs Vtrivsqve* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1534; STC 11218)

-----, *The true dyffere[n]s betwen [the] regall power and the Ecclesiasticall power*, trans. by Henry, Lord Stafford (London: William Copeland, [1548]; STC 11220)

FOXÉ, JOHN, *Actes and Monuments of these latter and perillous dayes, touching matters of the Church, wherein ar comprehended and described the great persecutions & horrible troubles, that haue bene wrought and practised by the Romishe Prelates, speciallye in this Realme of England and Scotlande, from the yeare of our Lorde a thousande, vnto the tyme nowe present. Gathered and collected according to the true copies & wrytinges certificatorie, as wel of the parties them selues that suffered, as also out of the Bishops Registers, which wer the doers therof, by Iohn Foxe* (London: John Day, 1563; STC 11222)

-----, *The First Volume of the Ecclesiasticall history contaynyng the Actes and Monumentes of thynges passed in euery kynge's tyme in this Realme, especially in the Church of England principally to be noted. with a full discourse of such persecutions, horrible troubles, the sufferyng of Martyrs, and other thinges incident, touchyng aswel the sayd Church of England as also Scotland, and all other foreine nations, from the primitiue tyme till the reigne of K. Henry viij. Newly recognised and enlarged by the Author Iohn Foxe* (London: John Day, 1570; STC 11223)

-----, *Two Latin Comedies by John Foxe the Martyrologist*, trans. by John Hazel Smith (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973)

FRERE, WALTER H., ed., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1910)

FROISSART, JOHN, *Sir John Froissart's Chronicles Of England, France, Spain, Portugal, Scotland, Brittany, Flanders, And The Adjoining Countries; Translated From The Original French, At The Command Of King Henry The Eighth, By John Bouchier, Lord Berners, Reprinted From Pynson's Edition Of 1523, And 1525; With The Names Of Places And Persons Carefully Corrected. To Which Are Added, a Memoir Of The Translator, And a Copious Index To The Work*, trans. by John Bouchier, 2 vols (London: for F. C. and J. Rivington, and others, 1812)

FULKE, WILLIAM, *A Defense of the sincere and true Translations of the holie Scriptures into the English tong, against the manifolde cauils, friuolous quarels, and impudent slaunders of Gregorie Martin, one of the readers of Popish diuinitie in the trayterous Seminarie of Rhemes* (London: Henry Bynneman, for George Bishop, 1583; STC 11430.5)

FURNIVALL, F. J., ed., *Ballads from Manuscripts*, Ballad Society Publications, 1-3, 10, 2 vols of 4 parts (London: Taylor; Hertford: Austin, 1868-73)

GILBY, ANTHONY, *A commentarye vpon the prophet Mycha* (London: John Day, 1551; STC 11886)

GOLDSMID, EDMUND, ed., *The Maner of the Tryumphe of Caleys and Bulleyn, and the Noble Tryumphaut Coronacyon of Quene Anne, Wyfe unto the Most Noble Kynge Henry VIII/ Printed by Wynkyn de Worde, 1532-1533* (Edinburgh: the editor, 1885)

Gravissimae, atque exactissimae illustrissimarum totius Italiae, et Galliae Academiarum censurae (London: Thomas Berthelet, [1531]; STC 14286)

'GREAT BIBLE', *The Byble in Englyshe that is to saye the content of all the holy scrypture, both of ye olde and newe testament, truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by ye dylygent studye of dyuerse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tonges* ([Paris]: [Francis Regnault]; [London]: Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, 1539; STC 2068)

-----, *The Byble in Englyshe, that is to saye the conte[n]t of al the holy scrypture, both of ye olde, and newe testame[n]t, with a prologe therinto, made by the reuerende father in God, Thomas archbysshop of Cantorbury, This is the Byble apoynted to the vse of the churches* ([London]: Rychard Grafton, 1540; STC 2071)

GREGORY, MARTIN, trans., *The Holie Bible Faithfvly Translated Into English, Ovt Of The Avthentical Latin. Diligently conferred with the Hebrew, Greeke, and other Editions in diuers languages. With Argvments of the Bookes, and Chapters: Annotations. Tables: and other helpes, for better vnderstanding of the text: for discoverie of Corrvptions in some late translations: and for clearing Controversies in Religion. By the English College of Doway*, 2 vols (Douai: Laurence Kellam, 1609-10; STC 2207)

-----, *The Nevv Testament of Iesvs Christ, Translated Faithfvly Into English, out of the authentical Latin, according to the best corrected copies of the same, diligently conferred vvith the Greeke and other editions in diuers languages; Vvith Argvments of bookes and chapters, Annotations, and other necessarie helpes, for the better vnderstanding of the text, and specially for the discoverie of the Corrvptions of diuers late translations, and for cleering the Controversies in religion, of these daies: In the English College of Rhemes* (Rheims: John Fogny, 1582; STC 2884)

GUEVARA, ANTONIO DE, *The Diall of Princes. Compiled by the reuerende father in God, Don Anthony of Guevara, Bysshop of Guadix. Preacher and Cronicler, to Charles the fyft Emperour of Rome. Englysshed oute of the Frenche, by Thomas North, seconde*

sonne of the Lorde North. Ryght necessary and pleasaunt, to all gentylnen and others whiche are louers of vertue (London: John Wayland, 1557; STC 12427)

-----, *The Golden Boke Of Marcvs Avrelivs, Emperovr and Eloqvnt Oratovr*, trans. by John Bouchier, (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537; STC 12437)

HALL, EDWARD, *The vnion of the two noble and illustrate famelies of Lancastre & Yorke beeyng long in continual discension for the croune of this noble realme: with all the actes done in bothe the tymes of the princes, bothe fo the one linage and of the other, beginnyng at the tyme of kyng Henry the fowerth, the first aucthor of this deuision, and so successiuely proceadyng to the reigne of the high and prudent prince kyng Henry the eight, the vndubitate flower and very heire of both the sayd linages* (London: Richard Grafton, 1548; STC 12721)

HAPPÉ, PETER, ed., *Four Morality Plays* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979)

HARD, ROBIN, trans., *The Library of Greek Mythology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

[HENRY VIII], *A Necessary Doctrine and erudicion for any chrysten man, set furth by the kynges maiestye of Englande. &c* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1543; STC 5176)

-----, *Ansvvere Made by the Kynges Hyghnes to the Petitions of the rebelles in Yorkeshire* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; STC 13077)

HESIOD, *Hesiod's Theogony*, trans. by Richard S. Caldwell (Newburyport, MA: Focus Information Group, 1987)

HOOPER, JOHN, *A Declaratyon of the ten holy commaundementes of almyghtye God wryten Exo. xx. Deu. 5. Collected out of the Scrypture by John Houper, with certayne newe addisions made by the same maister Houper* (London: Richard Jugge, 1550; STC 13750.5)

HUGHES, PAUL. L., and James. F. Larkin, eds, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961-69)

Inivncions geuen by the moste excellente Prince, Edwarde the .VI. by the grace of God, kyng of Englande, Fraunce, and Irelande: Defendour of the Faith, & in earthe vnder Christe, of the Churche of Englande & of Irelande the supreme head: To all and singuler hys Louinge Subiectes, aswel of the Clergie, as off the Laietie (London: Richard Grafton, 1547; STC 10088)

KNIGHTON, C. S., ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Edward VI, 1547-1553, Preserved in the Public Record Office*, rev. edn (London: HMSO, 1992)

LACTANTIUS, FIRMIANUS, *The Divine Institutes, Books I-VII*, trans. by Sister Mary Francis McDonald, O.P., *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, 49 (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1964)

LATIMER, HUGH, *The fyrste Sermon of Mayster Hughe Latimer, whiche he preached before the Kynges Maiest. wythin his graces palayce at Westmynster M.D.XLIX. the viii. of Marche* (London: John Day and William Seres, 1549; STC 15272)

-----, *A Moste faithfull Sermo[n] preached before the Kynges most excellent Maiestye, and hys most honorable Councell, in hys Courte at Westminster, by the reuerend Father Master Hughe Latimer. Anno Dom[in]i. M.D.L.* ([London]: [John Day], 1550; STC 15289)

-----, *The seconde sermon of Master Hughe Latemer, whych he preached before the Kynges Maiestie in hys graces palayce at Westminster ye xv day of Marche M.ccccc.xlix* (London: John Day and William Seres, 1549; STC15274)

LEGG, J. WICKHAM, ed., *The Sarum Missal* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

LEGG, LEOPOLD G. WICKHAM, ed., *English Coronation Records* (Westminster: Archibald Constable, 1901)

LELAND, JOHN, *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis/ auctore Joanne Lelando Londinate. Ex autographo Lelandino nunc primus edidit Antonius Hall, A.M. Coll. Reg. Oxon. Socius.* (Oxford: E. Theatro Sheldoniano, 1709)

-----, *The laboryouse Journey & serche of Johan Leylande, for Englandes Antiquitees, geuen of hym as a newe yeares gyfte to Kynge Henry the viij. in the .xxxvii. yeare of his Reygne, with declaracyons enlarged: by Iohan Bale* (London: [S. Mierdman for] John Bale, 1549; STC 15445)

-----, *Leland's New Year's Gift to King Henry VIII*, ed. by Walter Arthur Copinger (Manchester: Priory Press, 1895)

LEVER, THOMAS, *A Sermon preached the thyrd Sondaye in Lente before the Kynges Maiestie, and his honorable Counsell, by Thomas Leauer* (London: John Day, 1550; STC 15548)

[LILY, WILLIAM], *Of the tryu[m]phe/ and the v[er]ses that Charles theemperour/ & the most myghty redouted kyng of England/ Henry the. viii. were saluted with/ passyng through London* ([London]: Richard Pynson, [1522]; STC 15606.7)

LUCIAN, *Lucian: A Selection*, trans. by M. D. MacLeod (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1991)

MANLY, J. M., ed., *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, 2 vols (Boston: Athenæum Press, 1897)

'MATTHEW BIBLE', *The Byble which is all the holy Scripture: in whych are contayned the Olde and Newe Testament truly and purely translated into Englysh by Thomas Matthew. M, D, XXXVII, Set forth with the Kinges most gracyous lyce[n]ce* (Antwerp: Matthew Crom for Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, 1537; STC 2066)

-----, *The Byble/ That is to Saye, all the Holye Scripture: In Whiche are Contayned the Olde and New Testament, Truly and Purely Translated into Englishe, & Now Lately with Great Industry & Diligence Recognysed* (London: John Wyghte, 1551; STC2085)

[MORISON, RICHARD], *An Exhortation to Styre all Englyshe Men to the Defence of Theyr Countreye* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1539; STC18110.5)

-----, *A Lamentation in VWhiche is Shevved what Ruyne and destruction cometh of seditious rebellyon* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; STC 18113.3)

-----, *A Remedy for Seditiō, VVherin are Conteyned many thynges, concernyng the true and loyall obeysance, that comme[n]s owe vnto their prince and soueraygne lorde the kynge* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; STC 18113.7)

MURRAY, JAMES A. H., ed., *The complaynt of Scotlande wyth ane exortatione to the thre estaits to be vigilante in the deffens of their public veil. 1549/ With an appendix of contemporary English tracts, viz. The just declaration of Henry VIII (1542), The exhortacion of James Harrysone, Scottisheman (1547), The epistle of the Lord Protector Somerset (1548), The epitome of Nicholas Bodrugan alias Adams (1548)* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1872; repr. 1891)

The noble tryumphaut coronacyon of quene Anne/ Wyfe vnto the moost noble kynge Henry the. viij (London: Wynkyn de Worde for Johan Goughe, [1533]; STC 656)

ORTELIUS, ABRAHAM, *Theatrum orbis terrarum/ opus nunc denuo ab ipso auctore recognitum, multisque locis castigatum, & quamplurimis nouis tabulis atque commentarijs auctum* [Antwerp: Ex Officina Plantiniana, Abrah. Ortelij aere & cura, 1595]

OVID, P[ublīi]. *Ouidii Nasonis Metamorphoseos Libri moralizati cum Pulcherrimis fabularum principalium figuris. Ouidii metamorphoseos quindecim libri cu[m] ip[s]ius poetæ uita ex eius op[er]ibus dilige[n]tiissime collecta: familiaribusq[ue] co[m]me[n]tariis & reru[m] uerboru[m]q[ue] cognitu dignissimoru[m] alphabetico indice: ac etia[m] cu[m] præclarissimis doctissimi eloque[n]tissimiq[ue] uiri Lacta[n]tīi Firmiani [...]* [Lyon: Iacobi Mareschal, 1519]

PAUCK, WILHELM, trans., *Melanchthon and Bucer* (London: SCM, 1969)

PELIKAN, JAROSLAV, and others, eds, *Luther's Works*, 55 vols (St Louis: Concordia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press (formerly Muhlenberg Press), 1955-86)

PLATO, *The Republic*, trans. by Paul Shorey, rev. edn, 2 vols (London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963)

POCOCK, NICHOLAS, ed., *Troubles Connected with the Prayer Book of 1549: Documents Now Mostly for the First Time Printed from the Originals in the Record Office, the Petyt Collection in the Library of the Inner Temple, the Council Book, and the*

British Museum, Camden Society Publications, n.s., 37 (Westminster: Camden Society, 1884)

POLLARD, A. W., ed., *English Miracle Plays, Moralities, and Interludes*, rev. edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927)

PONET, JOHN, *A notable sermon concerninge the ryght vse of the lordes supper and other thynges very profitable for all men to knowe preached before the kynges most excellent Mayestye and hys most honorable counsel in hys courte at Westmynster the 14. day of Marche, by Mayster Iohn ponet Doctor of dyuinity* (London: for G. Walter Lynne, 1550; STC 20177)

-----, *A shorte treatise of politike pouuer, and of the true Obedience which subiectes owe to kynges and other ciuile Gouvernours, with an Exhortacion to all true naturall Englishe men, compyled by. D. I. P. B. R. VV. [Dominus John Ponet, Bishop of Rochester and Winchester] ([Strasbourg]: [the heirs of W. Köpfel], 1556; STC 20178)*

PRATTE, POORE [pseud.], *The copie of a pistel or letter sent to Gilbard Potter in the tyme when he was in prison, for speakinge on our most true quenenes part the Lady Mary before he had his eares cut of* (London: Hugh Singleton, 1553; STC 20188)

A Proclamacion, set furth by the kynges Maiestie, with thassent of his derest vncler, Edward Duke of Somerset, Gouvernor of his moste royall person, and of his Realmes, Dominions and Subiectes Protector, and others of his moste honorable Counsaill, concernyng certain Riotes and vnlawfull assembles, for the breakyng vp of Enclosures (London: Richard Grafton, [1549]; STC 7822)

A Proclamacion, set furth by the Kynges Maiestie, with thassent of his derest vncler, Edward Duke of Somerset Gouvernor of his moste royall persone, and of his realmes, dominions and subiectes Protector, and others of his moste honorable counsaill, for the repressyng of certain Sedicious and Disobedient persones (London: Richard Grafton, 1549; STC 7820)

A proclamacion, set furth by the kynges Maiestye, with thassent of his derest vncler Edward duke of Somerset, Gouvernour of his most royall persone, and of his realmes, dominions and subiectes Protector, and others of his most honorable Counsayle, for the executyng of a lawe Martiall for payne of death against rebellors and their vpstyrros (London: Richard Grafton, [1549]; STC 7827)

A Proclamacion, set furthe by the Kynges Maiestie, with thassent and consent of his moste dere Uncle Edward Duke of Somerset, Gouvernor of his moste royall persone, and of his dominions and Subiectes Protector, and others of his highnes priuie counsaill, against enclosures, lettyng of houses to decaie, and vnlawfull conuerting of arable ground to pastures, the first daie of Iune in the second of his maiesties moste gracious reigne (London: Richard Grafton, [1548]; STC 7816)

A Proclamation deuised by the kinges hyghnes, with thaduse of his most honorable counsell, to auoide and abolish suche englishe bookes, as conteine pernicious and detestable errours and heresies ([London]: Thomas Berthelet, [1546]; STC 7809)

A proclamation made and diuysed by the kyngis highnes, with the aduise of his honorable cou[n]saile, for dampning of erronious bokes and heresies, and prohibitinge the hauinge of holy scripture, translated into the vulgar tonges of englisshe, frenche, or duche, in such maner, as within this proclamation is expressed (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1530; STC 7775)

A proclamation set furthe by the Kynges Maiesty, with the aduise of his most honorable priuey counsayll, for the valuacion of the Shillinges and grotos to a meaner and lower value and rate ([London]: Richard Grafton, 1551; STC 7836)

SAMPSON, GEORGE, ed., *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More: Ralph Robinson's Translation, with Roper's Life of More, and some of his Letters to which is added the Latin text of Utopia, reprinted from the first edition (London: Bell, 1910)*

SENECA, *Moral Essays [Epistulae Morales]*, trans. by John W. Basore, 3 vols (London: Heineman; New York: Putnam's Sons; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928-35)

SILVESTRIS, BERNARDUS, *The Commentary on the First Six Books of the Aeneid of Vergil: Commonly Attributed to Bernardus Silvestris*, ed. by Julian Ward Jones and Eizabeth Frances Jones (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977)

SKELTON, JOHN, *Magnificence*, ed. by Paula Neuss (Manchester: Manchester University Press; Baltimore, MA: John Hopkins University Press, 1980)

SMITH, THOMAS, *De repvblica Anglorvm: The Maner of Gouvernement or Policie of the Realme of England (London: Henry Midleton for Gregory Seton, 1583; STC 22857)*

STALBRYDGE, HENRY [John Bale(?)], *The Epistel Exhortatorye of an Englyshe Christiane vnto his Derely Beloued Contrey of Englande Against the Pompose Popyshe Bisshoppes Thereof, as yet the True Membres of Theyr Fylthye Father the Great Antychrist of Rome (London: A. Scoloker and W. Seres, [1548]; STC 1292)*

State Papers Published under the Authority of His Majesty's Commission: King Henry VIII, 11 vols ([London]: [His Majesty's Commission for State Papers], 1830-52)

The Statutes of the Realm, 9 vols (London: printed by George Eyre and Andrew Strahan, 1810-1828)

STEELE, ROBERT, ed., *A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns and of others published under authority 1485-1714*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910)

STOW, JOHN, *The annales of England (London: Ralfe Newbery, 1592; STC 23334)*

STRYPE, JOHN, *Ecclesiastical Memorials, Relating Chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of it, and the Emergencies of the Church of England, under King Henry VIII*,

King Edward VI, and Queen Mary I: With Large Appendixes, Containing Original Papers, Records, &c, 2 vols in 4 parts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822)

SURTZ, EDWARD and Virginia Murphy, eds, *The Divorce Tracts of Henry VIII* (Angers: Moreana, 1988)

THOMAS, WILLIAM, *The Pilgrim: A Dialogue on the Life and Actions of King Henry the Eighth*, ed. by John A. Froude (London: Parker, 1861)

TURPYN, RICHARD, *The Chronicle of Calais, in the Reigns of Henry VII, and Henry VIII to the Year 1540*, ed. by John Gough Nichols (London: J. B. Nichols for the Camden Society, 1846)

TYNDALE, WILLIAM, *That fayth the mother of all good workes iustifieth us before we ca[n] bringe forth anye good worke [Parable of the Wicked Mammon]* ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser(?)], 1528; STC 24454)

-----, *The Newe Testament, Yet Once Agayne Corrected by Wylliam Tyndall. Wheare Vnto is Added an Exhortacion to the Same of Erasmus Rot. with an Englyshe Kalendar/ And a Table/ Necessary to Fynde Easly and Lyghtely Any Story Contayned in the .iiii. Euangelistes & in the Actes of the Apostles* ([n.p.]: [n. pub.], 1536; STC2835.2)

-----, *The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man and howe Christe[n] rulers ought to governe/ where in also (yf thou marke diligently) thou shalt fynde eyes to perceave the crafty conveyance of all iugglers* ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser(?)], 1528; STC 24446)

-----, *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, ed. by David Daniell (London: Penguin, 2000)

-----, *[The Pentateuch]* ([Antwerp]: Hans Luft [Martin de Keyser(?)], 1530; STC 2350)

-----, *Tyndale's New Testament: Translated from the Greek by William Tyndale*, ed. by David Daniell (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989)

-----, *Tyndale's Old Testament: Being the Pentateuch of 1530, Joshua to 2 Chronicles of 1537 and Jonah*, ed. by David Daniell (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992)

[UDALL, NICHOLAS], *Respublica, A.D. 1553: A Play on the Social Condition of England at the Accession of Queen Mary*, ed. by Leonard A. Magnus, EETS, e.s., 94 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1905)

-----, *Respublica: An Interlude for Christmas 1553*, ed. by W. W. Greg, EETS, o.s., 226 (London: Oxford University Press, 1952 for 1946)

VALLA, LORENZO, *A treatyse of the donation or gyfte and endowme[n]t of possessyons, gyuen and graunted vnto Sylvester pope of Rhome, by Constantyne emperour of Rome: & what truth is in the same grau[n] thou mayst se, and rede ye iugement of*

certayne great lerned men, whose names on the other page of this leafe done appere (London: Thomas Godfray for William Marshall, 1534; STC5641)

VERGIL, POLYDORE, *Polydore Vergil's English History, from an Early Translation Preserved Among the MSS. of the Old Royal Library in the British Museum: Vol. 1, Containing the First Eight Books Comprising the Period Prior to the Norman Conquest*, ed. by Henry Ellis (London: Camden Society Publications, 1846)

VIRGIL, *P. Virgilio Maronis Opera. Mauri Seruii Honorati grammatici In Eadem Commentarii, Ex antiquis exemplaribus suæ integritati restituti. Index eorum quæ à Seruio explicantur, ita copiosus vt vel Dictionarii instar esse possit / Castigationes & varietates Virgilianæ lectionis, per Ioannem Pierium Valerianum* (Paris: Roberti Stephani, 1532)

'VULGATE BIBLE', *Biblia* (Venice: Hieronymus de Paganinis, 1492)

WACE, HENRY and Philip Schaff, eds, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 14 vols (Oxford: Parker; New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1890-1900)

WILKINS, DAVID, ed., *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, ab Anno MCCCL ad Annum MDXLV*, 3 vols (London: Gosling, Gyles, Woodward, and Davis, 1737)

WRIOTHESLEY, CHARLES, *A Chronicle of England During the Reign of the Tudors, from AD 1485-1559*, ed. by William D. Hamilton, 2 vols, Camden Society Publications, n.s., 11, 20 (Westminster: Camden Society, 1875-77)

SECONDARY MATERIAL

ALFORD, STEPHEN, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

ALSOP, J. D., 'Latimer, The "Commonwealth of Kent" and the 1549 Rebellions', *The Historical Journal*, 28 (1985), 379-383

ANDERSON, BENEDICT, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983, rev. 1991)

ANGLO, SYDNEY, 'An Early Tudor Programme for Plays and other Demonstrations Against the Pope', *Journal of the Warburg and Courthauld Institutes*, 20 (1957), 176-79

-----, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

APPLEBY, JOHN, *John King of England* (New York: Knopf, 1959)

ARMITAGE, DAVID, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire, Ideas in Context*, 59 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

- ASTIN, ALAN E., *Cato the Censor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978)
- ASTINGTON, JOHN H., *English Court Theatre, 1558-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- BAKER, DAVID W., 'Topical Utopias: Radicalizing Humanism in Sixteenth-Century England', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 36:1 (1996), 1-30
- BASKERVILL, C. R., 'Sir Richard Morison as the Author of Two Anonymous Tracts on Sedition', *The Library*, 4th ser., 17 (1936-37), 84-85
- , 'William Lily's Verse for the Entry of Charles V into London', *The Huntington Library Bulletin*, 9 (1936), 1-14
- BENJAMIN, WALTER, 'The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire's "Tableaux parisiens"', in Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*, ed. by Hannah Arendt, trans. by Harry Zohn (London: Jonathan Cape, 1970), pp. 69-82
- BERARDINO, ANGELO DI, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. by Adrian Walford, 2 vols (Cambridge: Clarke, 1992)
- BERRY, HERBERT and James Stokes, 'Actors and Town Hall in the Sixteenth Century', *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, 6 (1993), 37-55
- BEVINGTON, DAVID M., *From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962)
- BHABHA, HOMI K., 'DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. by Homi K. Bhabha (London: Routledge, 1990; repr. 1991), pp. 291-322
- BIDDLE, MARTIN, ed., *King Arthur's Round Table: An Archaeological Investigation* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000)
- BLACKBURN, RUTH H., *Biblical Drama under the Tudors* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971)
- BLATT, THORA B., *The Plays of John Bale: A Study of Ideas, Technique and Style* (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1968)
- BOBRICK, BENSON, *The Making of the English Bible* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 2001)
- BOSSY, JOHN, *Christianity in the West 1400-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985)
- BRADSHAW, BRENDAN, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley, *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

BREITENBERG, MARK, 'Reading Elizabethan Iconicity: *Gorboduc* and the Semiotics of Reform', *English Literary Renaissance*, 18 (1988), 194-217

BRIGHT, WILLIAM, *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882)

BRUMBLE, H. DAVID, *Classical Myths and Legends in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: A Dictionary of Allegorical Meanings* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998)

BURKE, PETER, 'L'image de Charles Quint: construction et interprétations', in *Charles Quint 1500-1558: L'empereur et son temps*, ed. by Hugo Soly (Arles: Actes Sud, 2000), pp. 393-475

BURNS, JAMES. H., ed., *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought, c.350-c.1450* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)

BUSH, M. L., *The Government Policy of Protector Somerset* (London: Arnold, 1975)

BUSH, MICHAEL, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: A Study of the Rebel Armies of October 1536* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996)

CARGILL THOMPSON, WILLIAM. D. J., 'Martin Luther and the "Two Kingdoms"', in *Political Ideas*, ed. by David Thomson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), pp. 34-52

CARSON, THOMAS and Joann Cerrito, eds, *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd edn, 15 vols (Detroit: Gale, 2003)

CARTWRIGHT, KENT, *Theatre and Humanism: English Drama in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

CHAMBERLAIN, ARTHUR, *Hans Holbein the Younger*, 2 vols (London: Allen, 1913)

COHEN, JEFFREY JEROME, ed., *The Postcolonial Middle Ages* (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 2000)

COHEN, WALTER, *Drama of a Nation: Public Theater in Renaissance England and Spain* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985)

CORNWELL, JULIAN, 'Kett's Rebellion in Context: A Comment', in *Rebellion, Popular Protest and the Social Order in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paul Slack (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 63-67 (first publ. *Past and Present*, 93 (1981), 160-164)

DANIELL, DAVID, *William Tyndale: A Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994)

DARBY, HAROLD S., *Hugh Latimer* (London: Epworth, 1953)

DERRIDA, JACQUES, 'Given Time: The Time of the King', *Critical Inquiry*, 18 (1991-92), 161-187

-----, *Of Grammatology*, ed. and trans. by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976, rev edn 1997)

DILLER, HANS-JÜRGEN, 'From Synthesis to Compromise: The Four Daughters of God in Early English Drama', *The Early Drama, Art, and Music Review*, 18 (1996), 88-103

DUFFY, EAMON, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992)

EDGERTON, WILLIAM L., *Nicholas Udall* (New York: Twayne, 1965)

EDWARDS, PHILIP, *Threshold of a Nation: A Study in English and Irish Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)

EISENSTEIN, ELIZABETH L., *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980)

ELTON, G. R., *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972)

-----, 'Politics and the Pilgrimage of Grace', in *After the Reformation: Essays in Honor of J. H. Hexter*, ed. by Barbara C. Malament (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), pp. 25-56

-----, 'Reform and the "Commonwealth-Men" of Edward VI's Reign', in *The English Commonwealth, 1547-1640: Essays in Politics and Society Presented to Joel Hurstfield*, ed. by Peter Clark, Alan G. R. Smith, and Nicholas Tyacke (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979), pp. 23-38

FANON, FRANTZ, 'On National Culture', in *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. by Constance Farrington, preface by Jean-Paul Sartre (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967; repr. 1990), pp. 166-99

FICHTE, JOERG O., 'The Estate Moralities as a Mirror of Tudor Concepts of Kingship', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 235 (1998), 267-84

FINCHAM, KENNETH, 'Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud', in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660*, ed. by Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *Studies in Modern British Religious History*, 2 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), pp. 125-158

FLETCHER, ALAN J., *Drama, Performance, and Polity in Pre-Cromwellian Ireland* (Cork: Cork University Press; Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2000)

FOUCAULT, MICHEL, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. by Alan Sheridan (London: Penguin, 1979)

-----, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. and trans. by Colin Gordon (Brighton: Harvester, 1980)

FROEHLICH, KARLFRIED, 'Johannes Trithemius on the Fourfold Sense of Scripture: The *Tractatus de Inuestigatione Sacrae Scripturae* (1486)', in *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: Essays Presented to David C. Steinmetz in Honor of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by Richard A. Muller and John L. Thompson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), pp. 23-60

GARRETT, CHRISTINA H., *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938; repr. 1966)

GELLNER, ERNEST, *Nationalism* (London: Phoenix, 1998)

GHOSH, KANTIK, 'Eliding the Interpreter: John Wyclif and Scriptural Truth', in *New Medieval Literatures*, ed. by Rita Copeland, David Lawton, and Wendy Scase, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1997-2002), II (Clarendon Press, 1998), 205-224

GILLESPIE, VINCENT, 'Justification by Faith: Skelton's *Replycacion*', in *The Long Fifteenth Century: Essays for Douglas Gray*, ed. by Helen Cooper and Sally Mapstone (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 273-311

GREY, ERNEST, *Guevara: A Forgotten Renaissance Author*, International Archives of the History of Ideas, 4 (The Hague, NL: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973)

GRIERSON, PHILIP, 'The Origins of the English Sovereign and the Symbolism of the Closed Crown', *The British Numismatic Journal*, 33 (1964), 118-134

GUY, JOHN, 'Thomas Cromwell and the Intellectual Origins of the Henrician Revolution', in *Reassessing the Henrician Age: Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500-1550*, ed. by Alistair Fox and John Guy (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), pp. 151-178

HABERMAS, JÜRGEN, 'The Public Sphere', *New German Critique*, 3 (1974), 49-55

HADFIELD, ANDREW, 'John Skelton's Influence on John Bale', *Notes and Queries*, 239 (1994), 19-20

-----, *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

HAIGH, CHRISTOPHER, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)

HAMMOND, GERALD, *The Making of the English Bible* (Manchester: Carcanet, 1982)

- HEADLEY, JOHN M., 'The Habsburg World Empire and the Revival of Ghibellinism', in *Theories of Empire, 1450-1800*, ed. by David Armitage, *An Expanding World, The European Impact on World History 1450-1800*, 20 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998)
- HEINZE, R. W., *The Proclamations of the Tudor Kings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976)
- HELGERSON, RICHARD, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992)
- HOAK, DALE, ed., *Tudor Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)
- HOYLE, R. W., *The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Politics of the 1530s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)
- HUDSON, ANNE, 'Visio Baleii: An Early Literary Historian', in *The Long Fifteenth Century: Essays for Douglas Gray*, ed. by Helen Cooper and Sally Mapstone (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 313-329
- HUNT, ARNOLD, 'Licensing and Religious Censorship in Early Modern England', in *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 127-146
- INGRAM, WILLIAM, 'The Costs of Touring', *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, 6 (1993), 57-62
- IVES, E. W., *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986)
- JAMES, MONTAGUE R., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912)
- JONES, NORMAN, *The English Reformation: Religion and Cultural Adaptation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002)
- JONES, RICHARD H., 'Absolutism and the Common Good', in *The Royal Policy of Richard II: Absolutism in the Later Middle Ages*, *Studies in Mediaeval History*, 10 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), pp. 147-163
- KANTOROWICZ, ERNST H., *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957)
- KASTAN, DAVID SCOTT, "'Holy Wurdes" and "Slypper Wit": John Bale's *King Johan* and the Poetics of Propaganda', in *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts*, ed. by Peter C. Herman (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994), pp. 267-282

- KELLY, JOHN N. D., *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986)
- KING, JOHN N., *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982)
- , *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989)
- KIPLING, GORDON, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)
- , "‘He That Saw It Would Not Believe It’: Anne Boleyn’s Royal Entry into London”, in *Civic and Ritual Drama*, ed. by Alexandra F. Johnston and Wim Hüsken, *Ludus: Medieval and Early Renaissance Theatre and Drama*, 2 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997), pp. 39-79
- KOEBNER, RICHARD, "‘The Imperial Crown of this Realm’: Henry VIII, Constantine the Great and Polydore Vergil”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 26 (1953), 29-52
- LIDDELL, J. R., ‘The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the Sixteenth Century’, *The Library*, 4th ser., 18 (1937-38), 385-416
- LIVINGSTONE, ELIZABETH A., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- LOADES, DAVID, ‘John Foxe and the Godly Commonwealth, 1563-1641’, in *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 112-126
- , *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England, 1553-58*, 2nd edn (New York: Longman, 1991)
- LOADES, DAVID and Katherine Walsh, eds, *Faith and Identity: Christian Political Experience*, *Studies in Church History*, 6 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990)
- LUNNEY, RUTH, *Marlowe and the Popular Tradition: Innovation in the English Drama Before 1595* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002)
- MACCULLOCH, DIARMAID, ‘Kett’s Rebellion in Context’, in *Rebellion, Popular Protest and the Social Order in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paul Slack (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 39-62 (first publ. *Past and Present*, 84 (1979), 36-59)
- , ‘Kett’s Rebellion in Context: A Rejoinder’, in *Rebellion, Popular Protest and the Social Order in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paul Slack (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 68-76 (first publ. *Past and Present*, 93 (1981), 165-73)

- , *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996)
- MALTBY, WILLIAM, *The Reign of Charles V* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)
- MARSHALL, PETER, and Alec Ryrie, eds, *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- MARTIN, LUTHER H., Hick Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton, eds, *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988)
- MATTHEW, HENRY C. G., and Brian Harrison, eds, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: From the Earliest Times to the Year 2000*, 60 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- MATTINGLY, GARRETT, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (London: Cape, 1962)
- MCCOY, RICHARD C., *Alterations of State: Sacred Kingship in the English Reformation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002)
- MCCUNE, PAT, 'Order and Justice in Early Tudor Drama', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s., 25 (1994), 171-196
- MCGOLDRICK, JAMES EDWARD, *Luther's English Connection: The Reformation Thought of Robert Barnes and William Tyndale* (Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern, 1979)
- MCMILLIN, SCOTT, and Sally-Beth MacLean, *The Queen's Men and their Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- MOORHOUSE, GEOFFREY, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: The Rebellion that Shook Henry VIII's Throne* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2002)
- MOZLEY, J. F., *Coverdale and his Bibles* (London: Lutterworth, 1953)
- MULLER, RICHARD A., 'Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: The View from the Middle Ages', in *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: Essays Presented to David C. Steinmetz in Honor of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by Richard A. Muller and John L. Thompson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), pp. 3-22
- NELSON, PHILIP, *Ancient Painted Glass in England 1170-1500* (London: Methuen, 1913)
- NORLAND, HOWARD B., *Drama in Early Tudor Britain 1485-1558* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995)
- PAYNE, JOHN B., 'Erasmus's Influence on Zwingli and Bullinger in the Exegesis of Matthew 11:28-30', in *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: Essays Presented to David C. Steinmetz in Honor of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by Richard A. Muller and John L. Thompson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), pp. 61-81

- PETTEGREE, ANDREW, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996)
- POLLARD, ALFRED. W., and G. R. Redgrave, eds, *A Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*, 2nd edn, rev. by W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson, and Katharine F. Pantzer (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976)
- POOLE, KRISTEN, 'Saints Alive! Falstaff, Martin Marprelate, and the Staging of Puritanism', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 46 (1995), 47-75
- ROBERTSON, JEAN, 'L'Entrée de Charles Quint a Londres, en 1522', in *Fêtes et Cérémonies au Temps de Charles Quint*, ed. by Jean Jacquot (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1960), pp. 169-181
- ROSENTHAL, EARL E., 'The Invention of the Columnar Device of Emperor Charles V at the Court of Burgundy in Flanders in 1516', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 36 (1973), 198-230
- ROSS, TREVOR, 'Dissolution and the Making of the English Literary Canon: The Catalogues of Leland and Bale', *Renaissance and Reformation*, n.s., 15 (1991), 57-80
- RUSSELL, FREDERIC WILLIAM, *Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk* (London: Longman, 1859)
- RUSSELL, JOYCELYNE G., *The Field of Cloth of Gold: Men and Manners in 1520* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969)
- SALTER, F. M., 'Skelton's "Speculum Principis"', *Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies*, 9 (1934), 25-37
- SAXL, FRITZ, 'Veritas Filia Temporis', in *Philosophy and History: Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer*, ed. by Raymond Klibansky and H. J. Paton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), pp. 197-222
- SCATTERGOOD, JOHN, 'Skelton's *Magnyfycence* and the Tudor Royal Household', *Medieval English Theatre*, 15 (1993), 21-48
- SCHRAMM, PERCY ERNST., *A History of the English Coronation*, trans. by Leopold G. Wickham Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937)
- SCHWARTZ, WERNER, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and their Background* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1955)
- SHAGAN, ETHAN H., *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

SHRANK, CATHY, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England 1530–1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

SHUGER, DEBORA K., *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture*, *The New Historicism: Studies in Cultural Poetics*, 13 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990)

SIMPSON, JAMES, 'Ageism: Leland, Bale, and the Laborious Start of English Literary History, 1350-1550', in *New Medieval Literatures*, ed. by Rita Copeland, David Lawton, and Wendy Scase, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1997-2002), I (Clarendon Press, 1997), 213-235

SKINNER, QUENTIN, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)

SMITH, ALAN G. R., *The Emergence of a Nation State: The Commonwealth of England, 1529-1660* (London: Longman, 1984)

STRONG, ROY, *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals, 1450-1650* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1984)

STUBBS, WILLIAM, *The Constitutional History of England: In its Origin and Development*, 4th edn, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906)

TANNER, LAWRENCE E., *The History of the Coronation* (London: Pitkin, 1952)

TURNER, RALPH, *King John* (London: Longman, 1994)

TYACKE, NICHOLAS, 'Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism', in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660*, ed. by Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *Studies in Modern British Religious History*, 2 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), pp. 5-33

ULLMANN, WALTER, 'This Realm of England is an Empire', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 30 (1979), 175-203

VAN HIJUM, LISA M., 'Charles V and his Ideal: One Emperor, One Empire', in *The Propagation of Power in the Medieval West: Selected Proceedings of the International Conference, Groningen, 20-23 November 1996*, ed. by Martin Gosman, Arjo Vanderjagt, and Jan Veenstra, *Mediaevalia Groningana*, 23 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1997), pp. 129-142

VANHOUTTE, JACQUELINE A., 'Engendering England: The Restructuring of Allegiance in the Writings of Richard Morison and John Bale', *Renaissance and Reformation*, n.s., 20 (1996), 49-77

WALKER, GREG, *John Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)

-----, *Persuasive Fictions: Faction, Faith and Political Culture in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1996)

-----, *Plays of Persuasion: Drama and Politics at the Court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

-----, *The Politics of Performance in Early Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

WALSHAM, ALEXANDRA, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England*, Royal Historical Society Studies in History, 68 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993)

-----, "'Yielding to the Extremity of the Time": Conformity, Orthodoxy and the Post-Reformation Catholic Community', in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560–1660*, ed. by Peter Lake and Michael Questier, Studies in Modern British Religious History, 2 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), pp. 211-236

WARNICKE, RETHA M., *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn: Family Politics at the Court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

WARREN, WILFRED LEWIS, *King John* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1961)

WATSON, ANDREW G., ed., *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts, c. 435-1600*, in *Oxford Libraries*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984)

WATSON, NICHOLAS, 'Conceptions of the Word: The Mother Tongue and the Incarnation of God', in *New Medieval Literatures*, ed. by Rita Copeland, David Lawton and Wendy Scase, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1997-2002), I (Clarendon Press, 1997), 85-124

WHITE, PAUL WHITFIELD, 'Drama "in the Church": Church-Playing in Tudor England', *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, 6 (1993), 15-35

-----, 'Patronage, Protestantism, and Stage Propaganda in Early Elizabethan England', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 21 (1991), 39-52

-----, *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage, and Playing in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

WILKINSON, BERTIE, *The Coronation in History*, The Historical Association, general ser., 23 (London: George Philip for the Historical Association, 1953)

WINSER, LEIGH, 'Skelton's *Magnyfycence*', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 23 (1970), 14-25

WITHINGTON, ROBERT, *English Pageantry: An Historical Outline*, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918-1926; repr. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1963)

WOMACK, PETER, 'Imagining Communities: Theatres and the English Nation in the Sixteenth Century', in *Culture and History 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing*, ed. by David Aers (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), pp. 91-145

YATES, FRANCES A., *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975)

ZEEVELD, GORDON W., *Foundations of Tudor Policy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948)