Shaping the Nation before the Reformation: English National Identity up to 1530

Stephanie Kathryn Collinson

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds
School of History

July 2015

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her 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.

Acknowledgements

I owe a debt of gratitude to my supervisors, Dr Paul Cavill and Dr Alan Murray. Their patience and encouragement have been invaluable, as well as their advice on numerous drafts, guidance of my writing style, and help in shaping my ideas into their present form. I am also grateful to Professor Anthony Wright, as my second supervisor until his retirement, who was also very influential in guiding the direction and focus of this thesis.

This thesis could not have been produced without the financial support of the University of Leeds: their Faculty of Arts Partial PhD Scholarship and maintenance allowance has enabled me to pursue this degree full-time.

Staff particularly at the British Library, the Institute of Historical Research and the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester have been very helpful and accommodating. I am also indebted to the Reverend Roger Farnworth, for access to the beautiful Church of St Michael and All Angels in Ashton-under-Lyne, and for providing me with information about the Henry VI window.

I am grateful for the support and unending encouragement of my family and friends. Finally, thanks to James – whose life has been almost as invested in this thesis as my own – for love, patience and minimal complaint.

All remaining errors I acknowledge as my own.

Abstract

The broad subject of 'nation' has received substantial scholarly attention, which has resulted in a variety of opinions regarding the dating of the emergence of nationhood. Dominant theories suggest that it is a modern development, belonging to post-eighteenth-century democratic government and a result of this shift in the political landscape. Others have asserted much earlier developments, particularly for England, such as the Reformation of the 1530s, the Hundred Years War or earlier, as the defining periods of identity formation. However, the period of almost a century between the final stage of the Hundred Years War and the break with Rome, particularly the decades preceding the 1530s, has not been fully explored in relation to English nationhood.

This thesis will look at evidence for the articulation of English nationhood – that is the sense of belonging to a community which identified itself as English – within this period. It will draw upon the definition of modern nations, outlined by Craig Calhoun, in order to demonstrate the capacity for early sixteenth-century England to understand identity within the same parameters. It will suggest that national identity was complex, and articulated in a number of ways, and that these depended upon earlier developments and sentiment but were more fully explored and made available through the advent of print. In their turn, ways in which identity was expressed during this period provided a framework for negotiating the break with Rome and its implications for Englishness. In contrast to theories which suggest the incompatibility of monarchical systems of government and the idea of nations, it will also demonstrate that the crown was central to directing national sentiment, and aimed to invest the nation in itself as a means of ensuring support and participation of subjects, although sentiments of Englishness did not always follow, but transcended the crown's rhetoric.

Contents

Abbreviations

BL

British Library

Calhoun

Craig Calhoun, *Nationalism* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1997)

Chronicle of London to 1483

A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483: Written in the Fifteenth Century (London: Richard Taylor, 1827, reprinted, Felinfach: Llanerch Publishers, 1995)

EEBO

Early English Books Online

English Chronicle

An English Chronicle, 1377-1461: Edited from Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 21068 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34, ed. C. William Marx (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003)

Great Chronicle

The Great Chronicle of London, ed. by Arthur H. Thomas and Isobel D. Thornley (London: G. W. Jones, 1938)

Hall's Chronicle

Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle: Containing the History of England, During the Reign of Henry the Fourth, and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are Particularly Described the Manners and Customs of those Periods* (London: G. Woodfall, 1809)

Heralds' Memoir	*The Heralds' Memoir 1486-1490: Court Ceremony, Royal Progress and Rebellion*, ed. by Emma Cavell (Donington, Lincolnshire: Shaun Tyas, 2009)
Libelle	*The Libelle of Englyshe Polycye: a poem of the use of sea power*, ed. by George F. Warner (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926)
LPFD	*Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, 21 vols (London: Longman, 1862-1910).
REED	*Records of Early English Drama*
Relation	*A Relation, or rather, a true account of the Island of England: with sundry particulars of the customs of these people and of the royal revenues under King Henry the Seventh, about the year 1500*, ed. and trans. by Charlotte A. Sneyd (London: The Camden Society, 1847)in *The Making of the Modern World* <http://0-find.galegroup.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/mome/> [accessed 14th November 2011].
Shrank	Cathy Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)
Statutes	*The Statutes of the Realm*, 11 volumes (1810-1828), in *MOMW*.

TRPI   *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, volume 1: The Early Tudors, 1485-1553, ed. by Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964)

Introduction

In 1523, John Bourchier, Lord Berners, translated into 'our maternall englysshe tonge' chronicles which 'redounde to the honoure of Englysshemen'. He aimed to inspire 'gentylmen of Englande' to emulate their 'valyant aunceytours... in defence of their countre'.[1] His choice of source was Jean Froissart, a native of Hainault whose work recounted the first phase of the Hundred Years War. His motivation, at least in part, was the renewal of conflict with France. Not only was Lord Berners able to view the contemporary war as a collective undertaking of Englishmen on behalf of England, but he also identified his intended audience by their common descent from the Englishmen of the text, and their shared native language. Lord Berners' introduction, then, demonstrates his own sense of belonging to a national community, of how it was constructed and defined, and an understanding of the significance of an English translation. The broad subject of 'nation' and the related phenomena 'nationalism' and 'national identity' have received substantial scholarly attention, particularly in the last four decades, producing a range of opinions regarding the dating of the emergence of nationhood. As a result, there is a fundamental disagreement between modern and medieval scholarship.

Contrary to the experience of Lord Berners, dominant theories assert that the nation is a modern development, coinciding with an age of democratic government, from the eighteenth century onwards, which replaced earlier monarchical systems of rule. Although these theories recognise the significance of earlier developments, they emphasise the incompatibility of earlier systems of government with the concept of the 'nation', and suggest

---

[1] John Bourchier, Preface, *Here begynneth the first volum of sir Iohan Froyssart* (London: Richard Pynson, 1523), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 15th April 2010].

that this shift in the political landscape resulted in the emergence of national identity.[2] 'Nationalism' in particular, when taken to mean the political utilisation of national sentiment, is thought to be 'rooted in modernity'.[3] Others have rejected the placement of the birth of the nation in the modern period, and the characteristics identified by theories of modern nationhood may be used to demonstrate their earlier existence. Research has identified the break with Rome as a significant turning point and suggests that the decades following the Reformation were 'a crucial time for forming the image of England'.[4] Looking still further back, others have highlighted the impact of events such as the Hundred Years War in initiating a 'great awakening of vigorous national feeling'.[5] While this research has successfully departed from the modern origins of the nation, and asserted the capacity of late medieval and early modern people to express national identity, the period between the Hundred Years War and the Reformation has received little attention with regard to English identity, while the events and impact of the 1530s have drawn scholarly focus more generally, resulting in the relative neglect of the earlier years of Henry VIII's reign.

It is the intention of this thesis to explore the evidence for the articulation of English nationhood – that is the sense of belonging to a community which identified itself as English – within this period. It will follow the work which departs from the modern dating of nationhood, in order to establish earlier origins and highlight the ability and tendency of individuals and communities to imagine the nation and express a sense of belonging to it. More importantly, it will demonstrate the nature of national rhetoric up to the break with Rome, in order to suggest that an earlier understanding of English identity, based upon

---

[2] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism,* new ed., (London: Verso, 2006), pp. 5, 19-22.

[3] Ernest Gellner, *Nationalism* (New York: New York University Press, 1997), p. 13.

[4] Shrank, p. 7.

[5] Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 3.

developments and expressions of the previous century, informed its renegotiation. While arguing for this continuity of ideas, the thesis will also show that this period saw developments in the form of the greater dissemination of material which asserted the idea of the nation, the establishment of new, or the development of existing, symbols of nationhood, the deliberate construction of the relationship between crown and nation, and a debate over the meaning of Englishness.

The question of when national communities formed is one of the most central debates in determining their nature and construction. The modernist view of the development of nations, and the embracing of 'nationalist' ideologies, defines these phenomena as recent and novel, and certainly as having existed no earlier than the eighteenth century.[6] Although this work acknowledges the impact of earlier developments on the formation of modern nations, earlier periods largely only serve to provide memories and a sense of ethnicity, through which modern communities may claim permanence and historical relationships with the land they occupy. Opinions differ on the exact reasons for the rise of the nation in the modern period, and several significant changes of the eighteenth century have been identified as catalysts. Ernest Gellner suggests that the increased mobilisation and literacy demanded by industrialisation facilitated the modern nation, which was not compatible with the 'agro-literate' elite-dominated pre-modern society.[7] Inward-looking communities were, as a result, encompassed into a wider society through political and economic pressure. Crucially, Gellner therefore sees the nation as created by nationalism, an imposed 'high culture' which was distinctly modern.[8] That nationalism as a doctrine is a modern phenomenon is widely accepted. Anthony D. Smith's examination of the formation of modern nations identifies

---

[6] Anthony D. Smith, *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), pp. 28-9.
[7] Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (London: Cornell University Press, 1983), pp. 8, 42-6; Smith, *The Cultural Foundations of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), p. 3.
[8] Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, p. 52.

nationalism as the 'legitimating principle of politics and state-making today.[9] Similarly, Craig Calhoun asserts that nationalism is not only a result of modernity, but 'one of the definitive features of the modern era'.[10] One reason for this theory is that the understanding changed, that 'the term "nation" is old...but before the modern era, it meant only people linked by place of birth and culture', based upon the original Latin *natio*, meaning birth.[11] In contrast, Calhoun sees the modern understanding of the nation as complex, multi-layered and variable and identifies the most significant forms of imagining the nation, listing ten 'features of national rhetoric'. Briefly, this list highlights boundaries, indivisibility, sovereignty, 'an "ascending" notion of legitimacy', 'popular participation in collective affairs', 'direct membership' and equivalency to other members, a shared culture, temporal depth, common descent, and 'special relations...to a certain territory'.[12] Although not definitive, Calhoun suggests that "nation" may be applied to populations claiming most of these characteristics. Compared with his definition of the pre-modern 'nation', Calhoun therefore suggests that understanding nations in this way is strictly modern.

The construction of nationhood through the imposition of nationalistic rhetoric and political influence has long been the focus of work which identifies nationhood as modern. Michel Foucault, writing of the eighteenth century, argued that the rise of democratic government in Western Europe led to the birth of the nation-state, and it is this process which led to the development of national identity.[13] This assertion is shared by some of the most influential studies. Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* argues that both nationalism and 'nation-ness' were the result of eighteenth-century political developments. He suggests

---

[9] Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), p. 129.
[10] Calhoun, p. 12.
[11] Calhoun, p. 9.
[12] Calhoun, pp. 4-5.
[13] Michel Foucault, 'The Political Technology of Individuals', in *Technologies of the Self, A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, ed. by Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), pp. 145-162.

that nations are regarded as both 'sovereign', because the concept was created during this period of enlightenment when the 'hierarchical dynastic realm' was in decline, and 'limited', because even large nations have 'finite, if elastic boundaries'.[14] He outlines this assumption that 'sacral monarchy', the 'high centre' and indistinct borders, characteristics of pre-modern kingship, were incompatible with nation-ness, as the construction of monarchical states was dictated by dynastic marriages.[15] Such states or 'composite monarchies' were formed from several territories brought under a single rule, encompassing regions with varied customs and languages.[16] Anderson's central concept supports Gellner's view that nationhood emerged from a constructed nationalism. Anderson identifies nations as 'imagined communities', based upon the impossibility for direct communication between all constituent members, and upon the reliance of such formations on the belief of individuals in their membership.[17] Anderson does concede that significant elements of nationalism had origins in the sixteenth century.[18] Print technology 'created the possibility of a new form of imagined community, which...set the stage for the modern nation'.[19] Yet for Anderson, the potential of print was only realised following the decline of religion, as it fulfilled a need of a secular, capitalist society for a wider community through which to engage with a sense of immortality.[20]

However, while the political conditions of the eighteenth century onwards may have given rise to a need for nationalistic rhetoric, the circumstances of modernity do not preclude the earlier existence of the nation in a recognisable form. Although Anderson and others see the 'hierarchical dynastic realm' as incompatible with the construction of nations, the

---

[14] Anderson, pp. 5-7.
[15] Anderson, pp. 19-20.
[16] John H. Elliott, 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', *Past and Present,* 137 (1992), 48-71 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/650851> [accessed 5th August 2013] (pp. 50-2).
[17] Anderson, pp. 5-7.
[18] Anderson, pp. 37-46.
[19] Anderson, p. 46.
[20] Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations*, p.3.

existence of such monarchies did not prevent the development of national identities within their structure, or the extension of national membership, over time, to newly acquired regions. This process, and the reconciliation of the various possessions of English kings with English nationhood, demonstrates instead the complexities and adaptability of ideas of nation. Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century kingship was not incompatible with the concept of nation-ness. Instead, both before and after the break with Rome, England's kings aimed to, and to a certain extent did, exercise influence on the direction of English national identity, and aimed to invest it in the crown. Populations of medieval kingdoms were able to think in terms of a regnal community.[21] It will be shown in Chapter Four that popular participation was necessary for the exercise of kingship, and this was often sought through appeals to national sentiment. Furthermore, understanding of the nation was, by at least the fifteenth century, more complex and varied than Calhoun allows. It could be understood to be defined by language or sovereignty, but not necessarily in association with a particular land or area. The appearance of 'nation' in primary material therefore poses a problem, as it could be intended to mean a community other than that which included all 'Englishmen', for example referring to *an* English community as opposed to *the* English community.

The different uses of 'nation', however, do not prevent the existence of nations and communities bound together by a shared sense of belonging to them. Several features of modern national rhetoric are equally applicable to fifteenth- and sixteenth-century England. This thesis will not be concerned as much with the use of the word 'nation' as with the sense of its existence, of how England was defined, and who was seen as English. A task of the first chapter will be to determine what was meant by 'England' itself, and to whom English identity was applicable. It will always be difficult to identify the subjects of a study of

---

[21] Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 264.

national identity. Given that part of the purpose of the work itself is to examine to whom the label of 'English' was applied, it is not possible to simply say 'the English'. It is also not accurate to say, for example, that it is a study of 'English speakers', or 'residents of England', as no one parameter of identity could be considered definitive: people who were labelled 'Scots' were also described as speaking English, while many who were determined aliens by other standards lived in England.[22] The phrase 'English subjects' will be used to refer broadly to the members of the English nation, to show that it is concerned with the subjects (although not the Welsh subjects) of the kings of England, in that capacity, not, for example, as lord of Ireland or the assumed title of king of France.

Anderson's outline of the 'imagined community' may also be applied to earlier periods. That nations are 'imagined' is a difficult idea. Nationhood, of course, is dependent upon the beliefs and sentiments of those who consider themselves members. Secondly, viewing a nation as a community which is not reliant upon the direct communication of all members, but on a perception of its existence, allows for its earlier existence. It also justifies the labelling of communities which could not be considered nations by standards of territory or official membership as such, for example the Jewish 'nation' bound by descent, and history, or pre-modern German national identity, constituted by language. However, 'imagined' also implies 'not real', and nations and identities were, and are, felt to be real. This may be illustrated by examples of the ways in which nations are 'limited'. England's boundaries were remarked upon as real frontiers in descriptions of journeys, while encroachments by 'others' were real threats. Within England, too, there were concrete manifestations of identity, for example when the idea of membership was reinforced by the removal of non-English residents from communities. Populations of towns would not have

---

[22] Len Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 13.

needed direct communication with all other Englishmen to know that it was their belonging to this wider community, and specific rules concerning their parentage, that was the difference between their own fate and that of the people removed. In this circumstance, nationhood was not imagined, but official and legislated.

As Anderson suggests, the advent of print technology created a significant means by which nations could be imagined. However, not only was its impact felt much earlier than Anderson allows, but its relationship with nationhood was not as a facilitator for its creation, but a means of transmitting and increasing the dissemination of existing ideas. The commercial motivation of printing meant that material was produced in order to satisfy a market. Work which acknowledged national identity therefore responded to an existing need to express national sentiment. Even material which was produced with a specific agenda, for example to direct support towards the interests of the crown, appealed to national sentiment among its audience which must have already existed in order to have made such work effective. Rather than initiating the development of the nation, then, print was a new means of communicating sentiment which was already part of how its readership, at least, understood their identity. This thesis aims to show a continuity and development of ideas from the fifteenth century through to the eve of the Reformation, ideas which pre-dated print. However, print did facilitate the transmission and greater dissemination of these pre-existing ideas. It contributed greatly to the construction and assertion of England's 'temporal depth' as it increased the production of historical material. It also enabled more effective communication between crown and subjects, and became a forum for debate.

The modernist position has been extensively challenged. One major contention of modernists, which is used to justify the identification of the nation as a phenomenon arising out of specific, modern circumstances, is that the nation is not a universal or natural

occurrence. However, the existence of parallels in earlier periods lends legitimacy to arguments which view the nation as an organic, primordial tendency. Although Anthony D. Smith is concerned with examining the basis of modern nations, he highlights the flaw of the modernist perspective which sees little dependence on earlier periods, and which assumes that modern political conditions were enough to bind previously diverse populations into nations.[23] At the same time, Smith does not wholly accept the view that the nation is perennial and natural, instead offering a perspective which recognises the significance of subjective, 'cultural givens' of blood, religion and language emphasised by 'primordialists', of ethnicity rooted in the 'myths, memories, values and symbols' which were essential to modern identities.[24] It is *Ethnie*, rather than fully-formed nations, which he sees as perennial.[25] Despite this, Smith's earlier work more firmly identifies with established modernist opinion, insisting that 'nationalism…is a wholly modern concept'.[26] This is an opinion that Smith has more recently modified to take into account that, although a modern doctrine, elements of nationalism emerged much earlier, identifying the English Reformation as the 'first kind of nationalism'.[27]

More recently, Azar Gat has also challenged the modernist position, instead, in common with Smith, viewing the nation as an ethnic group sharing birth, culture and geographical space, defining identity in contrast to strangers.[28] He argues that 'modernists have ignored early national state consolidation common across Northern Europe', and points out instead that 'from the British Isles to Russia ethnic realities formed the basis of the

---

[23] Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations*, pp. 17, 73-7.
[24] Smith, *Nation in History*, pp. 21-5; C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (London, Fontana, 1973), pp. 259-60.
[25] Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations*, pp. 15-18, 22-46.
[26] Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations*, p. 18.
[27] Smith, *Cultural Foundations of Nations*, pp. x, 93-4.
[28] Azar Gat and Alexander Yakobson, *Nations: The Long History and Deep Roots of Political Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 28-32.

emergent states' from the early pre-modern period.[29] In reference to the complications of early-medieval England, when the ethnicity of the rulers could be considered different to that of the ruled, Gat observes that such differences gradually eroded.[30] However, this focus is questioned by Chris Wickham, who, while agreeing with the argument which places the development of nationhood in this early period, suggests that, in relation to medieval nationhood, Gat is too reliant upon strong ethnicity, and questions his opinion that city states could not be considered 'nations'.[31]

Smith advocates viewing the development of individual nations as distinct processes. In his treatment of England, the case is considered for the existence of a pre-modern nation, and he indicates that, by the tenth century, England possessed origin myths which provided the foundations for at least an elite sense of nationhood and English ethnicity during the late-medieval period onwards.[32] Existing research has argued more strongly for the pushing back of the development of nationhood to particular periods. Work concerning English nationhood in particular has sought to date its origins to much earlier periods, by identifying landmark events or processes in which national rhetoric was defined or refashioned. Cathy Shrank argues that suggesting expressions of national consciousness such as an 'investment in national language' belong to the modern age represents a 'misreading of early modern political processes'.[33] Anderson's 'imagined political community' is also applicable to sixteenth-century England, while studies of other early modern communities demonstrate

---

[29] Gat, *Nations*, pp. 183-4.
[30] Gat, *Nations*, pp. 71.
[31] John Hutchinson, Chris Wickham, Bo Strath, Azar Gat, 'Debate on Azar Gat's *Nations: The Long History and Deep Roots of Political Ethnicity and Nationalism*', *Nations and Nationalism*, 21, 3 (2015), 383-402 (pp. 385-9).
[32] Smith, *Cultural Foundations of Nations*, pp. 992-8.
[33] Shrank, pp. 2-6.

their ability to imagine their construction and limits.[34] Shrank suggests that the 1530s onwards, 'the age of Reformation', was 'a crucial time for forming the image of England', and the 'instruction' of Englishness.[35] Furthermore, she states that at least seven of the features listed by Calhoun are applicable to sixteenth-century England.[36] This is demonstrated as Shrank explores expressions of nationhood in English writing. She shows that an awareness of the boundaries of the nation, and a sense of its 'temporal depth', were important elements of the articulation of Englishness from the 1530s onwards, particularly in the immediate wake of the break with Rome.[37] So too, was kingship, as Shrank responds to Anderson's view of the incompatibility of 'sacral monarchy' by highlighting the reciprocal relationship between England's kings and their subjects and their reliance upon popular support and an ascending legitimacy of authority.[38]

Although Shrank does not insist that English nationhood began with the Reformation, she argues that the sixteenth century witnessed a 'revolution' in processes which fuelled England's nation-building. Among these changes, the break with Rome is considered the most influential in shaping identity, doing so both immediately and more long-term, through its own evolution towards the late sixteenth-century 'Protestant England'.[39] In agreement with Smith's identification of the Reformation as an early example of nationalism, a national doctrine which particularly emphasised the image of England as an empire was integral to the establishment of the royal supremacy and the Church of England, while England's separation from the Catholic Church made the sense of 'otherness' and outside threats more acute. The

---

[34] Shrank, pp. 6-7; Miriam Bodian, '"Men of the Nation": The Shaping of Converso Identity in Early Modern Europe', *Past and Present*, 143, (1994), 48-76 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/651161> [accessed 10th August 2013].

[35] Shrank, pp. 1-7.

[36] Shrank, pp. 3-6.

[37] Shrank, pp. 27-64, 65-103.

[38] Shrank, p. 5; Calhoun, p. 5.

[39] Shrank, pp. 7-10; Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), p. ix.

relationship between England's religious changes and its articulation of nationhood is emphasised by other works which date their studies from the 1530s onwards, or focus on Elizabethan and Stuart England.[40] Philip Schwyzer shares Shrank's opinion that 'there is no doubt that the Reformation and subsequent conflicts with Catholic powers encouraged the development of national consciousness in England', and identifies elements of a national rhetoric in the debates surrounding the break with Rome.[41] Edwin Jones emphasises still further the impact of the 1530s as the pivotal period for English identity. He highlights the centrality of 'temporal depth' as a driving force of national rhetoric, arguing that it was during the Reformation that the 'great myth' of the English nation, the framework of identity which centred on insularity, was established through the creation and manipulation of a specific history.[42]

However, in order for nationhood to have developed during the Reformation, a strong sense of national identity must have existed much earlier. As Smith points out, the capacity to at least understand and adhere to sentiments of nationhood existed earlier than Anderson, Calhoun and Gellner allow. Furthermore, the characteristics central to Shrank's illustration of English identity, including the relationship between English kingship and Englishness, were part of this earlier understanding. Kathy Lavezzo suggests that the search for English identity must extend further back. It was 'possible to imagine an English community in the Middle Ages', through notions of shared history, language and even popular participation.[43] Ralph

[40] For example Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts, eds, *British Identity and British Consciousness: the Making of the United Kingdom, 1533-1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity, Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994).

[41] Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 4, 50-9.

[42] Edwin Jones, *The English Nation: the Great Myth* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998).

[43] Kathy Lavezzo, *Imagining a Medieval English Nation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), p. xvii; Andrew Galloway, 'Latin England', in *Imagining an Medieval English Nation*, ed. by

Griffiths draws attention to the events of the fifteenth century and their 'significance for relations between peoples of the British Isles', as they sharpened the distinctions of identity through comparison.[44] He observes that 'this was the very age when English elites', at least, 'expressed themselves more robustly as English', shaping arguments defending their own identity and reasserting British origin myths which defined them in relation to Scotland and Wales.[45] History was thus a means of expressing a sense of identity, as it stressed the differentiation of one people from another, and provided a powerful form of exclusion: common descent. Although, as Griffiths shows, history and origin myths were particularly important during the fifteenth century, they had long been intrinsic to the legitimacy of English nationhood. Thorlac Turville-Petre states that, by the thirteenth century, writers of histories were confident of the temporal depth of the nation and of a 'long period of common history'. Historical writing was 'fundamental to the establishment of national identity' in England, to justify the nation's existence in its current form, and legitimise claims of territory and language.[46] The fifteenth century, however, witnessed events which increased the need for reinforcing national unity, and, towards the end, also produced the means to extend and develop material which had long been significant, in print. The translation work of Lord Berners, then, in making a history available for the purpose of admiring and emulating English ancestors, expresses the same basic understanding of identity that was prevalent in the thirteenth century, but also a response to more recent events.

Lavezzo, pp. 41-95 (p. 43); Larry Scanlon, 'King, Commons and Kind Wit: Langland's National Vision and the Rising of 1381', in *Imagining a Medieval English Nation*, ed. by Lavezzo, pp. 191-233.

[44] Ralph Griffiths, 'The Island of England in the Fifteenth Century: Perceptions of the Peoples of the British Isles', *Journal of Medieval History*, 29 (2003), 177-200 (pp. 178-81).

[45] Griffiths, 'The Island of England', pp. 182-4.

[46] Thorlac Turville-Petre, *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 1, 7, 71.

The assertion of origin myths was not peculiar to English identity. Work focusing on other pre-modern populations demonstrates the parallel development of nationhood among England's neighbours. Defining membership through history, language and territory naturally depended upon the existence of 'others', and origin myths in particular dealt with England's relationship with Scotland. This was a reciprocal relationship, as contemporary Scottish identity was also dependent upon origin material which was, Griffiths suggests, asserted in response to English claims to British origin myths.[47] This had long been the case. Myths of Scottish descent and territorial claims were as crucial to inward-looking nation-building as they were for outward differentiation. Scottishness competed with, or absorbed, numerous ethnic groups, to impose a single identity, and claim a unified territory.[48] Interaction with England, however, was a major factor in the development of Scottish identity, as the threat posed by successive English kings made the insistence of nationhood imperative. The relationship was characterised not just by competing British myths and border territory, but by Scotland's status as an independent kingdom, from 1278 onwards, when Edward I began to demand homage from Alexander III for Scotland as well as his English lands. The response was to claim the uninterrupted descent of Scotland's kings from their earliest predecessors, something which could not be said of Edward I, and to dispute the British history upon which Edward relied, stating that Albany's name and British race had 'got the new name of Scotia with the race of Scots'.[49] The Scottish crown was therefore linked to the sense of nationhood, and the two depended upon each other for legitimacy and survival. It is this defence which leads William Ferguson to the conclusion that 'a Scottish nation

---

[47] Griffiths, 'The Island of England', p. 183.
[48] William Ferguson, *The Identity of the Scottish Nation: An Historical Quest* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), pp. 6, 19-21.
[49] Ferguson, pp. 30, 36-40.

undoubtedly existed by 1286', therefore seeing a 'nation' as constituted by the sense of temporal depth and the relationship of a people to a particular territory.[50]

While the threat of England was important in influencing Scottish national identity, the most significant relationship for English identity was with France. This was also prompted by suzerainty, a complex history of the English crown's lordship of land under the overall rule of French kings, dominated later by a claim to the French crown itself. Negotiating this relationship helped to shape English identity in terms of language, territory, sovereignty, loyalty and history. In terms of at least some characteristics, this was also the case for France. David Bell shows that it was during the eighteenth century that the word 'nation' and a related national lexicon became prominent in French literature. He suggests that, by the 1780s, ideas of nation had 'taken their place as central organising concepts of French political culture' and, preceding the Revolution, 'emerged as the principal sources of political legitimacy', and one of the period's most crucial debates.[51] However, in relation to France, too, the idea of the nation as an entirely modern development has been challenged. Josep Llobera highlights developments in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries which saw the 'de-personalization of the monarchy'. During this period, the territory was no longer considered the personal patrimony of the king, but an integral territorial unit, and the succession of the crown was, by the fifteenth century, not considered the king's possession.[52] The idea of France as the land of a people defined by the location of their birth also began to

---

[50] Ferguson, p. 19.

[51] David Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001), pp. 12, 70-3.

[52] Josep R. Llobera, 'State and Nation in Medieval France', *Journal of Historical Sociology,* 7, 3 (1994), 343-62 (pp. 352-53).

develop. The crown was instrumental in this process of imagining France, and created a rhetoric which engaged with earlier Carolingian traditions, and sentiment towards language.[53]

A sense of national history was also a central element of French identity. France had its own origin myths, which in the fifteenth century encompassed Trojan ancestry, supplemented by a Christian past which invested France's spiritual identity in St Clovis, the first Christian Merovingian king, whose conquests represented the limits of the kingdom.[54] More recent history had also become important, as the telling of the Hundred Years War, and negotiating its impact, was as necessary as it was for Englishness. Ellen Caldwell points out that 'French and English narratives of the events...have always been in conflict'.[55] Although Caldwell focuses mainly on the late-sixteenth century, on, in her opinion, 'the moment of emergent English nationalism', the point that accounts were influenced by national allegiance is equally applicable to the earliest interpretations.[56] French art, for example, articulated a need to re-establish the preferable relationship between France and England, as Jean Fouquet's illustrations of a mid fifteenth-century copy of the *Grandes Chroniques de France* took several opportunities to emphasise French sovereignty in response to the claims of English kings.[57] The impact of the war was also felt in searches for an understanding of French nationhood. Among the work of French poet Eustache Deschamps, produced between 1385 and 1405, Earl Jeffrey Richards sees a reliance on an image of England as a parallel opposing construction to French identity.[58]

---

[53] Llobera, pp. 356.
[54] Llobera, p. 357.
[55] Ellen C. Caldwell, 'The Hundred Years' War and National Identity', in *Inscribing the Hundred Years' War in French and English Cultures*, ed. by D. N. Baker (New York: University of New York Press, 2000), pp. 237-65 (p. 259).
[56] Caldwell, p. 237.
[57] Erik Inglis, *Jean Fouquet and the Invention of France: Art and Nation after the Hundred Years War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).
[58] Earl Jeffrey Richards, 'The Uncertainty in Defining France as a Nation in the Works of Eustache Dechamps', in *Inscribing the Hundred Years' War*, ed. by Baker, pp. 159-75 (p. 166).

Work treating the development of national identity among England's neighbours illustrates three important points. Alongside research concerning England, it demonstrates the legitimacy of searching for nationhood in what Anderson and others would consider the pre-modern period. Secondly, it highlights the significance of interaction with other nations and peoples, of establishing a sense of 'otherness', to the creation and renegotiation of nationhood. Finally, the ways in which other nations have been shown to construct their own identities demonstrate the variability of national characteristics.[59] Both France and Scotland were concerned with notions of sovereignty, descent, history and boundaries, but along different lines and dependent upon different combinations of characteristics. No study of national identity, therefore, can be generalised. An example is provided by Len Scales' study of medieval German identity, which developed within different circumstances of language, territory and authority.[60] Although it could not be said that there was a German nation in the territorial sense, Scales demonstrates that there was, through other perceived claims, a sense of 'Germanness'. The use of such terms is useful in emphasising the uniqueness of nationhood. This thesis is, therefore, a study of 'Englishness': it will show that the parameters of English nationhood were due to its own circumstances, and will not suggest that conclusions drawn for English identity were universal principles of nationhood.

Another important factor relevant to the study of nationhood in any period, is the issue of competing identities, both external and internal. Cathy Shrank points out that Englishness during the Reformation was reinterpreted as an identity which had rejected the outside influence of Rome. National rhetoric of the 1530s onwards therefore suggested that, previously, membership of the universal church had restricted or competed with national

---

[59] Calhoun, p. 5.
[60] Scales.

loyalties.[61] Advocates of modern nationhood such as Anderson also assert the dominance of the universal Christian Church over medieval thought to the exclusion or restriction of national sentiment, a dominance which needed to be challenged by the Reformation, and by print in order to allow the 'rise of national consciousness'.[62] According to Hans Kohn, the church superseded other communities, and even when acknowledging medieval sentiments of patriotism, he describes them as 'subordinated to the common Christianity'.[63] However, several medievalists have refuted the 'misconception that one identity must exclude or diminish another', or that Christendom held back any sense of nationhood, suggesting instead that 'multiple loyalties are not necessarily weakened loyalties', but could coexist and inform each other.[64] This was the case in England prior to the 1530s, as traditional Christian devotions provided a means of confirming national identity in the form of patron saints. Local identities, too, may be suggested to have threatened any notion of a single national identity. The claims they exercised upon loyalty would have often been at odds with the national idea, possibly through the desire to protect privileges. However, it may also be argued that the reliance of local communities upon higher authority for such rights also allows for the recognition a wider, national identity.[65] Susan Reynolds, in considering the organisation and collective activity of medieval communities, points out that, although several elements of local society created a sense of community, this was not necessarily always in conflict with wider regnal loyalty.[66] Len Scales acknowledges that multiple identities were an issue particularly relevant to the medieval territories collectively referred to as 'German', when this identification needed to be reconciled with being, for example,

---

[61] Shrank, p. 29.
[62] Anderson, pp. 37-41; Lavezzo, *Imagining*, p. viii.
[63] Lavezzo, *Imagining*, p. viii; Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: a Study in its Origins and Background* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 2005), pp. 78-96, 108-15.
[64] Lavezzo, *Imagining*, pp. vii-ix; Turville-Petre, pp. 7, 40; L. O. Aranye Fradenburg, 'Pro Patria Mori', in *Imagining a Medieval English Nation*, ed. by Lavezzo, pp. 3-40 (p. 3).
[65] Robert Colls, *Identity of England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 16.
[66] Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, pp. 264-6.

'Frankish'.[67] That this is the case for the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth, is shown throughout the thesis, as Englishness was not only compatible with, and even central to local identities and cultural expression, but was also not diminished by the performance of England's duty as a Christian realm.

This thesis will follow research which departs from the modern origins of nationhood, and assert the ability of pre-modern national communities to imagine their identity. It will show not only that the 'hierarchical dynastic realm' was compatible with English nationhood, but also that the crown engaged with, and was an integral part of, English identity. More specifically, it will explore the ways in which this identity was articulated, and what was important to its construction, from around the end of the Hundred Years War, and preceding the break with Rome. It responds to a lack of sufficient study of this period and the link between 'medieval' and 'Reformation' ideas of nationhood. It will demonstrate that the significant features identified in the construction of modern nationhood – a distinct notion of boundaries, a sense of the nation's past, and the performance of membership through participation and ascending political legitimacy – are also relevant to a much earlier understanding of Englishness. It will follow Ethan Shagan's definition of 'popular politics', taking 'popular' participation to mean the 'presence of ordinary, non-elite subjects as the audience for or interlocutors with a political action' or appeals to national sentiment, and recognising that elite and popular aims and priorities responded to one another.[68]

It is not the intention of this work to challenge the impact of religious changes of the 1530s. Identifying the break with Rome as a rough endpoint for the study is meant, instead, to allow it to demonstrate that the key ways in which the nation was re-imagined, or at least

---

[67] Scales, p. 6.
[68] Ethan Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 19.

modified, from this time, were existing forms of expressing identity, which were available as a means of negotiating a new and uncertain direction. Shrank suggests that, in the Act in Restraint of Appeals of 1533, 'English identities were refashioned in the spirit of long-standing independence from the Roman Church', redefining Rome as a hostile 'other'. This action also placed emphasis on the king, and loyalty, as a focus of nationhood, as John Bale, writing in the 1540s, suggested that 'he that naturallye loueth hys lande' followed the commandments which included 'the faythful obedyence of kynges'.[69] However, it will be shown that these features of Englishness had long been part of the process of constructing English identity. The notion of obedience to the crown was central to the dominant interpretations of nationhood at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and for much of his early reign, Henry VIII had been responsible for further asserting it as a definitive limit of national membership. Furthermore, elements of the redefinition of England's relationship with Rome, for example the image of the nation as a defendable and walled realm, repeated well-established earlier symbolism.[70]

The structure of the thesis is intended to demonstrate that nationhood was both a sophisticated, elite idea intertwined with the period's culture, and an important and practical feature of the lives of English subjects, witnessed and performed at all levels. The first two chapters are mainly concerned with how the nation was understood, as both an 'imagined' concept and a real community. In the second half, the thesis moves towards a consideration of the active performance and development of nationhood, in order to demonstrate that Englishness was participatory, shared, and debated.

---

[69] Shrank, p. 29; Stewart James Mottram, 'Reforming Nationhood: England in the Literature of the Tudor Imperial Age, 1509-1553', (PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2005), pp. 4-8; John Bale, *The laboryouse Iourney [and] serche of Iohan Leylande, for Englandes antiquitees* (London: S. Mierdman, 1549), fol. 13ᵛ, in *EEBO* [accessed 5th August 2013].

[70] Shrank, pp. 46-8.

The first chapter examines frontiers, both in the geographical sense, and in the ways in which 'England' and 'English' were thought of, and will demonstrate that the sense of 'otherness' was essential to its existence. While territorial lines during the period in question were often changeable and complex, they were also known and described at length. The borders of England were well-defined. The frontiers of Englishness, however, were more complex. Limits of land, language, birth, culture and even loyalty were asserted as the defining characteristics of nationhood, in varying combinations. The first chapter also engages with the conflicting assumptions concerning the identification of frontier domains with centres of government. The remote locations of frontiers such as Berwick have led to the suggestion that their residents had little, if any, attachment to central loyalties. However, it may also be suggested that the proximity of the 'other', in the form of the French, Scots, Welsh or Irish, could instead heighten the sense of being distinct from neighbouring peoples. The positions and conditions of frontiers also made it necessary for measures to be taken to control and define their residents. Thus, frontiers also demonstrate the exercise of royal and governmental legislation in the definition of national identity, and the assumption by the crown of the ability to confirm or withdraw a subject's right to an English identity.

Chapter Two considers how investment in a national past was part of the articulation of Englishness. Calhoun stresses the centrality of the past to a nation's rhetoric, while for Smith, the transmission of myths and memories are crucial to ethnicity and the formation of identity.[71] It will be shown that early sixteenth-century English nationhood was dependent upon the notion of 'English' history, as the basis for defining and asserting membership. Historical writing expressed individual adherences of writers to the idea of the nation, and also participated in a collective action of preserving the past with national priorities. The

---

[71] Calhoun, pp. 4-5; Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations*.

nature of historical writing at the end of the fifteenth century does not lend itself to the assertion that there existed a single 'master narrative', instead demonstrating a cumulative, multifaceted history, confirmed by repetition and consistency. Further, it will argue that material which contributed to this narrative encouraged not only the sharing of the nation's history, but the ownership of it by those who had not experienced it but were entitled to it through membership of the nation.

The third chapter moves on to focus further on the performance of English nationhood, to what extent 'Englishness' may be considered to have been inclusive of all English subjects, and to have involved popular participation. Work which stresses the impact of the break with Rome highlights an assertion of independence from the wider Roman Catholic community as key to the redefined identity.[72] However, traditional devotion also provided the means of engaging with the nation, through the recognition of saints who were identified as patrons of England or who were thought to have special concern for its welfare. This period saw wide celebration of cults that had long been associated with the fate of England, but which, during this period, received encouragement and development by the crown, and benefitted from literary attempts, aided by print, to standardise and confirm their status. This chapter will argue that the investment of national welfare in patrons was an important expression of English nationhood, and one that was collectively undertaken. Saint cults also provided a means to shape national identity. Henry VII's use of the existing popular cult of Henry VI, and, more significantly, Henry VIII's association with St George, demonstrate both royal recognition of the investment of the nation in these figures, and attempts to invest nationhood in the crown.

---

[72] Shrank, p. 29.

Chapter Four continues to focus on the participatory nature of English nationhood, exploring particular occasions that provided opportunities, or created a necessity, for the expression and definition of nationhood. Although, as Anderson points out, the legitimacy of kingship 'derives from divinity, and not from populations', the dynastic upheaval of the fifteenth century meant that English kingship needed to secure popular support.[73] This chapter will show that English kings needed to court the support and participation of their subjects, and this was often articulated in language of nationhood. Royal celebrations provided opportunities to draw upon existing sentiments to invest nationhood in the person of the king, both recognising that nationhood was an effective appeal among English subjects and suggesting that it was not fixed, but could be shaped. This support was needed in both the pursuit of war and the prevention of rebellion, as the crown sought to mobilise supporters 'on the basis of national membership'.[74] However, Englishness was not monopolised by the monarchy, but could transcend it. The need for the crown to gain popular support led royal rhetoric to encourage active responsibility for the nation. Occasions of popular protest demonstrated the ability of English subjects to interpret nationhood in opposition to the king's desires, and represented a debate on the right to speak for England, facilitated by print.

---

[73] Anderson, p. 19.
[74] Calhoun, p. 5.

1. Frontiers of Nationhood

A discussion of national identity should begin by addressing contemporary perceptions of the nation to which it related, and the limits within which it applied. Until 1558, the domains of England's kings consisted of a patchwork of territories that had belonged to their predecessors for varying lengths of time, some which existed on active, often hostile borders with other realms or peoples, occupied outposts of power separated from mainland England, or were remnants of historical divisions. Traditional historical opinion has placed the physically remote regions at the periphery of the Tudor state, and so research has previously marginalised areas such as Calais, the far north of England and Ireland. Local and regional power was seen as eclipsed by the centralised authority of south-east England.[1] More recently, however, research has highlighted regional jurisdiction and the influence of 'marginal' territories.[2] Steven Ellis in particular has questioned the identification of lowland England as the 'normal', defining region of Tudor government, instead arguing that these peripheral regions, forming the majority of the Tudor state, were central to shaping policy.[3] This approach is equally applicable to nationhood. The frontiers provide insights into the important features of national rhetoric, and emphasise the importance of the contrast with the 'other'. In this context, and with consideration for the traditional claims of the English crown to sovereignty over other realms, it will be important, first, to establish how 'England' itself was defined. Furthermore, the relationship between the English crown and these territories,

---

[1] David Grummitt, '"For the surety of the towne and the marches", Early Tudor policy towards Calais, 1485-1509', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 44 (2000), 184-203 (p. 184); Geoffrey R. Elton, *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558* (London: Arnold, 1977), pp. 20-1, 205.

[2] For example Tim Thornton, *Cheshire and the Tudor State, 1480-1560* (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, 2000).

[3] Steven G. Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: The Making of the British State* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995); Ellis, 'Tudor State Formation and the Shaping of the British Isles', in *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, eds Ellis and Sarah G. Barber (London: Longman, 1995), pp. 40-63 (pp. 40-2).

restricted by distance, difficulties in communication and the influence of neighbouring realms, poses a significant challenge to any suggestion of a unity of national sentiment. The position within the nation of militarised frontiers is particularly important: did the difficulties of maintaining an influence in these regions weaken the effectiveness of any national encouragement? It may be suggested, instead, that the proximity of these regions to 'otherness', and their defensive importance may have strengthened identification with a national idea, and made the regions themselves significant in the idea of the nation.

This chapter will examine how 'England' was perceived and defined in national rhetoric and the awareness of subjects and visitors, both as an imagined, symbolic nation, and as a physical, integral unit. It will be suggested that early sixteenth-century national consciousness consistently recognised England to have reasonably well-defined territorial 'boundaries', and expressed the 'notion that the nation was an integral unit'.[4] Calhoun suggests that this is not applicable to the period of interest, arguing that borders were fluid, due to expansionist aims of medieval and early modern kings. Equally, Anderson believes that the dependence of sovereign territories upon dynastic marriages meant that borders could not, at this time, be considered fixed. However, although military expeditions frequently pursued the expansion of territory, this did not affect assumed borders of England. These remained largely fixed, as expansion instead aimed to gain territory that would be held under titles other than that of 'King of England'. The chapter will then look at the frontiers, both on the geographical peripheries and within the realm, of membership of the nation, and will demonstrate that Englishness was not coterminous with definitions of England, but extended beyond it. It will be suggested that elements of popular participation and a shared culture were not only present during this period but were integral to the existence of nationhood

---

[4] Calhoun, p. 4.

beyond England's borders. This chapter also responds to Cathy Shrank's discussion of the ex-Carthusian monk Andrew Borde.[5] Borde's work reacted to the break with Rome with 'noisy protestations of his own Englishness' to demonstrate his repudiation of his former allegiance to Rome, and this is done in his work through the emphasis of stereotypes of other nations, especially in terms of language, while asserting the worth of England and English, and its defendable borders.[6] The earlier existence of such definitions of English identity suggests a continuity of ideas into the post-1530s articulation of nationhood, as existing ideas were used to understand a new and uncertain direction. Finally, it will be shown that there was, perhaps, a greater need to define and project Englishness to peripheral regions, due to the proximity of both enemies and the 'other', although this was not consistently experienced.

I. Defining 'England'

In seeking to demonstrate and understand perceptions of the nation and expressions of national consciousness in Henry VIII's England, it is important, initially, to establish contemporary definitions of the nation itself, to which these ideas related. The ways in which 'England' was used, both in symbolic or literary depictions and in legislative and administrative material, show an awareness of England as a single, integral unit, and also demonstrate the factors that were central to the definition of the nation.

England and its definition had long been of interest to chroniclers, and this continued into printed material. Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, an eighth-century work first printed in 1480, used information from even earlier writers to define Britain and its

---

[5] Shrank, p. 6.
[6] Shrank, pp. 29-49.

'four nations'.[7] A later description of England that would have been well-known, at least to literate sixteenth-century audiences, is that of Ranulf Higden, first written in the early fourteenth century as part of his larger chronicle the *Polychronicon* and later translated, and first printed by William Caxton in 1482, then in subsequent editions, examples of which survive from 1527 and 1528.[8] Due to the market-driven nature of the industry, the choice of material to print reflects an existing interest and demand, and so the reproduction of such histories demonstrates that the definitions they contained were at least well-known and possibly shared. In recounting the history of England from the first founding, Higden's 'descripcyon of Englonde' shows it to have been separate from Scotland and Wales from the land's initial division by Brutus for his three sons, into 'Loegria', 'Cambria' and 'Albania'.[9] However, this distinction is somewhat blurred by the use of England and Britain elsewhere within the work. The subtitle 'Of the settynge / boundynge / length and brede of Englonde' heads a physical description of 'Britayn' rather than England, and gives the length and bredth of the island between Cornwall and Scotland, and Wales and Norfolk.[10] More specifically, the text records that, after 'Brute conquered this londe & called it Brytayn', the 'saxons or Englysshmen conquered this londe & called it Anglia y[at] is Englonde'.[11] Higden's work does, elsewhere, record the coming of the Saxons in greater detail, showing that the Britons were driven 'out of Englond into Wales', but the suggestion remains that the names Britain

---

[7] Henry R. Loyn, *The Making of the English Nation: From the Anglo-Saxons to Edward I* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991), pp. 8-10; Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, revised edition, ed. and trans. by Leo Shirley-Price (London: Penguin, 1990), pp. 19, 44-6.

[8] The following paragraph is based on the 1528 version to demonstrate the persistence of his work and these ideas, as translated.

[9] Ranulf Higden, *The Cronycles of Englonde with the dedes of popes and emperours, and also the descripcyon of Englonde* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1528), fol. 167ᵛ, in *EEBO* [accessed 22ⁿᵈ December 2011].

[10] Higden, fol. 166ʳ.

[11] Higden, fol. 165ᵛ.

and England were interchangeable.[12] Similar perspectives were evident among local material. William Worcestre, a well-read Bristol antiquarian who travelled extensively throughout England and Normandy mostly in the latter half of the fifteenth century, recorded details from sources he encountered.[13] These included, for example, a calendar which labelled 184 AD with 'the first Christianity in England, or rather in Britain', and a chronicle in Bristol which measured 'England, largest of the islands', from 'Totnes in Cornwall' to 'Caithness in Scotland', and from 'St David's in Wales to Canterbury in Kent'.[14] Both examples suggest a wider adherence to the interchangeable use of England and Britain, or the use of England for the whole island.

Accounts of foreign visitors, too, suggest that the names of England and Britain were seen to mean the same thing. These opinions would have been informed partly by prior knowledge, but mostly by information gained from historical material or from experience of contemporary opinion, and therefore may reflect the perspective of at least those with which they had contact. The anonymous *Italian Relation of England* was written by a visitor to Henry VII's court, probably a Venetian ambassador, as the Venetians had produced 'relations' of other realms. Writing reports of countries visited was a usual practice of ambassadors, and so, as such a report, this account relied upon information collected during the visit. The text itself demonstrates this, often referring to 'common opinion' or 'modern opinion', the work of 'English chroniclers' and having talked to people who had travelled to Bristol and Cornwall, and to the Spanish ambassador Peter de Ayala who had been to Scotland.[15] It identifies itself as a 'true account of the island of England' ('Isola

---

[12] Higden, fol. 172ᵛ.

[13] John H. Harvey, 'Introduction', in William Worcestre, *Itineraries of William Worcestre*, ed. by Harvey (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), pp. ix-xi.

[14] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, pp. 241, 325-7.

[15] *Relation*, pp. 13, 17, 31.

D'Inguilterra') and then goes on to place England within the 'island named Britain'.[16] Although, as can be seen in Bede's work which identified the 'four nations' of the eighth century as 'English, British, Irish and Picts', the use of 'Britain' or 'Britannia' had followed this history as a label for Wales, it had, by the fifteenth century, come to be recognised as the name for the whole island.[17] It seems that so, too, had England.

A similar description is provided by Polydore Vergil, whose *Anglica Historia* was begun at the request of Henry VII and researched in England. 'Britannia omnis, quae hodie Anglia et Scotia duplici nomine appellatur, insula in oceano', specifically names Scotland and England as the two constituent parts of the island of Britain.[18] However, elsewhere in his writing, Vergil shows instead that Britain was the ancient name for England, as he states that he had been sent to 'Britain, now called England' ('Britannium, quae nunc Anglia est').[19] It could be that Vergil was referring to the southern part of the division between the Picts and the British described by Bede, rather than the whole island, however, it remains an example of the interchangeable nature of the two names. Given Vergil's presence at the courts of Henry VII and Henry VIII, his information, like that of the Italian author of the *Relation* but over a longer period, would have been gained from both historical material and from his experience of contemporary opinions.

It seems, too, in other circumstances, that 'England' came to apply to the British Isles. In 1417, representatives of Henry V of England at the Council of Constance responded to a challenge by French delegates concerning their legitimacy as a 'nation'. In the absence of the Spanish from the council, Henry V's representatives had been assigned a greater role as one

---

[16] *Relation*, p. 7; Griffiths, 'The Island of England', p. 177.
[17] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, p. 45; Griffiths, 'The Island of England', p. 177.
[18] Polydore Vergil, *Anglica Historia* (1555), ed. by Dana F. Sutton, Book I, pt. 1, in *The Philological Museum* <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/library.html> [accessed 14th January 2011].
[19] Vergil, *De Inventoribus Rerum*, (Paris, 1529), fol. 2ᵛ, in *MOMW* [accessed 5th September 2013].

of four conciliar 'nations'. The French, in the wake of Agincourt, complained that, due to the arrival of the Spanish delegation, the English should be deprived of their role, and argued that England should not be recognised as equivalent to the French, German and Italian groups.[20] The very existence of a defence of England's status suggests that international confirmation, particularly wider ecclesiastical recognition, was important to the definition of a medieval nation, as membership of Christendom here provided a forum for a detailed break-down of England's status. Robert Rees Davies has shown that this was also the case for the earlier assertion of the separate identity of Wales, and it also remained important into Henry VIII's reign.[21] Although the use of the label 'nation' was used at the council to group delegates and make political distinctions rather than recognise identities, the English response of 1417 is also revealing of an existing perception of 'England' as a distinct land and people, and the heightened aggravation with France caused England's status to be specifically held up against the French. Although the defence remained in the records of the Council for the rest of the fifteenth century, it became known to at least one of Henry VIII's court, as Sir Robert Wingfield, England's ambassador to the Emperor, found and published the debate in 1517.[22] This choice suggests that the English protest appealed to Wingfield's own opinions.

While acknowledging England alongside Scotland as constituent parts of Britain, the protest uses the phrase 'English or British' frequently, suggesting that they were equivalent

---

[20] C. M. D. Crowder, 'Introduction', in *Unity, Heresy and Reform, 1378-1460: The Conciliar Response to the Great Schism*, ed. by Crowder (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), p. 25; 'French Protest, 3 March 1417', in *Unity, Heresy and Reform*, pp. 108-9.

[21] Davies' analysis of the use of law in the shaping of Welsh national identity shows that Welsh laws asserted their international acceptability and conformity to church-defined norms, to avoid being labelled deviant. Robert Rees Davies, 'Law and National Identity in Thirteenth-Century Wales', in *Welsh Society and Nationhood: Historical Essays presented to Glanmor Williams*, ed. by Davies (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1984), pp. 51-69 (p. 57).

[22] Henry Pyne, 'Introduction', in *England and France in the Fifteenth Century: The Contemporary French Tract Entitled "The Debate Between the Heralds of France and England"*, ed. by Pyne (London: Longmans, Green, 1870), pp. xii-xiii.

identifiers.[23] In some cases, it seems that the terms are applicable to the 'group or nation' as present at the council, intended to suggest that the delegates could be known as the 'British nation' because of its wider representation of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales. This may be seen in the assertion that the 'English or British nation deservedly represents…a voice of just as great authority in a general council as any other nation', identifying the delegates rather than England.[24] Even with reference to the delegates, though, the frequent use of 'English' on its own suggests the label was used to mean both. Further references are not intended to apply to just the conciliar group. The protest claims the delegates were sent by 'the church of England or Britain', and the argument of the French against the small size of the 'English or British nation' is understood to mean the number of dioceses.[25] Finally, the 'famous English or British nation' is described as containing five languages. The subject of languages will be returned to below, but this statement demonstrates not only that the terms 'English' and 'British' were considered by some to be interchangeable, but that 'England' or 'English' could be used for the British Isles.[26]

The document suggests that this stems from the notion of England's superiority. It argues that the English delegation represented Wales, Scotland and Ireland, and does not allow the point that they do not obey one ruler, claiming that while the kingdom of England contains twenty-five dioceses, the king of England has 'quite one hundred and ten' under his jurisdiction.[27] Davies indicates that this notion of an imperial nature to the power of the king of England was more explicitly expressed in the interactions between Edward I and the Princes of Gwynedd two centuries earlier, as Welsh law was used to suggest to Edward his

---

[23] 'The entry in the official *acta* of the English protest, 31 March 1417', in *Unity, Heresy and Reform*, p. 117.
[24] 'English Protest', p. 125.
[25] 'English Protest', pp. 121-2, 125.
[26] 'English Protest', p. 121.
[27] 'English Protest', p. 117-8.

responsibilities to the Welsh as emperor.[28] Certainly, claims of suzerainty over Wales and Scotland dominated the policies of Edward I, but it has been suggested that, in relation to Scotland, these were largely forgotten, not appearing in the 1502 Treaty of Perpetual Peace.[29] However, the claim was maintained. The author of the *Relation* was aware that 'English chroniclers insist that their king is the supreme lord of Scotland', and he may have been informed by people with whom he spoke in England.[30] Later works, for example that of both Robert Fabian and Edward Hall, continued to assert the superior lordship of the kings of England. Fabian, a London merchant whose history was first published in 1516 as *The New Chronicles of England and France* and again several times, recalls of the inability of the Scots to 'kepe theyr allegeaunce / but many a tyme rebelled', and of homage sworn to English kings in times past.[31] Hall's account, later still, dedicated to Edward VI, demonstrates that the allegiance of Scotland was not a past issue. The king's response in 1513 to the news that James IV was poised to invade England in his absence, not only declared James to be an oath-breaker not only to their peace, but also to his allegiance, as he stated that

> I am the very owner of Scotla[n]d, & y[at] he holdeth it of me by homage, and…now contrary to his bounden duety he beinge my vassall, doth rebell against me.[32]

Supporting the record of this exchange between Henry and the Scottish king's herald, the obedience due to kings of England is also evident in John Skelton's celebration of the of the English victory at Flodden. The poet, whose role as Henry VIII's childhood tutor and

---

[28] Davies, 'Law and National Identity', p. 62.
[29] *Relation*, p. 67n.
[30] *Relation*, p. 16.
[31] Robert Fabian, *Fabyans cronycle newly prynted, wyth the cronycle, actes, and dedes done in the tyme of the reygne of the moste excellent prynce kynge Henry the vii* (London: Wyllyam Rastell, 1533), fol. 2ᵛ, in *EEBO* [accessed 14ᵗʰ January 2011].
[32] *Hall's Chronicle*, p. 545.

royal apologist during the 1490s, and whose work was still read by the king in later life, was very familiar with the crown's agenda for self-portrayal.[33] Skelton's *ballade of the Scottysshe kynge* declares that James should not have aided the French king, and tells him instead that 'Ye ought to honour your lorde and brother'. Not only should James have naturally sided with Henry as both his 'alye' and brother-in-law, but also because England's king was James's 'souerayne lor[d]'. The *Ballade* goes on to suggest that Scotland should 'knowe our kynge for your regent / Your souerayne lorde and presedent'. This notion of Henry as sovereign lord of Scotland is a central theme of Skelton's *Ballade*, suggesting it also remained at the forefront of the relationship between England and Scotland.[34]

The absence of Scotland, alongside Wales, in the titles of the king of England, despite the persistence of this claim, suggests that both were traditionally attached to the crown of England, and, as stated by the thirteenth-century Welsh princes, that the king of England was an emperor. Indeed, it is asserted by Davies and Malcolm Vale, in relation to earlier notions of an English empire, that the 'high kingship of the British Isles' had been subsumed into the crown and title of the king of England, and it seems, in the awareness of both Skelton and Hall at least, and therefore their audiences, that this was still the case.[35] However, this does not seem to have confused the issue of the kingdom of England, and so there were two meanings to 'England': the England which referenced the crown's possession of Wales and Scotland and was interchangeable with Britain, and the physical kingdom of England.

---

[33] David R. Carlson, 'Royal tutors in the Reign of Henry VII', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 22, 2 (1991), 253-279; David Starkey, *Henry: Virtuous Prince* (London: HarperPress, 2008), pp. 120, 123-4; 'The Latin writings of John Skelton', ed. by Carlson, *Studies in Philology*, 88, 4 (1991), 1-125 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4174406> [accessed 7th December 2009] (pp. 4-5).

[34] John Skelton, *A ballade of the Scottysshe kynge* (London: R. Faques, 1513), fols 1r-2v, in *EEBO* [accessed 14th January 2011].

[35] Malcolm Vale, *The Ancient Enemy: England, France and Europe from the Angevins to the Tudors* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2009), p. 4; Robert Rees Davies, *The First English Empire: Power and Identities in the British Isles, 1093-1343* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 30.

Also suggestive of the interchangeable nature of England and Britain are the frequent descriptions of England as an island. Although these references may allude to the whole island of Britain, the way in which the island nation depiction appears also suggests that it was important to the symbolic definition of England itself. In Higden's account of the founding and naming of England, the 'ylonde' to which he refers is named both 'Brytayn' and then 'Englonde', and this is echoed by Fabian, recording that 'Brute entred fyrste thys ile, then called Albyon, and now England'.[36] Of course, that Britain is an island must feature in its physical description, as is also the case with Bede's identification of it as 'an island in the ocean', and Higden's explanation that

> this ylonde is called insula for it is in salo that is the see & is beten of with
>
> dyuers course of waters with stremes & with wawes of the see.[37]

However, it seems, instead, that this is more significant than simply a physical descriptor. The above explanation from Higden's suggests that the identification as an island was, instead, part of England's identity, assigning a defining role to the surrounding water. Fabian's work aims to recount the history of England and France, and so his intention to show the 'famouse honour of this fertyle yle' may apply specifically to England. Furthermore, Fabian's pride in the fame of England seems to also suggest a certain pride in its status as an 'yle' too. Both Fabian and Higden, then, imply that portraying England as an island was not necessarily confusion or an alternative label for Britain, but an important element in England's definition.

The importance of England's situation as an island is most strongly celebrated by the anonymous work of 1436, the *Libelle of Englyshe Polycye*, written to advocate the protection

---

[36] Higden, fol. 165ᵛ; Fabian, fol. 1ʳ.
[37] Bede, p. 44; Higden, fol. 165ᵛ.

of England through the keeping of the sea. The work is chiefly concerned about the economic advantages of controlling the sea and trade routes. However, the *Libelle* also values the sea in a symbolic sense. It likens England to a city, protected by the 'see, that is the wall of Englond'.[38] In this image, then, England is itself entirely encompassed by the sea. The explanation of using England to mean Britain, or of an English empire, cannot account for all the depictions of England as an island. However, it may be somewhat reconciled with the suggestion that the island was symbolic, allowing for the sea, which for the *Libelle* is both the source of England's safety and its wealth, to define the nation. Furthermore, identifying the sea as a defensive frontier also acknowledges the presence of an outside threat, the 'other' with which England was contrasted. The physical barrier provided by the sea was therefore also made a metaphorical one, maintaining England's integrity and providing a frontier.

The *Libelle* also provides for the place of frontier regions. English ownership of the 'tweyne eyne' of Dover and Calais allowed control and 'lordship' of the sea that formed the wall around England, and the keeping of which guaranteed 'worshype and salvacione to Englande and to alle Englyshe menne'.[39] Calais was essential to the representation of England as an island, forming an outpost or bulwark of the defensive wall, but without being part of England itself.[40] The importance is further demonstrated as the majority of the *Libelle*'s treatment of English possessions is devoted to Calais, and the modern editor suggests that the author also planned to write further on the subject.[41] This role was later acknowledged, on the eve of the town's loss, by Venetian ambassador Giovanni Michele, who, in 1557, commented that Calais was guarded jealously as 'the key and principal

---

[38] *Libelle*, p. 55.
[39] *Libelle*, pp. 1-2, 50.
[40] H. F. Chettle, 'Burgesses for Calais, 1536-1558', *English Historical Review*, 50, 199 (1935), 492-501 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/553556> [accessed 21st January 2011] (p. 494); Vale, *Ancient Enemy*, p. 118.
[41] *Libelle*, p. xxxiv.

entrance to their dominions, without which the English would have no outlet from their own'.[42] It seems, then, that the surrounding sea could also be viewed as a disadvantage. This was also proposed by an earlier French text which responded to England's protest at the Council of Constance, presenting a debate concerning the comparative value of England and France within the model of a herald from each trying to prove to Prudence that their kingdom should be 'advanced in honour'. The French herald criticises English claims to be masters of the sea, calling them pirates and pointing out that the number of their ships was due to needing to pass over the sea, in which they had no choice.[43] This text, produced around 1458-61, demonstrates that England's relationship with the sea, articulated in the *Libelle*, was well-known, and important in interaction with France. In this context, the position of Calais was vital to seeing the sea as an advantage.

In addition to Calais, the *Libelle* allows for other potentially problematic territories to fit into its image of England. It assigns Ireland an equivalent role, as an outpost crucial in defending the sea, suggesting that 'Oure londe and herres togedre to defende…Shulde helpe to kepe well aboute the see'.[44] The more complex existence of Wales is also dealt with by the *Libelle*, as Ireland is seen as 'a boterasse and a poste / Undre England, and Wales isanother'.[45] Wales and Ireland, then, are cast as structural supports, in a description similar to the positioning of Dover and Calais.[46] However, it is made clear that Wales, unlike Dover, is not part of England, as, in stressing the value of Ireland, the author predicts that, if Ireland

---

[42] *The Chronicle of Calais, in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII to the Year 1540*, ed. by John G. Nichols (London: Camden Society, J. B. Nichols, 1846), p. xxv; Vale, *Ancient Enemy*, p. 115; Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison: War and Military Service in England, 1436-1558* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008), p. 9.

[43] 'The Debate', in *England and France in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Pyne, pp. 3-5, 47-59.

[44] *Libelle*, p. 35.

[45] *Libelle*, p. 36.

[46] *Libelle*, p. 2.

is lost, then 'Farewell Wales; than Englond cometh to drede'.[47] This loss by stages shows Wales to be a separate unit, shown instead, with Ireland, and in the same way that was insisted with Scotland above, to be of 'one ligeaunce dewe unto the kynge', separate but with shared interests.[48] The *Libelle*'s treatment of Wales reinforces the suggestion that the island image could have both reflected an overarching imperial use of England for the whole physical island, and been used metaphorically.

The way in which overseas travel is recorded also suggests the significance of the sea as the frontier of England. The *Chronicle of London* that concludes in 1483, for example, the responsibility of one compiler to 1442, and a second to 1483, frequently and consistently emphasises the necessity of having to sail or pass 'over the see', in almost every recorded journey to or from Calais, France or Flanders, and even occasionally to Scotland.[49] Rather than simply describing the journeys, the authors may have been articulating the value of the sea as a defining, and defensive, frontier. This notion is clearest in the chronicle's account of 1399, when the Earl of Huntingdon 'wolde a passed the see to have brought in Frensshmen for to distroye Engelond'.[50] The sea is shown to be maintaining the integrity and safety of England from an external enemy. The experience of coastal towns too, subjected to various attacks by the French, would have emphasised the protection of the sea, and of their vulnerability should the enemy pass over it. Not only was this role recognised by the *Chronicle of London* in the collective responsibility of the 'V portus of Engelond' for keeping the sea, but it also highlights that this role of the Cinque Ports was emphasised in

---

[47] *Libelle*, p. 37.
[48] *Libelle*, p. 36.
[49] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 68.
[50] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 86.

Parliament.[51] The use of 'portus of Engelond' also broadens this responsibility from the coast itself to the wider realm, investing the sea and the ports with the protection of England.

Although the *Libelle* was written in 1436, it may have been available to early sixteenth-century readers, as it appeared in more than one edition and survives in several late-fifteenth century manuscripts, one of which shows evidence of ownership circa. 1520s. It also continued to receive attention later as one manuscript bears the Elizabethan hand of William Cecil.[52] As well as existing in the histories of Higden and Fabian, both frequently printed during the early-sixteenth century, that the island nation portrayal also persisted is suggested by the reports of ambassadors such as the *Relation*. As mentioned above, it is directly stated that the author considered his account to show, in places, the 'modern opinion, for Bede does not positively say so'.[53] The *Relation* does, however, state that some information was gained from Bede, and claims to express the collective opinions of 'all the English chroniclers'. However, another symbolic representation of England highlights more clearly the continuation of the island depiction into the reign of Henry VIII. Within the first decade of his reign, an illuminated manuscript choir book was produced for Henry VIII's personal use, and, as such, contains imagery, and music, thought to have appealed to the king. Although produced in the Netherlands, that it was made for the king suggests that the piece utilised current thought and sources of pride associated with Henry's rule. One of the most prominent illustrations of these *Motets for Henry VIII* accompanies a Latin poem in praise of his family, and is an allegorical garden representing England, identified by a gateway bearing a scroll

---

[51] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 127.
[52] Warner, 'Introduction', *Libelle*, p. liv.
[53] *Relation,* p. 13.

inscribed 'salve felix Anglia'.[54] The garden is depicted as a unit of land encompassed entirely

by the sea. Of initial importance, then, is the illustration's rendering of England as an integral

unit: the sea forms a symbolic and permanent border. The sea plays a crucial role in the

representation of the nation's imagined indivisibility.[55] The image suggests that the sea was

considered a natural frontier, and was therefore a fundamental element in the definition of

England, and also invests the nation with a sense of permanence. The image also echoes the

Libelle's advocacy of maritime control in the presence of ships in the background, identifying

the role of the surrounding water as protective, further emphasising the importance of

outward threats in defining the nation.

Identifying England as an imagined island, the meaning of the sea's presence in the

image is, perhaps, ambiguous, and may instead represent the other element expressed in the

Libelle, that of the sea's value for trade. However, the image further highlights the defensive

element. The frontier is also represented by a fortified wall, echoing the *Libelle*'s likening of

England to a walled city, although the image separates the idea of the sea and the wall which

were one and the same in the 1436 rendering. While the image from the *Motets* suggests that

these ideas existed within the limits of royal perceptions and rhetoric, parallels may also be

found in other sources, and suggest a wider use of the figurative 'wall'. A pageant planned,

but not performed, for Henry VII in Worcester was intended to appeal to the king and prove

the city's loyalty following its implication in the Stafford rebellion, the first uprising of his

reign.[56] In so doing, it employs a similar image to that used later by the *Motets*. After

dramatically mistaking the king for several heroes, it describes him as the 'defence of

---

[54] Motets for Henry VIII, London, British Library, MS Royal 11 E XI, fol. 2
<http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=42690>
[accessed 10th January 2012].
[55] Calhoun, p. 4.
[56] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 83n.

England as a walle'.[57] Again, this identifies England as an integral unit. It is significant as it demonstrates the wider use of the figurative wall around England, and shows some correlation between the perception of the realm within different levels of society and different expressive media. This speech, part of a planned public display and written in English, shows that the symbolic representation of England as an enclosed and indivisible land reached a much wider audience than those which would have had access to the *Libelle* and the *Motets*, and, if performed, would have reached still further as part of the city's communication with the local population. Furthermore, the preparation of such a pageant for the king suggests that it recognised this depiction as an element of royal imagery.

Also in common with the image in the *Motets* is the speech's combination of the portrayal of the king with the depiction of England. The 'garden' may, therefore, have drawn upon an earlier element of royal symbolism in this respect, or least was not the first example. The pageant's identification of kings as the defence of England is echoed in the *Motets* as the garden's gateway is guarded by the dragon and greyhound supporters of the Tudor arms. The main focus of the garden image, however, is a crowned Tudor rose, echoing the accompanying poem's celebration of the unity of the two roses, and its roots are flanked by two smaller flowers, a daisy (or marguerite) and a marigold, Henry's sisters. Henry and his family are therefore shown to be both England's defence and also part of the realm itself, their roots binding them to the land, suggesting that representation of England was a significant element of Henry VIII's royal rhetoric. However, the figurative plants featured in the garden also suggest another dimension to its portrayal of England. Katherine of Aragon is represented by a pomegranate tree, planted within the walls of the garden, and the arms of Castile flying from one of the towers. This placement of Katherine, perhaps, reconciles the

---

[57] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 88.

notion of the insular and exclusive portrayal of the realm with having the first foreign queen since Margaret of Anjou. The pomegranate tree suggests that Katherine had become part of England, without changing the nature of the realm.

Sea power and coastal defence remained priorities, and gained importance, during Henry VIII's reign. By 1539, detailed coastal surveys were being ordered in order to assess the dangers of invasion from France, and the best places for fortifications, beacons and watches.[58] As the debate of the French and English heralds suggested, the sea was both an advantage and a difficulty. The maps produced from this survey demonstrate the vulnerability of the coasts and the need for fortifications. However, they also reinforce the significance of the sea, the value of the coasts, to the physical and symbolic definition of England, as the production of the maps responded to an outside threat and reaffirmed the natural barrier provided by the sea. Although this survey took place after the period of interest, it is important to show that, rather than a new process, it was instead a development of a long-standing sentimental and practical investment in the sea. Furthermore, the order to produce these maps would have reinforced, locally, the importance of the coasts to all of England.

Alongside symbolic representations of England, the perception of the nation as an integral unit is also suggested by frequent references to England having acted, expressed opinions or experienced phenomena as a whole. The notion that England could have a single experience appears frequently. Chronicles provide numerous examples in which an experience is imagined to have affected all of England, and one way in which this is expressed is in suffering as a result of weather and disease. The *Chronicle of London, 1086-1483* records that, during Henry III's reign, there was a 'gret wynd and an horrible tempest whiche dede muche harme thorugh all Engelond', while, on St. Mary's day in 1364, another

---

[58] Sir Richard Bulkeley to Cromwell, 18 April 1539, *LPFD*, vol. 14, pt. 1, p. 381.

'gret wynd...caste doun tres, houses, pynacles and steplees of chirches and manye places in Englonde'.[59] In the 1370s, the chronicle records a 'gret derthe of corne in Engelond', and, the following decade, 'a gret erthequake in Engelond'.[60] The *Great Chronicle of London*, too, in the hand of its first compiler responsible for the text to 1439, records a 'grete wynde' in 1358, whiche hadde doune houses...in many places in England'.[61] Similarly, the later *Grey Friars' Chronicle* suggests that the realm suffered as one, as it recounts that Edward III's reign witnessed a 'gret pestelens in Yenglond', while, in Henry VII's reign, another 'grete pestelens' was seen 'thorrow all Ynglonde'.[62] Chroniclers and contemporary observers, then, even those supposedly mostly concerned with London's, rather than England's, history, were able to imagine 'England' as an entity able to experience phenomena.

Other, more localised material records England having suffered collectively on such occasions, suggesting that it was common to imagine that the realm could share experiences. *The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar*, mainly the work of Robert Ricart, Bristol's town clerk until around 1508, and written on the request of a mayor who wanted an account of the town's history and customs, records that, in 1485, 'there was a sodeyn sikenes in all places of Englond, called the sweting syknes'.[63] The placement of such descriptions, as with other ominous phenomena, was often employed in juxtaposition with other, often momentous events, to emphasise their significance. In this context, such phenomena have two implications for the imagined unity of England: not only is it evident that they were imagined to have occurred simultaneously in all of England, but they may have been intended to

---

[59] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, pp. 17, 65.
[60] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, pp. 68, 74.
[61] *Great Chronicle*, p. 41.
[62] *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, ed. by John G. Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1852), pp. 5, 26.
[63] Robert Ricart, *The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar*, ed. by Lucy Toulmin Smith (London: Camden Society, 1872), pp. i-iii, 46.

suggest that the juxtaposed events were also of significance to the whole realm. The notion of one national experience is also shown in accounts of the simultaneous application of taxes, charges or proclamations, for example in the *Chronicle of London*'s record of the 'enterdytynge of the reaume...proclamed thorugh out Engelond' in 1208, and the acquisition of war funds on two occasions from 'every plough land in Engelond'.[64] 'England' was also frequently used as a point of reference or means of judging the extent or impressiveness of something, for example 'the highest bridge in England', or a ship 'suche another as was neuer seen before in Englande'.[65] Such statements suggest that the writers thought in terms of England, as the broadest extent of their community.

The use and definition of 'England' represents a significant and consistent awareness in early sixteenth-century perceptions of the realm as an integral unit, indivisible and defined by symbolic borders. The relationship of the peripheral regions in Henry VIII's possession to England, thus defined, varies with each region. The depiction as an island places Ireland, Calais and the Channel Islands firmly outside England itself, although the *Libelle* designates places for Ireland and Calais, and reconciles the position of Wales. However, the border regions, marches and possessions over which the king of England ruled are less simple to discern: it may be suggested that the town of Berwick, taken in conquest, and the regions labelled as marches on the borders with Wales and Scotland, may at least be seen, if not within the 'garden', as part of the defensive wall. The origins of the marcher regions cast them in this role, as does the name itself. Max Lieberman identifies the use of the term 'Marchia', in relation to Wales, as having its origins in the Domesday Book, and shows the term's military associations, more broadly applied, in its use by Gerald of Wales in relation to Ireland, who suggests that the lands 'closest the enemy, the so-called marches' could be

---

[64] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, pp. 4, 6, 8.
[65] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 29; *Hall's Chronicle*, p. 535.

called '"lands of mars" from the god of war'. This nature was also consistent with the wider European use of 'marches'.[66] As such, even despite the greatly reduced significance of the Welsh marches as a military frontier by the sixteenth century, and the suggestion, by their abolishment in 1536, that their label was anachronistic, this meaning must have been known, as it continued to be applied in all other hostile peripheral regions.

However, a more precise impression of the boundaries of 'England' may be found in the application of official distinctions among the statutes and proclamations of Henry VIII's reign. The meaning of 'England' is indicated by what is considered *not* to be covered by the name. Consistently, the naming of peripheral regions, alongside England, is shown to be required in order to demonstrate the application of a statute. An early Henrician Act concerning the specifics of apparel for different levels of society, for example, lists the domains from which wool was allowed as 'this Realme of Englonde Irelonde Wales Cales or the Marches of the same or Berwyk'.[67] Thus, 'England', in this sense, was not considered to encompass Wales, and had not done so since the first distinctions made of the laws of Wales by English kings.[68] Reflecting their external placement by the *Libelle*, Ireland and Calais are also distinctly separated from England, and, although they are sometimes omitted, Calais more so than Ireland, it may be suggested that it was because they were also excluded from the acts concerned, rather than because they were thought to be included in 'England'. Ireland and Wales, among the possessions, are sometimes afforded a higher status, for example, in the same act mentioned above, when the list is exchanged for simply 'this Lande of Englonde Irelonde Wales or in any Lande under the Kyngs obeysaunce', yet here, too, Ireland, Wales

---

[66] Max Lieberman, *The Medieval March of Wales: The Creation and Perception of a Frontier, 1066-1283* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 4-12.
[67] 1.Hen.VIII, *Statutes III*, p. 8.
[68] Lieberman, pp. 13-14.

and any other possessions that may be named are shown to be separate from the 'Lande of Englonde'.[69]

Given its absence, except by implication, from other descriptions of England, the statutes are most useful in distinguishing Berwick. This is also considered separate. Interestingly, with regard to the suggestion made above that the peripheral regions may be seen as the figurative wall of the *Motets*' 'garden', the defensive character of certain peripheral regions is identified, and given a sense of permanence, in the listing of exemptions from an act concerning privileges for soldiers engaged in 'the Kings Warrs'.[70] The act states that its contents should not extend to 'Caleys Hammes Guysnes Rise banke and Berwyk Wales or any of theym and the Marches of the same'.[71] In doing so, the act suggests not only that those towns and regions listed together shared a common purpose, but also that, in being exempt from the normal soldiers serving in a specific type of conflict, the garrisons in these places had a permanent role, as protective frontiers of England, separate from it but crucial in its definition as the figurative 'wall'.

Acts such as these also provide a jurisdictional definition of the place of the 'marches'. As borders with either other possessions of the king, or outward, often hostile, realms, their position seems unclear. Their appearance in the lists of domains that were not encompassed by the label 'England' shows these regions to be separate from it, but the fact that they are listed at all also suggests that neither were they considered to be included in the names Wales, Ireland, Calais or Berwick. Max Lieberman identifies earlier separations of the laws of England, Wales and the Marches, for example in phrases contained within the Magna Carta, and tentatively suggests that this implied equal status, or at least a separate identity,

---

[69] 1.Hen.VIII.
[70] 3.Hen.VIII, *Statutes III*, pp. 26-7.
[71] 3.Hen.VIII, p. 27.

although the position of the marches remained ambiguous.[72] However, the frequent, though

not consistent, addition of the phrase 'and the marches of the same' among the statutes of

Henry VIII's reign may be seen as at least a recognition of both the separateness of the

marcher regions from England, and a degree of distinctiveness from the possessions to which

they were attached.

Another region that had an ambiguous relationship with perceptions of England is

Cornwall. In contrast to other peripheral regions, Cornwall fits into the symbolic island

nation. There is also no physical distinction of Cornwall as separate in the map of the south

coast. However, this inclusion is made less clear by the comments of a second Italian visitor.

In 1506, Vincenzo Quirini, the Venetian ambassador to Castile, was forced by weather to

land in Cornwall, and, in the account he provided of his experience, the county is said to be

treated as a separate division 'like Wales'.[73] As has already been shown, Wales was treated as

separate, and this description therefore implies that Cornwall was not considered part of

England. The rest of the account provides little clarification, as, in the description of the

people of Cornwall as 'so different…from the Londoners and the rest of England', the 'rest of

England' could be meant to be associated with London rather than Cornwall. An earlier

account, that of John Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter, complained that the diocese was 'divided

from the rest of England', implying a sense of separateness, but, in contrast to Quirini,

including Cornwall within his own definition of England.[74] Higden's inclusion of Cornwall is

also ambiguous. His explanation of 'prouynces and shyres' initially stresses the exclusion of

Cornwall, but concludes that,

---

[72] Lieberman, pp. 13-14.
[73] Griffiths, 'The island of England', pp. 180-1.
[74] *The Register of John de Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter: A.D. 1327-1369*, Part I, ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolf, (London: G. Bell, 1894), pp. 97-8; Griffiths, 'The island of England', p. 181.

where as afore is wryten that Cornewayle is not fet amonge the shyres of

Englonde it may stande amonge them well ynough for it is neyther in wales

nor in Scotlonde but it is in Englonde & it loyneth vnto Deuenshyre so may

there be accounted in Englonde.[75]

The description explicitly recognises Cornwall as part of England, but also implies that this assertion required justification. The statutes of Henry VIII's reign seem to agree with Grandisson and with Higden's argument. It does not appear among the list of towns and regions not covered by the label of 'England', and where it does appear listed, it is as the last of 'every Shyre wythin this Realme', therefore identifying it as much a part of England as the other shires named.[76]

Both symbolically and officially, definitions and perceptions of 'England' demonstrated that it was largely seen as an integral unit, which existed as a separate entity from the other domains under the rule of England's king, but which relied upon these peripheries as part of its own definition. Part of this self-definition was the assertion of the superiority of England within Britain, which served to blur the difference between the two, and also informed England's island image. Definitions and uses of 'England' also demonstrate that it was a parameter by which actions, landmarks, events and experiences were thought of, measured and defined.

II. Geographical Frontiers

The symbolic representation of England demonstrates that the collection of peripheral regions were important to how it was understood. However, the place within these definitions

---

[75] Higden, fol. 171ᵛ.
[76] 23.Hen.VIII, c. 2, *Statutes III*, p. 363.

of England of these possessions is not as clear, although they might fit into the notion of England's 'wall'. State use of 'England' shows more clearly that Wales, Berwick, Calais and the Irish lordship, and the marches of each, were considered separate from England. However, these definitions seem to apply more as somewhat abstract, generalised notions of what 'England' meant. The problem of the border regions is that they could, potentially, have had one of two very different relationships with nationhood. Because of their distance from the centre of government, they may have been less aware of, or less invested in the nation. Conversely, the presence of the 'other' across often hostile frontiers could have emphasised feelings of their own identity. It has been suggested that, until the sixteenth century, frontiers were not well-defined as 'traceable, measureable lines'.[77] If this was the case, then any sense of 'England' would have been difficult to determine in the border regions. However, examples exist from much earlier of specific linear divisions. As Robert Rees Davies has illustrated, from the fourteenth century onwards, the English crown had become increasingly identified with the land, as well as the people, of the realm. As Kings of *England*, more emphasis was placed on the nation state defined by distinct borders with other nations.[78] There had long been an interest in, and a need for, specific descriptions of Britain, as Bede and his literary heirs were concerned with providing as accurate a measurement as possible. Accounts of travel also express an awareness of leaving or returning to England at a particular point, while efforts were made from the thirteenth century onwards to empirically measure distances.[79] It may be suggested, then, that Henry VIII's England was reasonably

---

[77] Griffiths, *'This Royal Throne of Kings, this Scept'red Isle': The English Realm and Nation in the Later Middle Ages* (Swansea, 1983), p. 4.

[78] Krista J. Kesselring, '"Berwick is our England": Local Identities in an Elizabethan Border Town', in *Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. by Norman L. Jones and Daniel Woolf (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 92-112 (p. 95).

[79] Harvey, 'Introduction', *Itineraries*, pp. xiv-xv.

well-defined with acknowledged physical borders which largely corresponded with the symbolic and official definitions.

The sea, as well as playing an important role in the symbolic identification of England as an island and as an imperial power, was also significant in its geographical definition and distinction from Scotland from the earliest accounts. Bede's description identifies the feature 'which originally formed the boundary between the Britons and the Picts' as 'a very extensive arm of the sea'.[80] Due, in part at least, to the longevity of Bede's influence, the 'arms of the sea' continued to be recognised as physical borders with Scotland. Higden describes the southern border of Scotland as marked 'w^t armes of y^t see', while Fabian, too, directly refers to Bede's description when he records the original separation of Scotland and England by 'two armys of ye see, but they mete not'.[81] Later, Fabian's account gives a different historical boundary, identified as the River Humber.[82] Vergil, writing of the contemporary sixteenth-century division names the Tweed as the 'river which separates the English from the Scots'.[83] The account of William Worcestre states that 'the river of Solway...runs between England and Scotland'.[84] Given his use of local opinions and material, this detail could have come from either a source or from his own observations.

The significance of water frontiers is also demonstrated by surviving maps. The thirteenth-century Hereford *Mappa Mundi*, for example, of English origin, places England, Scotland and Ireland as separate islands. This may have been adhering to symbolic representations, particularly as the priority of the map is the focal point of Jerusalem, and the

---

[80] Bede, p. 47.
[81] Higden, fols 171^v, 181^r; Fabian, fol. 6^r.
[82] Fabian, fol. 6^r.
[83] *Anglica Historia*, book 1, pt. 2.
[84] Harvey, p. ix; Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 73.

shape of Britain is contorted to fit the map's circular shape.[85] However, it remains an interpretation of physical boundaries. It also echoes a slightly earlier map of Britain contained within Matthew Paris's *Abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliae*, from around the 1250s, which shows England and Scotland almost completely separated by 'arms of the sea'.[86] Given the quite close dates of the two, and their quite different styles and subjects, it is likely that they were produced independently of each other, which suggests a common perception of this physical separation of Scotland. The depiction of the two as either partially or completely separated by the sea was continued in some examples of the portolan charts, a Mediterranean tradition of maritime navigational maps begun in the thirteenth century and continuing into the sixteenth century, demonstrating that this notion was not limited to England.[87] It has been suggested that the number of maps from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries showing this type of border was limited to around eleven in over one hundred, mainly drawn from earlier work, and focused on Solway Firth rather than the Tweed until the sixteenth century.[88] However, the persistence of the view in early sixteenth-century England of the 'arms of the sea' is demonstrated again, by the Italian *Relation.* When indicating the border between England and Scotland, the account names the 'two arms of the sea which penetrate very far inland' as the physical division, noting that they do not meet, due to mountains in-between.[89] There is a very close resemblance between the description of the *Relation* and that of Bede, and Bede is named as a source. However, the *Relation* also indicates that 'there are some who say that two rivers rise in these mountains', and that 'it is common opinion that they

---

[85] Ronald V. Tooley, *Maps and Map-Makers* (London: Batsford, 1949), pp. 14, 49.

[86] Map of Great Britain, *Abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliae*, St. Alban's, 1250-1259, London, BL Cotton Claudius D. VI, fol.12ᵛ, in Christopher Daniell, *Atlas of Medieval Britain* (London: Routledge, 2011).

[87] Paul D. A. Harvey, *Maps in Tudor England* (London: Public Record Office and the British Library, 1993), p. 9.

[88] Michael C. Andrews, 'The Boundary Between Scotland and England in the Portolan Charts', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, vol. 60 (1925-26), 36-66 (pp. 36-9).

[89] *Relation*, p. 13.

themselves are the two arms of the sea', suggesting that this is the 'modern opinion'.[90] Among those from whom the author gained his information in England, then, it was thought that the 'arms of the sea' were not only a decisive barrier, but that they extended so far inland as to almost divide the two, which may account for the 'island' image.

As had already been shown, the sea decisively placed possessions such as Ireland and Calais firmly outside this portrayal. Calais, in particular, is important in demonstrating the complex notions of Englishness, because its status is particularly complex itself. First captured by Edward III in 1347 under his claim to the French throne and Dukedom of Normandy, Calais was also the last remaining continental possession of the English kings in 1453, and, apart from the few conquests of Henry VIII's early career, remained so until its loss in 1558, until which time it remained a priority in the policies of England.[91] As suggested by the *Libelle*, the situations of the Calais 'Pale' and the possession of the English crown in Ireland, also known as a 'Pale', are directly comparable, as overseas possessions, military garrisons geographically isolated and in close proximity to often hostile neighbours. The appearances of Calais and Ireland in travel accounts reinforce the use of the sea as the permanent physical boundary of England as well as the symbolic frontier. Despite the long possession of Calais by English kings, and their longer struggle for Ireland, geographical awareness of England demonstrates that, territorially, the Calais and Irish frontiers were not only 'peripheral', but outside England. Furthermore, these possessions seem to emphasise the borders of England to those travelling.

As the *Libelle* and the comments of Giovanni Michele show, the symbolic and practical importance of Calais to England, demonstrated above, was entirely dependent on its

---

[90] *Relation*, p. 13.
[91] Grummit, *The Calais Garrison*, p. 9.

isolated position. The *Libelle* emphasises the physical, as well as the symbolic position of Calais, as it describes Merchants of Spain and Flanders passing 'By the costes…of oure Englonde / Betwyxt Dover and Calys', identifying the limit of England as the east coast.[92] Other examples which identify the position of Calais remain consistent with the placing of the Pale as separate from England, and there appears to be no extant suggestion, despite its annexing to the English crown, that Calais was ever seen as part of England. Furthermore, accounts of travel towards the town demonstrate a distinct awareness of having left England. One of the earliest accounts in which Calais appears is that provided by Jean Froissart. A native of Hainault, the home of Edward III's queen Philippa, he entered royal service and subsequently witnessed many details of the king's career. Froissart's *Chroniques* remained well-known, and was made more accessible to later audiences as it was translated into English and printed in 1523 by Lord Berners, the king's Deputy in Calais in during the 1520s. While the chronicle states that Calais 'ought to apperteyn to the realme of Ingland', this seems to have been meant in terms of allegiance and ownership, and, both before and after the town's capture, Froissart's accounts show that travellers 'departed out of England' and 'arryued at Calays'.[93] Similarly, the *Chronicle of London, 1086-1483* shows that journeys to or from the town involved leaving or returning to England, describing, for example, Henry V as having 'schipped fro his town of Caleys toward Engelond' following Agincourt, while the separateness of the town is highlighted as it describes travellers having 'seyled over the see and landed at Caleys'.[94] Other chronicles show consistency with this, as in 1435, another

---

[92] *Libelle*, p. 5.
[93] Froissart, 1523, fol. 73ᵛ.
[94] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, pp. 62, 102.

London chronicle describes the movement of the Duke of Orléans as a prisoner, brought 'oute of Englond, and whas at Caleys' then 'cam home ayen in to Englond'.[95]

Later accounts follow the same pattern. Henry VII's historian, Bernard André, describes the king as 'leaving the English shore', 'after a happy crossing…came to Calais'.[96] Fabian's history also records that Edward III 'sayled into Englande' after he had 'sped his nedes at Caleys'.[97] Records of journeys during Henry VIII's reign demonstrate consistency with these earlier accounts. John Taylor, Henry VII's royal chaplain, and clerk of Parliament from 1509, recorded his participation in the 1513 campaign in France, and this account states that important prisoners were 'sent to Calais and England'.[98] Elis Gruffydd, a Welsh soldier whose experience in France and membership of the Calais retinue in 1529 made him an eye witness of some important interactions with France, produced a history of England and Wales from 1066 to the sixth year of the reign of Edward VI which, in recounting his own time, seems characterised by his concern for detail and for human behaviour.[99] In his account of the Duke of Suffolk's campaign of 1523, he explains that the Duke returned to Calais and 'sent the soldiers across the sea to England', while the Duke himself 'stayed in Calais till after Epiphany when he went to England'.[100]

Gruffydd's account expresses the separateness of the town from England, but also suggests that the circumstances of war may have heightened this sense, as it records that

---

[95] Cleopatra C IV, in *Chronicles of London*, ed. by Kingsford (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), p. 139.

[96] Bernard André, *The History of the Life and Accomplishments of Henry VII*, pt. 66, in *The Philological Museum* <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/library.html> [accessed 23rd April 2011].

[97] Fabian, fol. 107ᵛ.

[98] John Taylor, in R. E. Brock, 'The Career of John Taylor, Master of the Rolls (d.1534), as an Illustration of Early Tudor Administrative History', (Masters thesis, University of London, 1950), p. 249.

[99] Jonathan Davies, 'Introduction', *'An ill journey for the Englshemen': Elis Gruffydd and the 1523 French Campaign of the Duke of Suffolk*, ed. by Jonathan Davies, trans. by M. Bryn Davies (Pike and Shot Society, 2006), p. 1.

[100] Elis Gruffydd, *An ill jurney*, p. 16.

soldiers, both Welshmen and Englishmen, 'were turning their faces towards England' due to a reluctance to fight.[101] Edward Hall's history maintains the separateness of Calais from England throughout, and its account of Henry VIII's first personal campaign in France suggests that war heightened the sense of leaving England, describing movement 'oute of Englande to Caleys', and identifying Dover as the limit of England, the point at which Henry made Queen Katherine regent, and therefore became absent from his rule.[102] In this context, the situation of Ireland is very similar to that of Calais, as it mostly only appears in accounts of travel in chronicles in reference to military purposes, for example Richard II having 'sailed the secounde tyme into Irlond', and then returning 'out of Irlond into Engelond'.[103] Calais remained an important destination during periods of peace: the printed account of Henry VIII's symbolic use of the town in 1532 as a location for meeting the French king prays that, on leaving the 'English Pale', the king would be sent 'good passage and safe agayne in to Englande'.[104]

Legislation, as well as providing for the separate jurisdiction of England and its possessions, also illustrates the physical separation of Calais. In 1432, the restriction of exports to Calais and 'none other Place beyond the Sea' serves to show Calais's location as important in English trade, while simultaneously confirming the physical separateness.[105] In 1465, the distinction between England and Calais is again evident in the movement of goods 'out of this Realm' to Calais.[106] The movement of the Staple 'from cales in to englande' further confirms the geographical separation of Calais, as does the 1515 reference to goods

---

[101] Gruffydd, p. 9.
[102] *Hall's Chronicle*, pp. 539-43.
[103] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 84.
[104] *The maner of the tryumphe at Caleys and Bulleyn* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1532), fol. 4ʳ, in *EEBO* [accessed 15th July 2011].
[105] 10.Hen.VI, c. 7, *Statutes II*, p. 276.
[106] 4.Edw.IV, c. 2, *Statutes II*, p. 407.

'to be shipped oute of this realme of Englond to the Staple at Calais'.[107] Another statute dealing with restrictions to the shipping of wine of Gascony, originally enacted in 4 Henry VII and appearing again in 1527 as part of John Rastell's publication of statutes, specifies the use of only 'englissh shyps or shyps of walys yreland berwyk or calyce & marches of thesame'.[108]

Accounts of journeys to Calais demonstrated not only the separateness of the possession from England itself, but also awareness among the writers of England's geographical limits, of leaving England itself at the coast. However, although it was seen as outside the physical boundaries of England, Calais was also, more significantly, considered as distinct from France. As such, it represented not only a foothold, but a guarantee of safe passage. Although England ended at Dover, the border with France only began on the other side of Calais. The claim of Edward III to the throne of France through his mother Isabella, pirncess of France, was the pretence under which war was declared in 1337. However, some of the major issues which had characterised the relationship between the kings of England and France were the more realistic titles of kings of England to the Dukedoms of Normandy and Aquitaine, for which Edward owed homage. One of his key aims, as demonstrated in his demands during periods of English dominance in France, was to gain possessions in full sovereignty. The Treaty of Brétigny of 1360 realised this aim, when the lands which were then under the control of Edward III and his heir the Black Prince were granted to them in full sovereignty, without the requirement of homage.

The point at which the town ceased to belong to France and was recognised as a possession of the English crown, however, is disputed. Clifford Davies identifies the Calais

---

[107] 7.Hen.VIII, c. 10, *Statutes III*, p. 202.
[108] *The statutes prohemium Iohannis Rastell* (London: John Rastell, 1527), fol. 215ʳ, in *EEBO* [accessed 15th July 2011].

Act of 1536 as the point at which the town was transferred from Henry VIII's rightful French crown to his real English one as part of a wider process of consolidation in the 1530s.[109] The act itself supports Davies in places, describing Calais as 'one of the mooste pryncipall treasours of this… Realme of England', providing comprehensively for its upkeep, and allowing the distribution of offices only through 'speciall lycence…under the greate seale of England'.[110] It was also not until 1536 that Calais was represented in Parliament, the same year as Berwick, although Calais had waited considerably longer.[111] David Grummitt argues, however, that the Calais Act, rather than changing the position of the town and marches, instead confirmed an existing view of 'English Calais' officially established in 1360.[112] This interpretation is supported by the treatment of Calais from that point onwards. This turning point in the status of the town is acknowledged in several accounts. The *Chronicle of London, 1089-1483*, describing the negotiations of the late 1350s, states that Edward was to receive, 'withoute homage doyng', the 'londes of Guyon, Angeoy, and Normandye and othere that longen to hym'.[113] Immediately following this entry is the first suggestion that Calais had also been made geographically separate from France. As early as 1357, and again in 1360, the *Chronicle* recounts that Edward III 'seyled to Caleys, and rood up into Fraunce', suggesting that, following the conquest of the town, it was, from this point, no longer considered part of the kingdom of France.[114] Later, Henry V is also shown to have 'seiled over the see to Caleys, and passed forth into Fraunce', while in Fabian's account of the reign of Edward IV,

---

[109] Grummitt, '"One of the mooste pryncypall treasours belonging to his realme of Englande": Calais and the Crown, c. 1450-1558', in *The English Experience in France, c. 1450-1558: War, Diplomacy and Cultural Exchange*, ed. by Grummitt (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), pp. 46-62 (pp. 57-9).

[110] 27.Hen.VIII c. 63, *Statutes III*, pp. 632, 634, 641.

[111] Chettle, 'Burgesses for Calais', p. 494.

[112] Grummitt, 'Calais and the Crown', pp. 58-62.

[113] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 62.

[114] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, Preface and pp. 62-4.

the king 'spedde hym to Caleys, and frome thens into Fraunce'.[115] Despite Grummitt's assertion that, during Henry VI's kingship of France, Calais reverted briefly to the crown of France, the difference between Calais and France is suggested by both the *Libelle*, and a London chronicle which still distinguishes between sending soldiers to Calais and sending them to France in the 1430s.[116]

However, it does seem that the position of Calais received greater definition when, by 1453, it had become England's last remaining continental possession. The marking of the border between the Pale and the kingdom of France in the 1450s by Sir Thomas Findern with a sword and the declaration that 'this is the right pale between Ingland and Ffraunce' supports David Grummitt's suggestion that the sense of separation from France was strengthened by the loss of other possessions. It not only expresses the military purpose of the 'outwork' but places the town between England and her ancient enemy, physically part of neither.[117] More specifically, it is at least implied that Calais was no longer seen as part of the claims of the English kings to either France or Normandy. In 1483, a letter of Richard III illustrates the threat posed by Henry Tudor, suggesting that, in return for French assistance, he would give up the claim to the French throne, 'togidder with the Duchies of Normandye, Angeoye and Maygne, Gascoygne and Guyenne, the Castelles and Townes of Caleys, Guisnes, Hammes', suggesting that Calais was not considered part of the others listed.[118] The separation of Calais from France was firmly established, and continued into Henry VIII's reign, as descriptions of travel during this period also acknowledge crossing a border between Calais and France.

---

[115] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 109.

[116] Grummitt, 'Calais and the crown', p. 51; Cleopatra C IV, *Chronicles of London*, p. 141.

[117] Vale, *The Ancient Enemy*, p. 118; TNA SP 1/168, fol. 185, quoted in Grummitt, 'Calais and the crown', p. 53.

[118] 'King Richard III to his Chancellor, to prepare a Proclamation against Henry Tudor and other rebels his followers', *Original Letters, Illustrative of English History*, series II, volume 1, ed. by Henry Ellis (London: Harding and Lepard, 1827), pp. 162-6 (p. 164).

Polydore Vergil's description of the 1520 'Field of the Cloth of Gold' expresses Henry VIII's decision to 'go to Calais, and thence to the French border'.[119] The *Chronicle of Calais*, too, acknowledges the separateness of the town from France, as, in 1515, it records the return of the king's sister Mary, dowager queen of France, to Calais 'out of Fraunce'.[120] Covering the years 1485-1540, and most likely written by Richard Turpyn, a Leicestershire-born Burgess of Calais, the chronicle mostly concerns itself with prominent events of what might be identified as 'national' importance to England. It does, however, prioritise the role played by Calais in its significant position between England and France, suggesting that the chronicle reflects the perceptions of the town itself.

Awareness of this distinction both on the border and among contemporary observers is demonstrated by the 1512 report of Venetian ambassador, Andrew Badoer, recording his journey to England in 1508, and in particular the difficulty he experienced in travelling from France to England. The report suggests that the borders were identified by 'numerous fortified towns belonging to the French', and recounts that Badoer was stopped three times by French companies because the border was 'very strictly guarded from the fear of the English'.[121] It seems, then, that the military priorities of Calais and its surrounding area were central to its separateness from France. This is also evident in the earlier *Relation*. Its description of the town states that its 'jurisdiction extends over three leagues of country, in every direction', and suggests that this area is defined by the presence of the French, by whom it is almost 'entirely surrounded'.[122] Furthermore, the *Relation* suggests that contemporary opinion drew direct comparisons between border regions as it also states that

---

[119] *Anglica Historia*, book XXVII, pt. 29.
[120] *Chronicle of Calais*, p. 17.
[121] Sebastian Giustinian, 'From the Ambassador in England, Andrew Badoer, 1512,' in *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII: Selection of Dispatches*, volume 1, trans. by Rawdon Brown (London: Smith, Elder, 1854), p. 66.
[122] *Relation*, p. 45.

'it is the same case with Berwick in Scotland'.[123] That Calais remained a priority to Henry VIII is demonstrated not only by its use, but also by expenditure, which was directly related to its fortification and neglected during periods of peace.[124] The first year of Henry VIII's reign saw only £95 spent on the town, but in the second year, in anticipation of war, this rose to around £3000, concentrated on its fortifications.[125] A final suggestion of the relationship between military necessity and the definition of borders is provided by the example of Calais, as a 1542 inventory of pictures in the king's possession lists maps and descriptions of the town, including a 'large mappe of Dover and Calice', the pairing of which suggests a defensive purpose.[126]

The example of Calais, then, not only demonstrates an awareness of borders and distinctions between regions, but also suggests that, while the geographical definition of England by its coasts was permanent, it was thought possible for colonised conquests to be considered as separate from the land from which they were taken. Furthermore, the example of Calais suggests that the need for definition was increased by the presence of a hostile 'other'. To a certain extent, the situation in Ireland echoed that of Calais, although it does not appear to be as frequently commented upon, perhaps because it was not a means of interaction with other sovereign states. Henry VIII's own opinion of the separate identification of 'our dominion of Ireland' is demonstrated through his intentions to send soldiers 'out of the north parts of this our realm' to Ireland and allowing others to 'return to our realm of England'.[127] As with Calais and Berwick, similarities between Calais and

---

[123] *Relation*, p. 45.
[124] H. M. Colvin, *The History of the King's Works,* volume III, 1485-1660, Part I (London: H.M.S.O., 1975), p. 338.
[125] Colvin, p. 342.
[126] TNA E 315/160 f.59v, quoted in Colvin, p. 347.
[127] 'Henry VIII to the Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland, 1520', in *Letters of the Kings of England*, volume 1, ed. by James O. Halliwell (London: Henry Colburn, 1848), pp. 248-55 (p. 249).

Ireland would have been apparent to early sixteenth-century subjects, for whom a direct parallel was drawn by the labelling of both regions with the term 'Pale', the first use of which, in reference to Ireland, is identified by Steven Ellis as having possibly occurred as early as 1446, and was certainly in use in the 1490s, and was also identified as such by Henry VIII.[128]

More specific definitions were also made during Henry VII's reign, for example the 'Act of the Marches and Maghery', of 1488, which defined the border of the English-controlled region, and also demonstrates the identification of both the 'maghery', or the 'land of peace', and the marches, labelling a militarised frontier.[129] At the end of the fifteenth century, it seems that, although the crown-controlled region was greatly reduced, it was reasonably distinguishable, as a border was formed by a ring of towns around Dublin and the outline of the 'four obedient shires' of Dublin, Louth, Meath and Kildare within which were the marcher regions.[130] The suggestion that the frontier could be defined by a largely stable geographical boundary is also supported by the idea that, in the 1490s, the Irish Pale should be enclosed by an earthwork barrier, which, although not carried out, demonstrates a sense of not only physical, linear distinction of frontiers but also the military need for such distinctions.[131] A defensive barrier, although of a different nature, had already been in use at Calais and was heavily invested in during the 1520s: the region surrounding the town could be flooded if needed, with access controlled by Newneham Bridge to the west of the town.[132] Although of a different nature, the flood plains would have provided a clear definition of the

[128] Steven Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447-1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998), p. 74; 'Henry VIII to the Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland', p. 249.
[129] Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*, p. 70-2.
[130] Daniell, *Atlas*, p. 57.
[131] Daniell, *Atlas*, p. 57.
[132] Colvin, p. 361-3.

Pale, while plans to build earthworks reflect at least a sense of permanence of the frontier in Ireland. In both cases, defence made the physical frontiers more important.

The definition of the English Pale in Ireland continued to be viewed in terms of loyal areas during Henry VIII's reign, as, in 1515, concern for the 'state of Ireland, and a plan for its reformation' involved the identification of divisions of Ireland, which distinguishes between 'cheff Iryshe regions and countreys' and 'thEnglyshe Countyes', of which further divisions are made according to, for example, loyalty and law.[133] However, Ellis suggests that the definition of the frontier in Ireland was not quite so straightforward, and argues that the 'Act of the Marches and Maghery' did not really represent the real frontier.[134] The border that existed was the limit of obedience to the king, but it was too long a frontier to maintain effectively, and not as well-defined as Calais.[135] Also unlike Calais, the only physical separation of the English-controlled lands in Ireland seems to have been the identification of the 'English Pale', and elsewhere, no other distinctions seem to have been made, as the whole island is consistently referred to as simply 'Ireland'. The reason for this may have been that the English possessions in France had been captured, and then lost, gradually, while the first claim to lordship of Ireland had been gained, at least nominally, as a whole, and was described as such by Polydore Vergil as Henry II 'accepted the islanders' surrender' in 'Ireland, freshly conquered'.[136] Alternatively, as it may be argued that the crown of France was never thought of as a serious goal, except by Henry V, Calais was instead seen as part of the land gained in full sovereignty. Ellis suggests that the geographical border between Irish and English simply mattered less than language and custom, given that a major purpose of the

---

[133] State of Ireland, and Plan for its Reformation, 1515, *State Papers Published under the Authority of his Majesty's Commission: King Henry the Eighth, 1830-1852, vol. 2: Part III: Correspondence between the Governments of England and Ireland, 1515-1538*, pt. 1 (London, 1834), p. 1.
[134] Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*, p. 70-2.
[135] Ellis, 'Tudor State Formation', p. 46.
[136] *Anglica Historia*, book XIII, pt 9.

English presence was control and subjugation.[137] However, perhaps it may be accepted at least that perceptions of early Tudor Ireland involved some awareness of a geographical boundary, much earlier than the physical distinction that Ellis associates with the 1550s.[138]

The issue of borders with Wales and Scotland is more complex. As shown above, the border with Scotland was generalised as being defined by the 'two arms of the sea'. Similarly, the border between England and Wales was also recognised in terms of geographical features. The *Relation* states that

> wherever it is not surrounded by the sea, it is bounded by England; fromwhich it is separated to the north, by a river called… Da (the Dee) and to the south by another named Offa.[139]

The definition of the border by rivers is confirmed by contemporary writers, although there is some disagreement on which river. William Worcestre's work contains some remarks that demonstrate a clear sense of the separation of England and Wales, most likely reflecting local knowledge as a native of Bristol. The 'city of Caerwent' is located 'in the beginning of Wales', which is to the west of both the Wye and the Severn, but the physical description of the Severn Estuary includes the identification of 'Welsh Stones' and 'English Stones', suggesting that the Severn was the border.[140] Near the end of Henry VIII's reign, the work of another itinerant, John Leland, based on travels that ended in 1545, provides a more specific border. In describing the Forest of Dean in Gloucestershire, Leland identifies the 'left bank of the Wye to its mouth, which is the boundary with Wales'.[141] The Wye, which runs roughly

---

[137] Ellis, 'Tudor State Formation', p. 42.
[138] Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*, p. 111.
[139] *Relation*, p. 13.
[140] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, pp. 67, 77.
[141] *John Leland's Itinerary: Travels in Tudor England*, ed. by John Chandler (Stroud: Sutton, 1993), p. 177.

from north to south past Chepstow into the Severn, was defined as the border in 1536. His description of Shrewsbury not only notes that 'Welsh Bridge' was so named because it was 'the way from the town towards Wales', but also explains that the far end of the bridge was 'facing Wales' and was fortified to 'prevent enemies from getting on to the bridge'.[142] Leland therefore suggests that the bridge and the river marked a border, and demonstrates an awareness of the role of past hostilities in defining it.

What Leland recognised in Shrewsbury was articulated in different ways earlier, during actively hostile periods. Some of the first of Glyn Dwr's followers to be executed were sent to Bristol, and were displayed on the town walls facing Wales.[143] This act of warning demonstrates the crown's awareness of Bristol's proximity to a frontier with Wales, and also, significantly, would have highlighted this to its intended audience. It also seems to imply that, although the rebellion was confined to North Wales, as further communications with Bristol pointed out, it was feared that it could spread to all of Wales, therefore identifying Wales as a single region with shared characteristics and motivation, and Bristol as part of the single frontier that contained it.[144] Accounts of travel and movement also demonstrate a distinction between England and Wales, where, often, 'Wales' is identified as a single, separate integral unit, able to act as one, for example, when there was 'a gret rysyng in Walys'.[145] The *Chronicle of London, 1086-1483* records that Edward I 'with a gret oost wente into Walys', and, later, 'wente into Walys and made pees and reeste'.[146] The separateness of Wales is also demonstrated as it is identified as a place of exile or escape, for

---

[142] *John Leland's Itinerary*, p. 389.
[143] *Calendar of the Patent Rolls of Henry IV*, vol. 1, 1399-1401 (London: H.M.S.O, 1909), p. 359; Peter Fleming, 'Identity and Belonging: Irish and Welsh in Fifteenth-Century Bristol', *The Fifteenth Century VII: Conflicts, Consequences and the Crown*, ed. by Linda Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 175-94 (p. 184).
[144] Fleming, 'Identity and Belonging', p. 184.
[145] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 36.
[146] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, pp. 29, 36.

example in 1459 when the Duke of York, his sons, the Earl of Warwick and followers 'voidid into Walis' or went to Ireland or Calais.[147] The definition of land and frontiers had long characterised the relationship between Wales and the English crown. As has already been shown, the Welsh Marches were named in the Domesday Book. Edward I's conquest led to a new stage in the definition of the border, as the marches became more fixed and the king redrew Wales in a manner which one later chronicler recognised as 'as it is in Engelond', suggesting both a working knowledge of how England was divided, and a recognition that Wales remained a separate unit.[148]

The existence of the Welsh marches also reinforced the separation of England and Wales, as they were administered separately from both. Although the marches had changed shape since their first incarnation as conquered lands, and through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries seem to have included areas of south Wales, they did serve as a frontier.[149] Towards the end of the thirteenth century, around the time of Edward I's conquest, a distinction was made between 'Marchia Wallia' and 'pura Wallia', which seems to separate the two in a similar manner to the 'march and Marghery' regions of the Irish Pale identified later, labelling the marches as separate and different in nature to the Principality.[150] The persistence of the term 'march', which, in Ireland, was recognised as a military frontier, would have encouraged such a perception of its division of England and Wales, even if its existence, by the sixteenth century, was mainly administrative.[151] That the term, and the sense of

---

[147] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 140.
[148] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 31; Lieberman, *The Medieval March of Wales*, p. 5.
[149] Lieberman, *The Medieval March of Wales*, p. 5.
[150] Lieberman, *The Medieval March of Wales*, p. 18, 20.
[151] Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power*, p. 4.

separateness, persisted is indicated by the creation of the Council in the Marches of Wales in 1471 for the young Prince of Wales.[152]

However, significance of the marches as the border does not appear to be consistently acknowledged, while the marches seem to have been responsible for the disagreement over the border of Wales. The *Chronicle of London, 1086-1483* does not always distinguish between Wales and the marches. Furthermore, the inclusion in marcher lordships and their administration of areas of four English shires seem to have confused notions of a border and of the march itself. In 1528, it was thought that Bristol was included, as the Mayor was summoned to Princess Mary's council at Ludlow, but the summons was appealed against, pleading Bristol's exemption from marcher jurisdiction.[153] In 1536, the Marcher lordships were abolished and dissolved into new or existing shires, defining the border of Wales as the river Wye, which was followed by Leland.[154] Despite this, the previous inclusion of English shires in the marches allowed Welsh writers to insist that the Severn, rather than the Wye, was the correct border, based on Geoffrey of Monmouth's use of the Severn as the original division.[155] The existence of varied opinions is highlighted by Vergil, who follows the assertion of the Severn as the boundary, but also acknowledges the opinions of 'modern writers, who make the city of Hereford the boundary…between Wales and England', and who 'want to have Wales begin at the town called Cheapstowe, were there is river named Vey'.[156] Although both Vergil and Leland may have been informed by the 1536 abolition of

---

[152] Rhys Morgan and Gerald Power, 'Enduring Borderlands: The Marches of Ireland and Wales in the Early Modern Period', in *Frontiers, Regions and Identities in Europe*, ed. by Steven G. Ellis and Raingard Eβer with Jean-François Berdah and Miloš Řezník (Pisa: Plus-Pisa University Press, 2009), pp. 101-28 (p. 104).

[153] *Kalendar*, p. 51.

[154] Lieberman, *The Medieval March of Wales*, p. 4; Morgan and Power, 'Enduring borderlands', p. 115.

[155] Morgan and Power, 'Enduring borderlands', pp. 115-6.

[156] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 8.

the marches, the use of the Wye is also implied by Worcestre's earlier description, as the identification of Caerwent as 'in the beginning of Wales' is followed by its placement 'five miles from Chepstow'.[157]

In some ways, England's border with Scotland is similar to that of Wales, although, perhaps because of the persistence of hostilities with Scotland during this period, descriptions of the border with Scotland are both more frequent and more consistent. Accounts of travel, as with Wales, acknowledge the separateness of the two. The *Chronicle of London* records that Edward II 'with a ryall oost wente into Scotloud', and later describes how 'Scottes comen into Engelond and deden muche harme'.[158] As has already been shown, the importance of the sea extended to symbolically defining a physical border with Scotland. Discussions of potential territory gained in conquest in Scotland, in 1462, talks of land 'beyonde Scottishe See'.[159] In common with Wales, the border with Scotland was defined by rivers, and the use of the Tweed as a frontier was almost universal in descriptions of the north of England. It is identified as such by both Fabian and Vergil, and although Vergil acknowledges a past use of both the Grampians and the Tyne, 'as the fortune of war (like everything else) varied', there is no suggestion in his description, as there is for Wales, that there was any contemporary dispute about the Tweed as the border.[160] John Leland, too, states that, from the point at which 'the Tweed first touches English soil' it 'begins to mark the boundary with Scotland'.[161] Writing in the mid-fifteenth century, the first compiler of the

---

[157] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 67.
[158] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, pp. 44, 45, 53.
[159] March 17. Ratification by the K. of a treaty with John de Isle, earl of Rosse, lord of the Isles, Donald Ballagh, and John de Isle, son and heir of Donald Ballagh, whom the K. retains to assist him in the conquest of Scotland, dated London, 13 Feb. 1462, in *Rymer's Foedera Volume 11*, ed. Thomas Rymer (London, 1739-1745), pp. 482-497 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol11/pp482-497> [accessed 12 July 2015].
[160] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 4.
[161] *John Leland's Itinerary*, p. 344.

Chronicle of London at least identifies Northumberland as the northern-most part of England, stating that the Scots 'comen into Engelond and distroyden Northumbr''.[162]

The western border, however, seems to have been less well-established, which may be due to the movement of most campaigns taking place in the east. Worcestre states that the 'river of Solway…runs between England and Scotland', and, where the rivers of Solway and Eden 'fall into the sea at Solway...people ride [through it] to the kingdom of Scotland'.[163] Polydore Vergil's description states that 'westward, the border of Scotland used to be Cumberland, separated from Anandale by the river Solway', but does not name an alternative border.[164] Leland, in contrast, identifies the river Esk, but also acknowledges the existence of some 'disputed territory' in the area of Netherby, on the south bank of the Esk.[165] The 'debateable land' in the west had been so–called at least since 1450, and was an issue in communication between the kings, or their representatives, in both 1483 and, allegedly, in 1513.[166] The existence of 'debateable land', however, which was only given a solution in 1552, suggests that the rest of the border was not up for debate.[167]

Also in common with Wales, the border with Scotland is often seen to have marches, identifying the region as a military frontier. Vergil labels the land along the Tweed as 'that tract of land they call Merch...the borderland between the English and the Scotch'. He places this 'Merch' on the Scottish side of the border, stating that 'the Tweed separates this from Northumbria, the northernmost district of England'.[168] In Vergil's opinion, then, the marcher

---

[162] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 46.
[163] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 73.
[164] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 4.
[165] *John Leland's Itinerary*, p. 94.
[166] Anthony Goodman, 'The Impact of War on the Scottish Marches, 1481-1513', in *The Fifteenth Century VII*, ed. by Clark, pp. 195-211 (pp. 196-7, 209).
[167] Griffiths, *This Royal Throne of Kings*, p. 4; Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power*, pp. 27-8.
[168] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 4.

land is part of Scotland, or at least not part of England. However, elsewhere, official definitions identify marches in both England and Scotland, similar to those of Wales which sat either side of the frontier. The discussion of land in 1462, although identifying the 'Scottishe See' as a frontier, also recognises the existence of land 'betuix the seid Scottisshe See and *Englonde*': it is unclear if this land is seen as Scotland, or land between the two. Although cooperation was a rare feature of the relationship between England and Scotland,[169] in 1531, a discussion between commissioners from both realms, concerning their shared interests, talks of 'eny inhabytant of the Merchiez of ather Realme', also suggesting that this was a separate jurisdiction, at least in terms of customs.[170] From the late-fifteenth century, the north of England had been administered as three marches.[171] Among the inhabitants of the north of England, the border was also of particular importance to those whose responsibility it was to maintain order. In 1512, for example, the sheriff of Cumberland petitioned against a murder indictment concerning the Liddel barony, 'in the ferthest partie of your said countie toward Scotland'. Again in 1536, two other sheriffs complained about the difficulties of coping with the inhabitants 'nygh unto the said borders of Scotland'.[172] Thus, a distinct awareness of the border existed there, if not among all the inhabitants, some of whom at least had little consideration for the border, compared with allegiances to 'surnames' and inter-married families.[173]

Along with the 'debateable land', the other, far more prominent part of the border, the status of which was ambiguous, is Berwick. It had been in the possession of the English crown since 1482, although it had changed hands several times, over several centuries. In a

---

[169] Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power*, p. 6.
[170] Decre of Concorde by the Commissioners of bayth the Realmz, 7 Sept 1531, *State Papers vol. 4: Part IV: Correspondence relative to Scotland and the Borders, CCXIV*, (London, 1836), p. 573.
[171] Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power*, p. 24.
[172] 4.Hen.VIII, c. 20, *Statutes III*, pp. 90-1; Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power,* p. 55.
[173] Goodman, 'The Impact of War', pp. 195-202.

number of ways, Berwick is the northern border's equivalent to Calais and the Irish Pale. However, unlike these, the position of the town in relation to the border, and in relation to England, was unclear. Vergil's description of the Anglo-Scottish border names Berwick as the 'principal town' of this region, and his identification of the Tweed as the border places the town firmly in Scotland.[174] Leland, too, by his identification of the Tweed, and his description of Berwick as standing 'a little way to the north side of the Tweed', also places it in Scotland.[175] Similarly, the earlier *Relation* states that 'the English possess beyond the eastern arm of the sea, named Tivida (the Tweed) in the kingdom of Scotland, the singular fortress of Berwick'.[176] Therefore the town had not, as Calais had not, become part of England, but, unlike Calais, nor was it separate from the realm from which it had been taken. This may have been due to both the very different circumstances in which Calais had been annexed, and the comparatively recent capture of Berwick at the time of writing for all three authors. Both the *Relation* and Vergil recall this aspect of Berwick's history, demonstrating that, throughout Henry VIII's early reign, which lies between the production of these two pieces, this was extant knowledge. The *Relation* describes how the town had 'belonged for a considerable time to each kingdom', and 'at length had fallen into the hands of the Scotch' who gave it to Edward IV.[177] Vergil continues by stating that it was a town 'which during my lifetime has been possessed by the King of England'.[178] He reflects here the fluid nature of Berwick's position, implying there was little permanence to its situation.

Further, Vergil suggests similarities between Berwick and Calais, as belonging to, but not part of England. This may have been the case in 1502, when the 'Treaty of Perpetual

---

[174] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 4.
[175] *John Leland's Itinerary*, pp. 344-5.
[176] *Relation*, p. 17.
[177] *Relation*, p. 17.
[178] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 4.

Peace' recognised the possession of the town by the Henry VII, but only saw Berwick as 'of', and not 'in' England.[179] The temporary nature of the position of Berwick on the border is illustrated by the differing descriptions of the town throughout the period. Froissart, for example, shows 'howe the lordes of Scotland had taken agayne dyuers townes and fortresses fro thenglysshmen such as they helde in Scotlande', leaving only 'Esturmelyne…Berwyke and Rousburge'.[180] Here, Berwick is shown as an English possession in Scotland, and, translated in the 1520s, would have been a known perception. However, these towns do, in this account, represent a borderland before entering England, as in 1347 the Scots army is described as having passed 'Rousbourg the first fortresse englysshe on that parte and so went forthe brennynge and distroyenge the countrey of Northumberlande'.[181]

Perhaps the best illustration of the position of Berwick is the account of Edward III's siege of the town found in William Caxton's 1482 printing of *The Cronycles of Englond.* Reflecting the notion that there existed marches on the Scottish side of the border, this account implies that the town had England to one side and Scotland to the other, while maintaining that crossing the river was generally considered to have marked the border.[182] Krista Kesselring demonstrates that the physical border and position of Berwick remained ill-defined to the beginning of the reign of James VI/I.[183] Significantly, she also suggests that the level of cross-border interaction this allowed before 1603 was such that the inhabitants were viewed as a distinct people, Englishmen 'carrying themselves as Scots'. As Kesselring demonstrates, however, and as discussed below, the fluid nature of the border and the town's defensive purpose was also the source of a specific brand of national awareness.

---

[179] Kesselring, 'Berwick is our England', p. 93.
[180] Froissart, 1523, fol. 38ᵛ.
[181] Froissart, 1523, fol. 67ᵛ.
[182] William Caxton, *The cronycles of Englond* (London: Caxton, 1482), fol. 112ʳ, in *EEBO* [accessed 15th April 2010].
[183] Kesselring, 'Berwick is our England', pp. 92-3.

Legislation and correspondence which deals with movement over borders is also illustrative of the physical boundaries, and here, too, the recognisable similarities between Berwick, Calais and Ireland are demonstrated. Even as late as 1642, legislation listed the town separately.[184] The official material also echoes the sentiments of the historical accounts in their treatment of the relationships between frontier towns and neighbouring territories. The role of Berwick as the first point at which Scotsmen were able to collect safe-conduct, and an unwillingness to send the safe-conduct into the 'strange realm' of Scotland, seems to position the town as a border control, and not as part of Scotland.[185] In contrast, the only act listed by John Rastell under the heading 'Berwykk' allows the carrying of merchandise to the town without customs 'though it be in skotlond'.[186] However, Berwick is also identified, in an act of 22 Edward IV, as the only 'Place within England, Ireland or Wales', alongside Carlisle, through which merchandise for Scotland must pass, suggesting Berwick was actually part of England.[187] There appear, therefore, to have been three distinct, co-existing views of the position of Berwick. However, the prevailing view seems, at least, to suggest that the town remained separate from England, reinforcing the idea that the boundaries of England itself were, by this point, mostly viewed as fixed, despite the notion that other realms could be reduced by conquest.

The last remaining region to be discussed is that of Cornwall. As has already been shown, while Cornwall was not separated from England either in the symbolic 'island nation' portrayal or in legislation, some commentators suggested that it was treated as a separate kingdom, 'like Wales'. It seems that the physical separateness of Cornwall is at least implied,

---

[184] *An ordinance of Parliament concerning the svbsidie of tonnage and poundage* (London: Lawrence Blaiklock, 1642), p. 4, in *MOMW* [accessed 22nd August 2013].

[185] 'Balthazar [Stuerdus] to Wolsey, 4 May 1515', *LPFD*, vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 121; Ughtredd to Albany, 29 August 1522, *LPFD,* vol. 3, pt II, p. 1042.

[186] Rastell, *The statutes*, 1527, fol. 30ᵛ.

[187] 22.Edw.IV, c. 8, *Statutes II,* pp. 475-6.

by the account of William of Worcestre's description of his journey there. Worcestre, interested in the Arthurian legends and British history, paid attention to Cornwall as the birthplace of Arthur, and also visited St Michael's Mount.[188] The account is detailed in its definition of Cornwall as it is for no other county border, showing that the 'bridge called Polston Bridge, a mile this side of Launceston is where Cornwall begins'.[189] This may be due, however, to Cornwall being his particular destination. Elsewhere, Penzance is shown to be 'in the westernmost part of England, nearest to the Scilly Isles', identifying Cornwall as part of the kingdom and excluding the Isles.[190] The rest of the work consistently refers to Cornwall as 'the furthest western end of the realm of England'.[191] However, Vergil, too, states that Cornwall is separate from England, and, like the 1506 Italian impression of the region, identifies it with Wales, as he describes England as 'bounded on the east and south by the ocean, on the west by the borders of Wales and Cornwall'.[192] In contrast, an early map, which labels 'Wallia' and 'Scocia' in a similar manner to each other, and shows them to be separated by rivers, Cornwall is labelled in the same way as other counties of England, and is not given a border, therefore also placing it within England.[193] Nor is there any physical separation obvious in the map produced in 1539. Similarly, although Vergil identifies it as separate, he also shows that definitions applied by the English government had long included Cornwall. Along with possessions such as Berwick, then, Cornwall's position was also somewhat ambiguous, but with the majority of the evidence seeming to indicate its physical placement within England.

---

[188] Harvey, pp. ix-xi, xiii; Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 21.

[189] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 17.

[190] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 33.

[191] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 115.

[192] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 3.

[193] Map of Britain, London, BL, MS Royal C VII f.5ᵛ <http://bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=41614> [accessed 24th June 2013].

It may be said, then, that while the relationship between England and the territories of which Henry VIII was also ruler was sometimes ambiguous, the definition of each territory suggests that there was an awareness of the geographical boundaries, and that the ways in which this awareness was articulated were largely consistent. Great significance was placed on the physical definition of England, and it was an important feature of the nation's definition. Furthermore, the similarities between the definitions of different border regions and their collective naming in legislation also imply that the regions were viewed collectively.[194] However, although the territorial borders of England were clear, boundaries of population were more complex.

III. Membership, Participation and Englishness

The existence of English enclaves of power outside the definition of England suggests that the application of Englishness, the definition of the nation's population, must have been more flexible. Further examination of the official and literary treatment of the border regions not only demonstrates that nationhood was not coterminous with definitions of England, but it also illustrates how the frontiers of Englishness itself were defined, both on the borders and within the realm. Alongside boundaries of territory and population, Craig Calhoun identifies features such as common descent, a shared culture and popular participation as significant elements of national rhetoric.[195] It will be shown that Englishness comprised a number of features, not all of which were necessary for participation in the nation, some of which varied in their relevance, and, significantly, all of which acknowledge the presence of the 'other'.

One of the most important features of nationhood, in both modern and early modern thought, is the possession of a shared language. Earlier discussions and the first

---

[194] Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power*, p. ix.
[195] Calhoun, pp. 4-5.

identifications of the 'nation of England' were not written in English, and, indeed, language separated the ruling classes from the ruled.[196] However, this did not prevent an awareness of a nation which was articulated as a concern for the vulnerability of its language.[197] Recognition of language as a unifying force was demonstrated as the use of English by Chaucer identified a specific and limited audience for his work, while the use of English by Henry V, even in international correspondence, suggests that the language was invested with the status of the nation.[198] It may be no coincidence, then, that the English protest of 1417 identified language as the most important determiner of a nation. The protest states that England possesses 'everything necessary to being a nation with an authentic voice', defined as a 'people (*gens*), distinct from another' by 'difference of language, - which is the chief and surest proof of being a nation'.[199] Reinforcing this, the protest goes on to recognise that the French nation, referring to France itself rather than the conciliar 'nation', 'has one vernacular… in every part of the nation'. In contrast, it says that 'within the English or British nation…there are five languages', and that this should really qualify it to have 'representation for as many nations as there are distinct languages'.[200] The protest, therefore, not only identifies a common language as a defining element of a nation, but also suggests that a common language meant a single voice, at least in terms of international representation.

The issue of language was also addressed by William Caxton, in the introduction to his own translation of *Eneydos* from French into English, printed in 1490. Of initial

---

[196] Vale, *Ancient Enemy*, pp. 75-8.
[197] Vale, *Ancient Enemy*, p. 76.
[198] Vale, *Ancient Enemy*, pp. 77, 79.
[199] 'English Protest', p. 120.
[200] 'English Protest', p. 121.

importance is his use of the phrases 'our langage' and 'our englysshe'.[201] Here, Caxton echoes the implication in the 1417 protest that language provided a nation's voice, as he shows that the English language was a unifying feature of English identity, and suggests a collective ownership of the language. Furthermore, although he acknowledges the difficulty of rendering the original French in English, and the development of the language over time from the 'rude' old English, Caxton also suggests that, by this point, English was at least an adequate literary language by his identification of the English language work of John Skelton as 'polyshed and ornate'.[202] This suggests not only some measure of pride in the language but also a recognition of the efforts of native writers to use English in this form. Caxton's prologue also addresses the issue of universal understanding, which seems to contradict the assertion of English as a common language, given the variation between regions. Caxton, instead, is led by this changeable nature of the language to a conclusion about the character of the English themselves, as he suggests that

> we englysshe men / ben borne vnder the domynacyon of the mone. whiche is neuer stedfaste / but euer wauerynge…And that comyn englysshe that is spoken in one shyre varyeth from a nother.[203]

Rather than seeing regional variation, even to the point of being unintelligible to each other, Caxton sees in the language a reflection of an intrinsic and natural characteristic of Englishness. Caxton identifies his audience as 'a clerke & a noble gentylman', but he seems to do this not because of illiteracy but only because of the content of 'faytes of armes in loue

---

[201] William Caxton, 'Prologue to his translation of *Eneydos*' (1490), in *The English Language: Essays by English and American Men of Letters 1490-1839*, ed. by Whitney. F. Bolton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), pp. 2-4 (pp. 2-3).
[202] Caxton, 'Prologue', pp. 2-4.
[203] Caxton, 'Prologue', p. 2.

& in noble chyualrye', which the ordinary labourer would not understand.[204] Similarly, only the problem of translating 'fayr & straunge termes', which had no English equivalent, seems to have limited the understanding of the 'comyn peple', suggesting that, otherwise, the audience of the language might be the definition of the English themselves.[205]

It is likely that these assertions would have been well-known given the distribution of Caxton's work among the literate, alongside the work of similar writers who sought to give the language greater prominence. Furthermore, by virtue of the language remaining largely insular compared to the more universal French, as Caxton suggests, English was the possession of a limited and mostly definable audience.[206] Significantly, it also allowed Englishness to exist outside the defined borders of England, and therefore made it possible for Englishness to encompass frontier territories. The Calais Act of 1536, far from enforcing entirely new notions of membership, mostly reinforced and made official features that already formed part of the identity of Calais, and its enforcing of the language 'used within this realm of England' merely confirmed the existing situation, as English had long been used in Calais.[207] This element of the Calais Act does, however, still demonstrate some important facets of contemporary perceptions of the relationship between language and nationhood. Of initial importance is the identification of language with the realm, which highlights its status, by this point, as the recognised official language.

The Act may be considered part of what is seen as Henry VIII's consolidation of his territories, following the break with Rome, therefore linking such elements with the sense of Englishness that began to develop after this point. The remainder of Henry VIII's reign

---

[204] Caxton, 'Prologue', p. 3.
[205] Caxton, 'Prologue', p. 2.
[206] Vale, *Ancient Enemy*, p. 79.
[207] Vale, *Ancient Enemy*, p. 117.

recognised Calais's vulnerability as a possible source of betrayal to the Pope and the French, and, with the 1540s invasion of France, 'strangers' were expelled from the Pale.[208] However, a great deal of what the Act enforced was extant already. Given the earlier identification of the language as a possession of the nation, it may be suggested that the Act identified and emphasised language as an existing and important feature of national identity. Furthermore, the establishment of the language as part of national identification was a gradual process, which gained significant ground during the fifteenth century. The inclusion of language in the Act, therefore, may be seen instead as the result, rather than the establishment, of the role language played in the nation.

This element of the Act also demonstrates an important feature of the relationship between England and the frontiers. Identifying it as the language used in the 'realm of England', it seems that the language was particularly labelled as a possession of the nation, as well as of nationhood, and it is therefore significant that it was felt important for the Act to reinforce its use in Calais. Firstly, and this will become more apparent below, it suggests that the definition of English identity on the frontiers was of particular importance, recognising their vulnerability and also demonstrating that, perhaps, this led to increased communication of national consciousness in peripheral regions by the 'centre'. However, it also shows that Englishness, outside England itself, needed some confirmation, as though, otherwise, the national membership of the peripheral regions was in question. That the English language was not only in use, but significant to Calais, is shown by the *Chronicle of Calais*. Most likely written by an England-born burgess of Calais, it suggests that English was, at least, the language of government and its prominent citizens. Furthermore, the chronicle may have been an intentional assertion of Calais's membership of English nationhood, as it represents

---

[208] Chettle, 'Burgesses of Calais', pp. 496-7.

an effort to participate in a tradition of writing in England, and so the use of English may also have been not just an indicator, but a declaration of Calais's identity.

Language, then, allowed wider membership outside the confines of England, suggesting popular participation in the idea of the nation, and a shared culture. It qualified the English membership of frontier regions and acted as a frontier of nationhood itself, as it emphasised the separateness of the regions from what lay beyond. This also seems to have been the case with the border between England and Wales, as it was perceived, at least, that language formed a frontier here too. The *Relation* identifies language as one of the main distinctions between the two, as it states of the Welsh that 'their language is different from both the English and the Scots'.[209] Similarly, it also emphasises the line drawn between England and Scotland as it describes the language of the Scots as 'the same as that of the Irish, and very different from the English'.[210] However, it does not seem that language, alone, could be seen as an exclusive classifier of identity. The *Relation* also claims that 'many of the Scotch people speak English extremely well, in consequence of the intercourse they have with each other'.[211] Vergil suggests that the use of English in southern Scotland was due to being 'better mannered' and 'more civilized', therefore investing the language with these characteristics, yet this still demonstrates that the language was not the sole possession of the English.[212]

Language could not be said to be the definition of nationhood, either in Scotland in which two languages existed among those identified as 'Scotch', or in England, because the English language extended to the Scots. Furthermore, it also seems that, on the border, it was

[209] *Relation*, p. 19.
[210] *Relation*, p. 18.
[211] *Relation*, p. 18.
[212] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 7.

a means of interaction and even an indicator of a shared identity. Nor can it be said that Englishness necessarily excluded other languages. The 1417 protest's identification of Cornish as one of five separate languages of the 'English or British nation', and suggestion that each language could be afforded a voice as a conciliar nation, allowed for the separate identity of Cornwall. However, the somewhat ambiguous position of Cornwall in relation to England suggests that here, too, the use of language to separate national identity was not definitive. It seems that, among the peripheral regions, language was only seen as a necessary element of English identity where it contrasted the region with the other side of the frontier, where the encroachment of another language was threatened. Thus, it was important in Calais, but was not considered an indication of identity between England and Scotland, and did not exclude Cornwall.

While language was important, it needs to be viewed in relation to other factors. The wider subject of English descent and awareness of temporal depth is the subject of the next chapter. However, it is evident that the suggestion of descent, a shared bond of blood, was a recognised, and central, element of nationhood in contemporary English perceptions of identity. Furthermore, in the case of the frontier regions at least, acknowledgement of common descent seems to have been key to participation in Englishness. In the 1417 protest's definition, descent is recognised as another way in which a nation may be identified. Although, in the writer's opinion, 'difference of language' is the primary means of defining a nation, the tract also states that it may be 'understood as a people…distinct from another by blood relationship'.[213] This demonstrates the views of Smith and Gat in seeing ethnicity and kinship as key to the development of nations. That these definitions appear as part of an international defence of England's status suggests that the representatives of Henry V saw

---

[213] 'English Protest', p. 120.

them as universally accepted principles of nationhood. The centrality and persistence of this definition of nationhood in English thought is shown by numerous and varied interpretations of the meaning of Englishness. Edward IV, for example, the security of whose throne depended upon proving the legitimacy of his claim, suggested in a letter to a London alderman that the Lancastrians would ally with England's enemies, resulting in the extinguishing of the 'blood English of this our said realm'.[214] This statement demonstrates a view that Englishness was related to birth and a notion of shared ancestry, and suggests that the integrity of English blood was something that made Englishmen distinct, in this case, from their enemies. Furthermore, Edward's use of such sentiment as part of a campaign for popular support suggests that he had identified the notion of 'blood English' as an effective appeal among his subjects. As with all propaganda, it may be suggested that the king's rhetoric responded to existing sentiment among the audience.

That a strong sense of descent was at least perceived to have existed in the early sixteenth century is also suggested by the *Relation*. The description of the Welsh records their opinion that they were 'the original inhabitants of the island', and were 'descended from the Trojans'.[215] This impression of the separate descent of the Welsh and the English may have been taken from Bede and other histories. However, the *Relation* suggests that this was the common contemporary 'generally supposed' opinion, as 'they themselves say, and it is also believed by the English'. Among the *Relation*'s contemporary sources, then, the distinctiveness of Welsh and English identities was still dependent upon lasting myths of ancient descent. Furthermore, the *Relation* also implies that there was a concern for preserving the separateness of the two, as it asserts that the Welsh would not 'on any account

---

[214] Charles Ross, 'Rumour, Propaganda and Popular Opinion during the Wars of the Roses', in *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England*, ed. by Griffiths (Gloucester: Sutton, 1981), pp. 15-32 (p. 18).
[215] *Relation*, p. 19.

intermarry with the English'.[216] Although this was not the case, as inter-marriage did occur with both the Welsh and the Scots, the example of the *Relation* demonstrates that this was an existing perception.

During Henry VIII's reign, the importance of descent and 'blood English' not only persisted through the distribution of historical material, but was articulated in official definitions and action. In 1513, war with both Scotland and France prompted the labelling of all Scotsmen living in England as enemies, and their banishment. The only exceptions specified here are those who were married to English women and had children.[217] This action would have served to directly highlight the 'other' status of Scots to the population with the resultant removal of those who were banished. With regard to descent and 'blood English', it initially seems to neglect any notion of wanting to prevent such marriages, and suggests instead that Anglo-Scottish marriages were acceptable, allowing for a sense of dual identity for these men. However, significantly, the exemption of these Scots is followed by the instruction that those allowed to remain must forfeit half their goods and find security for the other half. This suggests that, while such marriages were unavoidable, they were not desirable, and the resultant enforcement of the seizure of goods would have communicated this notion. It also demonstrates that they were not considered marriages of equals, as they were still to be acknowledged as aliens and treated with suspicion.

A clearer demonstration that the notion of common descent and birth remained an important element of identity during this period is provided by definitions which were applied to the inhabitants of Calais. In addition to the town's long-standing membership of the English crown, the Englishness of Calais is also consistently highlighted through the

---

[216] *Relation*, p. 19.
[217] Scotchmen and Frenchmen in England, August 1513, *LPFD*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 990.

acknowledgement that the inhabitants could be identified as of English descent. Calais was given a permanent place in the interests of England, as Edward III declared his intentions, following the siege in 1347, to repopulate the town with English inhabitants, mostly from Kent. Froissart provides a detailed explanation of both the siege and the decision to replace the inhabitants of the town with 'pure englysshmen', which seems to have begun immediately.[218] English descent continued to be acknowledged. A London chronicle, recounting the years following the victory at Agincourt, states that 'owre Englishmen of Calys redden owte…and sclew a grete hepe of ffrenshmen'.[219] This simultaneously expresses the writer's own national self-identification and an ownership of the history, which, significantly, acknowledges that Calais shared this identity. Further, it distinguishes explicitly between the English of Calais, and the French as the enemy. The English descent of Calais residents was brought to the attention of later audiences with the translation of Froissart's *Chroniques* by Lord Berners. Vergil also recalls the decision that 'only Englishmen should live in Calais'.[220] Onwards from the time of this re-population, then, Calais was not just important to English history, but were identified as participants in that history.

The same may also be said to apply to Berwick, as it is frequently shown to be inhabited, and held, by Englishmen, even during periods of Scottish ownership.[221] It may be suggested, then, that English birth was not necessarily dependent upon it taking place within the geographical confines of England, but could be extended by acknowledgement of common descent.[222] It may also be the reason why Calais came to be seen as part of the English crown rather than the French. The combination of annexation to the English crown,

---

[218] Froissart, 1523, fol. 72ᵛ; Grummitt, 'Calais and the crown', p. 59.
[219] Cleopatra, C IV, *Chronicles of London*, p. 125.
[220] *Anglica Historia*, book XIX, pt. 30.
[221] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 62.
[222] Griffiths, *This Royal Throne of Kings*, p. 5.

and recognised English descent also differentiates Calais from the Channel Islands, which were seen to have remained part of the Duchy of Normandy.[223] In contrast with the consistent recognition of Calais as English, in 1440, the residents of the islands were identified as aliens.[224] As these two factors distinguished the circumstances of Calais from those of the Channel Islands, it may be suggested that they provide the central definition of Englishness.

However, the identity of Calais residents was more complex, as legislation dealing with the town throughout its subjection to England's kings demonstrates. The settlement of an English population shortly after Edward III's conquest raised questions concerning their status and that of their children, causing a petition, in 1368, that 'Infants born beyond the Sea, within the Seignories of Calais' would have the same rights of inheritance as those born in England.[225] The need for such a petition suggests that birth outside the geographical definition of England led to a questionable status needing further legal qualification. This was still the case during Henry VIII's early reign. Chettle suggests that the issue of identity had been neglected in Calais until the Calais Act. However, it was clearly a concern much earlier, as the presence of aliens in Calais was regularly controlled through the employment of a collector of 'bilmoney', or fines from aliens, in 1509.[226] The existence of such a check on the alien population suggests that there was clear differentiation between English and non-English. This was more clearly articulated three years later, as the anticipation of war with France prompted the clarification of Calais's population. A proclamation of March 1512 expresses a concern for the 'continuance of Englishmen to be inhabitants' of the town, and allows for the marriage of the people of Calais to each other, or to any 'mere English' subject

---

[223] *Relation,* p. 45.

[224] Griffiths, *This Royal Throne of Kings*, p. 2.

[225] 42.Edw.III, c.10, *Statutes I*, p. 389.

[226] Chettle, 'Burgesses of Calais', pp. 496-7; Calais Accounts, *LPFD*, vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 98.

without licence, and for their children to be considered English.[227] Significantly, this proclamation both acknowledges that it long been thought that people born in Calais were 'mere Englishmen', and suggests an equality between them and other Englishmen. It also has wider implications for definitions of Englishness more generally as it identifies descent and birth as an important element of nationhood. However, as with the concerns expressed in 1368, the issuing of such a proclamation suggests that there existed some doubt as to the status of the town's inhabitants.

The example of Calais suggests that, in frontier regions, the definition of Englishness was both prominent and, simultaneously, questionable, and the 1512 proclamation identifies the reason for this. The conditions attached to this grant of English identity state that leaving the king's allegiance would lead to the forfeiting of their lands and, most importantly, would 'be reputed and taken afterwards as strangers', suggesting that it was the frontier's proximity to foreign influence that was the reason for the definition. The proclamation implies that betrayal meant forfeiting the right to be identified as English. More importantly, it suggests that Englishness was something which could be defined, and revoked, by the crown. Identifying loyalty as a factor in membership of the nation was part of a wider policy of investing nationhood in the crown. The emphasis placed on loyalty in the frontier towns may be seen elsewhere. Krista Kesselring's discussion of the relationship of Berwick with English identity in the late sixteenth century shows that attempts to enforce a border included making Anglo-Scottish marriages treasonous, and the suggestion that an Englishman ploughing land in Scotland would be considered to have left his proper allegiance.[228] The inhabitants of Berwick were able to articulate a sense of identity in order to protect privileges and to raise grievances in London, and emphasised this by drawing upon the 'spectre of a national

---

[227] *TRPI*, pp. 93-4.
[228] Kesselring, 'Berwick is our England', pp. 95-7.

enemy' over the border.[229] The relevance of this later example to Henry VIII's definition for Calais is that, in both cases, the proximity of an enemy made it important to take steps to ensure loyalty, which impacted their legal status and privileges.[230] Both examples suggest that the 'national' had to be, of necessity, part of the local identity of frontier towns. Peter Sahlins, examining similar developments on the Franco-Spanish border, suggests that the appearance of national identity on international borders shows an appropriation of the nation to suit local needs with little state intervention.[231] However, it seems instead that the requirement for loyalty and the recognition that Englishness protected the rights of the inhabitants, that the central government played an important role in defining border identities. The definition of the identity of border towns was more carefully considered in order to recognise specific requirements. The condition of loyalty, the presence of an enemy and the ability of the towns to refer to the threat of other peoples.

The example of Calais indicates that the notion of descent was a central element of English identity, although, as with language, it was not definitive. Further examples also demonstrate that the notion of descent or 'blood English' alone did not define the relationship between Englishness and the 'others' that it encountered, and that distinctions were not made either equally or consistently. It may be suggested that 'blood English' excluded both the Irish and the Welsh equally, however this was not always the case. Peter Fleming suggests that the definition of 'alien', from the mid-fourteenth century onwards, was generally fixed and was intended to exclude not the non-English, but those born outside the king's domains.[232] Actions concerned with exclusion or banishment do not always reflect this.

---

[229] Kesselring, 'Berwick is our England', pp. 97-108.
[230] Kesselring, 'Berwick is our England', p. 98.
[231] Peter Sahlins, *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), discussed in Kesselring, 'Berwick is our England'.
[232] Fleming, 'Identity and Belonging', p. 176.

Proclamations from the early-fifteenth century ordered the Welsh and Irish, equally, out of England, with the exception of those who paid for licenses. Two surviving mid fifteenth-century Bristol returns for alien subsidies differ from each other as one includes Irish residents. Although Fleming identifies this as a mistake, it does suggest that the Irish could be, and occasionally were, perceived as aliens.[233] If this was unintentional, discrimination of the Irish within Bristol was not, as legislation aimed specifically at Irish residents sought to exclude them from government and guilds and also tried to directly apply anti-alien measures to them.[234] In contrast, the prominence of Welsh residents was a characteristic of Bristol's local government from the late-fifteenth century into the 1520s.[235] Bristol's acceptance and differentiation here did not reflect elite and official labelling of the Welsh which persisted into the 1530s. The imposition of further English institutions and laws in 1536 was considered a civilising measure, aimed at adjusting the natural barbarism and ill education of the Welsh, viewed as part of their shared culture with the 'wild' Irish.[236]

It seems, therefore, that the Welsh and Irish were sometimes categorised together, sometimes not. Furthermore, Bristol in particular, which may be identified as a frontier with both Wales and Ireland, demonstrates both possible characteristics of a border community: heightened discrimination towards the 'other' in the form of the Irish, and comparative acceptance of the Welsh. Awareness of the border, however, and of the proximity not only of 'others' but a separate region, entered local legislation, as Bristol's ordinances specify restrictions on sending 'whete or brede…unto Wales or to any other place in the contrey'

---

[233] Fleming, 'Identity and Belonging', p. 179.
[234] Fleming, 'Identity and Belonging', p. 182.
[235] Fleming, 'Identity and Belonging', p. 187.
[236] Ellis, 'Civilising the Natives: State Formation and the Tudor Monarchy, c. 1400-1603', in *Imagining Frontiers, Contesting Identities*, ed. by Ellis and Lud'a Klusáková (Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2007), pp. 77-92 (pp. 83-7).

without licence.[237] This suggests a recognition that Wales was separate. This was also the case in Shrewsbury, as the town's merchant guilds, in the mid-fifteenth century, listed a number of Welsh names.[238] At the same time, however, legislation aimed to prevent the acceptance of 'outsiders', and penalties so that guilds would 'make no foreyn Brother'.[239] Although not specifically referring to Welshmen, instead fitting in with references to 'foreigners' and 'strangers' in the sense of non-locals, as seen in many towns,[240] it seems at odds with local acceptance.

Another element in the definition of nationhood is articulated during this period in the relationship between Englishness and those it excluded. Differences of culture and customs were frequently commented upon and may be seen to have characterised the separateness of Englishness from other identities. The assertion of medieval Welsh identity was based on the shared ownership of law and customs, while the separateness of the Welsh Marches from both Wales and England was maintained in the same manner. Vergil also suggests that these factors were decisive in distinguishing peoples from one another, as he states that 'the English differ from the Scots in laws and customs'.[241] The 'Lawes…of England' were also shown to be an important characteristic of national unity in other ways. Richard III's 1484 Parliament identified the laws, and their maintenance, as the inheritance of 'every Englishman', suggesting that Englishness was invested in an ownership of, and collective responsibility for the nation's institutions. As this parliament was used to justify his claim to the throne to 'all the people', intended for popular consumption in the broadest sense,

---

[237] *The Ordinances of Bristol*, ed. by Maureen Stanford (Bristol: Bristol Record Society, 1990), p. 13.
[238] C. H. Drinkwater, 'Four Merchant Gild Rolls of the Fifteenth Century (1450-1459)', in *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series vol V (1905), 81-100 (p. 82).
[239] Ordinance of Richard, Late Duke of York, c. 1500, Shrewsbury, Shropshire Archives, LB/1/6.
[240] For example, *Ordinances of Bristol*, pp. xxi, 10, 12, 15, where 'stranger' is seen to mean anyone not of Bristol, protecting local privileges in trade.
[241] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 7.

including all 'people of this Lande' that are 'not suffisantly lerned', it may be suggested that it drew upon an existing perceptions of nationhood.[242]

Furthermore, the unity of 'every Englishman' in ownership of the laws allows the extension of nationhood outside the boundaries of England, and suggests that participation in shared customs and institutions were thought to be a defining factor of nationhood. The *Relation* shows that this was the case. The description of the practices of England's towns and shires identifies a desire for the 'imitation of London, which is truly the metropolis of England' in the election of mayors, bailiffs and sheriffs. The *Relation* also suggests that these customs were shared by Jersey and other Channel Islands, and states that 'there is no doubt that this is the practice at Calais' too.[243] It seems, then, that these customs were seen as a characteristic of English rule that extended beyond England itself, and, more importantly, were thought by the Italian visitor to have been a conscious and collective attempt to identify with London. This is supported by evidence from at least one town, as the Bristol *Kalendar* states as one of its main purposes the identification of the town's customs with those of London.[244] Calais's identity does seem to have been confirmed by the extension of English institutions to the town. England's administration of Calais included the imposition of an English town structure, and the establishment of the Calais Staple, and issued the town's statute law directly from Westminster, even, significantly, during Henry VI's kingship of France, during which the 'counsell of Englond whas holden at caleys'.[245] As early as 1379, the ecclesiastical administration of the town was also exercised from England, granted to the

---

[242] Ross, 'Rumour, Propaganda and Popular Opinion', p. 21.
[243] *Relation*, p. 45.
[244] *Kalendar*, pp. i, 2.
[245] Grummitt, 'Calais and the crown', pp. 48-52; Chettle, 'Burgesses for Calais', p. 494; Cleopatra C IV, *Chronicles of London*, ed. Kingsford, p. 135.

diocese of Canterbury by papal bull.[246] David Grummitt draws a comparison with the only other significant continental possession of Henry VIII, as, unlike Calais, the conquered town of Tournai's appeals and administration remained locally governed rather than by Westminster.[247]

The *Relation* also highlights other characteristics of culture and custom that distinguished the peoples of the British Isles from each other, indicating, for example, that the Welsh lived in the country rather than towns.[248] It also names arrogance, a taste for fine clothes, lack of affection and an inclination towards comfort as particularly English traits.[249] The suggestion that styles of education and upbringing distinguished the English from the Welsh is indicated by a Chancery case of the 1530s, identified by Fleming, in which a Welshman from Newport expressed the desire to send his children to Bristol in order to be 'browght upp according to the man[n]er et condicones of the nurture Inglonde'.[250] This statement suggests that, even between towns of such close proximity as Newport and Bristol, the boundary of identities was highlighted by differing customs. Elis Gruffydd also indicates that it was common for nations to be assigned particular collective traits of culture and character, as his account of the 1523 campaign records that the English were expected by the French to 'take their sport in strolling around the countryside and eating…and drinking wine, which was a great treat for the English common people'.[251]

Such generalisations about culture and character were particularly important in illustrating the nature of the relationship between Englishness and the other identities within

---

[246] Chettle, 'Burgesses for Calais', p. 493.
[247] Grummitt, 'Calais and the Crown', p. 55.
[248] *Relation,* p. 19.
[249] *Relation*, pp. 20-4.
[250] Fleming, 'Identity and Belonging', p. 190.
[251] Gruffydd, *An Ill jurney*, pp. 11-12.

the British Isles. The frequent references to the 'wild Irish', for example, uses of which can be found in the work of Higden, Fabian and Sir Thomas More, perpetuated an opinion of the inferiority of the Irish and therefore also recalled the original purpose of the English presence in Ireland as one of subjection.[252] Legislation was also made against Irish money, not only highlighting a difference of institutions but also implying the inferiority of Irish coinage. The first of two proclamations during Henry VII's reign that dealt with the outlawing of Irish money, in 1491, suggests that the use of Irish coins was a problem both because it was met with 'fear and ignorance' and because it was 'of much less value'.[253] It also implies that the influx of Irish money was due to 'evil-disposed persons'. This mistrust of Irish coinage was evident in Bristol, as the mayor's calendar records, as an important event of 1489, the imprisonment of two men from Waterford in Ireland for the 'brynging of Irissh money to the town'.[254] The expectation of 'fear and ignorance' suggests that this suspicion was not limited to Bristol. Both the outlawing of Irish coinage, and the mistrust with which it was thought to have met, suggest a wider awareness and reinforcement of the differences of culture and status. Surnames were also a source of differentiation, as at least some Irish settlers in Bristol changed or Anglicised their names.[255] Similarly, the Welsh surname tradition of the patronymic system would have been a source of differentiation between regions, as the Principality retained this tradition long after the Marches and the communities of Welsh residents in English border regions.[256]

However, despite the strong association made between shared characteristics or culture and the participation in a collective identity, further examples indicate that alternate

---

[252] Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power,* p. 19; Fabian, fol. 144[r].
[253] *TRPI*, p. 26.
[254] *Kalendar*, p. 47.
[255] Fleming, 'Identity and Belonging', p. 180.
[256] Fleming, 'Identity and Belonging', p. 191.

customs to what was considered 'English' could also exist within the notion of Englishness. The *Relation*'s description of Scotland, for example, identifies the existence of both the 'wild or savage Scots' of the countryside and the more civilised populations of towns, but does not suggest that one represents 'Scottishness' more than the other.[257] Therefore, while the piece uses custom or behaviour to distinguish peoples, it also acknowledges that different customs and characteristics do not indicate a separate nation. The identification of Calais as English did not exclude local and existing custom even with the removal of the original population. The Pale retained laws, customs and traditions from before its capture, as Froissart describes the expulsion of all the original inhabitants except for 'a preest / and two auncyent personages / suche as knewe the customes lawes / and ordynaunces' of the town, and the division of the land.[258] Finally, while the separateness of Cornwall, to Quirini in 1506, seemed distinguished as a 'wild spot' inhabited by a 'few bores', a 'barbarous race…different in language and customs', these factors did not, fully exclude Cornwall.[259] Vergil, too, sees Cornwall as separate by virtue of language and descent, but still an English county.[260]

The examples from Berwick, Bristol, Cornwall and Calais suggest that, while constructs of physical borders and national characteristics which were quite strong, the existence of identities on the borders themselves was imprecise. The distinction between the Welsh and English in Bristol, or between the English and Scottish in Berwick demonstrates that the borders were known, but that the subtleties of identity were less secure. Exclusion was not always applied with equality, and varied, not necessarily according to the strength of feeling English, but the climate and the relative 'otherness' of the excluded. In Bristol, for example, there existed an awareness of Wales as a separate entity, but the relative acceptance,

---

[257] *Relation*, pp. 14-6.
[258] Froissart, 1523, fol. 72ᵛ.
[259] Quirini, quoted in Griffiths, 'The island of England', p. 180-1.
[260] *Anglica Historia*, book I, pt. 9.

integration and even prominence of Welsh residents in Bristol contrasted not only with its attitude to the Irish, but also with elite ideas. Similarly, the application of defining qualities such as language and customs was not clear-cut, given the examples of cross-frontier interaction on the Scottish border, and the maintenance of pre-English traditions in Calais. Integration, inter-marriage and birth outside England made identity more complex, as the imposition of legislation demonstrates, suggesting that populations of frontiers could belong to more than one identity, or did not always possess a distinct sense of 'otherness'. While Lavezzo and others emphasised that multiple loyalties and identities could co-exist, the attempts to define Englishness in terms of loyalty, actions and marriages suggests that dual, or at least imprecise national identities existed but were problematic.

Awareness of frontiers and belonging to England was heightened in times of need, although the assertion of Bristol's exclusion from the rule of the Principality confirms only the town's awareness of a legislative border. The examples of the geographical frontiers, then, paradoxically demonstrate both possible consequences of their distance from the 'centre', or more importantly, proximity to 'otherness', which, depending on circumstances, either served to dilute or strengthen the sense of a national community. Physical borders were generally not, as Anderson and Calhoun believe, fluid, but identity could be. This does highlight the assertions of Ellis and Grummitt, that, due to the complexity of identity in border regions, they were significant and central to policy and to ideas of the nation.

Conclusion

An examination of what were considered the frontiers of the rule of kings of England in the early sixteenth century has demonstrated a number of important elements of contemporary definitions of nation and nationhood. Significantly, in both symbolic and

physical depictions, it seems that there was a clear and mostly consistent awareness of 'England'. The idea of the nation was associated with well-defined geographical boundaries. The examples provided by the border regions also show that, while the definition of 'England' was mostly fixed, notions of Englishness, and participation in it, were not contained by the physical nation itself. However, the articulation of national identity in, or towards border regions also demonstrates that participation was dependent on several defining factors, the importance and combination of which varied according to specific circumstances. Significantly, the circumstances of some frontier regions created the need for the intervention of the crown in the definition of identity. The definition of Englishness, then, was complex, changeable and adaptable, and suggests that, while Steven Ellis is right to point out that the frontiers of Tudor rule should be viewed collectively, and indeed often were by contemporary observers, there can be few generalisations about the application of Englishness to the frontiers.

2. Histories of Nationhood

Chapter One demonstrated that, while the physical boundaries of England were largely considered fixed, the theoretical limits of the 'English' depended upon more flexible factors. Another important influence on definitions of identity is a sense of a shared past. As has been shown, in the case of Calais, recollections of a common ancestry bound the townspeople to England. Furthermore, definitions of England's frontiers and membership of English nationhood developed from the earliest articulations of Bede to the descriptions provided by Vergil. Sixteenth-century understanding of the nation was the result of a long evolution. Ideas of identity grew and changed over time, and notions of the past influenced the formation of a national consciousness. From the later stages of the Hundred Years War onwards, the significance of historical writing increased, as it became the means through which the wars over the crown were justified in national terms. The earliest uses of print also demonstrated both the prevalence and the popularity of England's history.

This chapter will examine the role of the past in defining and articulating English nationhood. Craig Calhoun stresses the centrality of the past to a nation's rhetoric, as it accounts for a number of the features he highlights: descent, temporal depth, 'special relations to a….territory'. Anthony D. Smith also identifies shared experience as a defining characteristic of *ethnie*: a sense of the 'cultural uniqueness' of a 'historical community', collective experience which, modified over generations, differentiates peoples from one another.[1] Observers of early modern England have also indicated the link between historical writing and nationhood. Cathy Shrank's study of John Leland, an antiquarian who, like Andrew Borde, negotiated his identity in the climate of post-1530s England through his

---

[1] Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations*, p. 2, 22.

work, argues that he reconstructed England as an empire which had long rejected papal rule.[2]

Leland, desiring to reconstruct England's past as a tradition of resisting Rome, asserted

England's temporal depth and expressed a sense of possessiveness towards it, concerned with

material which 'laye secretlye in corners'.[3] However, a sense of shared history characterised

pre-Reformation nationhood, and Leland also recognised that constructing histories had long

been the practice of nations.[4] Work concerning the development of historical writing also

places an emphasis on the relationship between the past and national identity. Fred Levy

identifies changes in historical thinking in an increasing demand for English language works

providing moral lessons catering for patriotic needs.[5] More recently, Daniel Woolf has also

emphasized the increasing social relevance of the past, in many forms, during the early

modern period.[6] Work focusing on the fifteenth century suggests that events of 'national'

importance brought about 'great awakening of vigorous national feeling', expressed through

increased interest in historical writing.[7]

Sociological theories of identity formation also indicate the important function of the

past. Conflicting theories concerning individual and community memory means that

'collective memory' refers to two distinct phenomena: the first based on the assumption that

only individuals remember, and the second concerned with 'collective commemorative

representations', accounting for mythology and arguing that the group provides the setting for

---

[2] Shrank, pp. 65-9.

[3] Shrank, pp. 71, 95, 101.

[4] Shrank, pp. 3-4, 70-3.

[5] Fred. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1967), pp. 5-7, 13-19.

[6] Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Literature 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

[7] Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, pp. 2-3; Gerald L. Harriss, 'Introduction: the Exemplar of Kingship', in *Henry V: the Practice of Kingship*, ed. by Harriss (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 1-29 (pp. 2-6).

remembering.[8] This second approach suggests that the process of remembering constitutes the group itself. The two approaches are not necessarily incompatible.[9] As will be shown, individual pieces of writing participated, consciously or not, in a collective action of preserving the past, while the use of the past in the articulation of identity highlights the importance of remembering to the maintenance of the nation. Individuals may share a group's memory of events that they did not directly experience.[10] Ron Eyerman's study of African American culture emphasises the importance of the past to group identity, as he treats the past trauma of slavery as a collective memory upon which the people's identification of itself is formed.[11] Eyerman also makes use of the term 'master narrative', referring to the shared past which provides a group with temporal depth, encompassing facts and myths. The master narrative of a group or nation, then, defines and confirms its members by allowing them to possess this past, and, significantly, excludes those to whom it does not apply.[12]

It will be shown that historical literature which was available to early sixteenth-century audiences demonstrates awareness of nationhood. Such literature shows how individual writers perceived the nation and their own identity. It will not be argued that there was a single 'master narrative', but instead a cumulative, multifaceted history, confirmed by repetition and consistency. During the fifteenth century, the partisan material which resulted from the period's political turmoil often sought legitimacy through the appropriation of

---

[8] Jeffrey K. Olick, 'Collective Memory: The Two Cultures', *Sociological Theory*, 17, 3 (1999), 333-48 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/370189> [accessed 15th April 2010] (p. 336).

[9] Olick, 'Collective Memory', pp. 338-43.

[10] Olick and Joyce Robbins, 'Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices', *Annual Review of Sociology,* 24 (1998), 105-40 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/223476> [accessed 15th April 2010] (pp. 105-8).

[11] Ron Eyerman, 'The Past in the Present: Culture and the Transmission of Memory', *Acta Sociologica*, 47, 2 (2004), 159-69 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4195021> [accessed 15th April 2010]; Eyerman, *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 12.

[12] Olick, 'Collective Memory'.

established national material, or in expressing concern for the good of the nation. The division of the fifteenth century also became part of the early sixteenth-century historical narrative, showing a divided England made whole. Individually, the historical works demonstrate the authors' own identification with the past. Considered collectively, they represented the 'collected memory' of the nation. Jennifer Summit not only supports the suggestion that the fifteenth century provided much of the early sixteenth-century historical material, but also examines library collections as creative spaces, representative of the construction of national identity through the collation of individual choices.[13] The availability, production, translation and preservation of certain works created a particular past, which yet encompasses different narratives and aspects. Extending this notion, it is also possible to view even conflicting and local material as part of the nation's collection.

This chapter will also consider the role of the past in shaping identity and in facilitating its expression, and the extent to which it may be considered 'shared'. Individual members of a community may share a past of which they had no direct experience. Through identification with the protagonists of events such as Agincourt as fellow Englishmen, the past is not simply shared or remembered, but possessed. Those who consider themselves Englishmen are able to appropriate events they did not experience themselves, providing a link between all members to the exclusion of others.

I. Origin Myths and Ancient Pasts

The Chester monk Ranulf Higden, writing in the fourteenth century, indicated the importance of the past in the expression of nationhood, as he highlighted the tendency of nations to 'extol in excessive praise some one from their members…or to praise their own

---

[13] Jennifer Summit, *Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

blood'.[14] It had long been thought a characteristic of a nation to recognise its own temporal depth, to exaggerate figures which represented their past. Historical writing and commemoration could be viewed as a means of expressing sentiment on behalf of the nation. Individual writers, translators, and printers sought to demonstrate a notion of descent and temporal depth, of sharing blood with the figures of the past, and were aware that they were engaging in a wider collective action that confirmed their nationhood. The way in which the origins of England and Britain were transmitted in historical material both shows that there was a distinct awareness of the nation having 'existed through time' and, more importantly, suggests that early sixteenth-century readers and collectors would have received a generally consistent, recognisably 'English' history.

For a long time before the fifteenth century, the historical accounts of England's past were dominated by a small number of distinct, well-known narratives which had appeared in different versions, and which traced the historical and mythical origins of England and Britain. As the previous chapter has shown, foundation myths had long provided material for defining England's physical and imagined frontiers. The same may also be said of the importance of these works as parts of a developing narrative of the nation. These histories became so well-known and accepted that they influenced a great deal of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century work. One of the most influential texts is the *Brut* chronicle which, in various forms, continuations and abbreviations has survived in over 240 manuscripts. It is described by Lister Matheson as the 'standard account of English history', which 'defined and created a sense of England's past, its national identity, and its destiny'.[15] He gives two

---

[14] Lavezzo, *Angels on the Edge of the World: Geography, Literature and English Community, 1000-1534* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2006), p. 90.

[15] Lister Matheson, *The Prose Brut: the Development of a Middle English Chronicle* (Tempe, Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998), pp. 1, 29.

reasons for this conclusion. The first is the chronicle's content, providing the nation with temporal depth and a central version of its past, tracing the founding of Britain and England to the arrival of Brutus, or earlier to Albina. A semi-mythic history is followed through the succession of kings, providing continuity between the foundation myths and contemporary times.[16] The original composition is thought to have been completed after 1272, in Anglo-Saxon from Latin sources, and received several continuations.[17] Material such as the *Brut* provided the basis for the reconciliation of notions of Britain and England, highlighting an imperial past that allowed for English domination of the 'British island of England'.[18]

The large number of surviving *Brut* manuscripts suggests that it played a significant role in the transmission of England's ancient past. The writers also assert the importance of the material as England's history. The identification, for example, of one manuscript which takes the history to 1419, thought to have been written in 1420, as 'a boke callid Brute of the Croniculis of / Englond' demonstrates that the text was viewed as the narrative of English history.[19] With this in mind, although writing may also have been influenced by personal circumstances and other reasons, it seems that the points at which continuations ended were chosen for emphasis. Texts ending in 1333 marked the battle against the Scots at Halidon Hill, further continuations ended with the death of Edward III in 1377, then with the siege of Rouen in 1419, the death of Henry V in 1422, and the accession of Edward IV.[20] It may be that these points were chosen as significant ends of chapters in the nation's history.

---

[16] Matheson, *Prose Brut*, p. 29.
[17] Matheson, *Prose Brut*, pp. 1-3.
[18] Griffiths, *This Royal Throne of Kings*, p. 30.
[19] David Ruddy, Description of University of Michigan MS 225, 'About the Brut Chronicle and Manuscript 225', <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/b/brut/about/> [accessed 15th July 2010].
[20] Matheson, *Prose Brut*, pp. 3, 97-9.

However, the extent to which the *Brut* material provided a 'standard account' is more complex. Material associated with the *Brut* was widely disseminated, in the possession of Englishmen of varying social status, royalty, great families, ecclesiastics and, from the fifteenth century onwards, the mercantile classes. The volume and dissemination of texts has also lead several scholars to view the work as the most popular history of Britain, even 'the most popular secular work of the fifteenth century in England', assuming that manuscript survival reflects the comparative popularity of different works.[21] However, achieving a 'national audience' in the sense that its readership was consciously and characteristically 'English' cannot be shown simply by the volume of material. Language provides further indication: among the number of surviving texts are around 180 English-language manuscripts. The translation and continuation of the text in English, from the beginning of the fifteenth century, therefore represents the majority of known *Brut* material.[22] Although the English did not exclusively speak English, the language was largely insular. The *Brut* was not just popular in England, but popular in English, indicating a widespread English-speaking audience before printing. More than that, perhaps, this strong manuscript presence not only suggests acceptance, but widespread demand. In terms of popularity and accessibility, the *Brut* offered as standard an account as was feasible.

The vast range of material associated with the chronicle is such that no single text is definitive. Translators and continuators did not rely solely upon, and transmit, existing material, instead supplementing it with additional episodes, developing the narrative over time. If it did not provide a standard account, then it may be suggested instead that it did provide a 'master narrative' of the earliest layer of England's past, at least in the sense that it

---

[21] Matheson, *Prose Brut*, pp. 9-13; Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 113; Christina Hardyment, *Malory: the Life and Times of King Arthur's Chronicler* (London: Harper, 2006), p.65.
[22] 'About the Brut Chronicle and Manuscript 225'.

represents a process by which a series of writers sought to confirm an English history. It was, as a national narrative, open to interpretation and adaptation, therefore allowing the texts to linked together and considered one process. However, the *Brut* was not the only source of origin myths. Its success and status owes much to the work of Geoffrey of Monmouth, whose early twelfth-century *Historia Regum Britannie* was its main source, and remained relatively unchallenged into the sixteenth century.[23] Although linked inescapably to the *Brut*, Monmouth's work is also acknowledged as an independently significant influence.[24] Extant manuscript material indicates the independent popularity of *Historia*, as 215 texts have been identified with it. This was not the fate of all such writers, as, for example, the work of another twelfth-century writer, William of Malmesbury, was comparatively much less popular, his *Gesta Regum Anglorum* surviving in 35 manuscripts.[25] This comparison also throws doubt upon the suggestion of a standard account, given that Monmouth's *Historia* appears much more popular and dominant than Malmesbury's work.[26]

Another influential text during the fifteenth century was Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, or universal history, a history of the world surviving in over 120 manuscripts.[27] Like the *Brut,* the *Polychronicon* received continuations, concluding around 1327, then the middle of the fourteenth century, then in 1377, and then several continuations during the reign of Richard II.[28] Higden's work was also translated into English, by John

---

[23] Matheson, *Prose Brut*, pp. 27-8.

[24] Richard Barber, *Arthur of Albion: An Introduction to the Arthurian Literature and Legends of England* (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1961), p. 25.

[25] Michael A. Faletra, 'Narrating the Matter of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Norman Colonization of Wales', *The Chaucer Review*, 35, 1 (2000), 60-85 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25096117> [accessed 14th July 2010] (p. 61).

[26] Faletra, pp. 62-4.

[27] John Taylor, 'The Development of the *Polychronicon* Continuation', *EHR*, 76, 298 (1961), 20-36 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/557056> [accessed 14th July 2010] (p. 22).

[28] Taylor, '*Polychronicon* Continuation', pp. 23-5.

Trevisa, and in this form experienced some distribution before print, surviving in fourteen manuscripts of the full text, and in part in five others.[29] The *Polychronicon* therefore developed concurrently to the *Brut*, and, as continuations were added, the text became increasingly centralised, with local references left out and the influence of other works included.[30] The work lent itself to a role as a central narrative, as Higden recognised that histories facilitated the need of nations to praise their past.[31] Although Higden's work challenged the notion of a national narrative as it questioned the validity of Geoffrey of Monmouth's assertions, the *Polychronicon* was largely used selectively.

It is interesting that, despite the concurrent popularity of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia*, the *Brut* was not simply seen as a translation and continuation, but was a label given to a separate, developed narrative. More evidence that the *Brut* provided a 'standard account' lies in a further look at how it was used and extended. Matheson indicates that the range of *Brut* manuscripts categorised as the 'Common Version' also represents dialects and interest outside London, with manuscripts that show a Staffordshire dialect, a possible Northamptonshire dialect, and notes on the Earl of Gloucester.[32] These details add weight to Matheson's suggestion, as they demonstrate a degree of distribution and widespread popularity. The rendering of continuations in regional dialects also suggests a regional demand for the history, following a standard pattern, but expressing local identity, perhaps due to local patronage.

---

[29] Matheson, 'Printer and Scribe: Caxton, the Polychronicon, and the Brut', *Speculum*, 60, 3 (1985), 595-614 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2848177> [accessed 14th July 2010] (p. 594).

[30] Taylor, '*Polychronicon* Continuation', pp. 25-6.

[31] Lavezzo, *Angels*, p. 90.

[32] Matheson, *Prose Brut*, pp. 102-3, 110.

The *Brut* also received less widespread 'peculiar' continuations, which reworked the 'Common Version'.[33] *An English Chronicle* provides two such consecutive continuations, to 1437 and 1461.[34] The first, using the *Brut* for the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV to create the 'Peculiar Version', is associated with eleven extant manuscripts.[35] The two manuscripts used in Marx's edition may represent two developments of a text based on the 'Common Version', from which a Latin version was also derived, which formed the basis for the *Vita Henrici Quinti*, written by Italian scholar Tito Livio da Forli and probably commissioned by Humphrey Duke of Gloucester in 1437, suggesting a quick dissemination of material and a receptive audience.[36] The independence of the two main manuscripts from each other also suggests that the narrative was developed in more than one direction.[37] As with the 'Common Version', there is also evidence to suggest widespread dissemination. One of the two texts used by Marx contains elements which imply Welsh interest in its composition and patronage, suggesting that the narrative was acceptable to local audiences, but not exclusively English ones.[38] The range of surviving material suggests that it was considered an authority, and, more importantly, demonstrates the influence of the *Brut* on further generations of writing.

During the fifteenth century, the priorities of texts highlight the central role of *Brut* material. The relationship between *Brut* continuations and histories of Henry V's reign suggest that the chronicle and its continuations were thought of as the central, reliable source.

---

[33] Matheson, *Prose Brut*, p. 256.

[34] C. William Marx, 'Introduction', in *An English Chronicle, 1377-1461: Edited from Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 21068 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34*, ed. by Marx (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. xii-xiii.

[35] Marx, p. xiii.

[36] Marx, p. lxi; Kingsford, 'The Early Biographies of Henry V', *EHR*, 25, 97 (1910), 58-92 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/549793> [accessed 17th September 2009] (p. 63).

[37] Marx, pp. lviii-lxi.

[38] Marx, pp. xviii-xxiv.

However, it is in other, more partisan material that the importance of the *Brut* is clearer. The 'Wars of the Roses' prompted a need to justify the disruption of the realm, and partisan texts recorded the events that established a new king as the restoration of order. The vulnerability of 'usurping' dynasties heightened the importance of historical thought, and particularly of establishing legitimacy with links to the past. The first continuation of *An English Chronicle*, from 1377 onwards, has been labelled as a 'Peculiar Version' because, for the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV, it is a re-write and embellishment, developed from the Latin *Eulogium* continuation.[39] In particular, the narrative to 1399 is critical of Richard II and prioritises the unstable political situation.[40] The use and modification of the *Brut*, with the aim of wider dissemination and partisan priorities, suggests that the chronicle was an important element of presenting a legitimate history. The way in which the text justifies the deposition of Richard II also indicates specifically national concerns, expressing sympathy for the Peasants' Revolt, stating that the rebels wanted 'all the bounde men off Engelonde fre', it is implied that the Kent rebels represented the grievances of the realm as a whole.[41] Henry IV accepts the crown 'in the name off all men of Engelonde'.[42] The account is therefore very much concerned that the events it recounts are shown as England's history, implying that the choice of the *Brut* fulfilled the same purpose.

However, the *Brut* was not the only source for continuations. *The Chronicle of Adam Usk, 1377-1421*, compiled intermittently from around 1401, was written as a continuation of the *Polychronicon*. A recipient of the Mortimers' patronage, Usk was in the service of the

---

[39] Marx, pp. xxx-xxxvi.
[40] Marx, pp. xxxix-xliv.
[41] *English Chronicle*, pp. 5-7.
[42] *English Chronicle*, pp. 22-4.

Archbishop of Canterbury and the crown which placed him at the centre of events in 1399.[43] Usk's work is more useful as the account of an observer rather than as an example of an 'English' history text, given the difficult negotiation of Usk's Welsh origins and English patronage, nor can he be considered a Lancastrian apologist, as the Mortimers represented a rival claim. The text remained unknown and un-translated, and so had no further initial impact. However, it is interesting that he chose the *Polychronicon*, perhaps due to his ownership of a copy, yet this in itself suggests that the *Brut* was not the dominant account. A comparison between the *English Chronicle* and Usk's work suggests that the *Brut* was the basis for the more nationally-focused continuation, and seems to have been chosen for the legitimacy it provides. This also seems to have been the case with the addition of a second, more obviously partisan continuation to the *English Chronicle*, commissioned under Edward IV.[44] The use of the existing continuation rather than the creation of a new work highlights the importance of association with the *Brut* tradition. The attachment of new material to the original narrative seems to have been of particular importance, as the two manuscripts used for Marx's edition are the only two witnesses of the Yorkist continuation.[45] However, the use of the *Polychronicon* by Usk indicates that the *Brut* was not considered the 'standard account', even within the same broadly-defined political bias.

As well as receiving continuations, origin myths were the subject of new pieces during the fifteenth century. In common with others that sought to make histories available in English, Sir Thomas Malory, a knight with military experience in France, undertook to write an English-language history of King Arthur, a commentary on chivalry which 'drew out

---

[43] C. Given-Wilson, 'Introduction', in Adam Usk, *The Chronicle of Adam Usk, 1377-1421,* ed. and trans. by C. Given-Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. li.
[44] Marx, p. lxxxix.
[45] Marx, p. civ.

briefly into English' existing stories.[46] Rather than a simple translation, Malory's research

included a number of French texts and several earlier English sources in order to construct his

own. It was intended for a wide readership, at least among his own social class of England's

gentry.[47] His intention to emphasise the Englishness of the history is evident, with English

places added or substituted into the text, and his claim that 'some men say in many parts of

England that King Arthur is not dead' implies the boundary of his audience and suggests

widespread popular interest.[48] Although the surviving Winchester manuscript is missing the

first pages, and therefore any dedication, it is thought that Malory was also writing for the

benefit of Henry VI or Edward IV, providing lessons on kingship and knighthood.

More significantly, Malory's work drew parallels with the contemporary situation in

England, demonstrating the relevance of the history as a commentary on current times.[49]

Reliance on early history was a central theme of fifteenth-century royal rhetoric, as kings

sought legitimacy by proving their ancient lineage. Genealogies ending with both Henry V

and Henry VI traced the ancestry of the kings to the creation of the world.[50] The ancient roots

of these pieces reflected the use of prophecies and myth in relation to these kings. One

posthumous history of Henry V's life suggested that this king fulfilled the Welsh prophecy

that 'amongst them shoulde be borne a Prince that shoulde gouerne the vniuersall realme of

---

[46] Hardyment, *Malory*, pp. 19, 32.

[47] Hardyment, *Malory*, p. 20.

[48] Hardyment, *Malory*, pp. 31-2.

[49] Helen Cooper, 'Introduction', in Sir Thomas Malory, *Le Morte Darthur: the Winchester Manuscript*, ed. by Cooper (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. xvii-xxi; Hardyment, *Malory*, p. 20.

[50] 'Genealogy of the kings of England to Henry V', Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Bodl. Rolls 6 <http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/view/search/what/MS.%20Bodl.%20Rolls%206?q=Shelfmark=%22MS.%20Bodl.%20Rolls%206%22&sort=Shelfmark,Folio_Page> [accessed 19th July 2013]; 'Genealogy of the kings of England to Henry VI', Oxford, Bodleian, MS. Bodl. Rolls 10 <http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/view/search?QuickSearchA=QuickSearchA&q=Shelfmark%3D%22MS.+Bodl.+Rolls+10%22&sort=Shelfmark%2CFolio_Page&search=Search> [accessed 19th July 2013].

Englande', through his birth in Monmouth, thus attempting to reconcile the English crown with the assertion of the Welsh as descendants of the British.[51] The importance of British lineage is highlighted in Henry V's genealogy, as Brutus and Arthur are among the very few early individuals beyond biblical figures which are represented by images (in both cases their shields).[52]

The establishment of the new dynasty by Edward IV made direct use of origin myths, employed through the use of prophetic material to suggest his heroic status and legitimacy, a well-balanced man who embodied the healing qualities of his symbol, the sun, drawing upon recent history through a stark contrast with the weak Henry VI.[53] Genealogical rolls were produced in both parts of Edward IV's reign, tracing his descent from Adam to his 'realisation of the British nation in 1461'.[54] Not only was this intended to provide the king with historical legitimacy, and associate him with popular material, but it also reflects the choices of *Brut* continuators in emphasising significant events – 1377, 1419, 1422 and 1461 – as new chapters or conclusions. Edward's accession is shown to be fulfilling an expectation and bringing an end to England's problems. Edward's *Coronation Roll* in particular demonstrates the importance of not only English but British descent to his claim.[55] The Latin genealogy, produced between 1461 and 1464, follows Geoffrey of Monmouth's records of kings, and shows Edward's accession as the culmination of the history of the world, not while

---

[51] *The First English Life of King Henry the Fifth: Written in 1513 by an Anonymous Author known commonly as the Translator of Livius*, ed. by Kingsford (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911) p. 8.
[52] 'Genealogy of the kings of England to Henry V', Bodleian, MS. Bodl. Rolls 6, membranes 3, 6, 7, 8.
[53] Jonathan Hughes, *Arthurian Myths and Alchemy: The Kingship of Edward IV* (Stroud: Sutton, 2002), p. 72, 78-9, 88.
[54] Hughes, pp. 95-6.
[55] 'Chronicle of the History of the World from Creation to Woden, with a Genealogy of Edward IV', Philadelphia, Free Library of Philadelphia, Lewis E 201, <http://libwww.library.phila.gov/medievalman/ShelfMarkDetailList.cfm?srch=6&shelfmark=Lewis%20E%20201> [accessed 19th July 2013].

affording British history a prominent position. The arms of Brutus occupy the second image on the left of the roll, underneath those of St George. Seven lines of descent culminate in Edward, further emphasising a sense of finality.[56] The assertion of ancient lineage by Henry V, Henry VI and Edward IV echoed previous kings, from Edward I onwards, who began to appropriate the imperial status of British kings.[57] A genealogy of Edward I made up of a series of medallions not only traces an ancient lineage including Brutus and Cadwallader, but recounts a mythical history of Britain.[58] The appropriation of British descent and prophecy was therefore a well-established method of association with popular history which became more crucial during the fifteenth century. The importance of this link also justified Edward IV's ending of the Lancastrian disruption of the royal line: the identification of the new king as the heir of Brutus echoed Henry V's use of English descent from the Trojans, but, as Hughes indicates, it also associates Edward with the deposed Richard II.[59]

Surviving manuscript evidence has so far demonstrated the popularity and importance of origin myths. However, the advent of print provides a significant insight into how these texts were viewed. The initial choices of material made by printers suggests the importance assigned to existing texts, and the assumptions made about how popular they were as manuscripts, and would be in print. Matheson suggests that William Caxton recognised the previous popularity of the prose *Brut* when he chose to print it as the *Chronicles of England* in June 1480, perhaps based upon his own experiences as a seller of manuscripts, rather than

---

[56] Hughes, pp. 101-2.

[57] Griffiths, *This Royal Throne of Kings*, pp. 29-30.

[58] 'Genealogy of the kings of England to Edward I', Oxford, Bodleian, MS. Bodl. Rolls 3 <http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/view/search/what/MS.%20Bodl.%20Rolls%203?q=Shelfmark=%22MS.%20Bodl.%20Rolls%203%22&sort=Shelfmark,Folio_Page,Roll_#,Frame_#> [accessed 19th July 2013].

[59] Hughes, pp. 162-6.

any particular requests or patronage.[60] Although Caxton cannot have been fully aware of the exact material dominance of the *Brut* compared to other texts, the decision to print it 'atte requeste of dyuerce gentilmen' must have been based upon some knowledge of its popularity in manuscript form, while, in continuing to use the manuscript title *Chronicles of England* suggests that Caxton accepted and continued to assert the *Brut* as an authority on England's past, and utilised the existing title which had proved successful in manuscript form.

Often, the choice of material to print depended upon patronage for specific works, and in this sense, pieces which recounted the nation's past reflected at least the engagement of the patrons with their own identity, and their expectations that these works would be popular. Anthony Woodville, an early patron of Caxton who provided texts for printing, focussed on translation, and the interaction between them showed that both contributed to the texts prepared for publishing.[61] The decisions made therefore reflect more input than was experienced in manuscript production, and print was an opportunity to have greater editorial influence on texts. The expected and intended audience of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century printers may be seen in their own words. As shown in the previous chapter, Caxton's reasons for English translations demonstrate an awareness of writing for an English–reading audience, and expressed his own view of his identity in the importance of English as a literary language.[62] Further clues as to the audience he imagined are provided by the modifications made to a text. In his *Dictes or Sayengis of the Philosophres*, a translation by Woodville first produced in 1477, Caxton added in a section on women that his patron had

---

[60] Matheson, 'Printer and Scribe', pp. 593-4.

[61] A. E. B. Coldiron, *Printers without Borders: Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 69-70.

[62] Coldiron, *Printers without Borders*, p. 38.

omitted, and predicted that it may cause offence to 'he or she…that shal rede or here it'.[63] Caxton saw the audience of his work, interestingly, as both male and female, indicating the move towards lay literacy. More importantly, however, is the suggestion that people might 'rede or here' the text. Thus, expected audiences were not limited by literacy, but could extend to those to whom the contents could be transmitted orally. With the increase in the ownership of texts in private collections and lay households as well as institutions, printers were able to recognise the routes by which people could receive material, and so the construction of texts with national priorities were created with this audience in mind.[64]

This first printed edition of the *Brut* made use of a version beginning with Albina and ending with the accession of Edward IV, in common with existing continuations, although there is some debate as to whether Caxton himself actually compiled the material for the years 1419 and 1461.[65] The chronicle maintained its popularity in print, appearing in thirteen editions before 1528.[66] Thus, for the majority of Henry VIII's reign, *Brut* material not only remained popular and dominant, but was also consistent and mostly developed from a single source. Printed material did not replace manuscript transmission, as continuations and copies of Caxton's work and earlier versions of the *Brut* continued into the sixteenth century. One example of an early sixteenth-century continuation provides the date of November 1510, and is copied from Caxton's *Chronicles*.[67] This suggests not only an interest in the chronicle but another means of ownership. The early appearance of the *Brut* in print, the first of the histories to be chosen for publication, and its continued popularity in both media, confirms

---

[63] Caxton, *Dictes and Sayengis of the Philosophres* (Westminster: Caxton, 1477), in *EEBO*, f. 6v; Coldiron, *Printers without Borders*, pp. 65-6.

[64] Summit, *Memory's Library*, p. 11.

[65] Caxton, *Cronicles of Englond* (London: Caxton, 1480), in *EEBO*; Matheson, 'Printer and Scribe', pp. 594-601.

[66] Matheson, 'Printer and Scribe', p. 593.

[67] Matheson, 'Printer and Scribe', pp. 595-6.

the status of the history. Furthermore, printing the text as the *Chronicles of England* both suggests Caxton's recognition of the history as the narrative of England, and re-transmits it as such.

However, in August 1480, Caxton also issued a work taken from Trevisa's translation of the *Polychronicon* entitled the *Description of Britain*.[68] Although this was only a part of Higden's work, while the *Brut* was issued as a complete text, it seems unlikely that the *Chronicles* text was given priority over the *Description*, given the very short space of time between the two. In 1482, the translation of the *Polychronicon* was printed in full, separated from the second edition of the *Chronicles* by approximately three months.[69] On both occasions, then, the two texts appeared in print almost at the same time, suggesting that neither text was prioritised. However, Caxton's preparation of the texts suggests that he favoured the *Brut.* Trevisa's translation of the *Polychronicon* took the narrative to 1360, while the 1482 edition extended it to 1461, in common with the *Chronicles.* Caxton prepared the text for print by updating the 'rude and old englyssh' and providing the continuation, the *Liber Ultimus*, using, among other chronicles, the *Brut*, possibly his own *Chronicles.*[70] It may be that Caxton meant the *Chronicles* to provide a standard narrative, and used the *Brut* to achieve this. In terms of subsequent editions, the *Chronicles* did remain the dominant text, as the shorter *Description* appeared in two editions and the full translation of the *Polychronicon* three.

The inter-relationship between the two texts suggests that they were viewed as sources of the same history, and they were also used together elsewhere. Warkworth's

---

[68] Matheson, 'Printer and Scribe', p. 593.
[69] Matheson, 'Printer and Scribe', p. 593.
[70] Matheson, 'Printer and Scribe', pp. 601-7.

Chronicle, for example, covering the years 1461-1474, was added as a continuation to the *Brut* following an initial continuation of 1419-1461 which, in the manuscript that survives in Peterhouse Cambridge, where John Warkworth was master, and in the related texts in Glasgow and the British Library, was based on the 1482 edition of Caxton's *Chronicles* and then his *Liber Ultimus* of the *Polychronicon*.[71] The author did not consider either of Caxton's texts to be the central narrative, but utilised both to construct his own. Although these texts provided narratives of England's past, they were not the only texts available in the early-sixteenth century. Robert Fabian's chronicle *The New Chronicles of England and France* also seems to be an attempt to create a single standard account. Fabian's original title, *The Concordaunce of Historyes*, reflected an intent to reconcile variations and differing opinions, also demonstrated throughout his work in the comparison of different authorities, including the *Polychronicon*.[72] Fabian therefore seems to have recognised a need for a standard history. The posthumous printing of the text with the new title suggests both recognition of Fabian's work as a narrative of English history, and an appeal to a broader audience. Although the account uses the civic history of London as a structure, later editions suggest that it did represent a standard account with wide appeal. Further acknowledging the market for histories, in 1485, Caxton also printed Malory's Arthurian text, in 21 books, as *Le Morte Darthur*. Describing it in his preface as the history of 'our noble knights of merry England', alongside his *Chronicles* he saw it as England's history, with the purpose of providing an example, and expressed a sense of ownership of this past, identifying with the knights through a shared identity.

---

[71] Matheson, 'Warkworth's *Chronicle*', in *Death and Dissent: Two Fifteenth Century Chronicles*, ed. by Matheson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999), pp. 74-6.

[72] Fabian, 1533; Henry Ellis, 'Preface', in Fabian, *The New Chronicles of England and France, in Two Parts*, ed. by Ellis (London: Longman, Hurts, Rees, Orme and Co., 1811), p. xiii.

In the early-sixteenth century, then, England's ancient past was made available in a number of works, and although the *Brut* remained influential, its function seems to have changed. During the fifteenth century, it had provided legitimacy through direct association, whereas later it became the source for providing new works, new layers of English history. The existence, and use, of various texts dealing with the history of England suggests that there was no standard account. However, providing a standard account was a priority of early printed work. These texts also demonstrate a desire to re-assert the mythic narrative of England's past. Evidence of the extension of the *Brut* into regional dialects, mentioned above, suggests that this past was generally accepted. Warkworth's *Chronicle*, too, demonstrates wider interest in the national origin material, and an inter-relationship of local and national elements, as the author was a northerner, possibly from Yorkshire, and probably the owner of *Brut* manuscripts.[73] The work itself also demonstrates knowledge of and interest in the north, while still remaining an account concerning 'all Englond', and 'the peple of the lond'.[74] The chronicle therefore represents both a northern interest in England's origin narrative and an interaction between local and national identity in the text itself.

Individual towns were also assertive of their own foundation myths, expressing local identities through the recognition and celebration of the temporal depth of their own community. The provincial progress of Henry VII in the early years of his reign demonstrated that royal visits provided opportunities for displays and assertions of local identity, and this often included some recognition of towns' foundation myths. The king was met in Bristol by a pageant including the ancient king Brennius, who identified himself as the founder of the

---

[73] Matheson, 'Warkworth's *Chronicle*', pp. 80-7.

[74] 'Warkworth's *Chronicle*', pp. 102-5.

town.[75] Asserting local identity through knowledge of the town's ancient past, this pageant also had the effect of projecting this temporal depth to the town's inhabitants as well as its visitors. A similar pageant had greeted Henry VII earlier, in York, in which Ebraucus identified himself as its founder.[76] These important figures related the cities to the origin material which traced England's foundation. Ricart's *Kalendar*, the local Bristol chronicle which, as a contemporary text, is the best example of knowledge and views prevalent in the town during this period, begins by asserting its foundation by Brennius, or Brynne.[77] The opening lines of the first part of the chronicle outline its purpose, stating that

> it is righte convenient and accordinge to euery Bourgeis of the Towne of Bristowe…for to knowe and vnderstande the begynnyng and first foundacion of the saide worshipfull Toune.[78]

The author therefore suggests that knowledge of the town's foundation is a fundamental element of local identity. The manuscript further highlights the text's purpose of transmitting this knowledge through the provision of blank leaves for future continuation.[79] However, the history of Brennius is traced through descent from Brutus, even recounting the foundation of a number of other English cities.[80] Bristol's ancient past is therefore expressed in relation to the wider narrative, a history which the author identifies as an account of 'al the kynges that were in Englonde affore the Conquest', and is also accompanied by images of Arthur and other kings through to Henry VI.[81] Furthermore, the text identifies 'Brutes cronicles', or 'the

---

[75] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 93.

[76] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 76.

[77] *Kalendar*, pp. 8-10.

[78] *Kalendar*, p. 8.

[79] *Kalendar*, p. ix.

[80] *Kalendar*, pp. 8-10.

[81] *Kalendar*, pp. x-xii, 3.

olde Cronycles of Brute' as the source of this history, referring readers to it as an authority and suggesting ownership of a copy.[82] This, then, provides another example of the *Brut*'s popularity outside London, and also suggests that it was viewed in Bristol as the standard, or at least most available, account.

Descent and association with the popular past was an important aspect of Henry VII's legitimacy. In common with Edward IV, Henry's accession was also shown as a conclusion, restoration of order, and origin myths and prophecy were as important in 1485 as they had been in 1461. Henry's Welsh descent helped to reconcile the identification of the Welsh as the descendants of the British, opposed to the English, an issue which contemporary histories negotiated by demonstrating the return of British rule in the person of Henry.[83] The royal family's own pageantry emphasised the choice of Arthur as the name of the heir to the throne as a deliberate reference to the ancient king. The pageants greeting Katherine of Aragon landing, recorded in *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne*, took the opportunity of public display to announce that Prince Arthur 'Succedith the furst Arthure in dignitie'.[84] They also emphasised the link through the identification of the prince with the constellation Arcturus, echoing a fifteenth-century English interpretation of Avalon by writers such as John Lydgate, a theme that was also utilised by court poets at Prince Arthur's birth.[85] This was a common element of the prince's symbolism, as his relationship with Arcturus, supposedly the constellation under which he was born, was also asserted by Bernard André.[86]

---

[82] *Kalendar*, pp. 3, 8.
[83] For example, André, *Henry VII*, pt. 3.
[84] *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne*, ed. by Gordon Kipling (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 15.
[85] *Receyt*, pp. xvi-xvii, 23-4.
[86] André, *Henry VII*, pt. 48.

Elsewhere, the *Receyt* demonstrates that the association of the king himself with his mythical predecessors was a priority, describing the hall at Richmond and its series of paintings of kings including Arthur, Engest, Henry 'and many othir of that name', 'waryours and kings of this riall realme'. The compiler of the *Receyt* recognises this as a device to recall 'their dedis and actes in the croniclis', and shows Henry VII's intentions for his own place in history and his association with these figures, describing the inclusion of the king's own portrait, 'as worthy that rumme and place with thoes glorious princes as eny king that ever reigned in this lond'.[87] The text therefore views the king's own achievements within the context of England's history. More direct references were also made to Henry's descent, also echoing the genealogical material of Edward IV. Vergil's history records that Henry's accession was portrayed as 'preordained by God's will and plan' and, more significantly, predicted by the ancient British king Cadwallader, who 'had forecast that his stock would reign once more'.[88] Henry, as his heir, therefore rooted his legitimacy in popular legend, adding strength to his accession by implying that acceptance and ownership of this past meant support for the new king. Vergil also suggests that knowledge of this prediction was well-known, claiming that 'men's minds had already been gripped by the belief that Henry had been brought to the throne by this prophecy'. Although an exaggeration on the author's part, this does at least demonstrate the emphasis placed on ancient descent, and recognition of the effectiveness of appeals to ancient history.

Writing closer to the time, the use of Britain's ancient past is also recorded by Bernard André. His work does not seem to be attempting to contribute to a national history, but does demonstrate a distinct awareness of an existing one, and was a significant part of the

---

[87] *Receyt*, p. 73.
[88] *Anglica Historia,* book XXVI, pt. 1.

deliberate propagandist efforts of Henry VII. André's account of the king's lineage begins by stating that he 'comes from Brutus and all the kings of his line' through his father. In common with Edward IV's coronation roll, the description also includes Henry's French, Portuguese, Castilian and Imperial descent, suggesting that the work was more concerned with a wider European prestige, but British lineage is a priority. The account continues to emphasise his descent 'from St. Cadwallader, whom he has succeeded as lawful heir'. The notion of the restoration of the true line was therefore a recurring theme of the use of origin myths. However, André's history was not written to endear itself to an English audience. It seems instead to invest national identity in the land, almost as a solution to the opposition of British and English people, through the identification of 'the Realm of Britain, which nowadays we call England', adhering to the common dual labelling. André also shows that Henry VII's legitimisation campaign had more in common with Edward IV's, as he refers to the 'many books…in this realm written by the most expert genealogists in this kingdom and recently published'.[89] Although André's work was not printed, then, it seems that Henry did take advantage of printing to emphasise an association with origin myths.

Among the historical material that traced England's origins, it cannot be said that there was a standard account. However, the establishment and assertion of these myths was a shared pursuit, and there was certainly an awareness of needing to retell and confirm England's temporal depth, and attempt to provide a central, definitive account. This was also a pursuit that was widely engaged in, and the use of origin myths particularly in localised pageantry, specifically with a public audience, demonstrates not only that temporal depth was a crucial element of smaller identities as well as nationhood, but also that it was an important feature of the interaction between local and national identities. Furthermore, local expressions

---

[89] André, pt. 3.

of temporal depth suggest that smaller communities were able to simultaneously assert their own identity and participate in English nationhood.

II. The 'Ancient Enemy' and National Heroes

The perpetuation of origin myths provided early sixteenth-century national consciousness with a sense of England's existence through time. However, the place of material such as the *Brut* was confirmed through its later use for continuations, and these were also used to emphasise the importance of central events. The intermittent war with France, known later as the Hundred Years War, represents a significant period in the definition of English nationhood, as it prompted expressions of national sentiment in historical writing. More significantly, literature recording the war transmitted it as England's history, claiming and encouraging English ownership and allowing its appropriation by those who had not directly experienced it. This not only demonstrated the characteristic of a nation to praise its 'own blood', but also served to define membership. Historical material from this period remained particularly significant during the earlier part of Henry VIII's reign, and its use and translation into English further emphasised the war as a relevant past, contributing to a 'master narrative'. It may also be suggested that ways in which nationhood was expressed also articulated the memory of the Hundred Years War, both through differentiation from the French and the assertion of the Englishness of Calais. Henry V's career marked the height of England's achievements in France and earned the king a heroic afterlife in literature. The range of historical work of which he was either the central, or a prominent subject, has led Kingsford to suggest that England had witnessed a 'great awakening of vigorous national feeling'.[90] However, by the fifteenth century, national sentiment, expressed through pride in

---

[90] Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 3.

English characteristics, had arisen from increasing contact – peaceful and violent – with other nations.[91]

The legacy of Edward III was felt keenly both in the justification of war with France and as the exemplar of kingship, but it was also more widely available. The earliest continuations of the middle-English *Brut*, to his death in 1377, confirmed his place in the most widely-distributed narrative of the following centuries.[92] The transmission of the first phases of the war celebrated the events of Edward III's reign as a narrative of England, and English participants. This celebration began during the king's lifetime, as pieces such as *Songs on King Edward's Wars,* a collection probably compiled around 1352, and surviving in a fifteenth-century manuscript, showed the wars of 'oure king' to affect 'all Ingland'.[93] Threats from France and Scotland, their aims to 'stroy Ingland and bring to nought….that none suld pas with life', were seen as the collective experience of England, making events near Berwick and Calais more widely relevant, and identifying with the participants, 'oure Ingliss men'.[94] The king's wars also prompted the identification and praise of English traits, claiming for example that there 'Was never men better in fight / Than Ingliss men'.[95] In comparison, the Scots are portrayed as false, and the French as arrogant. War, then, had long encouraged the exploration and definition of Englishness through the contrast with other peoples, in the literature through which it was transmitted.

---

[91] Vincent J. Scattergood, *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Blandford Press, 1971), pp. 40-4.

[92] Matheson, *Prose Brut*, pp. 3, 87-97.

[93] Laurence Minot, 'Songs on King Edward's Wars', in *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History composed during the period, from the accession of Edward III to Richard III,* Volume 1, ed. by Thomas Wright (London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1859, reprinted Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 58-90 (pp. 58, 63).

[94] Minot, pp. 61-6, 68, 72.

[95] Minot, p. 66.

Following this early example, the celebration of Edward III continued in the fifteenth century, and expressed the same priorities, notably in both John Lydgate's poems and in the king's prominent role in the *Libelle*. The status of Edward III's career is suggested by the *Libelle*'s apparent assumption of widespread knowledge of his achievements, focusing mostly on the capture of Calais, portrayed as crucial to the security and prosperity of England.[96] Later histories echo the *Song* in consistently portraying the first phase of the war as the collective past of Englishmen. Caxton's *Chronicles* refers to the participation of 'Englishmen' throughout the narrative. However, from Edward III's reign onwards, the text begins to refer to 'our Englysshmen', for example at Crécy in 1346, as the king and 'our Englysshmen' thanked God for victory.[97] Soon after, 'our Englysshmen' are also credited with England's defence against the Scots. These references encourage identification with the participants and also emphasise collective ownership of the events. Furthermore, it seems that the use of 'our' from this point on reflects a stronger engagement or sense of pride in ownership of this past. The transmission of the earlier phase of the war in later material also highlights the importance of contact with other nations. Caxton's account of Crécy not only emphasises the victory of the Englishmen, but frequently identifies the enemy as 'the Frensshmen', opposing the two identities. Fabian's account of Crécy also suggests the opposition of French and English identities. Here, the narrative preceding the battle shows that 'the commons of Fraunce thought it a greate dyshonoure vnto all the lande' that the 'Englyssh hoste' was free to move through the country.[98]

The sixteenth century also received the history of the Hundred Years War through a number of individual works. The most well-known account of the first phase is Jean

---

[96] *Libelle*, p. 50.
[97] Caxton, *Cronycles of Englond*, 1482, fols 116ʳ-117ᵛ.
[98] Fabian, 1533, fol. 98ᵛ.

Froissart's French *Chronicles*. A native of Hainault, Froissart had come to England in the service of Edward's Queen, Philippa, and witnessed much of the early career of the king. His work was available, and influential, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, as it is referenced by Fabian as a reliable source.[99] In 1523, John Bourchier, Lord Berners, produced the first volume of a translation of Froissart's work, which stated that it was commanded by Henry VIII, drawing a parallel between the career of his predecessor and his own French wars.

Lord Berners' interest in the text seems to be two-fold. In the preface, he indicates a general need for history to provide knowledge of great deeds and prosperity, and also peril and adversary, in order to show 'howe we maye lede forthe our lyues'. He names Froissart's chronicles as one of many famous histories he had read, so that he might contribute to the writing of history.[100] In this, Lord Berners responded to what Levy identifies as a demand for English-language works providing moral lessons.[101] The other aspect to his motives also adheres to Levy's assessment of the nature of historical literature during this period. The title suggests that the choice to translate into 'our maternall englysshe tonge' is concerned with both availability of the text and an expression of his identity. The preface also demonstrates an awareness of the value of historical material, suggesting that it would

> exciteth moueth and stereth the strong hardy warriours for the great laude that they haue after they ben deed promptly to go in hande with great and harde parels in defence of their countre.

---

[99] Fabian, 1533, fol. 98ᵛ.
[100] Preface, Froissart, 1523.
[101] Levy, pp. 5-7, 13-19.

In particular, this highlights the martial elements of historical material, with national priorities, implying that both the participants in the text, and the future participants of war in France, were fighting for England. The prologue explains that he chose to translate Froissart's chronicles because 'they redounde to the honoure of Englysshemen' and show 'gentylmen of Englande' the deeds of their 'valyant aunceytours'. Thus, the translator emphasises the intention to 'put in perpetuall memory' the deeds of the war, but he makes it a specifically English memory. The text was, therefore, aimed at wide distribution among a noble, English audience, as Lord Berners was intent on contributing to the dissemination of historical literature and the praise of English blood. However, Froissart was not a simple choice, as the author had become increasingly hostile towards England, affecting the sympathy of his writing. Lord Berners was therefore consciously selective in his choice of material, as it was to earlier versions that he needed to look for English sympathies. Froissart was already popular in print in France, the first edition appearing in 1495, with further editions following in 1497, 1505, 1513 and 1518. It was the second, which published Froissart's original text of his first book, which Lord Berners used, as the version most compatible with his aim.[102]

What was probably of interest to Lord Berners, too, as the king's Deputy in Calais during the 1520s, was the value the text had in identifying Calais as English. Froissart provides a detailed explanation of both the siege and the re-population with 'pure englysshmen'.[103] The account of the later betrayal of the town by its captain further emphasises its value, stating that the king saw it as 'the thynge in this worlde y^t I loue best next my wyfe & chyldren', while his desire to protect it from 'the frenchmen', combined with

---

[102] R. M. Smith, *Froissart and the English Chronicle Play* (1915, reprinted London, 2013), pp. 22-3.
[103] Froissart, 1523, fol. 72^v; Grummitt, 'Calais and the crown', p. 59.

the identification of the inhabitants of Calais as English, makes the town a shared concern and the threat collective. The text therefore also serves to contrast different identities. Under the title 'the Frenchmen entred in to England', the account describes a raid on the 'hauyu of Hampton whyle the people were at masse'.[104] The raiders are shown to have 'robbed and pylled the towne and slewe dyuers and defowled maydens and enforced wyues'. Although it details the participation of 'Normayns Pycardes and spanyerdes' in this attack, the title's naming of 'the Frenchmen' as the perpetrators of these deeds in 'England' both assigns negative characteristics to the French collectively and extends the experience of the attack to the whole realm. Similarly, the Scottish invasion during the siege of Calais is shown to be an attack on all of England, and demonstrates identification with the distant frontier of the Scottish border, as the 'quene of England who desyred to defende her contrey' rallied the 'englysshe men'.[105]

The transmission of the first phase of the Hundred Years War to the early sixteenth-century audience emphasised collective English participation in, and ownership of the events. Lord Berners' explanation for the translation of Froissart's chronicles demonstrates that it provided a source for expressing nationhood through identification with the participants. Furthermore, Englishness was shown to be defined by a shared past. Contemporary material from the early stages of the war, and later histories, shows that anti-French feeling and conflict and comparison with others heightened the awareness of being 'Englishmen'. Thus, the Hundred Years War at least fulfils the requirements of an English 'master narrative', as a past that was important to the identification of the nation, confirmed through commemorative literature that allowed it to be collectively owned by those who had no experience of it. The

---

[104] Froissart, 1523, fol. 21ʳ.
[105] Froissart, 1523, fol. 68ʳ.

later stages of the war provided further confirmation of the importance of the war in defining English nationhood. In common with Edward III, Henry V's career was also linked with origin material, through continuations of the *Brut* that ended at significant events of his life, and through the dedication of John Lydgate's *Troy Book* to Henry, intending to associate the king with the nation's past by providing a parallel between the Trojan conquerors and their descendants, through Brutus, and the English and their king.[106]

Historical writing was quick in casting Henry V as an English hero, beginning with the 1417 anonymous biography *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, attributed to a priest, an eye-witness of Agincourt.[107] Its immediate aims were to provide justification for Henry's war to the Council of Constance and also, significantly, to encourage further English support for a new campaign.[108] Prominent in the *Gesta* are appeals to the prayers of the nation, indicating the effectiveness of 'the supplications and tears which the English Church had poured forth'.[109] This has the effect of viewing the campaign, with its limited number of actual participants, a collective experience. It shares this element with contemporary material, including the poem *God Save the King and Keep the Crown* which advises the king of the importance of the commons.[110] The *Gesta* also demonstrates contemporary sentiment of the French, echoing the justification of the war as the pursuit of the crown.[111] Reflecting the king's justification for war, the French are shown as unruly subjects who should 'abandon their most wicked

---

[106] Hughes, pp. 25-7.

[107] *Gesta Henrici Quinti: The Deeds of Henry V*, ed. and trans. by Frank Taylor and John S. Roskell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

[108] Taylor and Roskell, 'Introduction', *Gesta*, pp. xxv-xxvii.

[109] Taylor and Roskell, 'Introduction', *Gesta,* p. xxiv; *Gesta*, p. 87.

[110] Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 233.

[111] Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimisation, 1399-1422* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), p. 93.

ways'.[112] The application of negative characteristics and actions to the French collectively provides a contrast for English subjects.

Although it is incorrect to assume that the *Gesta* itself, a Latin text largely unused by contemporaries,[113] was aimed at wide distribution, its content does aim at domestic support. Its appeal to the English Church was an often-used route to a wider English audience.[114] The text as a whole is an example of the inward encouragement of national sentiment. However, it was also aimed at the international projection of English merits. As shown in the previous chapter, the Council of Constance made demands on the assertion of England's nation status, and this was, in part, characterised by comparison to France. Thomas Elmham's *Liber Metricus de Henrico Quinto* covered Henry V's reign to 1418, and was probably influenced in part by the *Gesta,* suggesting some distribution.[115] A note in a manuscript of the *Liber Metricus* held in the University of Glasgow Library, written in a late fifteenth- or early sixteenth-century hand, suggests that this text was known at this time.[116] Elmham is also referenced in late sixteenth-century histories.[117] The *Gesta* was also used in the compilation of the chronicle of John Hardyng, an eye witness of Agincourt whose accounts were compiled in the 1460s.[118]

---

[112] *Gesta*, pp. 95, 135; Christopher Allmand, *Henry V* (London: Historical Association, 1968), pp. 73-4.

[113] Taylor and Roskell, 'Introduction', *Gesta*, p. xlix.

[114] W. R. Jones, 'The English Church and Royal Propaganda and the Hundred Years War', *Journal of British Studies*, 19, 1 (1979), 18-30 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/175680> [accessed 14th July 2010] (pp. 18-21).

[115] Taylor and Roskell, 'Introduction', *Gesta*, pp. xix-xxiii.

[116] 'Document Details, Liber Metricus de Henrico Quinto', Special Collections, University of Glasgow, <http://special.lib.gla.ac.uk/manuscripts/search/detaild.cfm?DID=33396> [accessed 30th August 2009].

[117] Kingsford, 'The Early Biographies of Henry V', p. 92.

[118] Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 85.

Henry remained a source of inspiration after his death, and the themes of these early texts continued. The 1430s were characterised by divisions in Henry VI's minority government and decline in English fortunes in France, and produced influential historical material. It is likely that Livio's 1437 *Vita Henrici Quinti* was commissioned by Henry's brother Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, with the aim of encouraging unity and renewed interest in war.[119] It portrayed Henry as an example to his son, the model of kingship defined by piety, 'virtue and battaile'.[120] The intended audiences of the *Gesta* and the *Vita* are also similar, as the latter was probably intended for both the domestic government and foreign audiences, and was quickly transmitted internationally.[121] The *Vita* remained influential for later accounts, and was the basis for majority of the *First English Life of King Henry the Fifth* of 1513. Livio's work was also related to a longer anonymous Latin life of the king, now known as the 'Pseudo-Elmham'.[122] The important point here is that this group of Latin texts, the *Gesta*, the *Vita* and the 'Pseudo-Elmham', written at different times and interrelated, established a widespread legend using a number of common elements: Henry V fulfilled the ideals of his vocation, and was an effective source of propaganda, with national concerns.

Alongside these biographies, the king was also prominent in texts treating wider subjects. John Capgrave's *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, dedicated to Henry VI, offers examples to his king of celebrated men of the same name, in order that he may 'imitate the

---

[119] Kingsford, 'The Early Biographies of Henry V', p. 63.

[120] 'The prologue of Titus Livius directing his words to Kinge Henrie the Sixt', in *First English Life*, pp. 6-7.

[121] David Rundle, 'The Unoriginality of Tito Livio Frulovisi's *Vita Henrici Quinti*', *EHR*, 123, 504 (2008), 1109-31 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20485374> [accessed 20th February 2010] (p. 1110).

[122] Rundle, pp. 1109-1131.

virtue of the name'.[123] Capgrave's text borrowed from and followed earlier works such as the *Liber Metricus*.[124] This interrelation of material concerning Henry V demonstrates how quickly the retelling of his reign seems to have become standardised. Henry V is given the most space among the English kings in Capgrave's account, which follows the other histories in linking his piety with that of the realm and attributing his actions to his concern for his people. His devotions after Agincourt, for example, 'roused a very great spirit of devotion in the people', while his marriage negotiations were for the harmony of the realm.[125] The text also emphasises the responsibility of the French for the start of war. The Dauphin's affront to the king's pride, supposedly sending tennis balls for the king to play with instead of war, is implied as an insult to England.[126] Henry is shown to have been mocked for hoping to 'contend with so noble a kingdom' as France, challenging England itself. The account of Agincourt echoes this, as 'the war turned to the joy and pride of one nation, but the sorrow and disgrace of the other'.[127] Not only does this make the victory that of England, but it directly opposes England and France's fortunes. The 'brotherhood' between Henry and Emperor Sigismund is constructed with the praise of England and criticism of France, as they thanked God together for exposing French treachery. Capgrave includes a poem attributed to the emperor's servants, praising England's piety and victories, contrasting the characteristics of the two identities.[128] The celebration of Agincourt by Henry's subjects also shows an awareness of a relevant shared history. The text suggests collective ownership of both past

---

[123] Hingeston, 'Introduction', in John Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, ed. by Hingeston (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1858), p. xii; Capgrave, *The Book of the Illustrious Henries*, trans. by Hingeston (London: Longman, 1858), p. 3.

[124] Hingeston, 'Introduction', *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, p. xvii; Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 39.

[125] Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, pp. 129, 138.

[126] Allmand, *Henry V*, pp. 71-2, 427.

[127] Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, pp. 129-30, 134.

[128] Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, pp. 136-8.

and recent victories, as comparisons are made with Edward III, and Henry V is shown to be continuing the work of 'our kings'... 'to the great glory of our realm'.[129]

The significant elements of Capgrave's treatment of Henry V are also prominent in his accounts of the other English kings. Collectively, he portrays them as the 'guardians of our realm', while reconciling their mistakes through penitence.[130] He gives attention to victories against France, shows successes to be to the glory of the realm, and attributes failure to individual mistakes.[131] Rather than dwelling on the losses of Henry VI's reign, Capgrave focuses instead on expectations that he will regain French possessions.[132] In common with the earlier *Libelle*, the text advocates control of the sea through 'our navy' as a way to achieve this.[133] The sea in particular is shown to be an important part of Englishness. The depiction of ships on coinage combined England's history and geographical situation as a widely-distributed symbol of nationhood. However, Capgrave suggests that, without war and the assertion of sea domination, this symbol is not deserved. The text goes on to express the hope that God will 'raise up the spirit of bravery in our nation', against the false friendship of their enemies, emphasising a collective responsibility for England's success. Although the text cannot be said to have had a broad audience beyond king and court, surviving in only two Latin manuscripts, Capgrave's ideas of English history, and ownership of the past, are important.[134] The text is a good example of the medieval idea of the function of historical literature, as it is concerned with the relevance of history. Its relevance for the author is that it was a means of expressing nationhood. The piety of the king and his father is notable because

---

[129] Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, p. 135.

[130] Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, p. 51.

[131] Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, pp. 72, 76.

[132] Hingeston, 'Introduction', *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, p. xxxvi.

[133] Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, pp. 151-5.

[134] Hingeston, 'Introduction', *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, pp. l-liii.

of their influence on their subjects, while all the English Henries are praised for concern for the realm. Throughout this section of the text, the experience of the monarch is shown to be the shared experience of the nation, linking membership of English nationhood to loyalty and the remembrance of 'our kings'. Finally, the text also shows that England's relationship with France is central to Capgrave's own definition of his nationhood.

The place of Henry V in more widely-disseminated material provides an insight into the communication of his reign as a 'national' history. As has already been shown, the events of Henry V's reign, as significant markers and end points for continuations of the *Brut*, linked his contemporary success to England's popular past. That this in turn became the standard account of his reign is shown by the likely relationship between a 'Peculiar' continuation and the work of Livio. The *English Chronicle*'s treatment of Henry V, contained in the first continuation, has a great deal in common with the 'national' features of his biographies. In common with the *Gesta*, it emphasises popular approval of the Agincourt campaign, showing the king being greeted in England 'with moch ioie and worship'.[135] Its probable date of composition of c. 1437 means that, as the war had started to go against England, the text may have provided an explanation of how successes could be relived. More importantly, by emphasising the collective ownership of this past through the involvement of 'all Engelond', the chronicle demonstrates an awareness of writing a specifically English history, providing, or imposing a collective memory. The text was also consistent with the other accounts in its treatment of the French, repeating the story of the tennis balls.[136] The French are also blamed for the breakdown of peace during Sigismund's visit, as in Capgrave's account, and prove

---

[135] *English Chronicle*, p. 45.
[136] *English Chronicle*, p. 43.

their treachery through the Dauphin's murder of the Duke of Burgundy.[137] Wherever the enemy is referred to, they are 'Frenshemen', showing the war as an opposition of two identities. English ownership of the war is further suggested through the king's filling of Harfleur with Englishmen, a pragmatic act which is used in the text symbolically, to reverse the rightful places of the native French and the colonising English.[138] A collective derisory attitude towards the French is encouraged through the knowledge that, before the battle, they gambled for 'oure men', highlighting the flawed character of the enemy and opposing all members of the two nations.[139]

The later transmission of the later phases of the Hundred Years War remained consistent with these early accounts in establishing the events as part of a shared, English past. The account of Agincourt provided by Caxton's *Chronicles*, for example, both highlights the popular participation of all of England in the battle and, through the identification of the participants with the audience, encourages the appropriation of the narrative. Echoing Capgrave, the *Chronicles* highlight the role of domestic support in the victory, through Henry V's declaration that 'al Englond praith for vs'. To a much larger readership than Capgrave, and designed with a broad reading audience in mind, this statement shows the victory to belong to all of England, and therefore implies that non-participation means exclusion. The account further emphasises collective ownership through the identification of 'our Archyers', 'oure stakes' in the ground, 'our kyng', the defeat of 'oure enemyes' and the claim that 'god that daye fought for vs'. The account asserts the identity of the 'Englysshmen' frequently and in opposition to the 'frensshmen', whose gambling, fires and shouting on the eve of battle are placed in contrast with Henry's, and

---

[137] *English Chronicle*, pp. 48-54.
[138] *English Chronicle*, p. 44; Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, p. 1.
[139] *English Chronicle*, p. 44.

England's, prayers.[140] Fabian's account, too, opposes not just the two armies, but Englishmen and Frenchmen, and shows the 'presumpcion and pompe' of the Frenchmen as a factor in their defeat.[141] Both texts, then, continue from their treatment of Edward III's reign in assigning characteristics to the French and identifying the nation, and their audience, with the events they describe. Caxton also describes the celebration of the victory upon the king's return. In London, at least, his account indicates a very public celebration: a procession, the provision of wine in the streets and thanksgiving at St. Paul's. A London chronicle confirms the city's celebration, describing the ringing of all the church bells and a procession to St. Paul's, followed by a visit to the shrine of St. Edward at Westminster.[142] The account only concerns the celebrations in London, and the participation of the religious men, aldermen and crafts of the city. The writer's account of the battle itself does display a sense of identification with the soldiers, recognising them as 'oure syde', and, in common with other histories, generalises the enemy as 'the Frensshmen'.[143]

Elsewhere, events of Henry V's reign are, in places, not remarked upon: the Bristol *Kalendar* only records the king's death, although this is one of the few events of the relevant portion of the chronicle that departs from the simple list of years and mayors.[144] One important example of the celebration of Agincourt does suggest popular participation in the commemoration of the event and the war in general. Sydney Anglo draws attention to a recommendation to Henry VIII for a programme of anti-papal demonstrations. As an example, Calais is said to remember the victory of Henry V and 'his contreie men ayenst so grate a multitude of the frenshemen', recording that its inhabitants 'yerely make a solempne

---

[140] Caxton, *Cronycles*, 1482, fols 147^r-148^r.
[141] Fabian, 1533, fols 172^v-173^r.
[142] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 102.
[143] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 101.
[144] *Kalendar*, p. 38.

tryumphe, goyng in procession…to the great reioysyng of your subiectes', with trumpets and guns.[145] The dating of the programme to sometime before 1542, perhaps up to four years earlier, suggests that, in order for the practice to be recognised as a tradition, it must have long been in place. This not only demonstrates the popular participation of Calais inhabitants in the commemoration of the event during Henry VIII's reign, but it also suggests that it was important to the life of the community. The text itself shows that the Hundred Years War was by this time viewed as 'contreie men' fighting 'frenshemen', advocating similar events to strengthen the king's anti-papal stance in England.

The battle was, of course, followed by numerous renderings of the victory in verse, for example the Latin piece recorded by Adam Usk, which celebrates the battle at which 'the might of France came crashing down'.[146] These pieces echoed the less accessible histories in both their ownership of the battle as Englishmen, and their characterisation of the French in opposition. An English-language minstrel song, composed around 1417, identifies directly with the participants of the siege of Harfleur and the battle of Agincourt, expressing a collective ownership of the events through 'our archorys', 'our Englismen', the 'lordys of thys lond' and their fight against 'oure enemyes'.[147] The piece also extends the impact of the victory to all of England, suggesting a collective thanksgiving, that 'all England maye this syng, Laws Deo we may well saye'. In contrast, the enemy are consistently 'Frenche men' or the 'lordys of Franyse', whose pride and renown was lost. Another, the 'Agincourt Carol',

---

[145] BL, Cotton, MS. Faustina. C. ii, fols. 15b-18b; Anglo, 'An Early Tudor Programme for Plays and Other Demonstrations against the Pope', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutions*, 20, 1/2 (1957), 176-9 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/750157> [accessed 14th February 2011] (p. 178).

[146] Usk, p. 259; Juliet Barker, *Agincourt: The King, The Campaign, The Battle* (London: Little, Brown, 2005), p. 378.

[147] Thomas Warton, *The History of English Poetry from the close of the Eleventh Century to the commencement of the Eighteenth Century, in three volumes, Volume II* (London: Cheapside, 1840), pp. 257-8.

described as 'perhaps the best-known carol in English, not concerned with the Nativity', composed around the same time, stands out due to both its longevity and language, written mostly in English with a Latin chorus.[148] Helen Deeming suggests that, considering its advanced development as a piece of music, it was not merely created for the celebration of the king's return to London, but survived in different versions from later in the fifteenth century, indicating popularity, distribution and several stages of development.[149] It is also the only carol known to celebrate the battle, and follows the tone of the *Gesta* and *Liber Metricus* in ascribing the victory to God.[150] As a carol, it differs in tone to the English-language ballad, yet reflects the same sentiments. The carol also implies that England as a whole can act as one, that 'Englonde may calle and cry, *Deo gratias*'.[151] The Latin chorus, '*Deo gratias Anglia, redde pro victoria*', ('give thanks to God England, for the victory'), extends the impact of Henry V's first campaign to all of England, 'his peple'. Equally, the siege of Harfleur's impact is seen as one 'That Fraunce shall rewe tyl domesday'. Thus the fortunes of the two are opposed. Also in common with the ballad, the carol expresses ownership, celebrating 'owre kynge'.

One of the best examples of the importance of Henry V's career to the articulation of nationhood during Henry VIII's early reign is the production of the first English language history of his life in 1513. The *First English Life of King Henry the Fifth* was compiled in response to the start of Henry VIII's war with France. In common with the later translation of

---

[148] *The Early English Carols*, ed. by Richard L. Greene (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), p. 474; Brownell Salomon, 'The myth structure and rituality of *Henry V*', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 23, Early Shakespeare Special Number (1993), 254-69 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3507983> [accessed 20th February 2010] (p. 255); Barker, *Agincourt*, pp. 378-9.

[149] Helen Deeming, 'The Sources and Origin of the "Agincourt Carol"', *Early Music,* 35, 1 (2007), 23-36 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4137268> [accessed 20th February 2010] (pp. 24-31).

[150] Barker, *Agincourt*, pp. 378-9; Deeming, p. 23.

[151] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Arch. Selden B. 26.

Froissart's work, the anonymous author's decision to write an English language work is an expression of his identity, as his prologue, while recognising the failings of the language to adequately express his source, refers to it as 'our naturall English tongue', more accessible, and an intrinsic part of identity.[152] Also in common with the Lord Berners, the prologue states that the purpose of the text is to take lessons from the past, specifically by providing an example of kingship, and a source of inspiration to achieve 'like honnour, fame and victorie'.[153] Although it acknowledges that the war ended before the text was finished, the direct association of the king with his predecessor highlights not only how well-known this episode in England's past had become, but also Henry V's status as the best example of 'noblenes, manhoode, and virtue…amongest the princes of England since William of Normandie', judging him within a framework of specifically English history.

The material the author used provides an indication of the histories available as sources. A major source was the Latin *Vita* of Tito Livio, leading to the anonymous sixteenth-century compiler being styled, later, the 'Translator of Livius'. However, it does not follow his work exactly. The prologue also names Monstrelet as a source, a French writer whose *Chronique* covered the period 1400-1444. The author claims to have rendered both sources into English, while also, significantly, adding 'diuers sayings of the English Cronicles', which Kingsford identifies as Caxton's *Polychronicon* and probably manuscript *Brut* material.[154] Later in the text, the author, in his own words, suggests a sense of collective possession of 'our English Chronicles'.[155] The compilation of a new history, rather than a direct translation, suggests an attempt to provide a standardised and popular history. This

---

[152] *First English Life*, p. 3.
[153] *First English Life*, p. 4.
[154] *First English Life*, p. 3; Kingsford, 'Introduction', *First English Life*, pp. xv-xvi.
[155] *First English Life,* p. 123.

notion is reinforced in the text, as the author attempts to assess differing opinions of sources, for example the varied estimates of the size of the English army at Agincourt.[156] The author also names the Earl of Ormond, a participant in the Agincourt campaign who died in 1452, as a source.[157] The use of the Earl's experience, providing additional valuable material to his work not preserved elsewhere, indicates a missing written account, compiled by a servant remembering his late master's reminiscences, adding weight to the suggestion that the author of the *First English Life* wished to create a more widely available version of the histories.

The text itself echoes earlier material in its identification of this past as an English history, and demonstrates the author's awareness of his identity. The account of Henry IV's death describes the king's deathbed guidance to his son, in which he advises him to exercise both justice and mercy for the 'tranquillitie and rest' of the realm, 'which shalbe occasion of greate prosperitie within this Realme, which Englishmen naturallie desire'.[158] The text therefore intertwines principles of good kingship and domestic peace with the aims of English nationhood. More importantly, it implies that one purpose of the pursuit of justice is to have 'the most louinge, faithfull, and manly people of the worlde, which shalbe cause of no smale feare of thine aduersaries'.[159] The interests of the realm, and of Englishmen, are therefore directed outwards, opposing subjects to the king's enemies, and identifying the English as a people who cause fear in others. The text continues to emphasise both the opposition of identities and collective English participation. The present of tennis balls is repeated from Livio, emphasising the pride of the French and their 'many approbrious words

---

[156] *First English Life*, pp. 56-7.
[157] Kingsford, 'Introduction', pp. xvii-xviii.
[158] *First English Life*, p. 15.
[159] *First English Life*, p. 15.

and dishonest, both against the realme of England, and against the Kinge'.[160] Also echoing other available texts, Agincourt is shown as the work of 'the Englishmen'.[161] Kingsford indicates that this first reference to Agincourt is a paraphrase of Livius's work, and so it is probable that the author chose to use 'Englishmen' consciously rather than copying original sources faithfully.

The text continues to refer to 'the Frenchmen' and 'the Englishmen', 'the English host' and 'the bows of Englande' often and consistently, in sections taken from both Livio and Monstrelet, and in the author's own words, emphasising the representation of their respective nations by the armies.[162] The king's decision to march through France to Calais, instead of sailing back to England, is also shown have been made for both his own reputation and that of his realm, as Henry justifies the choice by suggesting that 'if we shoulde thus depart, they would say in reproof of vs and of our realme of England'.[163] Taken from Livio, this emphasises the relevance of war to England's character. Similarly, before Agincourt, the king answers the complaint about the size of the army by saying that, if they lost, then the fewer soldiers they had, 'the lesse domage and dishonnor shalbe to the Realme of England'.[164] The author, then, intended that the text should portray Henry V's war, and by implication the contemporary war of Henry VIII, as a collective English experience. The use of 'Englishmen' throughout the piece encourages readers to identify with the participants and feel a sense of ownership of the events. It also implies that identification with it would confirm their Englishness, and that participation in contemporary French wars was a requirement of it, in much the same way that Lord Berners expressed the belief that history

[160] *First English Life*, pp. 25-6.
[161] *First English Life*, p. 28.
[162] *First English Life*, pp. 55-9.
[163] *First English Life*, p. 42.
[164] *First English Life*, p. 54.

would encourage 'warriors' in the 'defence of their country'. Both his work and the 1513 anonymous piece, then, indicate the place of the Hundred Years War as part of a national narrative, both in providing a past that was the collective possession of the nation, and in continuing to define English nationhood.

The celebrations contained within the *First English Life*, both recording past events and, by providing an example, encouraging their repetition, also demonstrate an on-going process of commemoration of the past. The account records that the welcoming of Henry V back into London included banners and portrayals of the 'Victories, Tryumphes, and Princely Acts of the Kinge of Englande his progenitors'.[165] In the same way that contemporary events had prompted the remembrance of Henry V in the form of the *First English Life*, the text shows that Henry V's victories had prompted the popular remembrance and celebration of well-known history. Furthermore, it goes on to suggest that Henry VIII, viewing this celebration of his ancestors, 'might evedentlie see, what remembraunce his people woulde leaue to there posterities and successors of this his greate victorie and tryumphe'.[166] Not only did the celebration associate the king with his predecessors, it also demonstrated how he would be remembered. This seems to act as an instruction to the early sixteenth-century audience from their ancestors. In turn, it also implies that the association of contemporary events, and Henry VIII's actions, with those of his predecessors confirmed his own future celebration, and therefore begins to construct his own place in historical narrative.

Although the text was intended for circulation, and, if it was ordered by the king, for the encouragement of support for the 1513 campaign, it did not find its way into print, unlike

---

[165] *First English Life*, p. 65.
[166] *First English Life*, p. 65.

Lord Berners' work, published by Pynson between 1523 and 1525.[167] This may have been

because, as the author's preface shows, the history was not ready before the end of the short

war.[168] Cruickshank points out the problems faced justifying the expedition, and the problems

of war taxes would have been particularly acute to Henry, considering his early experience of

the Cornish rebellion against his father's Scottish war.[169] A history appealing to the cultural

popularity of Henry V would have been a useful medium to justify a nationwide tax.

However, it was part of a wider remembrance of Henry V. Also in 1513, Richard Pynson

published John Lydgate's *Troy Book*, a 1412 English translation of a Latin poem recounting

the fall of Troy.[170]

The ways in which Henry VIII seems to have consciously drawn comparisons

between himself and his predecessor, and, more broadly, associated his wars with the

Hundred Years War, suggests the recognition of a popular awareness of the past. The

similarities between the circumstances of the two kings at the start of their reigns are striking.

Of particular importance was the expectation surrounding both kings. For Henry V, the

continuation of the war with France was expected. Edward III's claim was part of his

inheritance, and war, in Gerald Harriss' opinion, was the logical step after the establishment

of the Lancastrian dynasty.[171] These expectations were also expressed by Henry's

contemporaries: the military reputation of his family caused Thomas Hoccleve, a Lancastrian

---

[167] Craig Taylor, 'Introduction', in *Debating the Hundred Years War: Pour ce que plusieurs (La Loy Salique) and a declaration of the trew and dewe title of Henrie VIII*, ed. by Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 32; Clifford Davies, 'Henry VIII and Henry V: the Wars in France', in *The End of the Middle Ages? England in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. by John L. Watts (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), pp. 235-62 (p. 237).
[168] *First English Life*, p. 4.
[169] *Anglica Historia*, book XXVI, pt. 34; Charles G. Cruikshank, *Army Royal: Henry VIII's Invasion of France 1513* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 9-12.
[170] Taylor, 'Introduction', in *Debating the Hundred Years War*, p. 32.
[171] Harriss, 'Introduction: the Exemplar of Kingship', pp. 1-2.

apologist, to predict that Henry 'shal make a knightly rode, And the pride of oure foos thristen adoun'.[172] Hoccleve's work suggests that, not only was war expected of Henry, but it was also seen as a collective action against a shared enemy. Similarly, Henry VIII also followed a father who had established a new dynasty, and his accession was greeted with the expectation of war, as John Skelton labelled him 'Mars's lusty knight' and prayed 'God save him in his right!', recalling his claim to France.[173] Clifford Davies points out the similarities between Henry VIII's route through France and that of Henry V's expedition, suggesting that the 1513 campaign was strategically modelled on the victory of his predecessor.[174] This suggests that some knowledge of earlier campaigns was assumed.

The production of historical material demonstrates the contemporary relevance of the Hundred Years War in the first decades of the sixteenth century, and it was consistently associated with Englishness, both as a shared experience and as a period which defined English identity in contrast with otherness. New material also aimed to do the same for contemporary events. As well as providing cultural support, the Hundred Years War remained politically relevant, and references to the past in the arguments surrounding Henry VIII's titles and wars also demonstrated its relevance to English identity. France was certainly the highest priority in Henry VIII's foreign policy.[175] His use of the historic claim and the importance of the Hundred Years War as a significant layer of England's narrative does seem to have been largely symbolic and practical rather than a realistic attempt at the

---

[172] Harriss, 'Introduction: the Exemplar of Kingship', p. 20; *Hoccleve's Works*, ed. by Frederick J. Furnivall, Early English Text Society Extra Series, lxxii (London: Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1897), p. 143.

[173] Steven Gunn, 'The French Wars of Henry VIII', in *The Origins of War in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Jeremy Black (Edinburgh: Donald, 1987), pp. 28-51 (p. 39).

[174] Clifford Davies, 'Tournai and the English Crown, 1513-1519', *Historical Journal,* 41, 1 (1998), 1-26 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640143> [accessed 14th July 2010].

[175] Davies, 'Henry VIII and Henry V', pp. 237, 232.

throne.[176] His letter to his ambassadors in 1525, following the French king's capture at Pavia by the Emperor, desires Charles to 'utterly exclude him [Francis] and his line with all other from the crown of France except only the King's Highness', or at least to ensure his possession of Normandy and Gascony, 'unjustly detained by the French King'.[177] Even in peaceful negotiations with France, for example when discussing the marriage of his sister Mary to Louis XII, Henry VIII points out the 'withholding of mine inheritance'.[178] Henry VIII's wars were also accompanied by legal justifications which further articulated the historical political opposition of England and France. *A declaration of the trew and dewe title of Henrie VIII*, an anonymous legal justification of the king's assumed title of King of France was prepared as a response to a more well-known earlier French legal attack of this claim. It is thought by Taylor to have originally been written to coincide with the 1513, and is a passionate, if inaccurate, denial of the French *Plus ce que plusieurs* that was still circulating in France.[179] It is bitterly distrusting of the French and the support of the earlier tract for 'the Valoys usurpers of the corone of Ffraunce'.

Symbolism remained important for the remembrance of the Hundred Years War, most notably in the status of archers and the longbow. The marriage of Mary Tudor and Louis XII was an opportunity for lavish display, emphasising England's power. With Henry's first great victory at the 'Battle of the Spurs' still fresh, Mary's train included 200 archers, which suggests that the famous symbol of the war had become part of traditional royal display.[180] The survival of archery as a sport in England has also been deemed a 'sentimental

---

[176] Gunn, 'The French Wars of Henry VIII', pp. 37-8.

[177] 'Henry VIII to Tunstall and Wingfield, 1525', in *The Letters of King Henry VIII*, ed. by Muriel St. Clare Byrne (London: Cassell, 1936), pp. 35, 38.

[178] 'Henry VIII to Thomas Wolsey', in *Letters of King Henry VIII*, pp. 23-4.

[179] Taylor, 'Introduction', in *Debating the Hundred Years War,* pp. 33-9.

[180] Walter C. Richardson, *Mary Tudor, The White Queen* (London: Peter Owen, 1970), pp. 93.

'attachment' to the weapon which came to symbolise historical victories, although this view has been challenged more recently.[181] Archery was also an important competition at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, which was as intense a contest as the earlier wars, as both kings were preparing for war once again.[182]

The legacy of the Hundred Years War is also evident in the lasting impact of opposing French and English identities. The presence of the 'other' served to define and emphasise awareness of nationhood. Steven Gunn has observed that, although there was a general dislike for foreigners in early sixteenth-century England, this was strongest when directed at the French.[183] It seems that, on the eve of war, Henry VIII's soldiers were aware both of their enemy and of the historical significance of the war. In 1523, the will of a Suffolk soldier, Richard Corbett, declares his intention to 'war upon the French men, being the king my said sovereign lord's ancient enemies'.[184] Corbett's identification of the enemy as 'the French men' suggests that he considered them, collectively, to be the enemy, while his recognition of the king's 'ancient enemies' expresses an awareness of the temporal depth of the conflict.

III. Cousins' Wars and the 'Trauma of their Time'

A number of the texts that recorded the fifteenth-century stages of the Hundred Years War were concerned not only with the war as a shared experience, but also with the legitimisation of a new dynasty. Dynastic struggles dominated emerging literature, as

---

[181] James Raymond, *Henry VIII's Military Revolution: The Armies of Sixteenth-Century Britain and Europe* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2007), p. 2.

[182] Joycelyne G. Russell, *The Field of the Cloth of Gold: Men and Manners in 1520* (London: Routledge, 1969), pp. 132, 188.

[183] Gunn, 'French Wars', p. 33.

[184] Gunn, 'French Wars', p. 28.

historical writing became a requirement of campaigns to secure new kings. It has already been shown that partisan works were written as continuations of established, popular histories, lending legitimacy to new pieces. Elements of the first continuation of *An English Chronicle* already mentioned have demonstrated that the authors of these pieces were also aware that they were participating in the telling of England's history. Further examples of material involved in the process of creating histories for the newly established kings in both 1399 and 1461, or that, as a result of the impact of the wars, were forced to negotiate the disturbed political landscape, reveal that the use of a 'national' rhetoric was a necessary part of this process. While the varied and often opposed partisan narratives seem to challenge any notion of a 'master narrative', the texts produced contributed to a sense of England's recent history and became layers of the past of the early sixteenth-century audience, particularly as the conflicts themselves were important in the establishment of Henry VII. Such texts not only aimed to write with national priorities and continued to suggest collective ownership of this history, but emphasised popular participation and an 'ascending notion of legitimacy' in the dynastic changes, and implied a sense of exclusion of those who did not participate.

The deposition of Richard II in 1399 was problematic. The direct challenge to an anointed king was complicated both by his direct descent from Edward III, and the existence of a stronger claim than that of Henry Bolingbroke. The new Lancastrian regime had to negotiate these issues, and this is reflected in their historical writing. Richard II's suitability for rule was questioned and his removal relied upon a consensus of opinion, suggesting that the legitimacy of the action ascended from the English people.[185] The notion of unanimous popular consent is an important aspect of *An English Chronicle*. Following the portrayal of Richard as damaging to the realm, and the representation of the grievances of all of England

---

[185] Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, p. 23; Calhoun, p. 5.

by the Kent rebels, the opposition of king and subjects is continued throughout. The lords opposing Richard are shown to be concerned for both the realm and the king.[186] However, Richard becomes gradually more duplicitous and fearful. The characters of the king's victims are developed along the lines of popular consent and concern for the realm. The 'gode erle' of Arundel is executed against the will of the people, while Archbishop Arundel gives a passionate refusal to leave 'this londe'.[187] Henry Bolingbroke's return from exile is met with very little resistance, emphasised by the king cursing the 'untruthe of Engelonde'.[188] The narrative is constructed as a warning against tyranny and a reminder of popular consent, serving to justify the accession of Henry IV, a king who 'the lords and commons of this londe chosen', and who accepts 'in the name of all men of Engelonde', in direct contrast to Richard.[189] It encouraged further support of the Lancastrian cause by implying that it would confirm the supporters' English nationhood, and exclude those who did not.

The theme of popular consent is a common one in other works that may be identified as Lancastrian in their sympathies. Usk's account is useful as a witness of the Lancastrian legitimisation campaign, and its treatment of Richard is consistently negative, blaming the king's youth, duplicity and evil advisors for his downfall.[190] Also in common with the *English Chronicle*, while having no sympathy for the rebels, Usk blames 'intolerable injustices' for the rising of 'the common people of the kingdom'.[191] Usk also highlights the role of Parliament, and consent, in Henry IV's accession.[192] Both Usk and the *English Chronicle*, then, illustrate the importance of the consent of English subjects to the legitimacy

---

[186] *English Chronicle*, pp. 7-9, 11.
[187] *English Chronicle*, pp. 19-21.
[188] *English Chronicle*, pp. 22-3.
[189] *English Chronicle*, pp. 24-6.
[190] Given-Wilson, 'Introduction', p. li.
[191] Usk, p. 3.
[192] Usk, pp. 69-71.

of a new dynasty.[193] This was also a prominent element of the dynasty's establishment, later, in Capgrave's *Illustrious Henries*. Echoing the earlier works, Capgrave acknowledges the accession of Henry IV 'by the election of the people', suggesting that Richard was 'unworthy to rule so great a kingdom'.[194]

Another significant element of Lancastrian legitimisation underlined by these three texts is a reliance on establishing descent, a theme that was also central to the justification of Henry VII's accession. The Lancastrian 'Crouchback' rumour, Henry IV's claim that his maternal ancestor, Edmund, the brother of Edward I, was actually the elder, appears in all three.[195] Although Usk is quick to demolish the claim, its prominence in both contemporary and later accounts represents a serious attempt to redirect royal past. Furthermore, it demonstrates the dissemination of such rumours. John Hardyng suggests that this need was recognised even earlier as he credits John of Gaunt with initiating this campaign.[196] This reliance on the past for legitimacy is frequently employed: the *English Chronicle* recalls the removal of Edward II, implying the significance of its mention.[197] This device is also used to imply a sense of continuity, as Henry is shown to solve problems of Richard's reign.[198] Lancastrian employment of the past is further demonstrated by the legend of the eagle vial of oil given by the Virgin Mary to Thomas Becket. The *English Chronicle* introduces this at the end of Richard's reign, as a desperate attempt by the king to protect himself through the possession of the vial and the legend that it would bring about great kingship and the

---

[193] Rodney S. Barker, *Legitimating Identities: the Self-Presentation of Rulers and Subjects* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 9.

[194] Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, pp. 102, 114.

[195] *English Chronicle*, p. 13; Usk, pp. 64-7; Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, p. 115.

[196] Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, pp. 3-4; John Hardyng, *The Chronicle of John Hardyng*, ed. by Henry Ellis (London: G. Woodfall, 1812), p. 354.

[197] *English Chronicle*, p. 9.

[198] *English Chronicle*, pp. xlix-li.

restoration of ancestral lands, while the anointing of Henry IV with the oil adds more weight to his accession.[199] The treatment of the rest of Henry IV's reign in the three accounts suggests that the king did not necessarily fulfil expectations. The *English Chronicle* is redirected, perhaps suggesting that the account was intended as a warning of the dangers facing kings who failed their subjects.[200] Through this change of heart, the text becomes closer to Usk's more critical account, while Capgrave treats the king's problems briefly, labelling the reign 'decidedly peaceful'.[201] Although Henry's flawed reputation in these accounts does suggest that the Lancastrian attempt to 'dominate their subjects' political imagination' was not successful,[202] these texts do demonstrate the recognition of the political value of historical literature and 'national' rhetoric.

The process of establishing Edward IV in 1461 had much in common with that of 1399, as it owed a great deal to recent history. Kingsford suggests that, after 1436, English historical work reflected the thirty years of political disorder, becoming 'formless and fragmentary'.[203] However, the decline of the Lancastrian dynasty and the establishment of Edward IV were marked by significant pieces that highlight the increasing reliance of English kingship on historical legitimacy and popular support. Again, historical literature was forced to negotiate the dynastic changes of 1461. As has already been shown, the second continuation of the *English Chronicle* sought to associate the foundation of the new dynasty with an established and recognisably English historical work, as a new layer of a national narrative. The ambiguity of the first compiler's attitude to Henry IV makes it compatible with a Yorkist narrative, and lends the new material the authority of an established history.

---

[199] *English Chronicle*, pp. 22-7.

[200] Marx, 'Introduction', pp. liv-lv.

[201] Capgrave, *Illustrious Henries*, pp. 118-24.

[202] Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, p. 2.

[203] Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 3.

Furthermore, it is interesting that the new compiler chose to continue a text that took the crisis of 1399 as its central theme. The end point of Edward IV's accession in 1461 emphasises the event, and acts as a conclusion. This suggests that, stronger than the need for continuity, the chronicle as a whole could provide a sense of completion, to show the coming of the new dynasty as the restoration of sound government.[204]

Echoing the defamation of Richard II, the reign of Henry VI is shown from the start to have been dominated by evil counsellors, the willing surrender of continental possessions 'be negligence and vntreuthe' – by now a recognisable theme of previous material – and episodes illustrating the unrest of English subjects.[205] The narrative for Henry VI's reign therefore constructs an image of a troubled realm, which corresponds with Jonathan Hughes' indication that the failings of the king caused his subjects to 'look for a young king of energy and vigour' who could recapture England's glorious past.[206] Although the fifteenth century produced partisan material, then, the continuation of the earlier piece here suggests that this was, instead, a new layer of the same narrative. The *English Chronicle* deals with the legitimacy of Henry VI's removal by providing justification for Edward's accession in the context of revenge, both for the Lancastrian usurpation 'by violent intrusyonne', and for the personal losses at the hands of Henry's supporters.[207] The final events of the piece are purposely blurred, as Edward's coronation is moved to after the battle of Towton, in order to emphasise the completeness of his re-establishment of peace.[208]

---

[204] Marx, 'Introduction', p. lxxxix-xc.
[205] *English Chronicle*, pp. 61-71.
[206] Hughes, pp. 47, 72.
[207] Marx, 'Introduction', p. xc; *English Chronicle*, pp. 92, 97.
[208] *English Chronicle*, pp. 99-100.

Although the work seems to have seen little distribution, it was written with a wider audience in mind, given the attachment to the *Brut* and the persuasive appeal of the text's tone. The importance of the text lies in its demonstration of the dependence of the Yorkist narrative on the preceding Lancastrian events. The association of the new narrative with the first continuation, and thus the *Brut*, demonstrates the mirroring of the Lancastrian strategy of utilising existing material and the careful retelling of recent history. Also in common with the first continuation, the second part of the *English Chronicle* expresses concern for widespread acceptance. As with 1399, the main concern is with providing legitimacy, and this is done through emphasising popular, ascending consent.[209] The chronicle emphasises the damage being inflicted on the realm, and the unity of popular opinion against Henry VI's government. It suggests agreement with the grievances of the people, expressed in Cade's rebellion as a protest against unreasonable taxes and untrue rule, as they provided articles in which there 'wasse nothynge conteyned but [wh]at wasse rightfull and resonable'.[210] It also shows that the rebellion was taken up in other parts of England, suggesting widespread unrest and general social malaise among all ranks, implied by the attention given to widely-reported scandals of heresy and witchcraft.[211] A ballad supposedly taken from the gates of Canterbury is included, lamenting the state of England, the 'kingdom of God', where 'Now regnum Sathane, it semeth', and 'every head is sick and every heart grieves'.[212] Although the ballad is unlikely to be authentic, its inclusion, and that of the articles of Cade's rebellion, has the effect of validating the claim of popular support, acting as evidence of the widespread opposition to Henry's government as 'enemyes to the sayde commune weal'.[213] The frequent

---

[209] Marx, 'Introduction', p. lxxxix.

[210] *English Chronicle*, pp. 67-8.

[211] *English Chronicle*, pp. 61-4, 70; Marx, 'Introduction', p. xcv.

[212] 'Ballat set vppon the yatis of Canterbury', in *English Chronicle*, pp. 86-7.

[213] *English Chronicle*, p. 83.

references to widespread harm suggest a determination to justify Edward's accession to a wide audience, and demonstrate the willingness of English subjects to trust the new dynasty, not asking for support but showing it is already given. This also has the effect of defining membership of the nation by excluding those who did not accept this version of events.

As with the first continuation, the second is designed both through its selective content and careful portrayal of public opinion to encourage the acceptance of its narrative and support for the new king. The text makes the importance of continuing support clear, as a threat was still posed, at the time of writing, by Margaret of Anjou and her son Edward. It was therefore necessary to demonstrate the role of the queen and prince in the realm's suffering, and from her first appearance, the account associates her both directly and implicitly with the injustices of Henry's reign. Her marriage to Henry is accompanied by a truce with France, and the chronicler associates this with the 'treson' that 'appered sone afterward be alienacion of Angeo and Mayn, and willfull lesynge of all Normandy', setting it in opposition to the importance of the Hundred Years War.[214] The claim of her son is also dealt with as his legitimacy is questioned.[215] Attributing this to a rumour, and therefore to popular opinion, provides more strength for imposing this idea on a wide audience.

In emphasising his descent, Edward IV's own genealogical material also aimed to emphasise both a notion of continuity with the past and a sense of completion which was suggested by the use of continuations of the *Brut*. The Latin coronation roll which showed his ancient descent emphasises a sense of finality, showing seven lines of descent culminating in a large, decorated surround of Edward's name and a prayer.[216] The only space underneath

---

[214] *English Chronicle*, pp. 64-5.

[215] *English Chronicle*, pp. 78.

[216] 'Chronicle of the History of the World from Creation to Woden, with a Genealogy of Edward IV'.

Edward is taken up by his siblings. Another genealogy produced for Edward IV, between 1467 and 1469, after his marriage, provides more detail of his descent accompanied by short passages in English describing significant historical events of the kings of England.[217] More so than the earlier Latin piece, it focuses on history and descent relevant to England's crown, showing both the Plantagenet kings and the Mortimer line in his claim. Edward III is particularly prominent, accompanied by one of the longest descriptions. In this paragraph in particular, the piece implies the relevance of this past to England as a whole, and the ability of England to act collectively as, when Edward III was 'beyonde the see, hys peple of englond toke the kynge of Scottis'.[218] Emphasising a direct association with this past suggests recognition of it as central to the narrative of England, and a need to show Edward IV as the continuation of this history. More recent history is dealt with subtly. Richard II is reinstated, and Lancastrian guilt is implied by his reburial by Henry V. The three Henrys are included, but Henry VI's son is not. Henry IV is shown to have suffered 'greet trowble bothe of enemyes and of hys awne peple'.[219]

Despite the complete victory presented by the *English Chronicle* and genealogical pieces of the 1460s, the Yorkist use of historical accounts was called upon again in 1471 as Edward returned from exile. The *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV* recounts the heroic return of the rightful king, and was written almost immediately after the event. The account

---

[217] 'Genealogy of the Kings of England, to A.D. 1461', Oxford, Bodleian, MS. e Mus. 42, fols 031ᵛ-032ʳ, <http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/detail/ODLodl~1~1~44338~121622:Genealogy-of-the-Kings-of-England,-?qvq=w4s:/where/English;q:%3D%22Kings%2Band%2BQueens%2Bof%2BEngland%2B(Henry%2BIV%2Bto%2BRichard%2BIII).%22;lc:ODLodl~29~29,ODLodl~7~7,ODLodl~6~6,ODLodl~14~14,ODLodl~8~8,ODLodl~23~23,ODLodl~1~1,ODLodl~24~24&mi=4&trs=20> [accessed 19th July 2013].

[218] 'Genealogy of the Kings of England, to A.D. 1461', fol. 031ᵛ.

[219] 'Genealogy of the Kings of England, to A.D. 1461', fol. 032ʳ.

represents a need to re-establish Edward in the eyes of both his own subjects and other nations, as it exists in a short text prepared for foreign audiences, with topographical information, in both English and French, and a longer English version.[220] The original modern editor John Bruce suggests that the long domestic version was produced 'before the public mind had been filled with rumours' following Henry VI's death.[221] A number of features of the text support the view that it was prepared for popular consumption. The justification for Edward's claim, as in the *English Chronicle*, is a priority, as the king returns to challenge the 'usurpowre Henry', descended from the 'Usurpowr Henry of Derby'.[222] Also echoing the *English Chronicle*, an important concern for the *Arrivall* was to demonstrate that Edward was acting for the good of the realm. The king's offer of sparing the Earl of Warwick's life is made for the 'weal of peax and tranquilitie of the Realme of England', while, refusing, Warwick and his cause are therefore shown as the instigators of the 'cruell and mortall were'.[223] The *Arrivall* may therefore be seen as an example to would-be rebels, contrasting Edward's 'perfite victory' with the consistent defeat of his enemies.

Edward's progress through England is shown as largely un-resisted, and rebels' fear and lack of support meant they were easily disbanded, and cities easily reconciled with him.[224] This theme of reconciliation throughout the text, between king and subjects, or with his brother the Duke of Clarence, suggests that, as with his accession in 1461, Edward's return was accompanied by the gradual restoration of peace throughout the realm. Also in

---

[220] 'The short version of *The Arrival of Edward IV*', ed. by Richard Firth Green, *Speculum*, 56, 2 (1981), 324-36 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2846938> [accessed 20th February 2010] (pp. 324-5).

[221] John Bruce, 'Introduction', in *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Recouerye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI*, ed. by Bruce (London: Camden Society, 1858, modern reprint, Milton Keynes: Kessinger, 2010), p. 6.

[222] *Arrivall*, pp. 8-9.

[223] *Arrivall*, pp. 14, 17.

[224] *Arrivall*, pp. 12-3, 34.

common with the *English Chronicle*, Edward's English subjects are given a pivotal role in his success. Edward is shown to have landed with 'ij thowsand Englyshe men, well chosen', and to have quickly gained widespread support or submission.[225] In contrast, the responsibility for the 'great rebellion…contrye to the wele of the Realme' is attributed to the rebellious lords and usurping royal family, and their misguided or criminally-minded followers.[226] The audience is therefore encouraged to identify with Edward's supporters, as membership of the re-unified realm, and inclusion in the peace which belongs to Edward's 'frinds, alies…and all his people' depends upon the acceptance of this history. The devices employed in the short version of the *Arrivall* show that, although prepared for different audiences, the two texts have a great deal in common: the emphasis of Henry's wrongful usurpation would have been an important feature of a report to foreign courts, as would the re-establishment of peace in England. The short version does this selectively, and limits the descriptions of resistance. The important feature of the narrative is the king himself, attributing his quick success to God and showing him to have proved his right.[227] Although both texts are concerned with demonstrating England's re-established unity, the long version suggests more awareness of writing a specifically English history.

While a primary concern for the Yorkist histories was the careful portrayal of their own legitimacy, a particularly important aspect of both the use of history and the wide acceptance of a new national history was restricted by, and tied to a Lancastrian-based history: the legacy of Henry V. Unlike his father and his son, the histories of his life witness no decline. The Yorkist material could not, therefore, afford to contend with his legend. Instead, Henry's place in history was protected and even emphasised. His early death was

---

[225] *Arrivall*, p. 8.
[226] *Arrivall*, pp. 33-4.
[227] 'The short version of *The Arrival of Edward IV*', pp. 326-32.

met with a sense of loss. William Worcestre, an eye-witness of losses in France, wrote his *Boke of Noblesse* during the 1450s, as a commentary on the decline of England since the death of Henry V. Recalling the emphasis placed by Lydgate on the Trojan ancestry of the English, Worcestre aimed to encourage Henry VI to follow his father's example.[228] Worcestre's expression of the dissatisfaction with Henry VI's government, and the losses of England's continental possessions were compatible with the justification of Edward IV's accession. Both Worcestre's *Boke* and Livio's earlier *Vita* were produced because of the divisions in Henry's government over the war, and the *English Chronicle* demonstrates that this division allowed for the rise of the Duke of York.[229] Further, the chronicle is able to appeal to the sense of loss which had already been attached to the nation's recent history to emphasise the Duke's concern for England. Losses in France are attributed to Henry's lords and queen, and are part of York's appeal to clear his name against those who would put England into her enemies' hands.[230]

The success of Henry V, and the failure of his son, was already part of the popular version of recent history, and was a necessary part of Yorkist history. This also helped to reconcile Lancastrian historians to the new dynasty. Capgrave would have found that his careful treatment of Henry IV and his hope that England would regain its status against her enemies were still acceptable. Capgrave's last significant historical work, the *Abbreuiacion of Chronicles*, is believed to have been composed over a number of years and completed in the first years of Edward IV's reign, and is dedicated to the new king.[231] The dedication declares that the 'trew loueres of Þis lond desire… Þat al Þe erroure which was browte in be Herry Þe

---

[228] Hughes, pp. 36-7.
[229] Hughes, p. 34.
[230] *English Chronicle*, pp. 82-4.
[231] Peter J. Lucas, 'Introduction', in Capgrave, *Abbreuiacion of Chronicles*, ed. by Lucas (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. xxiii, xliii.

Fourte may be redressed be Edward Þe Fourte', seeing the number of his title as a 'grete conueniens' and associating the new dynasty with a love of England.[232] The history itself, in direct contrast to his *Liber Illustribus Henricis*, shows Henry IV's reign to have been characterised by rebellion, disunity and outside threats.[233] The account of Henry V is, however, consistent with treatment elsewhere. Peter Lucas suggests that this text may have been prepared for a wider audience than the king. Although the *Abbreuiacion* only survives in two main manuscripts, dedication to significant individuals was intended to lend more strength to a text, while features of the text suggest that Capgrave expected a wider audience, providing straightforward prose with dramatic exaggerations of key events.[234]

It also seems that he was writing for a specifically English audience. The structure of the text, beginning as a 'universal chronicle', gradually narrows to concentrate entirely on England.[235] The effect of this is to suggest English prominence through the descent of the text from biblical and imperial history to national history, identifying England as God's chosen nation. Capgrave's text encourages the acceptance of its narrative through demonstrating a collective ownership of the past. The threat posed by England's enemies is emphasised, altering details of events for example redirecting the blame for the Breton attack on Plymouth in order to focus on France.[236] Enemies, rebels and traitors are all shown to be a danger to the realm as a whole, through Glyndwr's 'mech harm upon Þe borderes of Ynglond', and the fighting at Shrewsbury 'to grete harm of Þis nacion'.[237] Therefore, although a stark contrast may be drawn between Capgrave's two accounts of Henry IV, there was significant

---

[232] Capgrave, *Abbreuiacion*, p. 9.
[233] Capgrave, *Abbreuiacion*, pp. 214-223.
[234] Lucas, 'Introduction', pp. xxv-xxvii, xc-xciii.
[235] Lucas, 'Introduction', pp. xciii; Capgrave, *Abbreuiacion*, p. 223.
[236] Lucas, 'Introduction', p. xc.
[237] Capgrave, *Abbreuiacion*, pp. 218-22.

compatibility between the existing elements of the English narrative and the new Yorkist narrative.

The texts and historical material involved in the establishment of new dynasties in England in 1399 and 1461 have a number of features in common which suggest that their authors' and patrons' awareness of a need for encouraging and directing national sentiment. They also demonstrate, over the course of the century, the increasing importance of popular will in the strength of kingship. Although often presenting opposing narratives, the examples cited, each to a different extent and with varying dissemination, all represent an attempt to integrate their narrative into an existing idea of national history. This was also the case for the establishment of Henry VII, as historical literature not only expressed an awareness of a wider national narrative of which fifteenth-century divisions were an important part, but also mirrored previous campaigns in how events were portrayed. Just as the mistakes of Richard II and Henry VI were central to establishing the legitimacy of their replacements, so too were the wars of the fifteenth century, and the defamation of the previous king, at the heart of the new layer of England's historical narrative in 1485. This therefore reinforced the place of the 'Wars of the Roses' in England's collective memory, as the celebration of Henry VII was dependent upon the emphasis of the divisions from which he saved his subjects. As well dominating early symbolism in the form of a union of the red and white roses, the wars were also prominent in the justification of Henry VII's accession.

Writing in around 1500, Bernard André's account of the wars of the previous reigns, and the 'storms of those times', emphasises the collective impact of the conflict, stating that 'England came ablaze with great dissentions and upheavals'.[238] In this context, Henry VII's

---

[238] André, pt. 16.

desire to restore peace and unity is shown to be a concern for all Englishmen, as he declares that he is 'moved by pity for the protracted, ruinous captivity of the realm and people of England'.[239] More effectively, upon landing, Henry addresses England directly, praising her as 'mistress of war and peace', who surpasses 'all the nations enclosed by the great ocean', acknowledging the 'countless tragedies' she had suffered.[240] Not only does this emphasise the wars as a single experience of suffering by all England, it also imposes a memory of Henry's victory as a collective English experience of salvation. Henry is also shown to praise England's population as 'men of holy character' who have 'never received adequate praise'. This at once both defines nationhood by assigning a characteristic and acknowledging a shared, praiseworthy history, and suggests a sense of shared experience. Upon his accession, the victory is also shown to be a cause of national celebration, as the author's poem desires that 'all our land rejoice today'.[241] This celebration is also acknowledged in the later work of Polydore Vergil, as it suggests that, with the accession of Henry VII, the people were 'assured that the day had dawned upon which the fount and seedbed of factions had been exhausted'.[242]

Although André's history was not published, its production in the climate of Henry VII's legitimisation campaign suggests that it reflected much of what the king intended for his own portrayal. The author makes it clear that a great deal of his information had been gained through what he had heard. An important part of both Edward IV and Henry VII's use of origin myths, prophecy and prediction was also involved in Henry's use of more recent history. André records Henry VI's prediction concerning the young Henry Tudor, that

---

[239] André, pt. 26.
[240] André, pt. 33.
[241] André, pt. 40.
[242] *Anglica Historia*, book XXVI, pt. 1.

'someday he would assume the helm of state, and was destined to hold everything in his grasp '.[243] In the same way that Henry was shown to fulfil the prophecy of the return of Cadwallader's heir, he is also shown here to have fulfilled that of the last Lancastrian king, therefore strengthening his claim and, emphasised in the above extract, providing his accession with a sense of historical completion. Its role in his accession is further emphasised as André suggests that Edward IV had heard, and feared this prediction, implying that it was well-known.[244]

Perhaps the most important aspect of Henry VII's use of the recent past for his own establishment was the notion of the union of Lancaster and York. André identifies this as the main reason for Henry's council to agree to his marriage to Elizabeth, deciding that 'a single harmonious dynasty be made out of these two families which once suffered from mortal hatred'. Again, the wars are made the memory of all of England, as the account states that 'great happiness rose throughout all the realm. For previously…a vehement and undying hatred had come close to destroying those right noble houses'. The account also records the building of 'bonfires far and wide', and 'incredible pleasure for the entire realm'. Thus, the marriage is related directly to the shared experience of the wars, and is itself thought of as a collective and unifying celebration.[245] The importance of the union is further demonstrated in the birth of Prince Arthur, a sign of favour bestowed on the 'sweetest and brightest roses, I mean the red and the white'.[246]

The emphasis placed upon recent history, the importance of the wars and the concluding union of Henry and Elizabeth, meant that the wars remained a significant aspect

---

[243] André, pt. 9.

[244] André, pts 21-25.

[245] André, pt. 44.

[246] André, pt. 47.

of Henry VIII's own legitimacy and association with England's past. John Skelton, tutor to Henry VIII as prince, specifically advocated the study of his ancestors, advising him to 'read books, look through chronicles, study histories, commit them to memory'.[247] He also acknowledged the relevance of this past to the king in his own repetition, in a poem for his coronation, of the union of the 'rose both white and rede', resulting 'in one rose', the person of Henry VIII.[248] Stephen Hawes also acknowledged and emphasised this at his accession. His coronation poem for Henry VIII celebrates the king's descent, perpetuating the symbolism of Henry's parents, and drawing attention to his 'two tytles in one', the result of 'Whan the rede rose toke the whyte in maryage', providing Henry with 'vnyd tytyls and worthy lygnage'.[249] Hawes therefore identifies Henry's descent from both houses as a significant aspect of his accession, worthy of celebration. The importance of the union is further emphasised later in the poem, both remembering the wars and, through this, investing the current peace in the new king as it recalls the end of 'our trouble' brought by the union of 'the rose so red / And of the whyte', a 'ryall tree' planted by God, 'the rancour to downe throwe'. Henry, the child of this marriage, is identified as the 'floure that doth this grace dystyll'.[250] Printed in 1509 by Wynkyn de Worde, the piece emphasised to its reading audience, and through them the recipients of its verbal transmission, the priorities of the new king's imagery, and appealed to popular knowledge of the turbulence of the previous century to invest consent and participation in the coronation.

---

[247] Skelton, *Speculum Principis*, (1501), in, 'The Latin Writings of John Skelton', ed. by Carlson, pp. 39-42; Starkey, *Henry: Virtuous Prince,* p. 126-7.

[248] Skelton, 'A Lawde and Prayse made for our Souereigne Lord the Kyng', in *John Skelton: The Complete English Poems*, ed. by John Scattergood (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), p. 110.

[249] Stephen Hawes, *A ioyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall souerayne lorde kynge Henry the eyght* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509), fol. 1^r, in *EEBO*, [accessed 29th November 2012].

[250] Hawes, fol. 2^r.

In common with Bernard André, the works of both Skelton and Hawes also express and encourage an awareness of the wars as a collective history. Skelton recalls that the past had 'browght Englond in wo', while Hawes's poem suggests England's collective participation, and joy, in the coronation. It invests the happiness of the realm with Henry's lineage and the end of the wars, beginning with the instruction 'Englonde be gladde', and suggesting, through the use of 'our trouble', the collective ownership of both the turbulent past and the celebration of the new king, and the ability of England to express a single opinion. The combination of the image of Henry VIII as the 'one rose', and the celebration of the end of England's shared trouble, also has the effect of investing the collective good of the realm in the person of the king. The portrayal of the dynastic wars as a collective national past continued into Henry VIII's reign, as Thomas More's *History of Richard III*, of around 1513, recalled the 'inward war among ourself' which had caused the 'effusion of the ancient noble blood of this realm', and of 'English blood', 'to the great enfeebling of this noble land'.[251] Also in common with the coronation poem, More's history further emphasises both the shared English experience of the wars, and the national importance of the union of Henry and Elizabeth, describing the 'infinite benefit to the realm' of the 'conjunction of those two bloods in one, whose several titles had long enquieted the land'.[252]

Another significant aspect of Henry VII's legitimisation that remained important to Henry VIII was the reputation of Richard III. As discussed above, the establishment of new dynasties in both 1399 and 1461 involved the justification of the removal of the previous king. Claiming legitimacy through the Lancastrian line, histories celebrated the last Lancastrian king. Thus, the treatment of Edward IV was difficult to negotiate. André begins

---

[251] Thomas More, *The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems*, ed. by Richard S. Sylvester (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), p. 72.
[252] More, *History of Richard III*, p. 93.

by describing the ambitions of Edward as a desire for 'tyranny over the realm', but later shows the king as a 'right puissant and magnificent prince'. Similarly, Edward Hall's later *Union* demonstrates the difficulties of celebrating two opposing houses: fault is found with both families.[253] Thomas More's description of Edward IV both acknowledged the peace of his reign and widespread love of Englishmen for the king, and the discord 'for King Henry's sake the Sixth, whom he deposed'.[254] However, treatment of Richard III is consistent. Ralph Griffiths suggests that the defamation of Richard was 'an essential element of the national myth', necessary for Henry VII to portray the previous reign as an interruption of good rule.[255] Bernard André's account of Richard describes not just his evil actions but his character, his murder of Henry VI and his pleasure in it, 'for bloody crimes pleased him down to his very fingertips', following this with 'many evils'.[256] Similarly the 'bloodthirsty' king is also shown to have 'cut down' his nephews. The survival and development of the myth of Richard III during the reign of Henry VIII is demonstrated by Thomas More's history. It is suggested that More's text was more motivated by a desire to treat the subject of tyranny rather than to criticise the previous dynasty and provide further legitimacy for the Tudor dynasty.[257] However, his perpetuation and development of the evils of Richard's reign demonstrate that such myths were prevalent at the time. More's portrayal of the king, like that of André, treats both his deeds and his character, emphasising a false and deceptive nature, and his crimes, in terms of their effect on the realm, suggesting that 'the king's greedy appetite was insatiable and everywhere over all the realm intolerable', implying unified

---

[253] *Hall's Chronicle*, pp. 1-3.

[254] More, *History of Richard III*, pp. 3-5.

[255] Griffiths, *This Royal Throne of Kings*, pp. 15-6.

[256] André, pt. 16.

[257] Sylvester, 'Introduction', in More, *History of Richard III*, p. xv.

opinion against him.[258] Although the history was not published and, at least within More's own lifetime, was not widely circulated, the text does claim to reflect popular opinion. The death of Henry VI is attributed to Richard, 'as men constantly say'.[259] Similarly, More acknowledges that there were a number of theories on the death of the princes, but that he chose the one most probable.[260] André's account also suggests that the evils of Richard's reign were well-known, and it seems that this may have been the case. The Bristol *Kalendar* records in a marginal note in Ricart's hand, therefore added before 1508, that in the year 1484 the sons of Edward IV were 'put to scylence in the Towre of London', suggesting at least some dissemination of the rumour.[261]

Conclusion

Throughout the fifteenth century, and even before, historical writing asserted England's ancient past and temporal depth, and demonstrated the writers' awareness of their own identity. Furthermore, there seems to be a significant attempt, particularly with the introduction of printed material, for several writers to establish a single narrative of English history. Print made the number of varied pieces of earlier work more widely available. Furthermore, a great deal of the writing of the fifteenth century was politically charged, produced under the need to legitimise dynastic changes. They do not suggest, with such disagreement, that there can have been a 'master narrative'. Yet these works consistently sought to present events as the collective experience of the nation. They continued and contributed to a layered narrative of England's past which, by the sixteenth century, was important in defining English nationhood. The way in which histories were written also show

---

[258] More, *History of Richard III*, p. 73.

[259] *History of Richard III*, p. 9.

[260] *History of Richard III*, p. 85.

[261] *Kalendar*, p. 46.

that a shared past was considered to constitute the nation itself. Identification of the protagonists of texts as 'Englishmen' or 'our Englishmen' allowed for the limited experience of past events to be translated to all members of the nation, and implied that to be English was to adhere to and claim ownership of the recorded history, or be excluded from membership. The involvement of local material, too, largely confirms widespread participation in nationhood through the recording or performing of the past.

3. Personification of Nationhood

The cult of saints, particularly during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, dominated everyday life and provided special events and opportunities for travel.[1] Saints inhabited both the world of royal piety and display, and the sphere of popular devotion. They personified both personal and communal faith and celebration, and appeared in every available media. Their lives were known by the literate and illiterate, communicated in writing and church service. As such, the status of individual saints would have been an important means of communication between the crown and subjects, a cult which bound all devotees together in collective veneration, which demonstrated both elite and popular engagement with the nation. The importance of historical individuals as protagonists of nationhood was demonstrated in the previous chapter. Perhaps more so than these figures, the status of individual saints in England demonstrates both royal investment in the nation, and wider participation in national membership.[2]

The relationship between such figures and England varied, due to the circumstances of the development of their cults. Several saints were, at different times, named as patrons of England, all of which maintained their relevance into the fifteenth century. Others were invested with special concern for England's welfare. It has been suggested that some cults were replaced in their popularity as others came to prominence: Simon Walker believes, for example, that popular recognition of Henry VI after his death replaced that of Thomas Becket

---

[1] Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580*, 2nd edn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), p. 155.

[2] Calhoun, p. 5.

as the most prominent in England.[3] Other saints were placed together through imagery which, itself, emphasised their national status. The process of canonisation did not lend itself to the national association of saints, relying on the official sanction of Rome. However, the associations of cults with the nation were rooted in the actions of the saints, during their lives or after their deaths. The individuals that inspired the most popular devotion were often not officially canonised, as popularity was less effective than money and influence.[4] As the number of 'political saints' celebrated in England suggests, and the cult of Henry VI confirms, official appointment of saints was not necessary for the development of England-wide cults. As the process became more complex and unclear, 'St Henry' was an example of a new popularly-appointed saint, whose prominence coincided with both the need for legitimacy, and the greater means to use it.

National identity beyond the 1530s was influenced by religious changes, the early instigators of which placed particular emphasis on iconoclasm and hostility towards saint cults. The new character of the relationship between the English crown and the church was expressed through an investment in appropriate religious figures, as the imagery of the post-Reformation Henry VIII and Edward VI developed associations with figures such as King David.[5] However, prior to the Reformation, the exercise of traditional religion, through pilgrimage, imagery and devotion to saints, also provided material for the crown's association with the nation. It was also a means of participating in nationhood, through the investment of

---

[3] Simon Walker, 'Political Saints in Late Medieval England', in *Political Culture in Late Medieval England: Essays by Simon Walker* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 198-222 (p. 204).

[4] Sarah Salih, *A Companion to Middle English Hagiography* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2006), pp. 3-5; Michael Goodich, 'Biography 1000-1350', in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. Deborah Mauskopf Deliyannis (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 353-85 (p. 366).

[5] John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1989), pp. 54-115.

collective devotion, or even the nation itself, in such individuals. The late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries saw wide celebration of cults that had long been associated with the fate of England, but which received encouragement and development, and benefitted from literary attempts, aided by print, to standardise and confirm their status. Literature produced during this period made the earlier identification of saints which acted on England's behalf more available. Although Henry VI's cult was newly-established, his traditional celebration suggests that it was within this framework that his cult was developed.

This chapter will examine the celebration of saints, and consider the extent to which these figures were seen to be 'English', either instead of, or as well as, any royal, local or other associations. It will be argued that the recognition and investment of nationality in individuals was an important aspect of the expression of nationhood prior to the 1530s, and was collectively undertaken, although it often depended upon royal and ecclesiastical agency. This will be demonstrated both in the nature of their celebration and in the consistency of their images and use. Saints of English origin occupy a particularly important place in expressions of nationhood, as figures such as Edward the Confessor were recognised not only for sanctity but also for their special interest in England. Through this interventionist role, they represented England's past and participation in a national community. Such saints may owe their status to well-established royal patronage. However, challengers of royal authority also came to be seen as protectors of English interests. As Walker shows, the cults of 'political saints' owed their survival to a sense of unity, rather than rebellion.[6] A significant political figure of historical and devotional importance, Henry VI's cult reflected royal, local and wider interest, and to a certain extent developed independently from royal favour.

---

[6] Walker, p. 205.

This chapter will also explore the significance St George, agreeing with, and developing the assertions of Ronald Hutton that the saint was one of the most important figures in England's liturgical calendar. It will be shown that recognition of the saint in literature was as England's patron, and that the widespread use of George as a local patron was part of a broader, national celebration. Although used side-by-side on at least one royal occasion, the cults of St George and Henry VI were markedly different: while Henry VI's cult was a recent development, St George, not a native but adopted as an established saint, had been associated with England since at least the reign of Edward I. The cult of St George compared to that of Henry VI was also evidently vastly more popular and entrenched within English celebratory life. However, elements of both cults will suggest that the interaction between the 'local' and the 'national' was manifested in two ways: the adoption of such figures may be seen as recognition of a national cult, while local uses suggest compatibility between local and national tradition. Henry VIII's own personal devotion to St George was instrumental in his survival, and suggests that it was part of the king's intentions of his own image as a representation of the nation himself.

I. English Saints

The events of the 1530s initiated changes in the relationship between the Church and the English people and redefined the way in which religion mattered to national identity. However, traditional religious devotion, which the Reformation displaced, was also an integral aspect of English nationhood. The Hundred Years War, which required widespread popular acceptance and support, had helped to develop the role of the church as a means of participating in the nation. Alongside other efforts to engage the support of English subjects

as a 'domestic front', the clergy were required to ask for the prayers of their congregations.[7]

Prayers for the king had long been part of daily worship, and church support for international

ventures had begun in the thirteenth century. Under Edward III, instructions for services were

communicated through bishops down to parish priests. The effect of this nationwide

organisation of prayers and processions was to both increase awareness of wars and involve

the wider population in the otherwise remote foreign action.[8] It would also have served to

give parishes a sense of belonging to a wider community, membership of which was defined

by the subject of its prayers. By the end of the Hundred Years War, then, the role of devotion

as a means of encouraging national membership was well-established.

Routine celebrations, in the form of prayers, imagery and public display, also

provided national symbols. They identified saints in whom nationhood was invested, or who

represented England and English people, either by their actions while living or their

posthumous intercession. Saints Edward the Confessor, Edmund and Thomas Becket all

received acknowledgement of their association with aspects of nationhood. The roles of

saints, and the expectations of their patronage, confirmed the unity and collective community

of the English, and thus, through the framework of traditional devotion, at least the producers

of hagiographic and historical literature were able to think in terms of the nation. The

increase in writing activity in the fifteenth century, and most significantly the introduction of

print, served to circulate these ideas more widely, highlight the importance of these roles, and

witnessed attempts at standardisation of knowledge and worship. It is also possible that local

---

[7] W. R. Jones, 'The English Church and Royal Propaganda', pp. 18-20.

[8] Alison K. McHardy, 'Some Reflections on Edward III's use of Propaganda', in *The Age of Edward III*, ed. by James S. Bothwell (York: York Medieval Press, 2001), pp. 171-92 (pp. 172-5); Clive Burgess, 'An Institute for All Seasons: The Late Medieval English College', in *The Late Medieval English College and its Context*, ed. by Burgess and Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2008), pp. 3-27 (pp. 16-17).

commemoration of particular saints provided a means by which communities were able to engage with the nation. Pilgrimages, too, provided the means by which English subjects could participate. It is clear that both local commemoration and the mobilisation of devotees as pilgrims were participating in a widespread, shared experience. It also seems that, with the placement of images and the particular association of saints with each other, there was, to a certain extent, an awareness of their wider, national significance.

The printing of both existing and new historical material highlighted the association of saints with the fate of England since its earliest times. Saints were also the subject of specific pieces during this period, as print catered for the universal interest in devotion by producing, or reproducing, hagiographic works, in the form of collections or individual saint's lives. While the saints that occupied the liturgical calendar were not at all limited by their own country of origin, these works highlighted an interest in identifying those which were specifically English. *The Kalendre of the Newe Legende of Englande*, a collection of saints' lives translated and abridged from an earlier work and printed in 1516, took as its subject the 'sayntys of Englande Irelande Scotlande and Wales'.[9] Such a choice of subject, and concentration on saints associated with these lands, was not a new one. It belonged to a tradition of hagiographical collections, of which the *Golden Legend* was the most prominent and most prolifically printed, that aimed to provide standardised guides, for example for parish churches, the primary means by which popular knowledge of saints was gained. The text itself translated and abbreviated an earlier Latin work, and ultimately derived from the fourteenth-century John of Tynemouth's *Sanctilogium Angliae, Walliae, Scotiae et*

---

[9] Walter Hilton, 'Prologue', *Here begynneth the kalendre of the newe legende of Englande* (London: Richard Pynson, 1516), in *EEBO* [accessed 14th May 2011].

Hiberniae, originally drawn from a range of sources.[10] Before print, then, there existed

attempts to standardise knowledge, which demonstrate an awareness of their national

associations. The increased literary activity of the late-fifteenth century also saw translations

into English, such as Osbern Bokenham's 'englische boke', produced around the 1450s,

which translated and added to the *Golden Legend.* Although the text's prologue was lost,

Bokenham had elsewhere suggested that it was produced at the insistence of friends.[11]

Importantly, it does seem that the standardisation and distribution of knowledge through

parish churches was a reasonable goal, as an inventory of St Edmund's church, Sarum, listed

in its inventory in 1472 'Item j boke of the life of Seints'.[12] Although the volume itself is not

identified, the ownership of such a book demonstrates local knowledge and the possibility

that community instruction through verbal transmission might have taken place, as Caxton

had expected of his material. The *Newe Legende* represents continuing interest in, and wider

distribution of such instructional work into the sixteenth century, enabled by print. In this

venture, it was accompanied by other texts such as the closely-related *Nova Legenda Angliae*,

printed the same year by Wynkyn de Worde. More significantly, as the *Newe Legende*

explains, there was also a concern for greater accessibility 'for theym that vnderstande not the

Laten tonge', suggesting, as did Bokenham's work earlier, that there was a greater interest in

English-language texts, and popular demand for reading such material.[13] That the two 1516

texts were arranged in alphabetical order, and not according to the liturgical calendar as in the

---

[10] Michael Lapidge, *The Cult of St Swithun* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 745-747, 777-8.

[11] Karen A. Winstead, 'Osbern Bokenham's "englische boke": Re-forming Holy Women', in *Form and Reform: Reading Across the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Shannon Gayk and Kathleen Tonry (Ohio: Ohio State University, 2011), pp. 67-87 (p. 68).

[12] *Churchwardens' Accounts of S. Edmund and S. Thomas, Sarum, 1443-1702, with other documents*, ed. by Henry James Fowle Swayne (Salisbury: Bennett Brothers, 1896), pp. 3-4.

[13] 'Prologue', *Newe Legende*, 1516.

Sanctilogium, also suggests that their production was motivated by popular interest, intended as reference texts.

Before examining the representation of England by individual saints, it is worth considering briefly how their own identities were handled. The identification of saints with nations was a common element in historical and hagiographic material, and it seems that, certainly by the end of the fifteenth century, there existed a strong sense of certain saints belonging to nation. Eamon Duffy observes that the *Newe Legende* 'promoted pride and devotion to English saints'.[14] Although it would seem inaccurate to suggest this, given that it includes English saints among the Scottish, Irish and Welsh, Duffy's statement is supported by the text's explanation of national labels. The title employs 'England' in its all-encompassing capacity, because 'other countreys Irelande Scotlande and Wales of veray right owe to be subiecte & obedyent to this Realme of Englonde', and so 'England' may be used for convenience to mean all four, as well as England itself. The *Newe Legende*'s identification of patron saints of the four separate realms will be treated below, but what is interesting its selection of saints. It indicates that the work includes 'nat oonly those sayntes that were borne in theyse Countreys', but also those who had undertaken 'great labourys...for the saluacyon of the people of this Realme', for example St Augustine. It advocates devotion to all of them, because they have 'laboured i[n] this Cou[n]try for ye helthe of ye people'.[15] Firstly, this is important as it demonstrates a distinction between native and non-native saints, while also acknowledging that it did not prevent association with England. The importance of birth for their own identity is evident as the text indicates those born in England. There is thus a sense of inclusion of all native saints. As the text argues that they should all be honoured,

---

[14] Duffy, p. 79.

[15] 'Prologue', *Newe Legende*, 1516.

even the saints whose patronage may be considered localised rather than 'national', for example St Cuthbert in Durham, are shown to have contributed to the well-being of all English people. However, the text also emphasises the role of other saints, who it seems can belong to a people due to their work on its behalf. The notion that saints could act on behalf of the welfare of all inhabitants also expresses a belief that all Englishmen had ashared interest and experience.

The text's account of St Anselm also suggests that the saints themselves were able to act collectively. St Anselm's inclusion in the text is an example of a non-native being considered a saint of England due to his work during his lifetime. Born in Aosta, Anselm was Abbot of Bec in Normandy before becoming Archbishop of Canterbury during the reign of William II. Although his tenure was characterised by his defence of the rights of the church, the *Newe Legende* recounts his conflict with the king and his exile in terms which suggest his concern for England. In his vision, 'the seyntys of Englond complayned to our Lorde', who gave a burning arrow to St Alban.[16] Not only were the English unified in the interests of the saints, but an interest in England unified the saints themselves. André's account of Henry VII's arrival in 1485 also acknowledges the importance of the national associations of saints, having attributed his victory at Bosworth to 'you national saints' (sancti indigentes) 'by whose joint will I proven triumphant'.[17] Unlike the *Newe Legende*, only birth seems to be considered acceptable qualification for collective intervention here. However, it suggests that native status gave the saints an inescapable interest in the fate of the realm.

This acknowledgement of the continuing interest of saints in the fate of a nation, crucially, highlighted their individual representation of national interests. Several works

---

[16] *Newe Legende*, 1516, fol. 6ʳ.
[17] André, pts 38-39.

explicitly name patrons of realms and peoples, investing them with a specific responsibility for a nation. As shown in the previous chapter, historical writing produced during the Hundred Years War and onwards emphasised the shared experience particularly of past military engagements. The consistent emphasis of the participation of 'Englishmen' in victories appropriated the achievements of relatively few men. This was also, just as consistently, accompanied by the invocation of St Edward, or St George, as battle cries, associating them directly with English victories. The cry of 'A saynt Edward A saynt George' named together was often associated with the victories of 'Englishmen', while the use of St George alone as a battle cry was even more common.[18] The naming of St Edward as a particular advocate of English interests suggests widespread agreement in his role as a representative of nationhood. More explicitly than references in historical accounts of battles, religious material also demonstrates the investment of collective interests of a realm in individual saints. Specifically, the *Newe Legende* states that 'the people of Irelande haue seynt Patryke...for that he conuerted moche people theyre', indicating that the Irish were devoted to a saint whose actions were associated with their own past and welfare. Likewise, 'in Scotlande the people there haue seynt Nynian' or 'Tronyan', and 'in Wales they haue deuocyon to seynt Dauyd'. Finally, the *Newe Legende* recognises that the people of England 'honour the gloryous martyr seynt George as theyr chief patrone' by whom they have been 'p[re]seruyd agaynste theyre enemyes', demonstrating the investment of the collective interests of a people in an individual saint.[19] Further, the *Newe Legende* shows that such devotion was thought to be a characteristic of these peoples' identities, or at least a means for

---

[18] Anonymous, *Cronycles of the Londe of Englond* (Antwerp: Gerard de Leew, 1493), fol. 126ᵛ, in *EEBO* [accessed 15th July 2011]; Higden, 1528, fol. 123ᵛ; John Rastell, *The Pastyme of people: The cronycles of dyuers realmys and most specyally of the realme of England* (London: John Rastell, 1530), p. 96, in *EEBO* [accessed 15th July 2011].

[19] 'Prologue', *Newe Legende*, 1516.

observers and readers to assign identities. It is shown both to unite a people in their recognition of patronage, and differentiate them from those whose devotion was to another.

The notion that England could be represented by an individual saint was well-established. However, there also seems to have been a variety of saints appointed to this role. The *Newe Legende* acknowledges the patronage of St George, while the protective role of St Edward the Confessor is clear from the use of battle cries. *The Vertue of the Masse*, written by John Lydgate and so originally a product of the first half of the fifteenth century, and printed in 1520, provides a verse summary of the roles of several significant saints.[20] Acknowledging national patron saints, the verse names 'Albon for England' and 'saynt Denys for Fraunce'. As St Edmund, the pre-conquest king of East Anglia, is named 'for royall gouernayle' it is reasonable to suggest that St Alban is not meant as the patron of only the English crown, this taken by Edmund, but of England. In contrast to histories of the same period or later, the verse's reference to St Edward seems to localise his influence to his shrine, stating that 'at westmynster saynt Edwarde shall not fayle'. To an extent, the *Newe Legende* agrees on the subject of St Alban's role on England's behalf. In the account of St Anselm, in response to the complaints of the 'seyntys of Englond', 'our lorde gaue a burnynge Arowe to seynt Albon'.[21] Alban is appointed to respond to the plea of the saints, entrusted with England's fate. However, the text does not give him the same prominence as does Lydgate. Popular awareness of the roles of the saints also suggested that at least the significance of St Alban was acknowledged. *The English Register of Godstow Nunnery*, compiled around 1450, records a metrical calendar which names 'oure first martyr, Seynt

---

[20] John Lydgate, *The Vertue of the Masse* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1520), fol. 11ᵛ, in *EEBO* [accessed 15ᵗʰ July 2011].
[21] *Newe Legende*, 1516, fol. 6ʳ.

Albone'.[22] The existence of such a piece, and in English, indicates the importance of the liturgical calendar at all levels, and shows again the concern for accessible hagiographical material before print. Even if not read by large numbers, it represents the knowledge communicated through local parish churches. The use of 'oure' here suggests that the composer recognised membership of a community unified by devotion to St Alban, and expresses a sense of the saint belonging to it. Although not necessarily the patron, St Alban is given importance as their first.

Elsewhere, for example in the symbolism and pageantry employed during the celebration of Henry VI's dual monarchy in Fabian's chronicle, the parallel representation of England and France, echoing Lydgate, is done through the use of saints, but naming St George, not St Alban, alongside St Denis.[23] Rather than establishing a more unified investment of nationhood in a single figure, it seems that print facilitated the wider circulation of earlier stages, or varied perspectives, of national patronage. The previous chapter indicated an awareness of the nation's temporal depth, and it is within this context that the more prominent English saint cults which had a claim on national representation were developed. Cults that had been appropriated for the patronage of England, which were evident in the fifteenth century, were rooted in earlier periods. Of particular prominence were the cults of St Edward the Confessor and St Edmund, the pre-conquest king of East Anglia. The two kings often appear together in imagery of particularly the fifteenth century, their obvious association with each other that of royalty. However, they have both been identified as one-time patron saints of England, saw widespread recognition, and also appear alongside other figures, including St George and Henry VI. Although St George became significantly

---

[22] 'Metrical Church Kalendar', *The English Register of Godstow Nunnery, Part 1*, ed. by Andrew Clark (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner and Co., 1905), pp. 13-24 (p. 18, line 425).
[23] Fabian, 1533, fols 184ʳ-184ᵛ.

more prominent, such associations suggest that they represent earlier stages in the development of national saint cults, and were able to exist alongside, rather than be usurped by, later developments.[24]

The use of St Edward as a battle cry for English armies suggests at least a military nature to his patronage, and this aspect of his cult is alluded to in the texts that transmitted his life. Although not known for military prowess, it seems to have been as a symbol of resistance to foreign invasion that he came to be associated with English armies. The *Golden Legend*'s account of St Edward is dominated by the Danish threat to England before and during his lifetime, and emphasises the saint's opposition to the 'thraldom of the Danes', including his posthumous assistance in their defeat.[25] It is through his association with foreign war that his use by the English crown is also emphasised, for example during Edward I's wars against the Scots, when the captured regalia of Scotland was offered 'by kynge Edwarde at the shrine of saynt Edwarde'.[26] Similarly, following Agincourt, Henry V also made an offering there.[27] Further parading of the relationship between the English crown and St Edward demonstrates that the association was carefully cultivated. Henry VI's inheritance of two crowns presented an opportunity to emphasise his lineage, and this was done by direct appeal, in the form of a ballad at his coronation feast, to St Edward and St Louis (the French King Louis IX) to protect the new king, suggesting that Edward symbolised the English royal line from which Henry, the 'braunche borne of your blessed blode', was descended. More publicly, local pageants, staged in London for Henry VI and in Coventry for his son Prince

---

[24] Rebecca Pinner, 'Medieval Images of St Edmund in Norfolk Churches', in *St Edmund, King and Martyr: Changing Images of a Medieval Saint*, ed. by Anthony Bale (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2009), pp. 111-132 (p. 117).

[25] Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea sanctorum* (London: Caxton,1483), fols 322ᵛ-332ʳ, in *EEBO* [accessed 2ⁿᵈ May 2011].

[26] Fabian, 1533, fol. 64ʳ.

[27] *Chronicle of London, to 1483*, pp. 101-2.

Edward and later Edward IV's son, also Edward, highlighted the representation of the English royal line by their namesake. In both cities, the genealogical relevance of St Edward was prominent. In Coventry, the figure of St Edward addressed his namesake in 1474 as a 'prynce of oure lyne comyn dissent', while in London for Henry VI's coronation two trees bore 'the genelogy of saynt Edward, and...saynt Lewys'.[28] The association of successive kings with St Edward suggests that his primary role was the representation of English royalty, rather than England itself, and this is supported during the same coronation feast in England, as it seems Saints George and Denis are employed to personify the two realms.

The widespread prominence of St Edmund, indicated by over 60 parish churches which bore his name, and which was still evident in the early sixteenth century, was also at least partly the result of royal encouragement.[29] Despite his own rule being geographically limited during the period when England had, as the *Golden Legend* explains, 'dyuers kynges for the londe was departed', St Edmund quickly became a source of political and royal legitimacy.[30] Rebecca Pinner suggests that his cult may have been taken up by the Danes as a form of reconciliation, whose invasion Edmund resisted, and by following Saxon rulers, and therefore locates his subsequent visual cult, both local and national, within this political context.[31] In common with St Edward, Edmund received the direct attention of English kings, his shrine visited a number of times by Edward I, whose banner was touched by the saint's relics, while he also became associated with Henry II, Henry III and Richard II.[32] During the fifteenth century, Edmund was also employed in support of Henry VI, providing a basis for his later, posthumous association with the pre-conquest saint. The abbey of Bury St

---

[28] *REED: Coventry*, p. 54; Fabian, 1533, fol. 186ᵛ.
[29] Bale, 'Introduction: St Edmund's Medieval Lives', in *St Edmund, King and Martyr*, pp. 1-26 (p.13).
[30] De Voragine, 1483, fol. 377ʳ.
[31] Pinner, pp. 117-18.
[32] Bale, 'Introduction', pp. 13-16.

Edmund's was eager to use this association, as it commissioned John Lydgate's *Lives of Saints Edmund and Fremund*, which confirmed its intention to mark the visit of Henry VI in the 1430s with an image of the king kneeling before the shrine of St Edmund.[33] While Edmund remained prominent in East Anglian imagery, even this local visual celebration reflected his wider importance. His appearance alongside other royal saints, for example in roodscreens in Norfolk, suggests that his regional kingship was encompassed in a wider political relevance.[34] In common with St Edward, Edmund was also part of the assertion of Henry VI's lineage: he appears alongside other English kings and, significantly, one French king, St Louis, in the Salle windows.[35] Following Henry VI's death, St Edmund was also prominent in the imagery depicting Henry as a saint.

It may be suggested, then, that the widespread recognition of both Edward and Edmund was the result of this high level of royal interest and need for legitimacy through association. Certainly, the relationship between Edward and Edmund seems to have been this emphasis of their royal patronage. However, their association with each other also seems to have been of greater significance. Their visual pairing was widespread and prominent at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Windows and roodscreens in East Anglia and elsewhere place Saints Edward and Edmund together, while the coronation banners of Henry VIII also displayed St Edward, St Edmund and St George. Closer to the home of St Edmund's shrine, in the church of Mildenhall, between Ely and Bury St Edmund's, the carved emblems of St

---

[33] John Lydgate, *The Lives of Ss Edmund and Fremund*, London, BL, Harley 2278, fol. 4v, in *The Canon of John Lydgate Project*, ed. by Stephen R. Reimer <http://www.ualberta.ca/~sreimer/edmund/edmund.htm> [accessed 25th August 2013].

[34] Pinner, pp. 123-4.

[35] Pinner, p. 124.

Edward and St Edmund share a doorway.[36] Although the history of the manor of Mildenhall, granted to Bury St Edmund's by Edward the Confessor and therefore linking both, together, with local identity, may have been responsible for this visual recognition of the relationship between the two saints, the carvings do echo a wider trend.[37]

An important common element in the saints' lives is the centrality of invasion to their stories. Rebecca Pinner and Lisa Colton draw attention to the notion of exclusion as key to Edmund's importance both to East Anglia and to England. Specifically, emphasis is placed on the 'other' in music, referring to Edmund as 'King...of our homeland', his protection of Christians from enemies, and the nature of his martyrdom at the hands of the Danes.[38] His role as a symbol of exclusion was also evident in posthumous political actions attributed to him. He was credited with the death of Swein Forkbeard in 1014, and this story was recounted during a later dispute between Norwich and Bury, a reminder of St Edmund's interest in Bury's rights.[39] The maintenance of local rights seems to be a significant aspect of his regional patronage, and therefore suggests that a coterminous patronage of England was incompatible with his role in Bury. However, it seems to have been Edmund's representation of exclusion that was central to his wider English patronage. His resistance of Danish incursion meant he could appeal to 'indigenous Englishness'.[40] The suggestion that this aspect of opposition to 'otherness' broadened his appeal is also supported by material that recounted his story. The *Golden Legend*'s account of St Edmund's life acknowledges his

---

[36] Judith Middleton-Stewart, 'Introduction', in *Records of the Churchwardens of Mildenhall: Collections (1446-1454) and Accounts (1503-1553)*, ed. by Middleton-Stewart (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011), pp. xxviii.

[37] Middleton-Stewart, p. xxi.

[38] Lisa Colton, 'Music and Identity in Medieval Bury St Edmund's', in *St Edmund, King and Martyr*, pp. 87-110 (pp. 87, 99, 102-3, 106-10).

[39] Pinner, pp. 117-8.

[40] Pinner, p. 132.

localised kingship and miracles and the separateness of English kingdoms at that time. However, the Danish threat is set within a broader context, illustrating the widespread damage to the 'prouynce of Englond'.[41] Although the use here of 'province' acknowledges the sense of England's belonging to the wider community of Christendom, it also suggests a unity of England in the experience of the attacks, and therefore Edmund's relevance to England as a whole.

It is this aspect of his story that would therefore have been circulated with the printing of the *Golden Legend* in 1520. This also provides further explanation for the linking of Edward and Edmund. The invasion element of St Edward's own story, also recounted by the *Golden Legend*, not only provides a basis for royal association, it also links the king with the fate of England. The *Golden Legend* emphasises the impact of invasion as the shared experience of England. England and Englishmen are repeatedly shown to be the object of the invasion and the victims 'gretely troublyd wyth the Danes'. When St Edward is described as having restored 'the old felycyte of this lond', 'ioye and gladnes was thenne in Englond' and, following eventual success, 'the Englisshmen thanked god and saynt Edward'.[42] The benefit of St Edward's intervention and the act of thanksgiving, therefore, were both experienced by England as a single community. Similarly, the *Newe Legende* also associates Edward with the realm's collective happiness, recording that 'all his dayes was full peace in Englonde'.[43] In this context, then, the consistent use of his name as a battle cry may refer to his role as a protector of Englishmen against their enemies, which somewhat reconciles his peaceful character with his military application. Both Edward and Edmund, then, represent an element of opposition to 'otherness'.

---

[41] De Voragine, 1483, fol. 377r.
[42] De Voragine,1483, fols 322v-332v.
[43] *Newe Legende*, 1516, fol. 31r.

Through his symbolism of the boundaries of identity, as well as his association with late medieval kings, St Edmund's patronage was simultaneously regional and national. However, this was not the case for other saints whose regional significance was invested in the defence of borders. St Cuthbert's relationship with Durham, for example, was one of protection of regional rights. Although the authority to appoint bishops often rested with the crown, the crown was also forced to acknowledge that the bishopric's power lay in traditions of the local church and St Cuthbert.[44] The saint had often been invoked by the people of Durham against both the crown and their own bishops acting on behalf of the crown, particularly in response to demands for troops and taxes. In 1299, soldiers deserting the army of Edward I did so because they were bound to the confines of the bishopric for the 'defence of the body of St Cuthbert', while, as early as the 1070s, investigations by William I and then his tax collector were said to have been warded off by the saint, who made them ill until they passed back over the river Tees.[45] Significantly, in both situations, the patronage of St Cuthbert was linked to defined borders. His cult was also central to the identity of the inhabitants of the region who labelled themselves the *Haliwerfolc* or 'people of the saint', a term inherited from pre-Conquest tenants of the church of Durham and, therefore, also related to the land.[46] It seems, then, like Edmund for East Anglia, Cuthbert stood for the protection of a community against outside influence. However, it is not clear that Cuthbert's representation of borders and defence was utilised at a national level. Although the proximity of the Scottish border may have reinforced a sense of nationhood, it may be suggested that the cult of St Cuthbert is largely an example of the opposition of local and outside concerns. In his case, unlike Edmund, this aspect of his cult did not extend it to the nation. The similarities between

---

[44] Christian D. Liddy, *The Bishopric of Durham in the Late Middle Ages: Lordship, Community and the Cult of St Cuthbert* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), pp. 7-13.

[45] Liddy, pp. 165, 188.

[46] Liddy, pp. 186-9.

Cuthbert and Edmund suggest that, although important, Edmund's representation of exclusion alone may not have been enough to extend his influence to England, and that this would have required some form of conscious action.

The Abbey of Bury St Edmund's was instrumental in the extension of the cult outside its regional boundaries. The production of literary work concerning the saint began around the eleventh century, and in the fifteenth century Bury became involved in book-selling, which was used to extend Edmund's audience, including vernacular poetry.[47] As mentioned above, the abbey took the visit of Henry VI in 1433-1434 as an opportunity for literary output, as John Lydgate credits the abbot, William Curteys, with the idea of producing a commemorative text, *Lives of Saints Edmund and Fremund*.[48] Lydgate's presence at the abbey, after his career in the public sphere and status as a prolific poet, would have leant authority and prominence to such a text. Lydgate's own recognition of Edmund's patronage varies, and reflects both the multifaceted nature of the saint's cult and the investment of the fate of England in several figures. While *The Vertue of the Masse* names him for his royal patronage, and St Alban for England, Lydgate's *Lives* produced for Bury indicates the power of Edmund's banner to 'kepen and conserue this lond from enmyes'.[49] Edmund's defensive role here, in a text aimed at promoting his cult, reinforces the suggestion that this was an important aspect of his extension to national patronage.

Although the production of English language material at Bury suggests that the abbey was encouraging a national audience, production and trade here also added an international dimension, as the saint was also popular in Scandinavia and Iceland. However, the

---

[47] Bale, 'Introduction', pp. 4-10.

[48] A. S. G. Edwards, 'John Lydgate's *Lives of Ss Edmund and Fremund*: Politics, Hagiography and Literature', *St Edmund, King and Martyr*, pp. 133-44 (p. 133).

[49] Edwards, p. 135; Lydgate, *Lives of Ss Edmund and Fremund*, fol. 2ᵛ.

suggestion that the abbey promoted a specifically national role for Edmund is also demonstrated in its use of liturgical song. *Ave rex gentis anglorum*, written for Bury for the Office of St Edmund, identifies him as a 'king of the people / nation of the Englishmen', and the fact that this piece was often referenced, notably by Lydgate's *Lives*, suggests that it catered for a wider audience, with the intention of circulation.[50] The large audience from which Bury benefitted is indicated by the devotion of pilgrims to the site. Bale states that Edmund's shrine was the most popular pilgrimage site in England before 1140, overtaken by that of Thomas Becket.[51] Visitor numbers do not necessarily indicate England-wide popularity. Dee Dyas and Diane Webb argue that shrines had 'catchment-areas' which were 'predominantly local, or at least regional', due to conditions of travel.[52] This point of view is supported to a certain extent by the miracle text produced, most likely, by John Lydgate. The later compilation of the miracles of Henry VI demonstrated the purpose of such texts as part of the process of securing canonisation. However, given the long-standing status of St Edmund, Bury's commissioning of the *Miracles of St Edmund* in the mid-fifteenth century was instead for promotion, rather than proof, of the saint's continuing relevance.[53] This text, not originally a compilation but drawn from separate narratives, contains three miracles, two occurring in Bury and one in London.[54] However, further evidence of pilgrimage to Bury, the presence of pilgrim badges in Southampton, demonstrates wider devotion.[55] Evidence of English pilgrims to other sites also opposes the notion of 'catchment-areas' and unwillingness to travel. A character in an early-1530s play reciting an extensive list of shrines, claiming to

---

[50] Colton, 'Music and Identity', pp. 90-2.

[51] Bale, 'Introduction', p. 4.

[52] Diane Webb, quoted in Dee Dyas, *Pilgrimage in Medieval English Literature, 700-1500* (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2001), pp. 130-1.

[53] Bale, 'St Edmund in Fifteenth-Century London: the Lydgatian *Miracles of St Edmund*', in *St Edmund, King and Martyr*, pp. 145-62 (pp. 145-9).

[54] Bale, 'St Edmund in Fifteenth-Century London', pp. 146-7.

[55] Bale, 'Introduction', p. 14.

have visited them all, implies that it was not unknown for individual pilgrims to visit many, far-flung sites.[56] As will be shown below, pilgrims to Henry VI's tomb came from all over his former kingdom.

The significance that the site still held in the early-sixteenth century is, finally, suggested in its prominence as a target for destruction.[57] The cult of saints and the business of pilgrimage were of particular interest to Cromwell's commissioners of the mid-1530s, and the reports on relics suggest that they were still very much in use at the major shrines including Bury and Canterbury.[58] The cult of saints was a central issue of the redefinition of faith, and saints' days were the target of the first major change in the form of the Act 'for the abrogation of certain holydays', which abolished the observance of holy days during harvest and law terms.[59] Among others were included the days of St Edmund, St Edward the Confessor and Becket's translation, while a set of injunctions issued by Cromwell expressed hostility towards relics and pilgrimages.[60] As reform measures progressed into the targeted destruction of shrines, the inclusion of Edmund's shrine suggests its continued importance and function until this point.

In addition to the patronage of Saints Edward and Edmund, there are also frequent references, in both contemporary literature and modern scholarship, naming St Thomas Becket a principal saint of England.[61] Canterbury benefitted from both royal patronage,

---

[56] Duffy, pp. 192-3.

[57] Bale, 'Introduction', p. 18.

[58] Duffy, pp. 384-5.

[59] A copy of the act made for the abrogation of certain holydays, 1536, in *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, vol. 3, ed. by David Wilkins (London: Gosling, Gyles, Woodward, Davis, 1737), pp. 823-4.

[60] Duffy, pp. 191, 394-5, 398.

[61] Dyas, *Pilgrimage in Medieval English Literature*, p. 130.

visited by Henry V upon his return from Agincourt, and widespread popular devotion.[62] This

royal patronage, while it may simply have been due to the convenience of the shrine's

location, does at least imply some sense of an association with the king's wars. This

importance to England as a whole, and the notion that, in common with Saints Edward and

Edmund, Becket could represent collective concerns, is supported by John Mirk's *Festial*,

first written around the end of the fourteenth century, and printed in 1508. The text, a

collection of English-language sermons based on the *Golden Legend,* was intended to provide

parish churches with a guide for 'al the pryncypall feestes', and is an example of an attempt

to standardise knowledge and celebration of saints, and to make this knowledge available in

English.[63] As such, it aimed to distribute its interpretation of Becket's role widely, potentially

to a large number of parish congregations, even before the piece was produced in print. It

assigns Becket with the responsibility for 'the lawe of the londe', indicating at least a broad

patronage that was concerned specifically with the realm.[64]

A significant aspect of Becket's cult, particularly in terms of his importance as a

comparison for the cult of Henry VI, discussed below, is the suggestion that, having been the

most popular shrine in England in place of Bury, it saw decline in the fifteenth century.

Despite this, it seems that it remained important. It was still of enough interest in 1520 for a

life, based on the *Golden Legend*, to be printed by Richard Pynson.[65] Continued popular

devotion to the eve of the Reformation and beyond it, contrary to official condemnation,

seems to have been widespread, including pilgrims from Northumbria and the West

---

[62] *Chronicle of London to 1483*, p. 103.

[63] Duffy, p. 156; John Mirk, *The festyuall* (London: Wynkyn De Worde, 1508), fol. 2ʳ, in *EEBO* [accessed 20th January 2011].

[64] Mirk, 1508, fol. 79v.

[65] *Here begynneth the lyfe of the blessed martyr Saynte Thomas* (London: Richard Pynson, 1520), in *EEBO* [accessed 25th August 2013].

Country.[66] Local celebration in East Anglia also demonstrates continuing veneration of Becket in the early-sixteenth century. The Churchwardens' account of Mildenhall, Suffolk, shows that, in 1505, 'a play off Sent Thomas' was performed to mark the saint's day.[67] The play, probably performed by monks travelling from Thetford, proved popular, raising £7. It was probably part of a long-standing tradition of the region, echoed in Ipswich in a pageant of St Thomas, during the town's Corpus Christi procession, which was evident throughout the fifteenth century.[68] Not only does the example of Mildenhall illustrate the continuing popularity of Becket, it also demonstrates the local instigation of the promotion of his cult in the form of the accessible and evidently popular medium of drama.

Finally, in common with St Edmund, the particular vehemence with which his tomb was destroyed during the Reformation also demonstrates Becket's still-prominent status.[69] However, the nature of the attack on Becket differed greatly from the destruction of the Bury shrine. The survival, in both official and popular forms, of other saints who had developed a relationship with English nationhood suggests a difference in the nature of the removal of Becket's cult that it did not. Becket's life made his cult's removal symbolically important to Henry VIII. Despite previous royal patronage, the saint had remained a representative of the authority of the church, who, in the process of the denunciation of the papacy, had become particularly offensive to the king's supremacy.[70] The proclamation which justified the

---

[66] G. W. Bernard, *The Late Medieval English Church: Vitality and Vulnerability Before the Break with Rome* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), pp. 126-7; Dyas, *Pilgrimage in Medieval English Literature* p. 136.

[67] *Records of the Churchwardens of Mildenhall*, p. 44.

[68] Middleton-Stewart, pp. lvii-lviii.

[69] Bernard, *Late Medieval English Church*, p. 127.

[70] Bernard, 'The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1536: Henry VIII and the Search for the Middle Way', *The Historical Journal,* 42, 2 (1998), 321-49 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640109> [accessed 23rd August 2013] (p. 324).

destruction of the shrine names both Becket's actions while living, and his resulting saintly status, as well as 'other great and urgent causes', declaring

> that his canonization was made only by the Bishop of Rome because he had been a champion to maintain his usurped authority and a bearer of the iniquities of the clergy.[71]

During his lifetime, then, it was his enforcement of papal rule that had recommended him for sainthood. In 1539, his status as a saint was denied because his death was considered to be 'untruly called martyrdom', and his defiance of Henry II and his 'wholesom laws' were shown to have caused 'much trouble in this said realm'.[72] Thus, alongside the destruction of his physical shrine, Becket's history was also targeted and rewritten. A surviving copy of the *Newe Legende* of 1516 illustrates this, as the text's account of Becket's life bears later marks of deliberate alteration and graffiti not found in the rest of the work, eliminating the saint's name, suggesting an attempt to symbolically obliterate him.[73] At a local level, it seems there would have been pressure or fear in parishes with dedications to Becket, that this would draw unwanted attention: the church of St Thomas the Martyr, Sarum, was referred to after this point as St Thomas the Apostle.[74] The failure of his cult to survive the Reformation may be explained by his enduring opposition to the supremacy of English kings, and the fact that the two establishments for which he died according to the *Festial*, 'the ryght of holy chirche & the lawe of the londe', were no longer compatible. The particular survival of others must be explained through a look at their own cults.

---

[71] *TRPI*, pp. 275-6.

[72] Certain injunctions set forth by the authority of the king against English books, sects, and sacramentaries; also the putting down the day of Thomas Becket, 1539, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, vol. 3, p. 848.

[73] *Newe Legende,* 1516, fol. 97ᵛ-98.

[74] *Churchwardens' Accounts of S. Edmund and S. Thomas, Sarum*, p. ix.

II. Henry VI: Political National Saint

The ability of saints to both represent local boundaries and privileges, and articulate the shared concerns of England for which they had been appropriated, suggests that regional and national identity were not necessarily opposed. Royal patronage played a significant role in the extension of the cults of native saints. This was particularly the case during the fifteenth century as the visual association of Henry VI with saints contributed to their widespread recognition. However, their cults also saw active devotion. The strong association with English royal saints during Henry VI's lifetime provided an established visual tradition which leant itself conveniently to, or perhaps even influenced his quickly-established, politically-encouraged, devotional following after his death. In common with the saints with whom the king sought to associate himself, his own cult was multi-faceted, both political and popular in nature, a symbol of English royalty, and comprising both a local shrine-focussed significance and widespread invocation.

Alongside the significant representation of English nationhood in the forms of officially canonised saints, late medieval England celebrated political heroes, figures who represented episodes of political opposition and who were victims of violent deaths. It is within this context of 'political saints' that Simon Walker places the cult and canonisation campaign focused on Henry VI. Walker's work mainly concerns the changing nature of the definition of sanctity as it became closely associated with English politics, focusing on the veneration of figures such as Simon de Montfort, Thomas of Lancaster and Archbishop Scrope. The element of violent death common to all these cults has led some to believe that they demonstrate simply a tendency to commemorate the high-profile victims of political causes, but Walker rejects this, suggesting that the selection of political victims to raise to

cult or saintly status was more complex.[75] The development of these cults may be partly attributed to encouragement and manipulation by the crown. At least some of the cults initially saw attempted suppression. However, Walker suggests that, rather than continuing to represent the protest for which they died, this was 'neutralised' by royal patronage that aimed to use the cults to reinforce the sanctity of monarchy and re-establish unity.[76]

The nature of their collective identification as 'political', and this utilisation by the crown, suggests that their celebration and cults were largely top-down, rather than the result of widespread and popular veneration. The development of Henry VI's saint cult illustrates Walker's arguments concerning political saints. As an important facet of Henry VII's claim to the throne, it has been argued that the cult was created and manipulated by Henry VII. What may be said for certain is that Henry VII utilised the political value of his connection to Henry VI.[77] An application for his canonisation was made before 1492, and was not revoked until 1528, while papal authorisation to investigate miracles in 1494, repeated in 1504, kept the issue current.[78] Miracles reported at his Windsor shrine were recorded until around 1500 and investigated for authenticity into Henry VIII's reign.[79] Henry VI was important for Henry VII as a source of legitimacy, and provided a needed sense of continuity. Works that recorded Henry VI's naming of Henry Tudor as his successor also sought to emphasise the former's

---

[75] Walker, pp. 198-200.

[76] Walker, pp. 201-9; Leigh Ann Craig, 'Royalty, Virtue and Adversity: The Cult of Henry VI', *Albion*, 35, 2 (2003), 187-209 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4054134> [accessed 30th March 2011] (p. 190).

[77] John M. Theilmann, 'The Miracles of King Henry VI of England', *The Historian*, 42, 3 (1980), 456-71 (p. 456).

[78] H. Idris Bell, 'A List of Original Papal Bulls and Briefs in the Department of Manuscripts, British Museum, Part II', *EHR*, 36, 144 (1921), 556-83 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/552586> [accessed 18th July 2012] (p. 557).

[79] *The Miracles of King Henry VI: being an account and translation of twenty-three miracles taken from the manuscripts in the British Museum*, ed. by Ronald A. Knox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923), pp. 22, 29.

divinity. Bernard André's history claims that Henry VI 'summoned the Earl of Richmond and forecast that someday he would assume the helm of state'. The text identifies this prediction as a 'divine prophecy' that 'had been decreed by a divine oracle, since the holy king had commanded it', emphasising not only his holy status but also attributing divine vision to his mortal life.[80] The desire of Henry VII to be associated with his Lancastrian predecessor was also acknowledged by his subjects, as the pageant planned in Worcester for the king included the figure of Henry VI addressing him as 'newew…my cousyn dere / Next of my blood', suggesting that the appearance of Henry VI would impress Henry VII, and that the link was widely-known.[81]

The use of Henry VI to provide legitimacy suggests that his cult retained factional implications. This is also suggested by Henry VII's careful assurance that his crown did not depend upon his wife, although some suggested that Elizabeth's claim would have been more effective.[82] However, the previous chapter highlighted the emphasis placed on the restoration of unity. In the context of Walker's assessment of 'political saints' cults, it is possible to reconcile Henry VI's position. It may be suggested that the political division with which Henry was associated was 'neutralised' by his later use. Although Henry VII's use of Henry VI's cult was most prominent, its political impact predated 1485, as it was employed by those opposing the ruling House of York.[83] Edward IV's opposition to Henry's growing cult status, and the order of Lawrence Booth, Archbishop of York, in 1479 forbidding the veneration of

---

[80] André, pts 9-10.

[81] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 83.

[82] Paul R. Cavill, *The English Parliaments of Henry VII, 1485-1504* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 30-2; *Crowland Chronicle Continuations, 1459-1486*, ed. by Nicholas Pronay and John Cox (London: Sutton, 1986), pp. 194-5.

[83] Theilmann, 'Miracles', p. 456.

his image, emphasised its factional relevance.[84] However, Richard III's decision to re-inter Henry VI's body in St George's Chapel, Windsor, may be identified as a neutralising act, countering its anti-Yorkist associations, although it does not seem to have positively affected his association with Henry VI, as the *Great Chronicle of London* still recorded the early sixteenth-century belief that Richard had been involved in his death.[85]

Royal appropriation of Henry VI also demonstrated that the neutralisation of political saints' associations allowed them to represent not only political unity, but the collective concerns of England. Earlier political saints provide a precedent for the use of such figures in a national context. Edward III's interest in the canonisation of his relative Thomas of Lancaster, perhaps to distance himself from, and reconcile the issues of his father's reign, was expressed in a concern for English unity. Thomas represented the 'peace and tranquillity of the inhabitants of England', suggesting that the fate of the nation could be invested in such figures. Edward's statement that Thomas's blood flowed through England further reinforces the idea that an individual might embody the nation.[86] It is clear, then, that there existed at least the political thought that an individual could be seen to represent collective English interests. This is evident in the treatment of Henry VI in late fifteenth-century court literature, for example the poem commemorating the birth of Prince Arthur by Henry VII and Henry VIII's Latin secretary, Petrus Carmelianus. The poem names Henry VI as the saint with the personal charge of England's peace, suggesting that he stood for England's reconciliation.[87] In this respect, the commemoration of both Thomas and Henry, in their roles as 'political saints', echoed the responsibilities of official saints of England. One important similarity

---

[84] Theilmann, 'Miracles', pp. 461-2.
[85] *Great Chronicle of London,* p. 220.
[86] Walker, p. 210.
[87] Petrus Carmelianus, quoted in Walker, p. 211-2.

between the cults of Thomas of Lancaster and Henry VI which may offer some insight into the need to identify them as representatives of England's peace is their establishment following periods of civil war. It seems that, rather than civil war preventing their association with national unity, it instead facilitated it, as it made their use necessary to re-establishing peace.

Evidence that the popular celebration of Henry VI as a saint echoed his portrayal by Henry VII's court is provided by the number of hymns and prayers, recorded in bede rolls and primers, which not only acknowledged Henry's holy status but his representation of England. An English verse-prayer, added to an early fifteenth-century primer, states to Henry,

> O blessyd kyng so gracios and gud
>
> Thou pray to sett this reme in rest
>
> Unto our Saveyour that dyed on roud
>
> And to hys modyr that madyn blessyd.[88]

This, therefore, also expressed the belief that it was Henry VI's responsibility to intercede in heaven on behalf of England, particularly in the restoration of peace. Other pieces recognised Henry's role as the patron of an English nation in need of healing. A Latin verse from the bede roll of the Trevelyans, a staunch Lancastrian family, prayed that he would 'cleanse the souls of the English' who praised him.[89] Recognition of Henry as a saint, then, was considered a collective action, while Henry's own patronage was thought to apply specifically to the English, even by those who might be expected to maintain partisan

---

[88] 'A Prayer to Henry VI in English Verse', in *Henry the Sixth: a Reprint of John Blacman's Memoir with Translation and Notes*, ed. and trans. by M. R. James (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1919), pp. 50-1.

[89] 'Terge sordes Anglicorum / Qui te laudant vocibus', in *Trevelyan Papers*, Pt. I: Prior to 1558, ed. by John Payne Collier (London: Camden Society, 1857), p. 54; *Miracles of King Henry VI*, p. 13.

associations. The Trevelyan bede roll included several further prayers to Henry VI, some of which also recognise his role in restoring peace. An English prayer remembers his compassion, and forgiveness of rebellion.[90] Another Latin verse recalls him repaying the 'deep afflictions' he suffered with 'deeds of love'. This piece also bears witness to miracles, recording that

> Through him the blind receive their sight,
>
> The lame and crooked stand upright,
>
> And wounded men gain rest.

It goes on to broaden the relevance of these miracles to all English men, exclaiming 'Joy, men of England, for the Lord / Hath your martyr King restored, / A potent patron saint'.[91] Here, then, Henry was seen as a newly-established patron saint belonging to all Englishmen.

Henry VI's identification as a 'political saint' and the initiation of a canonisation campaign by Henry VII suggest that the king's cult was the result of political design. However, the verse-prayers quoted above, and several other Latin *Memoriae* dating from between 1480 and 1510, attest to the growth of his cult into the focus of popular veneration before, and during, its political development.[92] Leigh-Anne Craig has disputed the sole responsibility of the crown for the cult, arguing instead that it was firmly rooted in popular devotion, which began immediately following his death despite the opposition of Edward IV.[93] Craig's argument is based on the evidence provided by a Latin collection of miracles drawn from a vernacular record made by St George's Chapel, following his removal from his original burial site at Chertsey to Windsor in August 1484. Between 1484 and 1500, when the

---

[90] 'English Prayer', *Trevelyan Papers*, Pt. I, pp. 59-60.

[91] 'Another prayer of Kynge Herre', *Trevelyan Papers*, Pt. I, pp. 55-7.

[92] James, 'Introduction', in *Henry the Sixth*, pp. xii-xiv.

[93] Craig, p. 188-9.

collection is believed to have been compiled, the Chapel recorded 174 miracles attributed to Henry VI by pilgrims dating from 1481 onwards. It is this material that formed the basis for his attempted canonisation, which may therefore be seen, at least in part, to be a response to popular culture.[94] A lost English manuscript of miracles apparently took this number to 368.[95] The need for Archbishop Booth's prohibition of his veneration in 1479 also demonstrates that his cult was becoming prominent enough to concern Edward IV.

Veneration of Henry VI therefore predated the official canonisation proceedings.[96] The scale of his popularity is also demonstrated by other remaining evidence of pilgrimage to his shrine. The English prayer of the Trevelyan bede roll was a prayer for a 'servaunt and pilgreme' of Henry VI.[97] Visitors of Windsor were able to show their devotion by wearing a pilgrim badge representing the king. The Museum of London shows a badge recognisable as Henry by the presence of his heraldic antelope, which was found in the vicinity of the Thames, near the Tower of London.[98] The Museum of London and Brian Spencer indicate that over 500 pewter badges depicting Henry VI have been found in London.[99] A woodcut dating from around 1490 added to a fifteenth-century English bible, depicting Henry VI standing at his Windsor shrine surrounded by pilgrims, also shows popular devotion and its range.[100] Men and women, with different injuries, are represented, with a variety of offerings

---

[94] Craig, p. 189; *Miracles of King Henry VI*, p. 17.

[95] Theilmann, 'Miracles', p. 460.

[96] 'List of Original Papal Bulls', p. 557.

[97] 'English Prayer', *Trevelyan Papers*, vol. I, p. 60.

[98] 'Pilgrim Badge', <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/London-Wall/Whats-on/Galleries/medieval/objects/record.htm?type=object&id=28965> [accessed 31st August 2012].

[99] 'The Cult of Henry VI', <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/London-Wall/Whats-on/Galleries/medieval/Objects/28965/Page+2.htm> [accessed 31st August 2012].

[100] 'Henry VI, King of England, invoked as a saint', Oxford, Bodleian, MS. Bodl. 277 fol. 376ᵛ, <http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/detail/ODLodl~14~14~76776~135161:Henry-VI,-King-of-England,-invoked-

such as crutches, ships and chains, which correspond to miracles listed in the Latin collection including accidents, attempted suicides, prisoners being set free and survivors of shipwrecks or pirates. The presence of these items suggests that pilgrims came from a range of backgrounds. Although the woodcut was produced by an artist employed in the promotion of Henry VI's cult, it illustrates the relationship between the dead king and the wider population.[101]

The number of badges found in London does suggest that pilgrimage was largely limited to London.[102] This lends support to the idea that medieval shrines welcomed pilgrims mostly from regional 'catchment-areas'.[103] The importance of this local association with his shrine is also implied by the use of the title 'Henry of Windsor', the location of both his birth and his re-burial. John Foxe, later recording pilgrimage to Henry VI's tomb as an example of 'great idolatry', states that pilgrims were coming to 'offer to good king Henry of Windsore (as they called hym)'.[104] It is possible, however, that this presents a distorted view of the cult. The better preservation of the badges in the water, and the suggestion that it was considered lucky to throw badges into water allow for the suggestion that these badges may not represent Londoners alone, but also visiting pilgrims leaving badges in the closest water to Windsor. The suggestion of at least some pilgrims from further away is supported by the presence of

---

?qvq=q:england;lc:ODLodl~29~29,ODLodl~7~7,ODLodl~6~6,ODLodl~14~14,ODLodl~8~8,ODLodl~23~23,ODLodl~1~1,ODLodl~24~24&mi=13&trs=3107> [accessed 25th August 2013].

[101] Ellen Ettlinger, 'Notes on a Woodcut Depicting King Henry VI being invoked as a Saint', *Folklore*, 84, 2 (1973), 115-9
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1260417> [accessed 5th February 2011].

[102] Brian Spencer, 'King Henry of Windsor and the London Pilgrim', in *Collectanea Londiniensia: studies in London archaeology and history presented to Ralph Merrifield*, eds by Joanna Bird, Hugh Chapman, John Clark (London: London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, 1978) p. 238.

[103] Dyas, *Pilgrimage in Late Medieval English Literature*, pp. 130-1.

[104] John Foxe, *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church with an vniuersall history of the same*, vol. II (London: John Daye, 1583), p. 1211, in *EEBO* [accessed 24th August 2013].

individual badges depicting Henry VI found, for example, in North Lincolnshire.[105] Not long after his death, images and statues of Henry VI were also being established for veneration outside London, causing Archbishop Booth's forbidding of the act. It may be that this referred directly to a statue of Henry erected in York Minster in 1473, by the dean Richard Andrew, Henry's former secretary, which pilgrims were visiting, or to the decoration of the choir screen with the English kings from William I to Henry VI.[106] Miracles also began during this period, the first one recorded five years after his death, before his move to Windsor, although this dating, recorded later at the shrine at Windsor, may have been designed by the compilers to demonstrate an already established holy status and justify his commemoration.[107]

Both Craig and Theilmann suggest that the wider recognition in England of Henry VI as a saint is further shown in his recorded miracles. Significantly, of the 174 stories of the Latin collection, 85 can be identified as having occurred elsewhere in England, in Durham and Cornwall, and even in Calais and Wales.[108] Only six English counties are not represented, leading Theilmann to assert that interest in the cult was evident from 'most regions in England', and Henry's shrines were 'major national pilgrimage sites'.[109] Henry was particularly called upon in emergencies, as demonstrated by the majority of the detail of the woodcut.[110] Craig indicates that Henry's developing status as the 'patron saint of

---

[105] 'Pilgrim Badge: NLM-FACEC6', *The Portable Antiquities Scheme*, <http://finds.org.uk/database/artefacts/record/id/192277> [accessed 31st August 2012].

[106] 'Worship in the Minster', in *A History of the County of York: the City of York*, ed. by P. M. Tillott (1961), pp. 343-357 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=36373> [accessed 26th August 2012].

[107] Theilmann, 'Miracles', p. 463; Theilmann, 'Communitas among Fifteenth-Century Pilgrims', *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques*, 11, 3 (1984), 253-270 (p. 266).

[108] Craig, p. 191-4.

[109] Theilmann, 'Miracles', p. 461; Theilmann, 'Communitas', pp. 258, 269.

[110] Craig, pp. 194-207; MS. Bodl. 277 fol. 376ᵛ.

emergencies' meant that, often, his name was invoked, and his intervention was said to have occurred, immediately.[111] It might be further suggested, then, that Henry VI's influence was not confined to his tomb, but that he was a constant and ubiquitous presence among his former subjects.[112] The collection of these miracle stories implies that pilgrims also travelled from these distant places. The six English counties unaccounted for, (mainly those on Scottish or Welsh borders,) are not solely explained by distance, given the patronage from Durham and Cornwall.[113]

However, Theilmann also demonstrates that the majority of the pilgrims were associated with London, with over half of the recorded miracles occurring within a 50-mile radius of Henry VI's tomb. The concern caused to the Yorkist kings lay partly in the threat it posed to the support they had always received from London citizens, as even before the shrine was moved to Windsor from Chertsey, it was the London Mercers who were the most prominent pilgrims.[114] Furthermore, although the translators of the miracles suggest that the Windsor compilers were only interested in those sworn at the shrine, not all the recipients of Henry's help visited the shrine, and so the miracles themselves do not all represent individual pilgrims.[115] The recovery of a boy from drowning in 1481 occurred before Henry's re-interment at Windsor and so was recorded years later.[116] Although Craig suggests that the offerings and figures of the woodcut image all represent actual pilgrims, it also includes items sent to the shrine rather than brought by those healed, for example the effigy sent by the sister

---

[111] Craig, p. 206.
[112] Jonathan Good, *The Cult of St George in Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), pp. 2-3.
[113] Theilmann, 'Miracles', p. 461.
[114] Theilmann, 'Communitas', p. 260-1.
[115] Theilmann, 'Communitas', p. 261; *The Miracles of King Henry VI*, p. 22.
[116] *The Miracles of King Henry VI*, p. 34.

of a sailor who had survived a cannon shot.[117] The recording of miracles therefore often

relied on the transmission of stories. Given the London popularity of the cult, it is also

possible that some of the distant miracles may have been experienced by locals and those

close to the shrine while travelling. Therefore, while the collection of miracles does suggest a

popular engagement with Henry's cult, existing before official attempts to promote him as a

saint, it seems that it should not be taken at face value as a representation of a widespread cult

which covered all of England. What may be said instead is that, in collecting the miracles, it

was important to demonstrate a widespread nature to his miracles, and it does show devotion

to have existed beyond his shrine, largely among ordinary people. This also corresponds with

other descriptions of the king's cult, as Foxe later highlighted the devotion of pilgrims

'specially of Deuonshire & Cornwal'. Neither was the invocation of Henry VI a gradual

development outwards from Windsor, as distant miracles were reported from the

beginning.[118] Therefore, while his cult continued to focus upon his physical remains, to a

certain extent the popular devotion to Henry reflected Carmelianus's identification of the

king's nationwide responsibility for his former subjects.

Devotion to Henry VI also manifested itself in local commemoration. In the intended

Worcester pageant for Henry VII, he was to briefly introduce himself, address the current

king as his kinsman and heir, and then recount his own story, naming himself a 'martir by

great tourmenting' and acknowledging his burial at Chertsey and then Windsor.[119] This brief

account of the king's story suggests that it was well-known, and also that he was intended to

appear here not only as a former king but also in his saintly role. After acknowledging

himself as 'sumtyme of England king', Henry VI is then given the task of asking the visiting

---

[117] Craig, p. 204; *The Miracles of King Henry VI*, p. 78.
[118] Theilmann, 'Miracles', pp. 463-4.
[119] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 83.

king for mercy on behalf of the city. He is also directly associated with the local Worcester saints of Wulfstan and Oswald as he introduces the two as other figures in the pageant, which ends by naming Henry VII as a 'defence to England'.[120] Henry's speech, then, suggests that the writers of the pageant were aware of, and were taking part in, a wider cult that assigned to Henry VI a concern for England's welfare, acknowledging his martyrdom, his association with the Tudor monarchy and Windsor as the centre of his cult. This therefore places local use within his national cult, and Worcester's fate in the context of the wider safety of England. The introduction of the local figures of St Wulfstan and St Oswald also further demonstrates the compatibility of local and national symbolism. The pageant does not claim any particular association between Henry VI and Worcester. It was clearly designed to appeal to Henry VII's own desire to be linked to Henry VI. However, it may also be considered to be, at least in part, a belief that the famously merciful king would intervene on behalf of subjects of his former realm. It seems that one quality that had made Henry unsuccessful as king, his reputation for excessive mercy, also influenced his veneration as a saint.

Commemoration of Henry VI across England also involved the use of images. Henry was depicted in rood screens, stained glass and sculptures in areas remote from Windsor, such as Devon, Alnwick, East Anglia, and Ashton-under Lyne, while pilgrimages were also made to an image of the king at York.[121] These images show a surprising consistency. The stained-glass window in the church of St Michael and All Angels, in Ashton-under-Lyne near Manchester, seems typical of the depictions of Henry VI. The oldest window in the church, it is believed to have been installed before 1517, most likely ordered by the Ashtons given the identification of the family as donors in glass dating to around the beginning of the sixteenth-

---

[120] *Heralds' Memoir*, pp. 84-8.
[121] Craig, pp. 191-7; Walker, p. 204.

century, and names the image as 'S Henry'.[122] It therefore suggests a particular local interest in the king in his role as a saint, but the context in which the window places Henry is more significant. The third panel in the window, Henry VI is accompanied by St Edmund and St Edward. This direct association of Henry with the two other English royal saints acts to combine the local interest with the church's participation in a wider cult. It may be suggested that the window is an expression of participation in an idea of nationhood: although its installation by the Ashtons may have expressed Lancastrian political allegiance, it would at least have transmitted an 'English' idea to the local community. This portrayal of Henry VI is similar to the placement of his image in Eye and Ludham in East Anglia, described by Craig, where he shares a rood screen with St Edmund and St Edward again, Thomas Becket, and also with William of Norwich.[123] Not only is the portrayal consistent, but the combination of local and wider symbolism suggests that there was a degree of cooperation between local and national, that a figure such as Henry VI might simultaneously be invested with community and national interests.

Despite this consistency with the other images of Henry VI, the evidence which Craig believes is presented by the Ashton-under-Lyne window must be treated with more caution. While the addition of a Henry VI window would have been in keeping with the Ashton family's Lancastrian associations, Penny Hebgin-Barnes's description demonstrates that it is not certain the original image represented that king. The glass of this window has been moved and rearranged a number of times, and the three kings were only placed in their current setting in 1913. Previous photographs show that, before this, the king now labelled St

---

[122] Revd. R. Farnworth, 4th May 2011; P. Hebgin-Barnes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Lancashire* (Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi, Great Britain Summary Catalogue 8; Oxford: OUP/British Academy, 2009), p. 3.
[123] Craig, p. 194-5.

Henry was not placed together with the name, which is also painted on two pieces of glass.[124] Although the image bears similarity to the woodcut, it could also have originally represented a different royal figure. For similar reasons, even the identification of St Edmund cannot be considered reliable, also having been heavily restored. If it is the case that the 'St Henry' window does not represent an early-sixteenth century devotion to the king in Ashton, but a later arrangement, then this throws doubt onto the suggestion that the visual aspect of his cult was quite so widespread outside Southern England and East Anglia, which had its own reasons for associating with Henry VI. It is also simplistic to accept the image at York as evidence of spontaneous popular commemoration, established as it was by the saint-king's former secretary. Even given its apparent popularity with pilgrims, its erection was motivated at least in part by political allegiance and loyalty. Certainly the visual evidence of popular devotion to a cult of St Henry is quite limited, particularly when compared with the surviving image presence of St George which, in Lancashire and neighbouring Cheshire alone, includes a stained-glass depiction of St George standing on the dragon, and a church wall painting showing the Virgin knighting him, both dating from the same period as the Ashton glass, as well as other earlier images, and lost glass which only survive in descriptions.[125] The St Henry glass is, at least, dated to around 1485-1500, however, and it is possible that it was originally designed as Henry VI.

Henry VI's visual association with St Edmund began during his reign, when, recognising the use of imagery as the effective means of communicating to the majority of his subjects, Henry's legitimacy and descent was emphasised through placement of his

---

[124] Hebgin-Barnes, *Medieval Stained Glass of Lancashire*, pp. cxliv, 3, 7.

[125] Hebgin-Barnes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Cheshire* (Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi, Great Britain Summary Catalogue 9; Oxford: OUP/British Academy, 2010), pp. 2, 5, 48-9, 320; Hebgin-Barnes, *Medieval Stained Glass of Lancashire*, p. 367.

image alongside earlier English kings and saint-kings. This may have been partly responsible for the transition of his image into that of a saint-king himself. The examples which exist from both before and after Henry's death, which associated him with other English saint-kings, therefore followed an earlier tradition, but added to it following his 'martyrdom'.[126] . In addition to their visual association, there is also a similarity in the nature of their miracle stories. Later editions of Lydgate's account of St Edmund's life, originally prompted by Henry's visit, contain three additional miracles occurring during Henry VI's reign, all relating to the saving of children's lives, particularly from drowning.[127] Henry VI's miracles echo this element as, within the dominant category of emergency aid, 59 percent of miracles concern death, and 89 percent of drowning incidents refer to children.[128] This common element between Henry VI's nature as a saint, and the fifteenth-century development of St Edmund's miracles may be coincidence. However, it is also possible that this element may have been emphasised in Henry's case to strengthen this association.

Henry VI's miracles are also revealing of his cult's relationship with another established English saint. Walker suggests that Henry's cult overtook that of Thomas Becket's as the most prominent in England, and this displacement also seems to have been illustrated in one quite symbolic miracle attributed to the king, when a baby, choking on a Becket pilgrim badge, was saved by a prayer to Henry VI, after which the badge was taken to Henry's shrine. It suggests that, not only did Henry's popularity increase as Becket's decreased, but that it did so specifically at the expense of Becket's.[129] Grace Tiffany places the significance of this in the context of a developing trend that, leading up to the

---

[126] Pinner, p. 125.

[127] Ilaria Fornasini, 'St Edmund of East Anglia and his Miracles through the Centuries: Variation in Literature and Art', *Quest*, 6, (2009), 34-44 (pp. 40-3).

[128] Theilmann, 'Miracles', pp. 460-1.

[129] Duffy, p. 195.

Reformation, saw the 'gradual supplanting of saints by kings in the reverent English imagination', as part of the association of past kings with a religiously righteous conflict with England's enemies.[130] This would help to account for indications of Henry's survival beyond the Reformation. However, as the popularity of saints such as Edward the Confessor and Edmund demonstrates, saint-kings had long been part of the 'English imagination'. The conflict between Henry and Becket here was also not unique: Henry also encroached upon the miracle-territory of St Anthony, and Becket was challenged by St Wulstan.[131]

Furthermore, before the 1530s, it seems that Henry's cult did not mark a change in the traditional veneration of saints for everyone. John Blacman, the author of a late fifteenth-century Latin life of Henry VI, printed in 1510, appears to view Henry as an official saint, and places his veneration in the context of the traditional saint culture. He states that he chose to celebrate Henry 'because to praise the saints of God...is to praise and glorify Almighty God', while also highlighting his descent from the 'ancient royal stock of England'.[132] The vehemence with which Becket's tomb and legend were attacked during the 1530s, suggesting sustained popularity, and the apparent decline in the miracles attributed to Henry VI, do not seem to support the notion that one cult steadily rose as the other suffered. The relative popularity of Henry's cult may be attributed to its recent, and still current, relevance. More significantly, perhaps, the survival and greater prominence of the foreign-born, non-royal St George would seem to contradict this argument. The notion of conflict between the two cults suggested by the story, however, at least highlights the scale of Henry VI's cult.

---

[130] Grace Tiffany, *Love's Pilgrimage: The Holy Journey in English Renaissance Literature* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2006), pp. 72-3.

[131] Duffy, pp. 195-6.

[132] John Blacman, 'A Compilation of the Meekness and Good Life of King Henry VI', in *Henry the Sixth*, p. 25.

The cult of Henry VI grew quickly, and was clearly the result of both an initial, arguably limited, popular reaction and the subsequent manipulation of this response by those associated with the crown. While there was, perhaps, a strong local interest in the king's tomb, it seems inaccurate to suggest that Henry VI's cult replaced or overtook that of Becket, as its development seems different in its nature, representing instead a fairly quick, consistent popular interest. This interest was reflected by the crown, first encouraged by Henry VII, and then continued under Henry VIII. Both the veneration of Henry VI himself and the development of his status by Henry VII highlight the relationship between the crown and a sense of an English community. In contrast to Benedict Anderson's view of the incompatibility of 'sacral monarchy' and nationhood, the cult of Henry VI demonstrates the significance of sovereignty to the nature of Englishness, and emphasises Susan Reynolds' view that regnal loyalty did not prevent the expression of community. Blacman's life of the king, in common with other contemporary descriptions, deals with the inadequacies of his kingship by emphasising his piety, capacity for mercy and patience, and his therefore ideal candidacy for veneration. The attention it draws to the 'patience of this king and his most kind compassion' in particular, even to traitors, echoes the expectations of the city of Worcester's pageant when invoking his name.[133]

Although the application for Henry VI's canonisation ended in 1528, it seems Henry VIII continued his father's personal and public attachment to him, as his image appeared at the king's funeral in 1547.[134] It may be suggested that Henry VI's appearance in connection with Henry VIII mirrors his father's use of him as a symbol of his claim's legitimacy, although it was not necessary for Henry VIII to play down his mother's claim. This may

---

[133] Blacman, 'A Compilation of the Meekness and Good Life of King Henry VI', p. 39.

[134] Jennifer Loach, 'The Function of the Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII', *Past & Present*, 142 (1994) 43-68 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/651196> [accessed 2nd March 2011] (p. 63-4).

simply have been as a family symbol, as the procession also included those of the Tudor dragon, Beaufort portcullis, and Lancastrian greyhound.[135] However, the banner of 'kyng henry the sainte', despite the obvious issues that the heralds had with the term, was not included with these, but was allied instead with the traditional ones of the Trinity, the Virgin and St George, and was specially made for the funeral.[136] Rather than a dynastic statement, then, or perhaps in addition to this meaning, it seems that this post-Reformation appearance of St Henry was due to Henry VIII's own personal devotion, or perhaps indicates the possession of the king as a saint in the same manner as St George, as a figure whose royal and national importance allowed his continued veneration. It is also possible that 'St Henry' symbolised a form of defiance. The process of canonisation had become increasingly difficult, and was continually changing.[137] Henry had been unofficially acknowledged as a saint in England in spite of, or perhaps in anticipation of, official recognition by Rome. Following the break with Rome, precisely because of his failure to be officially named, the use of 'St Henry' could, therefore, have been intended as an indication of the crown's own recognition of the saint, and its independence from Rome.

The popular cult of 'St Henry' also existed after the religious changes of the 1530s. In support of her assertion that Henry represented the veneration of kings in place of traditional saints, Grace Tiffany indicates that, following the dismantling of his shrine, he received a new wave of pilgrimage, although she suggests that this was perhaps more historical than devotional, as she relates it to a similar level of interest in the Black Prince.[138] This is unconvincing, as John Foxe's description of Henry VI's pilgrims suggests otherwise. His

---

[135] Loach, p. 57.
[136] Loach, p. 63.
[137] Bale, 'Introduction', p. 21.
[138] Tiffany, *Love's Pilgrimage*, p. 73.

description of Robert Testwood's encounter with these pilgrims seems to relate to sometime after 1544, suggesting a still popular following. Furthermore, the nature of pilgrims' actions, making offerings, 'comming so farre to kisse a spur, & to haue an old hat set vpon their heds', juxtaposed with an encounter with someone 'kissing a white Lady made of Alabaster' and Testwood's reaction to this 'great idolatry', persuading them instead to 'worship the true liuing God', shows their devotion as traditional religious veneration. As will be shown below with St George, the survival of Henry's cult, and the lack of suppression of his traditional observation, seems to have been due to the personal devotion of the king, and a public association with the image. His use alongside the long-established national symbol of St George suggests that his survival also depended upon a national association.

III. St George

While Thomas Becket, Edward the Confessor, Edmund and Henry VI were, in different ways and to varying extents, identified as being particularly English, the recognition of St George is perhaps the best example for suggesting that the idea of a 'national' saint was prevalent in the early sixteenth century. St George represents a broad and multifaceted range of patronage, which included several countries, activities and people. It has been suggested that his cult also has roots in other cultures including Islamic legends.[139] However, his celebration in England was both widespread and consistent, in literature and in local commemoration. The origins and development of his English cult have been examined by Jonathan Good, who identifies the figure of St George as an important symbol for late-medieval expressions of English nationhood which had not been present in its earlier forms: in contrast to other saints in England who had previously represented royalty or political

---

[139] Samantha Riches, *St George: a Saint for All* (London: Reaktion, 2015), pp. 18-20.

opposition, George was acceptable to all.[140] While it has already been shown that political opposition did not necessarily prevent widespread acceptance, the lack of a limiting factor, with no initial association with political division, no tomb in England and no association with a particular location or group, may have been one reason for the broad nature of his cult.[141] This goes some way to reconciling the problem of a saint whose life and martyrdom were generally acknowledged to have taken place far from England becoming its patron. George was not a missionary to England, as had been the case with Denis for France and Patrick for Ireland.[142] The adoption of 'national' patrons was therefore an individual and unique process for different realms, as the early English equivalents of Denis and Patrick, or the king-saints that stood as patrons elsewhere, were limited by the early development of the English kingdom and the political contexts that produced earlier cults.[143] This did not prevent the establishment of St Edmund outside his East-Anglian kingdom, although this required active promotion by the Abbey of Bury St Edmund's.

The lack of connection with anywhere in England does not seem to have caused a problem. Various versions of George's life identify him as Greek, possibly Cappadocian, an officer in the Roman army, who is tortured for refusing to worship Roman gods, and resists several attempts at execution before being finally beheaded.[144] Other central elements of his legend, including the rescuing of a princess from a dragon, generally located in Libya, are widely acknowledged in later versions.[145] Far from casting doubts on his suitability for

---

[140] Good, p. 7.

[141] Muriel C. McClendon, 'A Moveable Feast: Saint George's Day Celebrations and Religious Change in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 38, 1 (1999), 1-27 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/175838> [accessed 14th February 2011] (pp. 9-10).

[142] Good, pp. 16-7.

[143] Good, pp. 17-9.

[144] Riches, *St George: Hero, Martyr, Myth* (Stroud: Sutton, 2005), pp. 3-7.

[145] Riches, *St George: Hero, Martyr, Myth*, p. 3.

English patronage, George's lack of contact with England is not removed from his legend by writers of medieval literature. Instead, for Walter Hilton, the inclusion of 'nat oonly those sayntes that were borne in theyse Countreys' was important. St George is only treated in the introduction, as the work is concerned with saints whose birth or deeds while living connected them with England. The importance of George occurred, instead, after his death, as England's

> chief patrone & defender by whose prayer & speciall proteccion they have ben in tyme past preseruyd agaynste theyr enemyes.[146]

It was, therefore, as an already established saint that George was adopted by England, and it seems, at least according to Hilton, that he was adopted collectively. By Hilton's period, the late fourteenth century, George was believed to be England's patron due to his special concern for the English, demonstrated in apparent past aid against their enemies, suggesting that the process by which he became England's 'chief patrone' was grounded in his military associations, associations that remained a significant characteristic of his celebration in England. Thus, the *Golden Legend* was able to recognise him simultaneously as both 'patrone of this royame of englond and the crye of men of warre', and advocated his celebration in military language, as the 'special protectour and defendour of thys royame'.[147] The concern of fifteenth-century writers and then printers for making such material available, and the transmission of such accounts through parish churches, means that this would have been the prevailing opinion of St George's relationship with England. The established position of St George would have also served to emphasise the existence of the community of the English, aided as a single people by their patron.

---

[146] 'Prologue', *Newe Legende*, 1516.
[147] De Voragine, 1483, fol. 158ᵛ.

Of the many aspects to St George's patronage, Jonathan Good identifies this special association with chivalry as not only a characteristic of his patronage of England, but also a significant factor in his adoption by the English.[148] It is in the guise of a patron of soldiers that St George appears in his first significant association with England, when he was reported to have come to the crusading army at Jerusalem in 1098, and then at Antioch, in 1199, where he led the struggling troops to victory, and was subsequently venerated by Richard I and recognised by the church in England.[149] It is this appearance that seems to mark the beginning of the relationship between St George and English armies. It also remained an important aspect of the saint's commemoration in England: the twelfth-century 'Lewes Group' of wall paintings in Sussex include a battle image that Riches suggests is intended to show the Antioch appearance. The story of St George's role in the crusades was familiar to later audiences as his appearance at Jerusalem was recounted in the *Golden Legend*.[150] Highly influential on further texts as well as popular itself, the *Golden Legend* seems to have provided a basis for literary commemoration of St George, as his story was also communicated by related material, such as the *Festial*. The text relates the story of a priest carrying St George's relics into the battle, with the instruction to 'praye to saynte George to helpe vs against our goostly enemye'.[151] The purpose of the text, and the extent of its use, would have ensured that this association reached the broadest audience likely for the period, as it became the most enduring and widely-used vernacular text of its kind.[152] With the same intentions as the *Golden Legend* to make a consistent collection of sermons, an accessible guide to feast days available for parishes, it suggests, through the use of 'enemye' as a

---

[148] Good, pp. 19-20, 95.

[149] Riches, *St George: Hero, Martyr, Myth,* p. 12; McClendon, pp. 6-7.

[150] De Voragine, 1483, fol. 158ᵛ.

[151] Mirk, 1508, fol. 97ʳ.

[152] *John Mirk's Festial: Edited from British Library MS Cotton Claudius A.II,* vol. I, ed. by Susan Powell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

standard prayer, that the chivalric aspect of St George's legend remained important and was broadened to characterise his intervention in the spiritual lives of parishioners. This can also be seen in the service provided for St George's day in the Sarum Missal. Here, God is asked that, 'through the veneration of the passion of thy martyr saint George…we may conquer the temptations of the old enemy'.[153]

The saint's association with the armies of English kings was made more direct when Edward I deployed St George, the patron of his crusading experience, as a 'public and official' expression of his domestic wars. Good suggests that the use of the 'arms of St George' to identify his army against the Welsh was a direct association with crusading and with the dragon-slaying aspect of George's legend, recognising the dragon as a national symbol of Wales.[154] If this was the case, then it may be further suggested that at least the political idea of national symbolism existed at this time, both for England and for England's understanding of the Welsh. Good also suggests that the extension of St George as a symbol for a large number of Edward's army 'democratized' the otherwise elite patron of chivalry, making the saint available for more widespread ownership.[155] However, although it may have encouraged a sense of possession among the army, it seems an exaggeration to say that the saint's use in this context encouraged an equality in this ownership, given his use to identify soldiers. The continued use of St George by Edward I in Scotland, and then by Edward III in France, did still more to secure George as the protector of the armies of English kings.[156] It required further development in order to extend his patronage to all Englishmen.

---

[153] *The Sarum Missal in English*, ed. by A. H. Pearson (London: Church Press Company, 1868), p. 362.
[154] Good, pp. 53-4.
[155] Good, p. 54.
[156] Good, pp. 54-75.

The development of war as an increasingly national undertaking aided the transition of St George from a patron of royal armies to patron of England. Through the use of St George in battle, the saint's relationship to English armies does become more explicitly national in its articulation. The establishment of the Order of the Garter by Edward III, with St George as its patron, suggests that his role in England was most strongly tied to the military elite surrounding the crown. In this, too, George was recognised in his national role: in the early sixteenth century the Order's own statutes named him 'the blessyd martyr seynt George patron of the right noble royalme of England'.[157] This had long been the case, as Edward III continued his grandfather's use of George not because of crusading or sentimental reasons but because he had come to represent England. It was recognised in 1351 that 'the English nation…call upon [St George] as being their special patron, particularly in war'.[158] The England of which he was patron, then, was thought of as not just the crown and government, but all English people. The ability of the saint, as patron of soldiers, to also be the patron of England, and the inclusive nature of this patronage, was further recognised in the suggestion of the Canterbury convocation in 1399 that the 'spiritual patron of all English soldiers' should be celebrated 'through all England…as other nations celebrate their patrons' feast days'.[159] This not only translates the interests of English soldiers to the nation as a whole, but shows an awareness that a nation, collectively, could be represented by, and could simultaneously celebrate, one figure. Thus, when St George was named as patron of the English nation, it seems that this was meant in a broad, inclusive sense, rather than only 'the

---

[157] Statutes and Ordinances of the Order of the Garter, 1522, London, BL Cotton MS Vespasian A XX, fol. 2ʳ.

[158] Riches, *St George: Hero, Martyr, Myth,* p. 21; *Calendar of Patent Rolls of Edward III*, vol. 9, 1350-1354 (London: H. M. S. O, 1898), p. 127.

[159] *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, vol. 2, p. 241; Good, p. 81.

monarchy and its associated hierarchy of government'.[160] By Edward III's reign, the patronage of St George was thought to be linked with the collective fate of Englishmen. Although the association of George with the crown, rather than the nation, continued to be acknowledged, there was a sense that he belonged to all Englishmen, and it comes from the English experience of war.

This direct ownership of the saint by the English is best expressed, however, in the numerous accounts in which the name or intervention of St George appears as a battle-cry or prayer for the English army. Froissart, Fabian and the authors of the various continuations of chronicles during the fifteenth century are consistent in their identification of St George as a battle-cry, or even as the figure credited with victories at Crécy and Agincourt. As a battle-cry alone, it may be suggested that the saint was still being called upon as only a protector of the king's army. Yet as well as playing this part in the major episodes of the histories that have been shown, in the previous chapter, to have a collective English ownership, appropriation of St George may be suggested in the same way. As the 1523 translation of Froissart's chronicle describes the 'battell of Cagaunt', the army that proceeds 'in the name of god and saint George' is made up of 'englysshmen', and the episode is described as 'bytwene thenglysshmen and the frenchmen'.[161] This close placing of the use of St George with the participation of Englishmen in battles recurs several times. During 'the batell of Gernzay' particular attention is called to the banner of St George when 'thenglysshmen sowned their trumpettes and reared vp their baners and standerdes'.[162] Against the Scots, too, Froissart records that Edward III's queen recommended 'thenglysshmen' and 'ye archers of Englande' to God and St George, while Fabian's account of Edward I's victory at Berwick

---

[160] Riches, *St George: Hero, Martyr, Myth*, p. 101.
[161] Froissart, 1523, fols 18^v-19^r.
[162] Froissart, 1523, fols 46^v-47^r.

shows that, 'by helpe of god and saynt George, the Englysshe men had the vyctorye'.[163] In Froissart's account of the recapturing of Calais, 'the englysshmen' collectively swear 'by saynt George'.[164] The same episode is recounted in 1530 by John Rastell in a similar manner: Edward III's secret defence of Calais is won by 'Engysshmen' who follow the king as he 'cryed saynt Edwarde / & saynt George'.[165] The *Cronycles of the Londe of Englond*, of 1493, also records Edward III leading 'our Englisshmen' and 'englyssh peple' with the cry of 'a seynt Edward / a seynt George', which helped them to victory against the odds in the same battle at Calais.[166] The same account continues to show Henry V tell his army at Agincourt that 'all englond praied for vs', and 'in the name of almighty god & of seint George avaunt baner & seint george this day thyne helpe'.

Significantly, not only does the king's speech here relate St George to a battle in which the nation is invested, it also implies that the saint was a means through which all of England could participate. The victory over 'our enemies' is then attributed to St George's intervention. The battle-cry of 'A saynt Edward A saynt George' having a rallying effect on 'Englisshmen' is also repeated in Higden's chronicle.[167] This combination of Edward and George further emphasises the association of the latter with the fate of England. The literature available to early sixteenth-century audiences, then, intertwined the name of St George with the collective participation of Englishmen in important campaigns. His status as England's patron stemmed from his particular intervention on its behalf as a saint. This intervention was not just considered a historical occurrence, but was seen as a continuing source of help during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The 1417 minstrel piece celebrating Agincourt claimed

---

[163] Froissart, 1523, fol. 68ʳ; Fabian, 1533, fol. 64ʳ.
[164] Froissart, 1523, fol. 74ʳ.
[165] *The Pastyme of people*, 1530, p. 96.
[166] *Cronycles of the Londe of Englond*, 1493, fol. 126ᵛ.
[167] Higden, 1528, fol. 123ᵛ.

that, before the battle, 'Sent Jorge before our kyng they dyd se'.[168] The piece therefore associates the saint's appearance with its opposition of English and French identities and the celebration of the victory by all England. The editor Thomas Warton suggests in the footnotes that this line should be interpreted as 'The French saw the standard of Saint George before our king', demonstrating that, as a symbol, he was integral to the victory that the piece claimed for all England. However as a piece written for performance and open to interpretation, it could also imply, with poetic licence, that it was the figure of St George himself that was seen. St George was also part of the personal experience of battle for some. The diary of John Taylor, recording his experience of the 1513 campaign in France, states that the English cavalry ('eques anglus') 'assailed the enemy...shouting for St George', and attributes a victory to 'God and St George, for we had received it of them'.[169] For Taylor, then, St George was still actively helping English armies.

Hilton also highlights that it was specifically due to his aid of not just English armies but of 'ye people of this Realme of Englond…agaynste theyr enemyes' that he was honoured, suggesting that George belonged to all Englishmen through his role in their collective history, and that this role was characterised by national war.[170] Material such as the *Golden Legend* also encouraged not only ownership of the saint, but the confirmation of membership of the nation. Its call to 'praye vnto hym that he be special protectour and defendour of thys royame' allowed, through the celebration of St George, for widespread, conscious participation in the nation by praying for its preservation. This then supports Jonathan Good's suggestion that the chivalric facet to his patronage led him to be considered as the protector of all Englishmen. This transition is further demonstrated in peaceful, and more general, uses of the saint as a

---

[168] Warton, *The History of English Poetry Volume II*, p. 257.

[169] John Taylor, in Brock, 'The Career of John Taylor', pp. 197-8, 247-8.

[170] 'Prologue', *Newe Legende*, 1516.

national symbol. In Fabian's account of the coronation of Henry VI, subtleties from the feast presented pairs of figures, St Edward and St Louis, and St George and St Denis. While the poem accompanying the first highlights the presence of Edward of England and Louis of France as holy ancestors representing the English and French blood lines, George and Denis are given to represent the king's 'reygne in Englande & Fraunce'.[171] The use of St George not only recognised the royal connection of the saint, as with his use of St Edward, but also his firm place as the patron of England.

Jonathan Good suggests that the association of St George with the 'successful' kings, which is evident in the historical literature treating the careers of Edward III and Henry V, while generally lacking with the 'unsuccessful' ones, was also of great appeal for the Tudor kings, but Henry VII's use of him demonstrates an awareness of the saint's national role too.[172] Fabian describes his use of George, as he landed, before Bosworth, and 'commaunded suche as were aboute hym, boldly in the name of god & saynte George to set forwarde'.[173] Thus it seems that St George offered a means of legitimacy to Henry's challenge of an anointed monarch. St George had a strong presence throughout Henry's reign, as the king personally indicated the importance of the saint specifically as 'the patron of this our royalme (which) hath yerely and contynuelly ben honnoured and obserued', and also received a relic of the saint, a shinbone, in 1505, his reverence of which 'all England' witnessed.[174] This extension of the experience to 'all England' demonstrates that the national significance of the relic was recognised, and an assumption was made that the saint was a unifying figure. The

---

[171] Fabian, 1533, fol. 186ᵛ.
[172] Good, pp. 52, 89-92.
[173] Fabian, 1533, fol. 227ʳ.
[174] *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII: From Original Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office*, vol. II, ed. by William Campbell (London: Longman & Co., 1877), pp. 152-3; Good, pp. 91-2.

relic's procession was accompanied by unusually ostentatious celebrations, in which Prince Henry took part.[175] Particular care was also taken to ensure that St George's day was observed during absences from court, when at Cambridge in 1506.[176] Events and symbolism were employed by the king to associate the saint directly with the crown. Henry VII commissioned a royal family portrait, depicting the king and princes on one side, and the queen and princesses on the other, under a large central figure of St George, mounted, slaying a dragon, reinforcing the saint's role as a protector of the royal family.[177] Local pageants, too, recognised the particular connection of the royal family to St George, in Hereford, and in Coventry for Prince Arthur, but these too express a wider, English interest, as the figure of St George at Hereford suggests his communication with the 'people of your realme'.[178]

Henry VIII's awareness of St George, then, was of a warrior saint with a particular concern for his family, his ancestors and the English subjects. He also expressed a particular dedication to St George, and furthered the saint's association with the English crown. His use of the saint in war, ceremony and royal imagery may be seen as more than personal devotion or royal tradition: like his father, he sought direct association with George as England's saint. Furthermore, Henry VIII's use of St George, while drawing upon the traditional associations of the saint, also developed his image, tying it further to the crown and, through this, relating his own image to the nation.

---

[175] Starkey, *Henry: Virtuous Prince*, p. 188.

[176] Carola Hicks, *The King's Glass: A Story of Tudor Power and Secret Art* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2007), pp. 25-30.

[177] Anonymous, *The Family of Henry VII with St. George and the dragon,* 1505-09.

[178] *Heralds' Memoir*, pp. 89-90; *Coventry Leet Book*, iii, p. 591.

Henry VIII's public use of St George began with his coronation procession which displayed the banners of St Edward the Confessor, St Edmund and St George.[179] Although all three may be identified as royal patrons, their specific English associations, and the English patronage of St George that was widely acknowledged, suggests that Henry VIII would have known that, through these banners, he identified himself consciously with symbols of Englishness. Far from an innovative move, however, Henry followed both his father and their Lancastrian predecessor in this use of St George. During Henry VIII's coronation, St George also appeared elsewhere, alongside different figures. In the personal crown of the king, which appeared in an inventory in 1521 and is likely to have been created for the coronation, George appeared as one of three images, with Christ and the Virgin.[180] Despite the personal nature of this image placement, particularly given the other images, the public use of the crown, which may have also appeared frequently in the years after the coronation, suggests a desire to be personally associated with the saint.

Henry VIII also echoed his predecessors in the use of St George in his first personal military campaign against France. Overseas or over-border wars had been instrumental in the establishment and development of the cult in England. This was also the case for other cults, as the association of St Edward with English armies served to emphasise his relationship with the fate of England, as did the touching of banners with the relics of St Edmund. Henry VI, too, received greater prominence in the symbolic ending of domestic war during Henry VII's reign. War, then, offered an opportunity to revive and develop saint cults, and the use of St George in 1513 re-affirmed his association with national interests. Ordinances issued in 1513 ordered the use of the badge, or cross, of St George for every member of the king's army, for

---

[179] Loach, pp. 50-1; *Great Chronicle*, p. 340.
[180] Loach, p. 54.

identification on the field of battle and recognition of each other.[181] Initially, it may be thought that this follows the king's personal interest in chivalry, and George's long-standing patronage of soldiers. However, it has already been shown that the protection of English soldiers had, by this point, extended to the nation, and so an association with Henry's army may have been immediately identified with England. Furthermore, the ordinance seems to assume, through its lack of description, that the 'crosse of seynte George' was well known regardless of the 'estate (or) condycyon' of the soldiers, or at least those responsible for carrying out the orders. Finally, the use of St George here is intended for a foreign war 'ayenst his auncyent Ennemyes of Fraunce', to be employed in order that soldiers could be identified on the field, suggesting that, rather than used for purely military patronage, the use of St George was seen as a particular identifier of the English. As shown by John Taylor's account of the same campaign, St George was also thought to have been instrumental in the king's victories, used as a battle cry and given credit for success.[182]

The employment of the cross of St George for the soldiers fighting the king's war 'ayenst *his* auncyent Ennemyes' (emphasis added) provides a further example of the king's desire to be linked to the saint, particularly in his role as patron of the realm, as the war is shown to be both Henry's and the nation's, as will be discussed in the next chapter. This may also be seen in the use of the image of St George himself. In 1526, the king, or rather Cardinal Wolsey on the king's behalf, issued the first representation of the saint on English coinage.[183] The 'George Noble' and half noble appeared after November 1526, and showed the saint mounted, in armour, slaying the dragon, while on the other side, Henry and his queen were

---

[181] Henry VIII, *Hereafter ensue certayne statut[es] and ordenau[n]ces of warre* (London: Richard Pynson, 1513), fol. 2ʳ, in *EEBO* [accessed 13th May 2011].
[182] John Taylor, in Brock, 'The career of John Taylor', pp. 247-8.
[183] Christopher E. Challis, *The Tudor Coinage* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978), p. 311.

represented by a ship bearing a Tudor rose and the initials H and K.[184] The saint's association

with the royal family is clear, while the image of George is, again, consistent with the

majority of his previous English depictions that put the saint in his military persona.

Importantly for Henry VIII, the issue of this coin marks a departure from the traditional media

employed by his ancestors to utilise St George, and a new way of publicly communicating the

king's association with the saint, which, through the inclusion of the dragon, utilised the most

widely recognisable aspect of his legend.

The association between the king and the saint became a frequent characteristic of the

king's personal symbolism, to the extent that it was later commented upon as a particular

example of the use of imagery by Stephen Gardiner. Questioning that the use of images and

saints was forbidden, (writing in 1547,) Gardiner asked 'why dothe the King weare S. Georg

on his brest…(and) why kepe we S. Georges feast?'[185] The king's personal attachment to the

saint, and the use of it in public display, was therefore such that it was central to his own

image, and extended beyond the general removal of saints' days from England's religious life.

More significantly, Gardiner's argument goes on to show that this association was more than

personal. Arguing for the use of religious images, Gardiner, wrongly, recognised a knight on

horseback depicted on the Great Seal of Henry VIII as St George. As Somerset's response

points out, it was in fact the image of the king.[186] Not only does Gardiner suggest here that it

was so common an association that it was an easy mistake to assume Henry VIII was using

the image of St George, but, in his explanation for the confusion also reveals a more

---

[184] Image 13: Henry VIII George Noble, 1526, in Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 155.

[185] Gardiner to Ridley, Feb 1547, in *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, ed. by James A. Muller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933), pp. 260-1.

[186] Gardiner to Edward Vaughan, 3 May 1547, *Letters*, p. 274.

widespread perception of this link. Gardiner's reply suggests that his mistake lies in the 'common language' of his upbringing, when, as the veneration of saints was still widespread,

> the people, taking Saynt George for a patron of the realm… to increase thestimatyon of there prince and soveraign lord, caled there king on horsbake…S. George on horsbake.[187]

Gardiner's assumption that people who cannot read would yet be able to 'rede Sainct Georg on horsback' shows that this particular type of image of St George was thought to be widely recognisable, as was its association with the king. Furthermore, Gardiner suggests that the king's subjects, recognising George specifically as the patron of England, directly named Henry VIII 'St George', in order to praise him. The king's association with George, then, may not just have been an interest in the chivalric, but also in the national, and this, significantly, expresses an investment of nationhood in the figure of Henry himself, that was, so Gardiner implies, widespread. It may be, then, that Henry's own use of the saint was not only as the traditional symbol of English nationhood, but was intended to invest his national associations, usually embodied by deceased, symbolic figures, in his own living person. Public recognition of the king's association with George was also demonstrated by individual subjects, as the Privy Purse expenses of Henry VIII record that, in 1532, a donation of 4s. 8d. was made to 'a poure woman that asked of the king for the love of saint George'.[188] This direct appeal to the king, citing the name of the saint, suggests that it was well known that St George had a special meaning for the king and that even his poorest subjects knew this.

---

[187] Gardiner to Somerset, 6 June 1547, *Letters*, p. 289.

[188] 31 July 1532, *Privy Purse Expenses of King Henry the Eighth, from November 1529 to December 1532*, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: William Pickering, 1827), p. 150.

Gardiner's descriptions of Henry VIII's use of St George in his imagery also show that his use of the saint continued following the redefinition of faith in England. This is also shown in the personal items in the king's possession at the time of his death, which included several items bearing images of St George, more than any other saint represented in the document,[189] and in the continued celebration of St George's day. Although the king did not exclusively use imagery related to St George, particularly during the establishment of the Royal Supremacy when figures such as King David were prominent, the endurance of St George suggests an importance beyond traditional faith. Jonathan Good suggests that the survival of the feast was due to the lack of a real shift in attitudes to saints, so that they 'were left untouched'.[190] However, when feast days during the harvest and Westminster term were restricted or removed in 1536 so that men might work instead, St George's day stands out as a specific exemption, alongside those of the Apostles and the Virgin Mary, 'all which shall be kepte holy'.[191] It may be that the lack of a tomb, and the comparative lack of emphasis placed upon pilgrimage, meant that there was little for earlier reformers to criticise when attempting to remove 'superstition and hypocrisy' from religious observance.[192] The Order of the Garter may also have been a factor in the special status of St George. The 1522 statutes demonstrate that the Order and the saint were inextricable, referring throughout to the 'moost noble ordre of saynt George named the Gartyre', or 'the knyghtes of saynt George', and legislating for the strict observance of the feast wherever they were, the wearing of his image, and penance to

---

[189] Items 225, 2995, 3426, 33, 17790 and 2091, *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Society of Antiquaries MS 129 and British Library MS Harley 1419*, vol. I: The Transcript, ed. by Starkey (London: Harvey Millar, 1998).

[190] Good, p. 124.

[191] A copy of the act made for the abrogation of certain holydays, 1536, p. 824; Fiona Kisby, '"When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year and Religious Reforms, at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547', *JBS*, 40, 1 (2001), 44-75 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3070769> [accessed 2nd March 2011] (pp. 71-2); Duffy, pp. 394-5.

[192] Duffy, p. 398.

his altar.[193] The objection of the author of the *Grey Friars' Chronicle* to the feast's eventual abolition in 1552 that 'it hath bene of ane olde costome that sent Gorge shulde be kepte holy day thorrow alle Englond' suggests that it was as a national tradition that St George in particular, rather than saints in general, had survived to this point. It seems that it was due to St George's own cult, rather than the lack of a shift in attitudes, that he was celebrated even into Edward VI's reign. The final public association between Henry VIII and St George occurred in the appearance of his image on a banner at his funeral in 1547. Although the traditional accompanier of kings' funerals, the fact that George still appeared following the Reformation reinforces both the king's personal devotion and his unique status in England.[194] The appearance of Henry VI was an unusual addition, and, as previously stated, suggests that Henry VI was of a similar standing, although it is clear that there were significant differences between the nature, extent and longevity of the two cults.

There was clear political recognition, and official encouragement of the veneration of St George, but his patronage was expressed as a wider protection and representation of all English people, firmly established by the end of the fifteenth century. To a greater extent than Henry VI, St George was also the object of genuine, extensive popular interest. While Muriel McClendon emphasises the lack of a permanent shrine or local connection to the saint's life in England as an important factor in St George's broad popular celebration, a central, physical home for St George's cult in England was, at least, created. The establishment of the Order of the Garter by Edward III, and its spiritual home at Windsor, where the king founded the College of St George, appropriated the martial saint as its patron. This would have served to associate the saint with a permanent physical location. The instalment of relics, including the

---

[193] Statutes and Ordinances, 1522, fols 2^r, 4^v-5^r, 10^v, 23^v, 25^v-26^r.
[194] Loach, pp. 62-5.

heart which Henry V is said to have received from the Emperor Sigismund in 1416 further emphasised this. Despite the lack of a tomb, then, the collection of the physical remains of St George at Windsor could have had the same significance for his cult as had the reburial of Henry VI here. The motives behind the establishment of the two figures' physical associations with Windsor were quite different, the translation of Henry intended to neutralise his political significance, the collection of St George relics intended to emphasise the status of the College and the association of George with the Order. However, both cults were, through these actions, provided with a home. The importance of this local association is acknowledged in the *Golden Legend*, which recognises both the Order and 'noble college in the castell of wyndesore', which also housed 'a pyece of his heed'.[195] The printing of the *Golden Legend* in 1483 would have served to broaden knowledge of the shrine's contents. Also in common with Henry VI, pilgrim badges survive depicting St George, indicating that pilgrimages were undertaken which sought him out at a particular location. A badge held in the Museum of London depicting St George killing the dragon was found near Southwark, London, supports this.[196] The usual desire of pilgrims to seek favour from, or a physical proximity to, a particular saint or shrine suggests that St George would have been commonly associated with a location.

It cannot be said, then, that there was no home of St George's cult in England, although there was no tomb. However, Windsor's importance did not limit its extent. His patronage extended to local churches throughout England. Guilds dedicated to the saint existed in Devon, Norwich, York, King's Lynn, Sarum and Cornwall, among others, and his

---

[195] De Voragine, fol. 158ᵛ.
[196] 'Pewter Pilgrim Badge of St George' <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/Collections-Research/Collections-online/object.aspx?objectID=object-28940&start=5&rows=1> [accessed 31ˢᵗ August 2012].

feast day formed an important part in civic life.[197] In York, the combined guild of St Christopher and St George received numerous and continual bequests, and by 1538 the guild was able to agree to continue to keep St George's day 'as haith beyn accustomyd'.[198] In Sarum, the Guild of St George, founded in Edward III's reign, was large, consisting of the 24 Aldermen and 48 councillors, and processed each year on the saint's day, well into the sixteenth century.[199] In Norwich, the celebration of St George, and the observance of his feast, took place over three days, and was the main concern of the guild's records throughout the year.[200] Founded in 1385, the guild in Norwich developed its tradition throughout the fifteenth century, but gained more significance in the second half of the fifteenth century, when, joined with the local government in 1452, the guild, and the feast, became central to local society.[201] In Bristol, St George's day was celebrated with a procession, and was considered among the most important civic events, listed in 1515 as one of the processions for which officials could be fined if they were absent, alongside those for Corpus Christi, St James, St Lawrence, All Hallows, Trinity Sunday and Michaelmas.[202] The records of Ashburton in Devon also suggest a particular prominence in the church's imagery, listing a payment for 'glazing a window of St George', later 'fixing and setting up of St George', another for 'painting…the image of St George', before bearing witness to his removal along with other images in 1547.[203]

---

[197] McClendon, pp. 7-11.

[198] Eileen White, *The St Christopher and St George Guild of York* (York: Borthwick Institute, 1987), pp. 4-5, 16.

[199] *Churchwardens' Accounts of S. Edmund and S. Thomas, Sarum*, pp. xv, 64.

[200] McClendon, pp. 11-15; *Records of the Gild of St. George in Norwich, 1389-1547*, ed. by Mary Grace (Norwich: Norfolk Record Society, 1937).

[201] McClendon, p. 12.

[202] *Ordinances of Bristol*, p. 11.

[203] *Churchwardens' Accounts of Ashburton, 1479-1580*, ed. by Alison Hanham (Torquay: Devonshire Press, 1970), pp. 58, 76, 85, 121.

Veneration of St George continued to grow up to the eve of the Reformation, as in the 1490s and after, new shrines were still appearing all over England.[204] Alongside his local importance in various places, it also seems there was awareness that this was part of a larger cult. Hutton suggests that, despite some places not seeming to have marked St George's day, the feast was still 'one of the national festivals of early sixteenth-century England'.[205] This sense of unity is suggested by the communal celebration of St George's day by 27 villages in Cambridgeshire in 1511.[206] Moreover, the broad appeal of the saint in England also demonstrates a degree of consistency in his portrayal, suggesting that the widespread recognition was part of the same celebration.

McClendon suggests that the appeal of St George in some places may have been linked to his other, less well-known associations with fertility and with themes of death and resurrection, given the timing of his feast in spring.[207] However, the majority of commemorations reflect, instead, George's patronage of chivalry and the central aspects of his legend. Riches indicates that the military associations of St George were common from around the twelfth century: in images from Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire, he is shown as a soldier, while a 1360s window in Heydour, also Lincolnshire, shows him in armour alongside St Edward and St Edmund, also in armour, therefore associating him with established English saints, in the same way that battle-cries often named him with St Edward.[208] The twelfth-century image in Fordington in Dorset also shows him as a crusading knight.[209] In Cornwall,

---

[204] Ronald Hutton, *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year, 1400-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 55.

[205] Hutton, p. 27.

[206] McClendon, p. 11.

[207] McClendon, p. 8.

[208] Riches, *St George: Hero, Martyr, Myth*, pp. 21-2.

[209] Image 3: Tympanum, Fordington, Dorset, in Good.

the procession of the guild of St George included a guild member playing him as a knight.[210] In Sarum, too, the procession included St George 'harnessed'.[211] The dragon also appears frequently. The pilgrim badges held in the British Museum and the Museum of London, of different designs, both show St George on horseback, slaying the dragon.[212] In Norwich, the St George's day procession included the figures of both George and the dragon, while the dragon was the only aspect of the celebration that later survived the Reformation.[213] The dragon also appeared in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Stratford-upon-Avon and Little Walsingham in Norfolk.[214] His military patronage was therefore widespread. The frequent use of the dragon and, in some places, a princess for George to rescue, also suggests the widespread acceptance of one version of his legend. Although the literary and visual narratives of the saint's life did vary, popular celebration of St George was quite consistent.[215] Finally, the consistency of the celebration of his feast across England may be seen to represent a degree of unity in the saint's commemoration. The importance and even centrality of the saint in local communities may also, therefore, represent local investment in a national figure. Thus, in response to the abolition of the feast by the Bishop of London in 1552, the author of the *Grey Friars Chronicle* was able to complain that St George's day was 'ane olde costome…thorrow alle Englond'.[216] In the author's opinion, at least, the feast was considered a long-standing tradition, a view gained both from religious observation and local celebration. Significantly,

---

[210] McClendon, p. 11.

[211] *Churchwardens' Account of S. Edmund and S. Thomas, Sarum*, pp. xv, 51, 64.

[212] 'Pewter Pilgrim Badge of St George'; 'Pilgrim Badge depicting St George and the Dragon' <http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights/highlight_objects/pe/p/pilgrim_badge_depicting_st_geo.aspx> [accessed 31st August 2012].

[213] McClendon, pp. 12, 22-3; *Records of the Gild of St George in Norfolk*.

[214] Hutton, p. 27.

[215] Riches, *St George: Hero, Martyr, Myth*, pp. 1-35, 36-67.

[216] *Grey Friars*, p. 74.

he was also aware that the tradition was a means by which the community participated in England.

Conclusion

The status and celebration of a number of individual saints in England, whose cults were observed within the framework of traditional religion, demonstrate that the investment of nationality in individuals was an important aspect of the expression of English nationhood prior to the 1530s. This was an action that was collectively undertaken, and although it often also depended upon both royal and ecclesiastical agency, these saints were central to the devotional and social life of local communities. The cults provided a means of participating in the nation, and this consistency is perhaps the best example of England almost acting and observing devotion as a single community. Several saints, in different ways, represent aspects and manifestations of the encouragement of, and participation in English nationhood. A number of saints represented different periods in England's devotional past. However, the interaction and compatibility of cults and imagery to the eve of the religious changes that sought their destruction demonstrates the simultaneous representation of Englishness by several figures which were often inter-dependent. The material that was made available at the end of the fifteenth century through print, rather than helping to define and invest nationhood in a single figure, instead increased the distribution of a number of long-established cults with claims upon the representation of Englishness.

The most widely distributed hagiographic and historical literature that identifies relationships between saints and English nationhood highlights St George most prominently, and demonstrates a consistently military character to both the development and continuing observance of his cult. Historical material emphasised and helped to further establish the roles

of both St Edward and St George as protectors of Englishmen in wars, which in turn stressed their national patronage. In contrast, the responsibility of Henry VI, as a saint, for the welfare of the nation was largely only asserted in less widely-circulated or unpublished material, although histories of his reign acknowledged his sanctity. This may be explained as a great deal of the literature printed in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries pre-dated Henry VI's reign in its original form, and the official recognition of Henry VI was still being pursued. However, the histories of Henry VII's reign demonstrate a desire to establish Henry VI's posthumous ability to intercede on behalf of the fate of England. The interventionist role is a particularly important aspect of the investment of nationhood in such figures. St George in particular, but also Henry, and to a lesser extent Becket and St Alban, are all identified as having a particular responsibility for England as a whole, or an issue which encompasses all Englishmen. Figures such as George, Edward and Edmund, particularly when placed together in the case of the two pre-Conquest kings, also embodied the temporal depth of England.

Henry VIII expressed a particular devotion to the saint that seems to have surpassed his predecessors, and significantly, this devotion recognised and sought an association with George's representation of nationhood. The continuation of this devotion after the removal of the majority of saints' days and the destruction of shrines demonstrates that the association was more complex than traditional religious devotion. It depended instead upon both the personal devotion of the king and a relationship with nationhood. Overall, the number of saints to whom some level of responsibility for the nation was assigned, their interaction and the relationship that they facilitated between local and national, demonstrate that the investment of nationhood in individuals was an important aspect of the expression and confirmation of Englishness prior to the 1530s.

Occasions for Nationhood

It is clear that the place of certain saints both in collective 'national' recognition and in local observation provided a means of participating in the wider community of the nation. More generally, the celebration of saints' days highlights a tendency for national participation to be more evident during occasions which were part of everyday lives, but provided a difference from the 'norm'. While it may simply be that there is more evidence of national sentiment at these times due to their prominent nature, it seems instead that, as today, particular causes of celebration or protest, or the need for troops and funding for wars, encouraged, or forced, a greater degree of engagement with the nation. The aim of this chapter is to examine occasions and events that provided opportunities, or created the necessity, for the expression and definition of nationhood.

It will be shown that, given the limited nature of English kingship, the ambitions of, and threats to, the crown demanded that kings courted the support and participation of their subjects, and that this was often articulated as an appeal to nationhood. Royal celebrations and public display provided opportunities to draw upon existing national sentiments in order to invest nationhood in the person of the king, and thus encourage support for, and participation in, English kingship. The use of significant individuals also characterised the interaction between local communities and royalty in their appearance in pageants and public celebrations. This support was needed in both the pursuit of war and the prevention of rebellion and usurpation, occasions which also necessitated, and influenced, definitions of the nation. However, the previous chapter demonstrated that Englishness was not merely monopolised by, or absorbed into the monarchy, but could transcend it. This is made more apparent in the following discussion of occasions that witnessed the expression of English identity. Although widespread celebrations suggest some identification of the king with the

nation, local civic celebrations also emphasise that English subjects' expression of their identity took place parallel to, but often independent from, definitions encouraged by the crown. Celebrations provided a means of communication between king and people, and allowed different interpretations of nationhood to coexist, while war necessitated the strengthening of royal rhetoric in order to stress the need to perform membership of the realm by supporting the king. The importance of this support caused royal rhetoric to encourage not just a sense of participation but an active responsibility for the welfare of the realm. While the dialogue between crown and subjects expressed through celebrations was characterised by the coexistence of different interpretations, the sense of responsibility that English subjects did express characterised a more fractious interaction with the crown. Occasions of popular protest, prominently 'Evil May Day' and, past the end of the period in question but representative of English subjects' sense of responsibility, the Pilgrimage of Grace, demonstrate a contest for the right to 'speak for England'. Contrary to the concerns of royal rhetoric to invest nationhood in the person and actions of the king, protesters sometimes saw themselves as expressing their membership of the nation, in often sophisticated popular, or 'non-elite' political action which was lent legitimacy by the importance of their consent.[1] Such occasions thus highlight popular participation in collective affairs through an emphasis on the shared experience. Proclamations concerning war in particular may be said to have encouraged participation 'on the basis of national membership', and highlight a 'reliance on popular political participation'.[2] The prominence of popular protest, and the sense of responsibility which it demonstrates among English subjects for the fate of the realm, also suggests 'an "ascending" notion of legitimacy'.[3] Popular, often political participation, and

---

[1] Shagan, p. 19.
[2] Calhoun, pp. 5, 66.
[3] Calhoun, pp. 5, 70-1.

the exercise of popular will in the actions of government, were therefore important elements of the early sixteenth century understanding of nationhood.

I. Celebration

Occasions of royal celebration demonstrate that the crown's self-definition often involved symbols of, and association with the nation, which drew upon traditional royal rhetoric. They were also opportunities to communicate to subjects a definition of nationhood that invested the nation in the crown and encouraged them to participate in the performance of Englishness. It will be shown that the limited nature of the English monarchy, combined with the challenges to its security and its ambitions, meant that kings needed to defend their actions to their subjects and court their support and participation. The reflection of elements of national rhetoric in local, civic celebrations suggests widespread awareness of the nation and a sense of participating in its definition. Further, the local performance of nationhood and response to royal events also demonstrates, as did evidence of saint cults, the ability of national and local to coexist. Celebrations provided the opportunity to confirm membership of the wider community of England, not only by encouraging involvement in such events, but also recognising a shared responsibility for England's crown and fate.

In the previous chapter, it was suggested that the role of St George as a representative figure of the nation was utilised by Henry VIII in order to invest Englishness in his own person. As an occasion, special royal attention was given to the saint's feast. Other royal occasions employed similar symbols in order to invest definitions of England in the crown. Significant occasions of Henry VII's reign were marked by royal rhetoric of nationhood. The royal family's own pageantry emphasised the choice of Arthur as the name of the heir to the throne as a deliberate reference to the ancient king. The celebration of the birth of Prince

Arthur by Carmelianus associated the new prince with a venerated king and an existing English cult, and invested him with the security of the nation.[4] Other such royal events were also utilised to associate Henry VII with symbols and representations of English nationhood in more public media. *The receyt of the Ladie Katheryne*, recounting in detail the public spectacles that accompanied royal occasions from the arrival of Katherine in England to the death and funeral of Prince Arthur, records the use of references to both St George and King Arthur in the pageants in London.[5] The arrival of Princess Katherine was one of the most significant and longed-for events of Henry VII's reign, having been negotiated since 1488 to secure powerful recognition of his kingship.[6] Although a civic display, this particular piece must have been constructed by a member of the king's court and so belongs instead to the category of royal rhetoric and expresses the intentions of the king to be associated with these figures.[7] The second and fourth pageants employed both the symbols of the crown in the form of roses, dragons, harts, lions and greyhounds, and the cross of St George, directly associating the king and his imagery with the English saint, while the name of King Arthur appeared in speeches to the princess which emphasised that the name given to her future husband bound him to the 'vaillaunt kyng' and allowed him to 'Succedith the furst Arthure in dignite'.[8]

The use of English, and not Spanish, for these displays indicates that this was for the benefit of Henry's subjects rather than Katherine, and demonstrates the intentions of the

---

[4] Walker, p. 211-2.

[5] *Receyt*, pp. 26-7, Kipling, 'Introduction', *Receyt,* p. xiii.

[6] Anglo, 'The London pageants for the reception of Katherine of Aragon, November 1501', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 26, 1/2 (1963), 53-89 http://www.jstor.org/stable/750570 [accessed 28 June 2015] (p. 53).

[7] Kipling, pp. xviii-xix; Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 58.

[8] *Receyt*, pp. 14-5, 26-7.

pageants to speak instead to the English audience, emphasising the popular association of Henry VII and his family with established representatives of England. This was not lost on the compiler of the *Receyt*, who recognises the opportunity for 'true and lovyng Englisshe people' to 'perceyve the pure and proper Prince Arthure'.[9] The displays were for the English audience, and so it was expected that the mythical allusions would be understood. The statement above suggests that the writer understood his own nationhood to be invested in the king and prince, implying that to be a 'true and lovyng' Englishmen was to be interested in the life of the prince. The priorities of this pageant are, as discussed in chapter two, illustrative of the emphasis placed on the use of ancient past by the crown in the rest of the text. Other opportunities for public display also referenced Britain's ancient past. The coronation procession of Elizabeth of York, for example, included a barge carrying a 'great red dragon spowting flamys of fyer', apparently the first of its kind.[10]

In addition to the association of kings with symbols of England, the displays described by the *Receyt* demonstrate that royal occasions were also used to encourage English subjects to collectively participate in both their kingship and in the performance of the nation. The pageants staged for Katherine aimed to invest the fortunes and safety of the realm in the king and his family, as a speech in the fourth pageant predicted that 'the realm of…Arthur…shall stond perpetually /Within the compass of his progeny', while the following pageant emphasised the role of kings as protectors of the realm, as the defeat of the prince's 'rebellious enemyes' was shown to be important for 'Encreasyng in honour bothe you [Arthur and Katherine] and your lande'.[11] In the context of the recent threats of pretenders, this public

---

[9] *Receyt*, pp. xix, 7.
[10] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 129; Anglo, *Spectacle,* pp. 246-61; Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992), pp. 41-71.
[11] *Receyt*, p. 27.

display therefore encouraged its (English speaking) audience to view the enemies of the crown as their own, suggesting that royal military actions were collective experiences. The *Receyt*'s account of Arthur's death also made this event a shared event, suggesting that his passing was, 'to oure Realme of Englond…dolour, sorrow, and great discomfort', and that England, as a whole, could experience an emotion and was in need of comfort from the king.[12] The realm's participation and collective experience of royal occasions was also highlighted by Bernard André, as he suggested that 'ye Englishmen' should celebrate the birth of Arthur, the 'hope of our realm', as a 'happy day most welcome to the English'.[13] André's account also records the collective celebration of the prince, stating that 'all England has begun to extol [him]'.[14] This suggests not only that English subjects were able to participate in the celebration of a royal occasion, but that participation in such collective celebrations was a way of expressing national membership. This is also apparent in another text produced on behalf of the crown. The *Heralds' Memoir*'s account of the coronation of Elizabeth of York reports the popular reception of the occasion as 'the rejoysing of many a trwe Englisshemannes hert', stressing the notion that identification as 'Englishmen' could be expressed by celebrating the queen.[15] Such a statement reflects the crown's intention that the celebration of royal occasions should confirm national membership, implying that 'trwe' Englishness depended upon engagement with royal triumphs.

Proving legitimacy and courting the support of their subjects had become crucial for kings of England. In response to Anderson's suggestion that 'sacral kingship' was incompatible with the development of nationhood, Cathy Shrank highlights the reciprocal

---

[12] *Receyt*, pp. 79-81.
[13] André, pt. 48.
[14] André, pt. 50.
[15] *Heralds' Memoir*, pp. 140-4.

nature of the crown-subject relationship, the reliance on popular support and ascending authority.[16] This is as evident in the communication of royal events as it was in historical material. Celebrations provided opportunities to establish this relationship, emphasising both the crown's importance to the realm's welfare and that of subjects to kingship. Henry VII had employed the rhetoric of nationhood in the public portrayal of kingship, perhaps to reconcile the population to the new reign and reconcile the weakness of his title. Henry VIII's coronation echoed the previous reign in its sense of collective celebration, and participation in the performance of nationhood. In his letter to Erasmus in 1509, Lord Mountjoy stated that 'all England is in ecstasies', a claim that recognised Henry's coronation as a national occasion that should bring all subjects together, and that viewed collective celebration as both possible and expected.[17] The coronation was also accompanied by material that aimed to engage a wider audience in the idea of the coronation as a shared experience. Stephen Hawes' contemporary poem of the coronation of Henry VIII, printed in 1509, is identified in its title, *A ioyfull medytacyon to all Englonde*, as an account intended to encourage interest and ownership of the royal occasion throughout the realm. In the service of the crown, Hawes emphasised Henry VIII's legitimacy by investing the peace of the realm in the king, the heir of both royal houses, predicting that after the shared experience of the recent past, 'our trouble', the king was sent 'By god aboue the rancour to downe throwe', and bring fame to 'all Englonde'. Henry VIII's coronation was therefore an occasion that the whole realm should celebrate, and the poem echoes André's work in its instruction 'Englonde be gladde'.[18] As well as emphasising the coronation as a shared experience, the poem expresses the view that England, as a whole, could articulate its unity, and a single opinion in celebration.

---

[16] Shrank, p. 5.

[17] Lord Mountjoy to Erasmus, *LPFD*, vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 28.

[18] Hawes, 1509, fol. 2r.

Significantly, Hawes' work also justifies the king's accession through the suggestion that it had the consent of the realm as a whole: that the role of 'England', acting as one, played in the coronation was not simply participation, but active responsibility. This recognition was consistent with the official 'device for the manner and order of the coronation' which also emphasised the consent of the realm in Henry VIII's accession identifying in this way the voice of the realm as articulated by Parliament.[19] The coronation thus highlighted that the legitimacy of English kingship depended on the cooperation of all subjects, and that 'an ascending notion of legitimacy'[20] was an important aspect of this relationship. Declaring that 'Englonde…hast crowned openly in syght/ This kynge and quene by good true loue and ryght', the poem suggests the consent and active participation of England.[21] Investing the welfare and interests of England in these ways, and highlighting the coronation as a collective action also suggests that membership of the nation was confirmed through participation in royal occasions, excluding from 'England' those unwilling to participate.

The accession of Henry VIII was also marked by an allegorical treatise, a piece which echoes both Hawes and the official 'device' in its outline of the reciprocal relationship of king and subjects. Edmund Dudley, one of Henry VII's most powerful and most unpopular ministers, was imprisoned in the Tower of London when he produced the *Tree of Commonwealth*, probably begun after his trial for treason, and intended for the king, possibly as an attempt at gaining a pardon.[22] The treatise celebrates the king's accession, and does so

---

[19] Preparations for the coronation, 1509, *LPFD*, vol.1, pt. 1, p. 37.
[20] Calhoun, p. 5.
[21] Hawes, 1509, fol. 2ʳ.
[22] 'Introduction', in Edmund Dudley, *The Tree of Common Wealth* (Manchester: Charles Simms & Co., 1859), p. xvi; Whitney R. D. Jones, *The Tree of Commonwealth, 1450-1793* (Cranbury NJ: Associated University Presses, 2000), p. 29.

by constructing an image of the commonwealth of England which invests the 'whole wealth and honor of this yor realme' in the person of the king.[23] The commonwealth is shown as a 'faire and a greate mightie tree' growing in England, unifying 'all the Subiectes o that realme' through its protection of them.[24] The five roots, its main root – the love of God – and the four supporting roots – justice, truth, 'concorde or vnitie', and peace – each of which produce a beneficial fruit, all grow from the king himself, therefore establishing the crown as the foundation for the good of the realm, its unity and prosperity.

Whitney Jones considers the *Tree of Commonwealth*'s image to belong to a medieval tradition of the 'corporate model' of king and subjects as the head and body, the maintenance of which depended upon the proper place of every person.[25] The treatise supports this view, as the root of concord is reliant upon each level of society being happy in their duty, not reaching above themselves or mistreating those below. However, as much as it follows a traditional viewpoint, it sets up the new reign as a new start. This was a common theme of Henry VIII's accession, as Thomas More also reflected on the vices of all levels of society, and suggested that the commonwealth is 'well nere vtterlie vaded and deade', in need of repair.[26] In particular, the roots of truth, justice and concord highlight the need for an example to be set for nobles, the prevention of corruption, and a sense of fellowship. In common with Hawes, Dudley's work emphasises his prediction that Henry 'is the Prince that shall renewe the com[m]on wealth wthin this his realme' through references to England's still recent turbulent past. His prayers for the new king lament that the commonwealth 'this longe tyme

---

[23] Dudley, *Tree*, p. 5.
[24] Dudley, *Tree*, p. 9.
[25] Jones, *The Tree of Commonwealth,* pp. 26-32.
[26] 'Introduction', *Tree*, p. xvii.

hathe bene in sore decaie', and the treatise also holds up as warnings of bad kingship to future monarchs of the realm 'their own progenytors'.[27]

Dudley also relates this construction of the commonwealth to his own identity, suggesting that the commonwealth and his prayers were important because of his status as 'an Englishe man'. It defines his identity through his concern for the good of the realm which is firmly invested in the crown, and implies the exclusion of those who do not. The treatise follows this thought, describing the tree as 'that thinge, for the wch all true englishmen haue greate neede to praie to god, that our Lorde and Kinge will thereon haue singuler regarde and favor'.[28] However, the way in which the *Tree* constructs the relationship between king and subject also implies a greater sense of involvement for 'all true englishmen'. Examples of Henry's predecessors provide lessons to avoid an untimely or 'marvelous cruell deathe', as in the cases of Harold, Richard II or Richard III, or Edward IV's loss of heirs, echoing histories of the fifteenth century in stressing the importance of having 'the loving hartes of his subiects'.[29] Furthermore, despite advocating the traditional, static social structure, the king's duty to 'maintaine and supporte' the commonwealth, and the duty of subjects to 'loue, dreade, serue and obey him', the assertion that the commonwealth 'toucheth people of eu[er]y degree' implies a sense of the responsibility of all subjects. Dudley expects everyone to 'helpe to reforme where need doth require...to the most worldlie ioye and comforte of...inhabitants of this realme of Englande', assigning all subjects a duty to challenge where, significantly, they believe it is needed.[30]

---

[27] Dudley, *Tree*, p. 2.
[28] Dudley, *Tree*, p. 8.
[29] Dudley, *Tree*, pp. 7-8.
[30] Dudley, *Tree*, pp. 2-3.

Aimed at a broad English audience, the reception of Hawes' poetry would have had similar expectations of transmission as Caxton suggested: broad ownership and oral communication. Dudley's treatise, by contrast, survives only in manuscript form and was meant initially for the king, and reflects instead his own, and prevalent elite opinion. However, other media through which celebrations were communicated to subjects suggest that the encouragement of popular engagement was aimed at all social levels. Other occasions encouraged the participation of subjects in the crown's celebrations, and were advertised in ways that allowed broad popular understanding. Payments recorded in 1512 list the use of 207 lb. of gunpowder at the Tower of London in celebration of the birth of Prince Henry the previous year.[31] London in particular would have been more involved in this type of royal celebration. The *Great Chronicle of London*, compiled in around 1512 but the work of an earlier hand to 1439, demonstrates both the proximity of these royal events to the city, and the local nature of their celebration. The account of Henry V's return from Agincourt describes the procession welcoming the king, including the Mayor and Aldermen of the city, while, in the second portion, Henry VII's coronation is marked by the description of the feast at Westminster, but no celebrations elsewhere, perhaps due to the ability of the author to access information from the feast.[32] However, the chronicle also acknowledges the setting of these celebrations within their wider significance, recognising Henry V's army as 'Englyssh men' and the king's return 'home into his Reume'. For this writer, the celebration encouraged his own sense of belonging to a wider community.

Royal encouragement of popular engagement with celebrations was not restricted to London. Towards the end of Henry VII's reign, the accounts of the port of Dover record the

---

[31] Payments for War, 1 November 1512, *LPFD*, vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 670.
[32] *Great Chronicle*, pp. 93-4, 239-40.

expense of 42s for a triumph to celebrate the marriage of the king's daughter Mary (her 1507 betrothal to Charles, later Holy Roman Emperor) at the king's command.[33] Later, a messenger was paid for news of Princess Mary's birth in 1516.[34] Similarly, in 1533, the birth of Princess Elizabeth was advertised to the realm by minstrels and letters, recorded in Cambridge,[35] in the same way that the arrival of Prince Arthur was announced, by 'messengers sent to al the astatez and cities of the realme'.[36] These examples suggest that it was important for the crown to encourage popular knowledge of its triumphs, inviting or ordering widespread ownership of these occasions. Further, they reinforce the recognition of celebration as a means to shape sentiment. In 1524, people were also encouraged to participate in celebrating the capture of the French king, as instructions were given to the Mayor of London for bonfires and wine 'for the pepulle'.[37] This occasion was not limited to London, and seems to have been 'national' in terms of the geographical extent expected. Archbishop Warham, reporting from Kent in 1525, shows that the people were 'commaunded to make fyers and tokens of joye for the taking of the Frenche Kinge', suggesting an attempted official coordination of celebrations.[38]

Examples of local celebrations across England at least corresponded with elements of royal celebrations. An important element of communication between subjects and the crown was the royal visit, an occasion that was utilised by cities in order to express loyalty. Perhaps responding to the attempts of English kings to invest in themselves both the welfare and the symbols of nationhood, these occasions provide a number of examples in which cities

---

[33] BL, Additional MS 29,617, fol. 355ᵛ.

[34] BL, Additional MS 29,618, fol. 117ᵛ.

[35] *REED: Cambridge*, ed. by Alan H. Nelson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), p. 106.

[36] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 101.

[37] *Grey Friars*, p. 32.

[38] *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, series III, vol. I, pp. 373-4; Bernard, *War, Taxation and Rebellion in Early Tudor England: Henry VIII, Wolsey and the Amicable Grant of 1525* (Brighton: Harvester, 1986), pp. 3-5, 96.

engaged with the nation. Echoing royal rhetoric, civic celebrations welcoming royalty often acknowledged the role of the monarch in the protection of the realm. The 1456 Coventry pageant for Queen Margaret predicted that through her son, 'pece & tranquilite shall take this reme' and 'in prosperite this empire shall stand'.[39] The importance of kings and princes to the realm's welfare also characterised Coventry's interaction with the Yorkist Prince Edward in 1474, identifying him with 'all the londis welth'.[40] In the first year of his reign, Henry VII was greeted in Bristol with a speech that recognised his duty 'to reforme thinges that be contrarious vnto the Comen wele',[41] while the planned Worcester pageant welcomed him as the 'defence to England as a walle'.[42] The visit of Prince Arthur to Coventry in 1498 also witnessed the identification of the prince's duty as the defeat of 'outward Enmyes', while a ballad for the same occasion echoed royal material by suggesting that 'yngland all playn' had cause to celebrate the prince and pray for his long life.[43] Unspoken but clear throughout all these occasions is the necessity for such appeals to prove loyalty, particularly evident in the successive celebration of Edward of Lancaster, Edward of York and Arthur by Coventry. In the same way that the crown needed to assert legitimacy, subjects needed to prove loyalty. Within this dialogue, both kings and subjects did so through the articulation of nationhood.

The civic pageants greeting royal visitors also employed figures with which kings often associated themselves. Significantly, these occasions demonstrate an appreciation of historical references, echoing devices employed by both Hawes and Dudley. Indirectly, hopes for peace and acknowledgements of potential dangers alluded to the recent domestic conflicts and those who still threatened the throne, while more direct references to England's history

---

[39] *REED: Coventry*, pp. 30-2.
[40] *REED: Coventry*, p. 53.
[41] *REED: Bristol*, ed. by Mark C. Pilkinton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), p. 11.
[42] *Heralds' Memoir*, pp. 87-8.
[43] *REED: Coventry*, p. 89-91.

show that such local occasions served to emphasise this element of nationhood. Arthur's appearance as one of the nine worthies in 1498 emphasised not only Prince Arthur's inheritance of his name and the prediction that he would emulate his deeds, but also a concern for preventing traitors that might 'make profer to your lande'.[44] As well as suggesting that King Arthur maintained a concern for England, and investing the welfare of the realm in the prince, this also showed potential usurpers as threats to the land as a whole, a feature of royal rhetoric that became important in deterring rebellion. King Arthur's association with English kingship is also highlighted by his use to address Queen Margaret and Prince Edward, as the only one of nine conquerors that 'yn this lande reyned right rially'. The Worcester pageant for Henry VII also mistook the king for 'Arture the very Britan kyng'.[45] The other figure that appeared frequently in civic pageants was St George. His appearance alongside St Edward or King Arthur identified his role as a patron of English kingship, while his speech to the Yorkist Prince Edward recognised his role as the defence of 'this Royme… from enimies ffere & nere', and an advocate of both the realm and the English monarchy in heaven.[46] The saint also addressed Henry VII in Hereford, speaking for England as he told the king that 'the people of your realme holy reporteth and saith' that he was a good ruler.[47] The speech therefore assigned the saint the ability to communicate with, and represent the realm, suggesting the exclusion of those who disagreed with this statement, a particularly important idea for the city, and the *Memoir*, to assert against the contemporary threat of Lambert Simnel.[48]

Records of civic celebrations also suggest that cities responded to the encouragement they received to take collective ownership of royal occasions. The pageant in 1456 for Queen

---

[44] *REED: Coventry*, p. 89.

[45] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 88.

[46] *REED: Coventry*, p. 55.

[47] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 89-90.

[48] 'Introduction', *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 31; *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 117.

Margaret also marked the birth of her son Edward, recognising the event as a cause for collective celebration, suggesting that, 'as mankynde was gladdid by the birght of Ihesus, so shall this empire ioy the birth of your bodye'.[49] The *Heralds' Memoir*'s account of the celebrations accompanying the birth of Prince Arthur suggests that, in response to the promulgation of the news, 'in the moost parties fiers were made in the presing of God and the rejoysing of every true Englisshe man'.[50] The author's knowledge of what wider celebrations actually took place would have been limited, but it may be suggested that he knew enough about the response to apply this generalisation. Furthermore, the account suggests that taking part in these celebrations identified participants as true Englishmen expressing their membership. These examples demonstrate that civic celebrations of royal occasions were a traditional part of local pageantry in England before 1509. It was expected, then, that English subjects would respond to encouragement to mark the births of Henry VIII's children. Dover acknowledged the birth of Prince Henry in 1511, and then Princess Mary in 1516.[51] The Wiredrawers and Pinmakers' accounts of Bristol recorded payments for celebrations in the city marking the two births. However, the nature of these celebrations in Bristol is revealing of the relationship between local communities and their sense of belonging to the nation, as the company's pageants for these two occasions took the same form as their participation in the city's celebrations of Corpus Christi and Midsummer.[52] Although celebrating a royal event, the nature of the celebration is characteristically local. This was also the case in Sarum:

---

[49] *REED: Coventry*, p. 30.
[50] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 101.
[51] BL, Additional MS 29,618, fol. 34ᵛ.
[52] *REED: Bristol*, p. xxix.

the community was advised of significant events through the ringing of the church bells, in the same way that local events were advertised.[53]

The use of local symbolism alongside the performance of nationhood is also indicated in the pageants staged for royal visits. Such events not only demonstrate the interaction between local communities and national institutions, but also show an awareness of, and engagement with, Englishness. As mentioned in the second chapter, during visits to both York and Bristol, Henry VII was presented with elements of local foundation myths that had developed alongside those of the nation as a whole. In York, the king Ebraucus bestowed the city on Henry, stating that 'Myn Heirez this my cetie shuld have in possession'.[54] The pageant confirms that authority of Henry VII over York, but seems to justify this in terms of the town's past, suggesting that this authority is derived from Ebraucus submitting the town to the king as his descendant, 'Sith that I am a primatyve of your progenye'.[55] The figure symbolically legitimised the king's reign using local mythology, but also combined it with knowledge of Henry's own history, with a scene depicting his landing at Milford Haven, and also a planned pageant of the six previous Henries.[56] In Bristol, the city's mythical founder Brennius described himself as the king who

bildede with her wallez olde

And called it Bristow in the begynnyng

For a memorial that folke ne wolde

---

[53] *Churchwardens' Accounts of S. Edmund and S. Thomas, Sarum*, pp. xxvii-xxviii.

[54] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 75.

[55] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 76.

[56] *Heralds' Memoir*, pp. 75-7; *The York House Books,1461-1490*, vol. 2, ed. by Lorraine C. Attreed (Stroud: Sutton, 1991), p. 483.

Oute of remembraunce that acte race ne unfolde.[57]

This public display therefore provided a stage for the performance of local identity, expressing the town's temporal depth to the visitors and reasserting it to inhabitants. It was also an opportunity to win favour with the king. The pageant was used to identify Henry as sent by God to help the city, while the speech of Prudence acknowledged Bristol's place in the wider community of the realm, telling the king that 'al your saide subjectes both love you and drede'.[58]

These pageants show that an awareness and celebration of temporal depth was an important part of the rhetoric of local identities, particularly during experiences of national institutions. The cities were motivated by needing to prove their loyalty, but in doing so they demonstrated the interaction of their own identity and that of England. They highlight an interaction and compatibility between local and central origin myths and suggest widespread acceptance of this past as part of England's foundation. In the same speeches, both Brennius and Ebraucus confirm their own authority and the places of their towns in the broader setting of the realm. Brennius welcomes Henry first to 'this lande', then to 'this towne', while Ebraucus names himself 'of Brytayn'. The choices of towns to greet Henry VII and his family with such figures demonstrate an awareness of the relationship between local and national pasts, and between crown and nation. Furthermore, they echo the new king's appropriation of origin myths, suggesting that the historical legitimacy sought by Henry VII was well-known by his subjects. Local engagement with the ancient history of England, and its relevance to civic identity, was demonstrated in the second chapter, particularly as Ricart's *Kalendar*

---

[57] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 93.

[58] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 93-4.

aimed to record Bristol's history within the framework of a wider ancient past.[59] Pageants for royal visits provided the stage for this awareness to be extended.

The celebrations of St George's day also demonstrate the coexistence of national and local, and the marking of events in characteristically local ways. The consistency seen in the images of St George across England is also shown in the features of the St George's day celebrations, in the frequent use of symbols such as the dragon. This, combined with the acknowledgement in the pageants staged for visiting royalty, suggests that there was some awareness of participating in the performance of Englishness. This participation was also accompanied by a strong sense of the local community. As shown in the previous chapter, the feast day was, in some places, one of the most important local events of the year.[60] Elsewhere, the day was marked by display and pageantry that characterised other local occasions. In Bristol, payments for torches for St George's day are listed alongside similar payments for Midsummer and Michaelmas, and the day was closely associated with the Mayor, as it was in Norwich.[61] By 1498, the saints' day was so firmly established in Coventry that the *Leet Book* was able to refer to the procession route as the one 'vsuelly vsed oane seynt George day'.[62] In York, the centrality of the day was invested in the combined guild of St Christopher and St George, which proved popular and important in the life of the local community, receiving numerous and continual bequests, and, in 1538, the guild was able to make the decision to keep the day 'as haith beyn accustomyd'.[63] St George's day therefore demonstrates the interaction between local communities and ideas of nationhood. However, the existence of

---

[59] *Kalendar*, p. 8.

[60] McClendon, pp. 11-15; *Records of the Gild of St. George in Norwich, 1389-1547*.

[61] *REED: Bristol*, pp. 7, 25-31.

[62] 25 January 1498, *Coventry Leet Book, or, Mayor's register, containing the records of the City Court leet or view of frankpledge, A.D. 1420-1555*, vol. 1, ed. by Mary Dormer Harris, (London: K. Paul, 1907), p. 283.

[63] *The St Christopher and St George Guild of York*, pp. 4-5, 16.

symbols of nationhood performed in the same communities as, but independently of their associations with kingship, also suggests that English subjects recognised the investment of their identity in their kings, but that their sense of nationhood also transcended this definition.

Occasions for celebration, then, provided opportunities for communication between the crown and its subjects, and were exploited by successive kings to shape definitions of English nationhood and invest Englishness in themselves. This was achieved through the identification and redefinition of existing, traditional ideas and the suggestion of shared experience and participation in their kingship. To a certain extent, the reflection of this rhetoric in civic pageantry suggests that English subjects were also able to associate their kings with their understanding of nationhood. However, this investment of Englishness in the crown was not definitive. The need for kings to intertwine their kingship with the definition of the realm became particularly important in order to both achieve their ambitions and to maintain their position, and such aims also highlighted debates over aspects of defining the nation on the public stage.

II. War

War occupied a significant space in the celebratory life of England, shown by the presence of St George and the official attempts at the collective celebration of victories. Conflict was also central to the construction of England's past. National membership was defined through the experience of the 'other'. To early sixteenth-century recipients of historical material, memorable victories belonged to England and Englishmen. The memory and experience of domestic war is evident in the military elements of civic display, in the several references to defence and peace.[64] Conflict itself was particularly important not only

---

[64] Ingram, *REED: Coventry.*

for expressions of nationhood but also for defining it. The encouragement of popular support and participation was often expressed in language that appealed to national sentiment. The experience of war and resultant material was also an opportunity to express English identity both in terms of symbolism and in encountering the 'other'. Finally, in seeking participation in war, the protection of England was shown to be the responsibility of all subjects, encouraging a sense of ownership. This responsibility for the nation's good, as advocated by the *Tree of Commonwealth* and suggested by Stephen Hawes, was not, however, always exercised in the pursuit of the king's aims, but had, and continued to have, important ramifications for popular response, both positive and negative, to the actions of government.

Royal display and imagery emphasised in particular the military obligations of kings as protectors of the realm. The poem written for St George's day in 1491 celebrated Henry VII as the military protector of the realm, as his victory and kingship meant that 'Al Englande hath cause [Henry] to love and drede' as, following the death of Edward IV, 'This realme, a season stode in great jeopardie'.[65] Rewriting the recent past, Bosworth is shown here to reunify the realm and bring peace. For Henry VIII, as prince, the influence of both his father's experience and the historical material included in his education emphasised the martial duties of his station and gave him a desire to gain fame through war. Both Henry and his subjects recognised that a king was expected to protect and maintain England. Echoing constructions of frontiers which defined England, the accession of Henry VIII was greeted with expectations of a king's obligation, and this king's desire, to make war. The coronation poem of Stephen Hawes, like the predictions of Lord Mountjoy,[66] sees 'ryght excellent courage', fame and honour, juxtaposed with the repeated references to the joy of England at

---

[65] *Heralds' Memoir*, pp. 159-60.
[66] Starkey, p. 282-4.

the coming of the new king. Furthermore, the direct role of England in crowning Henry and Katherine and its suggestion that his kingship was upheld by consent also implies that the protection of his people from a repeat of 'our troubles' was expected. Hawes also shows that the king's martial role was to gain fame for his realm, expecting 'the viii. king of his name / With golden droppes all Englonde to fulfyll', linking Henry's fame with the wellbeing of his kingdom. The king's enemies are considered the nation's enemies, and England hopes 'by hardynes that we maye subuerte / Our soveraynes enemyes to hym contraryous'. Henry's expected military achievements are made national goals and the act of war itself a unifying event, providing definition for the English nation through a comparison with the king's enemies. Hawes' *Medytacyon* is of the same type of nationally-themed material of this period which Cathy Shrank identifies as both encouraging and instructing English subjects in their nationhood, and it highlights in particular the relationship between the fortunes of the monarch and his realm in war. It recognises the importance of war in shaping ideas of nation and encourages and commits English subjects, defining membership of the England that crowned him as collective participation in his battles.[67]

Campaigns themselves often necessitated the rhetoric of nationhood to encourage support. The redefinition of Henry VII's victory at Bosworth as the salvation of England encouraged acceptance by justifying a past deed as the good of the realm. The St George's day poem of 1491 sought to define Englishness as joy in Henry VII's victories and kingship. Consistently, as popular participation was required in coming battles, appeals were made to the common good of all subjects, by outlining the enemy's threat as a danger to England. Anticipating the landing of Lambert Simnel, Henry VII ordered his nobility to him 'for aide

---

[67] Shrank, p. 2.

and strengeth of theym silf and of the hole realme'.[68] A threat to Henry was therefore a threat to England, the fortunes of the king intertwined with that of his subjects. A similar rhetoric also characterised the early wars of Henry VIII. As has already been discussed, the king's first personal campaign in 1513 was accompanied by an appeal to English historical narrative with an English life of Henry V. The ordering of an English work of this nature indicates an attempt to appeal for popular support, and echoes his father's order for a translation of Christine de Pizan, printed in 1489, which also recognised the value of printing in English in order to reach a broad audience, 'all manere men of werre'.[69]

More practical preparations for war began earlier and also made more direct use of national rhetoric. In this, early sixteenth-century campaigns could make use of print in order to further manipulate sentiments of nationhood, to an ever-increasing extent. A proclamation of November 1509 expressed concern on the king's behalf that the 'peace which…hath long continued in this his realm' meant that his subjects might not be as well prepared for war 'as they have been in time past'.[70] The suggestion here of the past might be intended to stir a desire to recreate past successes, recognising, or at least predicting, a widespread knowledge of that history and giving the credit of those victories to all subjects. Commanding 'all and every subjects…being able in person and in goods to serve his highness in time war', the king also includes all subjects in the 'defense of this his realm of England, and of his subjects of the same': the threat posed is to all of England, and all of its inhabitants would participate in its protection. Again, to 'serve his highness' and to defend England are shown to be the same. The concerns of this proclamation are echoed in the 1511 enforcement of the Statute of

---

[68] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 111.
[69] Printer's Notice, in Christine De Pisan, *the boke of the fayt of armes and of chyualrye* (London: Caxton, 1489), fol, 135ʳ, in *EEBO* [accessed 25th August 2013].
[70] *TRPI¸* p. 83.

Winchester, reference to which also recalled past glories as the statute was first issued under Edward I. This proclamation, echoing a traditional concern that had first been expressed in the early stages of the Hundred Years War, bemoaned the decay of archery among English subjects, necessary 'for the defense of their persons and of this…realm', suggesting not only that war was the pursuit of all Englishmen but that it was an ever-present concern.[71] The past importance of the longbow was recalled often, emphasising the role of archers who have 'defended this Realme' against 'owte ward enmys in tyme heretofore passed', and conquered other realms 'to the fere of all straunge nacions'. Widespread participation in this activity was enforced through the placing of archery butts in 'ev[er]y Citie Towne and Place' and the commandment that 'ev[er]y man being the Kynges Subjecte...shuld use & exercyse shotyng in long bowes', while the exclusive English possession of the longbow was guarded, as strangers were faced with imprisonment for unlawfully transporting bows or arrows outside the king's territory.[72] It seems that actual participation was extensive, with a broad geographical and social range, although it began to decline slowly from around the middle of Henry VIII's reign onwards.[73]

As the need for participation grew more urgent, national rhetoric encouraging support also grew more conspicuous. The need for Henry VIII to justify his intentions against France, and to seek consent and support is highlighted by the production of the 'trew and dewe title', the existence of which suggests that the need for support of the 1513 war was well-known.[74] However, while this document outlines at length the arguments behind England's wars with France, further proclamations provided the means for a more direct appeal to a wider

---

[71] *TRPI*, p. 89; Gunn, 'Archery Practice in Early Tudor England', *Past and Present*, 209, 1 (2010), 53-81 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40960933> [accessed 10th October 2011] (p. 53).

[72] 3.Hen.VIII, c.3, *Statutes III*, pp. 25-6; 6.Hen.VIII, c.2, *Statutes III*, pp. 123-4.

[73] Gunn, 'Archery Practice', pp. 55-61, 67-8.

[74] Cruikshank, *Army Royal*, pp. 2-7; Craig Taylor, ed., *Debating the Hundred Years War*, p. 32.

audience, indicating a need not only for the support of his council but that of his subjects. In November 1512, the justification for war against France was outlined as a response to Louis' intention 'to set and bring schism'.[75] Support for this war, then, was the duty of every good Christian. Christian duty could also be considered a national concern, as Polydore Vergil recognised that, in response to the Pope's appeal for aid against schism, it was given at least 'partly so England would not be stigmatized for ingratitude', echoing the proclamation by suggesting a threat to England's reputation.[76] However, the strongest argument offered is that of the threat posed to England. The proclamation adds that the French king 'hath of late attempted divers enterprises of war as well by sea as by land against his highness and his subjects of this his realm of England'.[77] The experience of this threat was therefore extended to all of England as a single community. This danger was repeated in more threatening detail in the order for muster against invasion, in January 1513, as the 'great and strong navy' had been prepared by the French 'to invade and enter this…realm of England' to 'burn, slay, and destroy all that they may overcome'.[78] Failure to support the king in his 'defense of this his realm of England' would, therefore, lead to invasion, submission and destruction. The ordinances of war for Calais later that year also spell this out through the juxtaposition of the 'manifest danger' posed to England and the suggestion of the 'subversion of realms, and destruction of people'.[79]

Proclamations concerning later conflict remained consistent, echoing these earlier counterparts by employing almost identical language, for example in 1522 when the king's 'ancient enemy the Scots' intended to invade 'the realm of England, and not only to burn and

---

[75] *TRPI*, p. 94.
[76] *Anglica Historia*, book XXVII, pt. 5.
[77] *TRPI*, p. 95.
[78] *TRPI*, pp. 101-2.
[79] *TRPI*¸ pp. 106-7.

consume…but also to steal, spoil and rob his subjects'.[80] The danger posed to the realm as a whole reinforced war as a collective experience, an occasion on which the nation was defined because it was threatened. Other proclamations reinforced the definition of the realm called for by war, as one, in December 1512, expressed concern for the 'sure keeping of the sea and for the defense of this realm against the enemies of the same'.[81] Here, the physical protection of the realm and the division between England and her enemies is emphasised and nationhood defined by the exclusion of others, as the threat of war emphasised the sea as a barrier. The wide appeal intended for the earlier piece of November is further suggested by the declaration that the necessary financial grant had already been made to the king by his 'loving commons', meaning that the king was now justifying the 'one whole fifteenth and tenth'.[82] In addition to the threat the nation was to experience as a whole, the consent and cooperation needed from the population further defined their role. This early group of proclamations, viewed together, demonstrates an appeal for participation in an anticipated war which was consistently articulated as a petition to recognised ideas of nationhood.

The language used in proclamations was also expressed by the king directly: a letter to James IV in 1513 on behalf of the king aimed to show that the safety of his realm was his personal concern. Henry's complaint outlined injuries inflicted on England by Scotland, the enmity of the French king towards England, and his intention to reciprocate.[83] It suggests that the causes of the king, against Scotland and France, were inseparable from those of the realm, and also recast the damage inflicted on the extreme North of England as the collective injury of all of England. Finally, the belief that the king's own cause was that of England is also

---

[80] *TRPI*, p. 138.
[81] *TRPI*, p. 100.
[82] *TRPI*, p. 95.
[83] Henry VIII to James IV, 12 August 1513, *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, vol. 1, ed. by M. J. Thorpe (Edinburgh: H.M. Register House, 1858), p. 1.

indicated by another, later letter, to Wolsey, discussing a truce with France. The main concern expressed here is the king's desire to be recompensed for his due inheritance of the throne of France, and it expresses his belief that this cause was of concern of his subjects, suggesting that 'if I be slack in [the inheritance], my subjects would murmur'.[84] The echoing of this cause in proclamations, for example that which announced an alliance with Spain in April 1513 and aimed for the 'recovery…of the inheritance of our said sovereign lord' alongside the protection of England, suggests an assumption of widespread knowledge of the nation's history and further supports the notion that the material discussed represents an attempt to shape identity and intertwine the fortunes of king and subject.[85]

In outlining the national threats faced collectively by the king and his subjects, the material justifying Henry VIII's early wars also approached another aspect of nationhood as it acknowledged the presence of the 'other'. In naming the French king the 'ancient enemy' of the king and his realm, the proclamations draw upon a distinctly national history.[86] The frequent references to the threat posed by outside forces also serve to unite the realm against a defined common enemy, and, again, drew upon past rhetoric as they echoed established fears of threats to England. The victories of Henry V and the realisation of his aims exposed feelings of the vulnerability of the nation state as, in 1420, the confirmation of the Treaty of Troyes was qualified by Henry's English government with a guarantee that the two realms would remain separate, and that England would not answer to Henry as king of France, which, in turn, echoed earlier fears of Edward III's government. Uniting the crowns of England and France therefore threatened at least the independent administration of England, and, according to Vergil, these fears resurfaced as Henry VII's daughter Margaret married

---

[84] Henry VIII to Thomas Wolsey, *Letters of King Henry VIII*, p. 24.
[85] *TRPI*, p. 103.
[86] *TRPI*, p. 101.

James IV. They feared, it seems, an 'accessory union', subsuming the rights of one realm to become part of another. However, the union which eventually resulted from this marriage followed the nature of the rule already practiced by the Spanish Habsburgs and outlined by the Treaty of Troyes, uniting the crowns but maintaining their separate identities.[87] Henry VII responded to fears for the realm's integrity by extolling England's superiority as the 'noblest head of this entire island', and predicting that it would therefore not be 'absorbed by Scotland'.[88] Although these instances only directly betray the fears of government, they tie the fate of the realm to the crown, and express a heightened awareness of England as a whole. The proclamations of Henry VIII encouraged these fears in a wider audience, establishing them as shared concerns, and England as an entity under threat. The fears of the 1420s were also made directly available to English subjects as statutes published by John Rastell during Henry VIII's early reign repeated the guarantee that 'Englond shall neuer be subiect nor obedient to the reame of Fraunce'.[89]

War therefore shaped ideas of nationhood, as the collective participation required a definition of the included against the excluded, of the limitations of national identity. As has already been shown, on England's frontiers, where English subjects directly encountered the 'other' through conflict, trade or everyday interaction, the importance of this presence to feelings of nationhood is more apparent. This proximity necessitated a definition of membership of the nation, which tied Englishness to loyalty and thus further invested nationhood in the crown. Although the proclamations dealing with the identity of Calais residents were specific and limited to a unique situation, their issue coincided with the preparations for the 1513 expedition, suggesting that impending war made securing the

---

[87] Elliott, 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', pp. 52-4, 59-61.
[88] *Anglica Historia*, book XXVI, pt. 41.
[89] Rastell, *Statutes*, 1527, fol. 69ᵛ.

participation of the frontier more urgent. Further evidence suggests that, during periods of war, this necessity for definition also applied, more generally, to the realm as a whole, and war therefore resulted in strict and specific definitions and instructions for Englishness. The threat of invasion from Scotland while the king was in France in 1513 necessitated the prevention of possible internal threats. An order to seize the property of subjects of the king of Scots in August 1513 made the assumption that Scots in England were a danger.[90] Other instructions provided more detailed definitions of enemies present in the realm. An article increasing the duties of commissioners investigating aliens, which in itself demonstrates the heightened sense of the 'other' during war, labelled all Scots in England as enemies, and called for the confiscation of their property and their banishment. However, it also provided strict allowances for complex identity issues. Those who had married English women and fathered children could stay, but were still regarded with suspicion as half their goods were forfeit. Similar instructions for the treatment of Frenchmen directly identified a wartime threat as those near the coast were to forfeit their goods and be imprisoned, while those inland were to find sureties.[91] Thus, although the greater danger posed by those near the coast reinforced the notion of a 'frontier', the extension of suspicion to the whole realm highlighted identity and 'otherness'.

While these orders demonstrate the identification of the 'other' as a threat and the exclusion of the non-English, their significance for stirring popular mistrust lies mainly in their dissemination and fulfilment. The first order, concerning the subjects of the king of Scots, was issued to Oxford and at least 40 other locations.[92] The accounts of Dover record a number of occasions on which the identity of its inhabitants was at issue, showing a payment

---

[90] Scotchmen in England, Grants in August 1513, *LPFD*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 996.
[91] Scotchmen and Frenchmen in England, 1513, p. 990.
[92] Grants in August 1513, *LPFD*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 996-7.

in 1496 for two proclamations for exiling Scots, while during the early 1520s, orders were received for the arrest of Frenchmen and Bretons and their goods, and an inquest held into Scots and their goods.[93] The instructions contained within orders suggest quite public actions: seizing goods and making arrests, the removal of people from communities, an example of which was witnessed in 1522 also under the threat of war, when commissioners recorded the abjuration of the realm by a Scotsman in Thistleton, in Rutland.[94] Such actions carried the definition of 'English' into small communities and may have therefore encouraged fear and suspicion, and a sense of inclusion and exclusion, particularly accompanying declarations of war, orders for watches and warnings about French ships.[95] The identification of enemies as the members of other realms, for example the 'ancient enemy', or 'the Scots' against whom the queen prayed for luck,[96] was therefore transmitted to a large number of English subjects if not through written word then through these instructions to differentiate between 'English' and 'other'.

Participation in wars abroad also contributed to the definition of 'English', as at least England's soldiers and those accompanying the army directly encountered the 'other' in their enemies and allies. Echoing earlier histories, John Taylor's account of the 1513 campaign labels the opposing forces consistently as French and English, and describes the sea battles preceding the campaign as between 'ourselves and the French'.[97] Participation therefore heightened the sense of separate identities, and allowed for the author to identify with the participants of hostilities for which he was not present. The experience of war more generally

---

[93] BL Add MS 29,617, fol. 156ʳ, and Add MS 29,618, fols 166ʳ, 166ᵛ, 191ʳ, 193ʳ.

[94] J. J. Goring, 'The General Proscription of 1522', *EHR,* 86, 341 (1971), 681-705 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/563926> [accessed 10th October 2011] (p. 687).

[95] BL Add MS 29,618, fols 161ʳ, 168ʳ-168ᵛ.

[96] Queen Katherine to Wolsey, 2 September 1513, *LPFD*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 998.

[97] Taylor, in Brock, 'The Career of John Taylor', pp. 230, 232, 238, 247.

produced or reinforced stereotypes and definitions of other nations. Taylor's diary twice points out barbaric and deceitful French behaviour.[98] It also records tension within the army, describing their German infantry as an 'uncouth, savage and ungovernable race', extending the characteristics he experienced of the soldiers to all Germans, and blaming their 'barbaric fury' for the fight which arose between the English and Germans.[99] Stereotypes were also a characteristic of later campaigns. *An ill jurney for the Englshemene*, the account of the Duke of Suffolk's campaign in France in 1523, written by Welsh author Elis Gruffydd, indicates the expression of already established stereotypes, based on previous encounters, between the English and the French. As a Welsh participant in the war, Gruffydd is valuable as an observer of the interaction of the English and the French, as well as the tensions between the Welsh and English. Gruffydd's account suggests that the French opinion of the English collectively led to their prediction that they would do nothing but

> take their sport in strolling around the countryside and eating wheaten bread and meat and fish / and drinking wine, which was a great treat for the English common people.[100]

This apparent English characteristic was also commented upon in the earlier *Italian Relation* which suggests that, during war, the English 'will seek for good eating'.[101] English encounters with other enemies, it seems likely, would have influenced the assumption, recorded by William Worcestre, that 'the Irish nation, as also the Welsh, is hasty to anger above other nations'.[102] Gruffydd also indicates that war emphasised divisions among those

---

[98] Taylor, in Brock, 'The Career of John Taylor', pp. 232, 234.
[99] Taylor, in Brock, 'The Career of John Taylor', p. 246.
[100] Gruffydd, *An ill jurney*, pp. 11-2.
[101] *Relation*, p. 23.
[102] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 121.

on the same side, as discord was created between the Welsh and English in a dispute over who was to blame for unrest within the army, with the Welsh being held responsible 'although there were twice as many Englishmen more eager to turn home than the Welshmen'.[103] Stereotypes were also expressed among the orchestrators of war, as a reaction to the difficulties of administrating the conquered town of Tournai, expressed to Wolsey in 1515, was to identify the problem as their French nature, suggesting that the people were 'so French in heart that they are sure to rebel'. Not only does this imply a stereotype of the French, but it also demonstrates a recognition of differing characteristics.[104] It also suggests that allegiance was expected to be national above anything else.

It has been shown that war necessitated a specifically nation-centred rhetoric that involved the encouragement of a shared experience and the definition of Englishness through the recognition of a non-English threat. War also provided a third facet to the expression of nationhood through its relationship to the celebratory life of England. Alongside the use of the cross of St George to distinguish Henry's troops, the preparations for war in 1512-13 also included orders for 'a standard of white sarcenet with a cross of Saint George', and banners of 'green sarcenet with the picture of Saint George' for use in Guyenne and Scotland.[105] Although the 'anthem of our Lady and another of St George' celebrated by the king after his entry into Therouanne may simply represent his personal devotion, Henry's identification of the saint as 'our patron' in his letter to James IV after his acknowledgement of the injuries received by England suggests that 'our' may refer to the realm collectively.[106] It may be reasonably assumed that the use of the saint and his cross on banners and badges was

---

[103] Gruffydd, *An ill jurney*, p. 9.

[104] Sampson to Wolsey, 15 January 1515, *LPFD*, vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 8.

[105] The Guienne Expedition, 6 July 1512, and Army against Scotland, 1 August 1512, *LPFD*, vol. 1, pt 2, pp. 589, 609.

[106] Henry VIII to James IV of Scotland, 1513, *The Letters of King Henry VIII*, p. 19.

intended as a symbolic representation of England, and followed a tradition of portraying St George as the advocate of Englishmen at war.

The celebration of war also took other forms, as the victory at Flodden was marked by Skelton with a verse echoing Henry's attitude to James IV.[107] The poem begins by responding to the personal conflict between Henry and James, admonishing the Scots king for trying to summon Henry back from France, and for choosing to ally himself with France over his 'lorde and brother', directly echoing the reported response of Henry to the Scots herald, suggesting that it 'becometh ill a Scot to summon a King of England'.[108] The close relationship between Skelton's work and the reported response of the king suggests that the poem purposely reflects royal constructions of nationhood. The superiority of Henry, 'our kynge your souerayne lor[d]', over the Scots King implies the superiority, too, of England, therefore also echoing Vergil's account of Henry VII's speech on the subject. Phrases such as 'our kynge', and 'you and your Scottes', and the physical absence of Henry from his victory, emphasise the involvement of the kings and their subjects in a collective action which did not demand direct participation. Skelton's work further stresses the collective experience of the English at Flodden as it suggests the Scots should have known better 'Than in England to playe ony suche prankes', making their invasion an attack on the realm. The victory is then attributed to 'our englysshe bowes', both assigning English identity to the direct participants and extending participation. The involvement of 'Englishmen' in the victory relates Skelton's poem to rhetoric employed in histories of the Hundred Years War. This relationship is further suggested as the poem gives thanks to St George.

---

[107] Skelton, *ballade*, 1513.

[108] James IV's defiance, 11 August 1513, *LPFD*, vol. 1, pt 2, p. 972; Taylor, in Brock, 'The Career of John Taylor', p. 244.

War both created a necessity and provided opportunities to disseminate a particularly strong concept of nationhood in order to encourage military and financial participation. Significantly, the rhetoric of proclamations and other material expressing the desired construction employed traditional concepts and drew upon similarities from the Hundred Years War. This construction of nationhood also shared common elements with particularly royal celebration: the notion of a shared experience and the participation of all English subjects. However, the suggestion of the realm's consent to Henry VIII's accession implies not just passive participation but an active role, and war seems to have further necessitated this. Evidence associated with war emphasises not just collective participation in the maintenance of the nation, but collective responsibility for it. Returning to Hawes' coronation poem, the hope that 'we maye subuerte / our soueraynes enemyes to hym contraryous' entrusts Henry's subjects with responsibility for defeating the king's enemies. Royal proclamations continued this emphasis. The 1509 muster for defence which suggested that in 'time past', English subjects had been better equipped for war, implies that, in ordering 'all and every his subjects' for the 'defense of this his said realm of England', the king's muster made future success the duty of all of his subjects.[109] Further references to the maintenance of archery, for example in the 1285 Statute of Winchester's reinforcement in 1511, also imply responsibility as it is shown as necessary for the 'defense of their persons and of this…realm'. In this, too, royal constructions of nationhood therefore drew upon established traditions, as the Statute of Winchester had long made it the personal responsibility of all subjects to be ready to fight. This was already adhered to in places such as Coventry, which,

---

[109] *TRPI*, p. 83.

in 1450, recorded detailed provisions for the arming of citizens in order to obey the 'kynges lawes' and preserve the city's peace.[110]

Proclamations outlining the 'manifest danger' posed by enemies who wished to 'burn, slay and destroy' the realm, which made the participation and support of the king's subjects necessary, as the destruction of them and England could only be prevented if, for example, 'the inordinate appetite of the said French King be speedily…repressed'.[111] In response to the threat posed by the Scots in 1513, Henry also reportedly told the Scottish herald that, in his absence, he trusted the 'realm of England' would resist them.[112] Although the description of this interaction is somewhat dramatised, it does echo quite accurately the sentiments of the king's proclamations and own correspondence, and it may therefore be inferred that Henry's response was similar. The best demonstration that the protection of the realm was the responsibility of all English subjects, however, is provided by the 'proscription' of 1522. Described by Vergil as the king's 'census' of the 'condition of his people', it was aimed at surveying the military capabilities of 'all the Realme of England'.[113] Such a survey of available men and equipment, in anticipation of war against France, and of invasion from Scotland, would have served to carry the experience to all parts of the realm simultaneously, but it also aimed to involve the people more directly. The intentions of the survey, outlined by Wolsey's letter to England's ambassadors to the Emperor, were to put the king's subjects 'in sufficient Arredinesse' and provide Henry with 'the [aid] of hys loving subiectes' to contynew the warrys'.[114] Commissioners assessed the ability of eligible men to carry and use

---

[110] *REED: Coventry*, 1450.
[111] *TRPI*, p. 107.
[112] James IV's defiance, 11 August 1513.
[113] Goring, pp. 681-3.
[114] Goring, p. 684.

weapons and also ascertained who could provide their own.[115] Thus, the survey emphasised the obligation of all subjects to be ready for military service, and made them the means by which the king could fulfil his aims. Although the completion of the survey was varied, the return of at least thirty-one county responses suggests that the majority of the realm was involved in this process.[116]

In response to the necessities of war, then, the officially disseminated construction of nationhood had three distinct facets: encouraging collective participation in a shared experience; defining English as distinct from the 'other'; and, perhaps most significantly, the suggestion that war was a collective responsibility. However, the extent to which this rhetoric was successful, or was echoed by English subjects, may be inferred from some examples of responses to war in England. The presence of military symbolism in civic pageantry also suggests that the war-time obligations of communities were long-established, and some took this more seriously and made specific provisions for arming citizens. In the case of Coventry, the sense of obligation was explicitly stated in 1455, coinciding with the first battle of St Albans, as the Leet Book recorded the muster of one hundred armed men for the 'preseruacion & sauegard of our soueren lorde the kyng as every true legeman owethe'.[117] The city therefore recognised the responsibility of all subjects to serve the king in war. It may also be suggested that Coventry's sense of obligation recognised a responsibility for England through this service, as, although these men were sent to defend the king, on other occasions Coventry's civic performances acknowledged the military role of kings as the defenders of the realm from 'all outward Enmyes', as did other cities.[118] Dover also responded positively

---

[115] Goring, pp. 687-90.
[116] Goring, p. 687.
[117] 22 May 1455, *Coventry Leet Book I / REED: Coventry*, p. 29.
[118] 17 October 1498, *Coventry Leet Book I / REED: Coventry*, p. 89.

to the death of the King of Scots. Although far removed from the war with Scotland, Dover's proximity to war with France, and the need for maintaining communication with Henry in France, ensured the town's awareness of it. The news was marked by a celebration on which 20d was spent, for 50 faggots to be burnt, 3s 4d for beer and 22d for bread.[119] Remote events of this nature were also considered worthy of note in the *Great Chronicle of London*. It records that, in 1496, the King of Scots led an army into 'this land', suggesting a sense of shared experience with the north against the Scots, who were later driven out by the 'Inglysh hoost'.[120]

However, the general lack of response to Henry VIII's victories suggests that efforts to encourage enthusiasm for war were not entirely successful. Those marking the king's accession in 1509 were not unanimous in their expectations for war in the new reign. Peace was one of the four supporting roots which Edmund Dudley believed was a 'verie necessarie roote' for the commonwealth, meaning both 'peace between our Soverayne Lorde and his realme, and other outward princes and realmes'.[121] His reason for wanting outward peace is financial, a concern that 'warre is a marvellous greate consum[er] of treasor and riches'. This argument was common, and was given by people in Kent as the reason not to celebrate the capture of the French king, as they were concerned about the 'infinite sommes of money the Kinges Grace hath spent alredy inuading Fraunce', and the greater 'empouerisshing and vndoing of this Realme' needed to keep it. Here, nationhood is instead expressed in the fear of the lasting impact of war, competing with the crown in the best course for England. Vergil also records the argument against responding to the Pope's appeal in 1511, that it would not 'serve the commonwealth's interest', and the fear that 'the entire burden of the war would fall

---

[119] BL Add MS 29,618, fol. 80ʳ.
[120] *Great Chronicle*, pp. 264, 278.
[121] Dudley, *Tree*, p. 21.

on England'. Dudley's root of peace also voices a concern for England's trade. 'There muste be entercourse between this realme and outward' realms, in order to sell surplus commodities and to gain the goods of other realms.

International disputes impacted heavily on trade, even before the employment of hostile forces, as restrictions and banishments of foreign goods were used as foreign policy manoeuvres, and, through this, became widely shared experiences. The *Great Chronicle* shows that Henry VII had 'banysshid all Flemysh warys & Restreynyd his Inglish marchauntes owth of those partys', and in return had caused 'all Inglysh cloth & yern' to be banished from Maximilian's lands, therefore broadening the impact of the diplomatic situation.[122] As an alternative to the glory of war, Dudley's work also sees honour and a reputation to be maintained through peace and trade. The author's pride in his nation is expressed in the recognition of the particularly 'noble' and 'plenteous' commodities of England. As others had referred to the past to demonstrate a need for war and glory, the *Tree* recalls the reputation of England's products, which had suffered, 'to the infamy and rebuke of people of this realme'. In this view, war was still considered to be a shared experience and a national concern, but a negative one, which threatened stability and trade potential, which was also a source of past pride and reputation.

In practical terms, Henry VIII's early wars met with difficulties. The results of the 1522 survey were far from complete, perhaps reflecting an unwillingness to participate. That is not to say that negative responses to the preparations for war necessarily represented a disagreement with the facets of nationhood that they imposed. Gruffydd's account also suggests a reluctance to participate, as it recounts how the Duke faced the problem of soldiers

---

[122] *Great Chronicle*, pp. 253.

'turning their faces towards England'.[123] This lack of enthusiasm in 1523 was also shared by individuals with a more influential forum for their opinions, as a speech attributed to Thomas Cromwell in Parliament opposed the plans for war against France, suggesting that the two conquered French towns of which Henry was proud were 'vngracious Dogholes' not worth the effort.[124] However, Cromwell's speech only expressed an alternative view on what to do about France, and echoed Sampson's letter to Wolsey in its recognition of the difficulties of governing the 'ungracious' and rebellious French, thus expressing an opinion of 'the Frenchmen', collectively, as a result of England's experience of war. It does not necessarily follow, then, that reluctance for war represented a failure to participate in nationhood, suggesting that royal rhetoric did not ultimately define nationhood, but was competing for the right to.

III. Popular Protest

The third major type of occasion on which English constructions of nationhood were effectively shaped is when, perhaps paradoxically, the unity of the realm was disrupted. Protest, rebellion or armed opposition to the crown or government made it important for official or partisan royal material to reduce the threat or, after the fact, justify its suppression, and this need was often fulfilled through the appropriation of nationhood. However, in some cases, popular protest also involved expressions of national consciousness among the participants, not only suggesting wider awareness of the nation but also demonstrating that concepts of England existed parallel to, and transcended those which invested nationhood in the aims of the king. Furthermore, opposition, in the form of rumour, writing or collective action, often demonstrates not just awareness of the nation, but also an active part in its

---

[123] Gruffydd, p. 9.

[124] *The Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell,* vol. 1: Life, Letters to 1535, ed. by Roger B. Merriman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), p. 39.

preservation, a sense that the legitimacy of England's government rested with its subjects, a responsibility for its welfare that corresponded with what English subjects were encouraged to feel, but resulting in actions other than as instructed. Rebellions, or popular protests from the participants' perspective, were therefore occasions on which the right to speak for England was contested.

Rebellion or protest, although often threatening the established regime, made similar demands to war on royal rhetoric, and therefore offered similar opportunities to invest nationhood in the crown. It has already been demonstrated that, in the partisan histories of the fifteenth century, protest or rebellion, or at least the actions of the removed regime, were shown in opposition to the good of the realm. Collectively, the writers employed the idea of unity and England's good in order to legitimise kings and to deter challenges to authority. As a result, the historical narrative of the fifteenth century defines membership of the nation as support of the crown, and so rebellion in particular was portrayed as 'un-English'. The stability of the crown represented the stability of the nation. The thoughts of fifteenth-century kings of England were often occupied with discouraging rebellious intentions, particularly when concerned with those who might challenge their throne. Edward IV, for example, adhering to the traditional royal rhetoric, suggested in a letter to a London alderman that the Lancastrians would ally with England's enemies, resulting in the extinguishing of the 'blood English of this our said realm'.[125] Not only did this letter seek to associate the king's enemies with a threat to nationhood, it also intertwined the preservation of Englishness with Edward's house. Furthermore, he reinforced the definition of nationhood in terms of blood, shared ancestry, and frontiers against the 'other'.

Richard III also had to fight rumour and opposition in order to establish his own reign,

---

[125] Ross, 'Rumour, Propaganda and Popular Opinion', p. 18.

and he also did this in language that suggested he was appealing to national sentiments. The Parliament of 1484 was used to justify his claim to 'all the people', and this intended popular consumption in the broadest sense, including the 'people of this Lande' that are 'not suffisantly lerned', therefore extending its target audience beyond the literate.[126] This was taken further, as the same document also explained that the 'Lawes…of England' were the inheritance of 'every Englishman', while earlier, in 1483, the king had expressed his concern for 'justice to every person' and the 'common weal of his realm'.[127] In aiming to discourage opposition, Richard was also appealing to broad popular opinion to feel a sense of responsibility for maintaining law and peace. Richard's letter to the city of York in 1485 tied the fortunes of his subjects to his own. In attempting to combat the spread of 'noise and disclaundre ageynst our persone', the letter extends this danger to the 'innocent people whiche wold live in rest and peas', making opposition to the king a threat to the well-being of all of his subjects.[128] The approaching threat of Henry Tudor's invasion necessitated further use of such rhetoric, as the threat to Richard's throne became a threat to England, not only because Henry intended to subvert the laws of the realm, but also because of his French backing. Richard's proclamations dealing with the threat instructed 'true and natural Englishmen' to oppose the surrender of continental possessions and the claim of the English kings to the throne of France by Henry.[129] As in times of foreign war, royal rhetoric was able to appeal for all subjects to defend and maintain the realm from an outside danger, and suggest that this, and loyalty to the king, defined 'true and natural' Englishness.

Edward and Richard's Lancastrian counterparts also appealed to ideas of nation, as an

---

[126] Ross, 'Rumour, Propaganda and Popular Opinion', p. 21.
[127] Ross, 'Rumour, Propaganda and Popular Opinion', pp. 27-8.
[128] Ross, 'Rumour, Propaganda and Popular Opinion', p. 22.
[129] Ross, 'Rumour, Propaganda and Popular Opinion', pp. 28-9.

anonymous 1459 pamphlet in support of the harsh treatment of the Yorkists demonstrates. The later-named *Somnium Vigilantis* seems to have been designed to encourage and justify measures on behalf of Henry VI for the permanent removal of the York threat, and did so in terms that demonstrated a threat to the realm, investing its safety in the person of the monarch.[130] Comparing the problem lords to a rotten tooth needing to be removed, the pamphlet argued against mercy as harmful to collective interests, and recommended that it was 'nedefull to the reyaume that thay be eternally depulsed and utterly distroyed'.[131] More significantly, the piece states that the welfare of the nation could only be advanced through obedience, stressing that the principal means 'by the whiche the common welthe of a royame stondyth' was 'due subjeccion…to the soverain', and, therefore, the lords in question, who had acted to 'exalte thaim selfe ayenst the wyll of the soverain, to gedyr his peple, to provoke and to sture him', had also acted against the good of England.[132] In this, the anonymous producers of the pamphlet subscribed to a number of the same traditional concepts which characterised Dudley's work half a century later: that the good of the commonwealth was rooted in the crown, that it was threatened by discord and those subjects who did not occupy their proper place.

The legitimisation of Henry VII's right to rule demanded a continuation of established royal rhetoric to shape nationhood. As with his predecessors, is was necessary for Henry to encourage unity and defend his crown from opposing claimants, and resistance to taxation in 1489 was, for Vergil and the author of the *Great Chronicle,* characterised by its Yorkist

---

[130] J. P. Gilson, 'A Defence of the Proscription of the Yorkists in 1459', *EHR,* 26, 103 (1911), 512-25 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/549840> [accessed 18th August 2011] (p. 512-3).
[131] Gilson, p. 517.
[132] Gilson, p. 518.

element.[133] Recounting the death of the Earl of Northumberland at the hands of rebels, Bernard André lauds the 'peaceful and mild' Henry VII for having 'suppressed all hostile furies' and giving the 'British' 'enduring peace'.[134] Rebellion in one place is thus shown to disturb the peace of all of the king's subjects, but, crucially, Henry restores order. This portrayal of the king was as important as it was to kings before him, as his own reign was also the result of armed opposition to an established monarch.[135] André's words echo earlier royal rhetoric, as one of Henry VII's earliest proclamations, on 11th October 1485, was required to deal with the aftermath of Bosworth and help establish his kingship as legitimate. The proclamation labelled those who were 'against us in the field with the adversary of us' as 'rebels' and 'enemies of nature, of all public weal'.[136] Opposition to this king, too, was therefore presented as a danger to the well-being of the realm, and, in pardoning these rebels, the proclamation also placed forgiveness within the king's gift. It may be suggested that the expectation that English subjects would respond to, and accept an appeal for national peace was not too ambitious or broad, as individual subjects were also able to think of peace in terms of realm-wide phenomenon. In the private correspondence of Elizabeth de la Pole to Sir Robert Plumpton in 1501, England is directly referred to as 'this land of peace', while the letter also expresses some knowledge or at least opinion of the state of the realm as a whole.[137]

Expressing the king's aims as peace and 'public weal', the proclamation of 1485 also

---

[133] Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, 5th edn (Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2004), p. 18.

[134] André, pt. 53.

[135] Fletcher and MacCulloch, p. 123.

[136] *TRPI*, pp. 3-4.

[137] Elizabeth de la Pole to Sir Robert Plumpton, in *The Plumpton Correspondence: Written in the Reigns of Edward IV, Richard III, Henry VII and Henry VIII*, ed. by Thomas Stapleton, with a new introduction by Keith Dockray (Gloucester: Sutton, 1990), pp. 162-3.

sought to placate the rebels by lauding their value to the realm. 'They of those parts be necessary, and according to their duty must defend this land against the Scots.'[138] This statement aimed to dissuade further rebellion by the enforcement of national sentiment, through both inclusion in, and importance to the nation, suggesting that rebellion put the realm at risk from a common enemy. The rhetoric employed in dealing with rebellion therefore shared the characteristics and aims of that which encouraged participation in war, and further demonstrates that war was seen as a means to unify the realm. Similar language is employed in further proclamations. A pardon published in June 1497, following the rebellion originating in Cornwall in response to royal interference in local mining and privileges, and involving 'divers other counties and places', again admonishes the rebels for acting against the interests of the realm, 'to the great slander and infamy of this land', put down by the king's 'true subjects'.[139] Far from a local problem, then, the rebellion was given national consequences, and the rebels' membership of the realm was forfeited, returned only through the king's mercy. The same sentiments were echoed by Edmund Dudley, citing this rising as an example of 'lewde enterprise'. His work warns against discontent and pride among the Commons, which might tempt them to forsake their duty and follow the 'banner of insurrecc[i]on'. It shows that this rising by the 'west p[ar]te of this lande' led by 'their captaine the blacksmyth' gained nothing, and prays that God will 'saue this realme from any such captaine hereafter'.[140] It places the rising within the wider context of England, suggesting that the blacksmith was harmful to the realm as a whole.

Again in common with the first pardon, and further demonstrating the use of a foreign threat, the Blackheath proclamation also cited a common enemy, criticising the rebels for

---

[138] *TRPI*, p. 4.
[139] *TRPI*, p. 39; Fletcher and MacCulloch, pp. 19-20.
[140] Dudley, *Tree*, pp. 50-3.

having diverted the army that was on its way to Scotland, an issue that was one of the causes of the rebellion.[141] The pardon not only emphasised the realm's consent in the expedition towards Scotland, suggesting that it was a collective enterprise and further alienating the rebels from the nation's interests, but also justified the expedition in national terms, as a response to the 'open injuries and damages as have been done unto our said sovereign lord and this his realm'.[142] The particular injury was the invasion of northern England by James IV of Scotland the year before, and therefore, again, used foreign war as the aim of the nation in retaliation for a shared hurt. The threat posed by Lambert Simnel to Henry's throne, as has already been observed, was also shown to be a danger to England as a whole, as the *Heralds' Memoir* records that nobles were instructed to assemble 'for aide and strengeth of…the hole realme'.[143]

The reactions of the government to the rebellions of Henry VII's reign therefore retained characteristics of the rhetoric employed by previous kings and the approach of the partisan fifteenth-century writing that reflected their needs. Royal rhetoric in response to rebels also shared several characteristics with that used for the encouragement of war, and the two were often intertwined. Not only was rebellion discouraged in terms of the nation's well-being, but that well-being was invested in the person of the king. The crown's approach to rebellion was therefore well-established as a precedent for Henry VIII. Before the 1530s, Henry VIII's reign was comparatively trouble-free. Stephen Hawes predicted increased security for the throne, as he sought to emphasise Henry's descent from both York and Lancaster, unifying 'Two tytles in one'.[144] The opposition that did occur during his reign took

---

[141] Fletcher and MacCulloch, pp. 19-21.
[142] *TRPI*, p. 39.
[143] *Heralds' Memoir*, p. 111.
[144] Hawes, *A ioyfull medytacyon*, fol. 1ᵛ.

a number of different forms, to which the responses of the king and his government reveal the use of the traditional elements of royal rhetoric that had been developed for over a century, and was often closely related to language employed in the encouragement of war. Echoing the start of his father's reign, the accession pardon of April 1509 confirmed the power of only the king to pardon 'rebellion done, insurrections…trespasses, riots, conspiracies'.[145] Also echoing his father and predecessors, Henry VIII's response to rebellion was intertwined with the encouragement of war, but under different circumstances: earlier kings had needed to oppose rebellion, and employed rhetoric to deflect this outwards towards a shared enemy, while Henry VIII was occupied with defending his desire for war and encouraging participation.

The most important aspect of this participation, other than military involvement, was financial. The justification for war in November 1512 also involved making English subjects aware that he had been granted the standard 'one whole fifteenth and tenth' by Parliament.[146] More than simply encouraging participation, this proclamation seems to need to justify the financial burden as though anticipating resistance. The rhetoric employed may therefore be seen as a preventative measure against protest and opposition. The tax granted by parliament in 1523 was also accompanied by a general pardon which referred directly to the grant as its cause, suggesting that appeasement might have been thought necessary, while the justification given in Parliament highlighted the intentions of the Scots 'to inuade this realme, wherfore the King of necessitie was driuen to warre and defence'.[147] Thus, the portrayal of war as a shared experience, and the investment of the nation's safety in the person of the king

---

[145] *TRPI*, p. 81.
[146] *TRPI*, p. 95.
[147] 14 & 15 Hen. VIII, c. 16 and 17, *Statutes III*; Roger Schofield, *Taxation Under the Early Tudors 1485-1547* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), pp. 6-7; *Hall's Chronicle*, p. 655.

were also employed by Henry VIII here, as by his predecessors, both in the pursuit of war and in the deterrence of opposition. The proclamation of 1512 demonstrates another dimension of the state-encouraged definition of nationhood, as it urged compliance of subjects to the collection because Parliament had granted it. This emphasises the representative role of government and the right of Parliament to be the voice of all of England collectively.

If measures to encourage participation were intended to avoid protest, then they proved prophetic, as the military campaign and related tax collection 1513-15 was met with some resistance. This opposition was largely passive and was represented in the form of petitions, and the response to this seems to have been mainly one of appeasement, but strictly on the king's terms, as returning peace to the realm is still invested in the king in excusing the petitioning locations from payment. The same problems were highlighted in the Parliament of 1523, as it was pointed out that there was 'not so much money, out of the kynges hands, in all the realme' to fulfil the demand.[148] In 1525, financial burdens were the cause of more opposition, as the capture of the French king at Pavia presented an opportunity for an invasion of France.[149] The Amicable Grant was intended as a non-Parliamentary means of raising income for the pursuit of war and, portrayed as a gift to the king from his subjects, was shown to be for the 'defence of his subgettes' against the 'auncient enemye unto this realme'.[150] However, the Grant followed two years of heavy taxation. In addition to the military aspects of the 1522 proscription, Wolsey's intention for the survey was taxation, and

---

[148] *Hall's Chronicle*, p. 656.

[149] Fletcher and MacCulloch, pp. 21-2; Bernard and Hoyle, 'Instructions for the Levying of the Amicable Grant, March 1525', *Historical Research*, 67, 163 (1994) 190-202 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2281.1994.tb01824.x> [accessed 12th August 2013] (p. 190).

[150] Bernard, *War, Taxation and Rebellion,* p. 53; Bernard and Hoyle, p. 193; Bernard and Hoyle, p. 195.

it was followed by loans and a subsidy.[151] In common with the previous decade, commissioners experienced passive resistance from 'the commons in euery place' that, in Hall's opinion, threatened to become rebellion.[152] Also in common with the previous resistance, the king's response was to relent, but in a way that preserved his position, as Hall's account recalls Henry both distancing himself from the attempted collection and expressing concern that his realm and his subjects 'were so stirred'. Peace was restored through the use of pardons for all 'theim, that haue denied the demaunde', proclaimed to 'all shires', therefore demonstrating to the whole realm that the 'kynges auchoritie royall' was responsible for returning peace. Significantly, it would have also suggested to his subjects that they really did have a role in the welfare of England and that the king recognised this.[153]

The Amicable Grant also repeated another important element of the royal rhetoric of nationhood. As with earlier attempts to encourage participation in the collection of funds for war, the preparations for the Grant also seem to have anticipated resistance. The instructions to commissioners outline the reasons for the Grant, and the process of transmitting them through the pulpit and reading them out, while they also suggest assembling people in stages, fearing it may be 'troublous to assemble the said people in oon day'.[154] As has already been suggested, this implies that all rhetoric employed in the encouragement of war on these occasions was intended to avoid rebellion too.[155] Therefore, in common with predecessors, Henry VIII's early reign also witnessed the direction of hatred outwards and the identification of the nation's shared enemy as a means of discouraging internal division. The relationship between foreign war and domestic peace is directly highlighted by the Grant, as it was

---

[151] Bernard, *War, Taxation and Rebellion*, p. 54.
[152] *Hall's Chronicle*, p. 697.
[153] *Hall's Chronicle*, pp. 700-1; Fletcher and MacCulloch, p. 24.
[154] Bernard and Hoyle, p. 200.
[155] Bernard and Hoyle, p. 193.

intended to fund what Henry saw as his best opportunity for gaining the French throne. The capture of the French king was advertised and 'sprede abrode amonges the people' to encourage the acceptance of the Grant. Instructions were issued to celebrate with 'solemne processions and other demonstrations of laudes and thankes to God', 'fyres and other tokyns ofjoye', and, at St. Paul's Cathedral, a 'hoggys hed of rede and another of claret for the pepulle', before the collecting started.[156] That these celebrations were specifically designed to encourage agreement with the Grant and avoid protest is shown by the instructions that 'the same to be doon not long before the dayes of apparaunce by cause the consolation therof may be fresh in the peoples remembraunce'. In addition to proclamations, then, royal rhetoric was also performed to influence as wide an audience as possible.

Although the *Grey Friars' Chronicle* recorded participation in the celebrations in London, which coincided with regular local celebrations, in the form of 'a grete wache…as it is wonte to be at mydsomer', resistance suggests that this was not necessarily so.[157] Although several places were able to celebrate the French king's capture, resistance indicates a view that war was not universally welcomed. Archbishop Warham reported reluctance in Kent, where he had been sent as chief commissioner, to celebrate the French king's capture. However, this was not a reluctance to engage with national sentiment, but a disagreement over what was good for England. According to the Archbishop, they wished that the king 'shuld not attempte to wyne Fraunce, the wynnyng wherof shuld be more chargefull to England than profitable'. This suggests that those resisting were aware of the wider significance of such events, perhaps heightened by the community's proximity to France. Their concern is placed within the context of the nation, demonstrating the compatibility of

---

[156] Fletcher and MacCulloch, pp. 22-4; Bernard and Hoyle, p. 200; *Grey Friars*, p. 32.

[157] *Grey Friars*, p. 32

local and national anxieties, a local reaction motivated by an awareness of a membership of a larger community, while simultaneously opposing the official encouragement of national celebration. Even within occasions for celebration and the pursuit of war, then, the investment of nation in the aims of the crown was contested.

However, other occasions of less passive popular action demonstrated that appeals to the definition of English through the identification of enemies might be effective. The suspicion of outsiders was woven into certain aspects of life in England, not just by government-imposed controls, but also some local civic controls, for example the exclusion from employment of children of foreign craftsmen by those with the freedom of the city of London.[158] Reactions against a foreign presence had occurred long before Henry VIII's reign, including during the popular action of the Peasants' Revolt in 1381.[159] Later, during Henry VII's reign, some Londoners, on behalf of domestic trade interests, rose against 'Estyrlyngys...and othir Flemyngys'.[160] With greater impact, in 1517, inhabitants of London reacted against the apparent protection received by aliens and again attacked foreign merchants and 'owte-landych' men.[161] According to the Venetian ambassador in London at the time, Sebastian Giustinian, this coincided with negotiations over the renewal of patents allowing Venetian merchants to trade in England.[162] His description of the riots which he witnessed state that it was at the instigation of a preacher, who had encouraged stereotypes and abused the manners and customs of strangers. Concerns were not only for the damage to

---

[158] Roger B. Manning, *Village Revolts: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 196.

[159] Manning, *Village Revolts*, p. 196.

[160] *Great Chronicle*, pp. 248-9.

[161] *Grey Friars*, p. 30.

[162] Sebastian Giustinian to the Signory, 5 May 1517, in *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 2, 1509-1519*, ed. Rawdon Brown (London, 1867), pp. 381-90.

English industry and profits but for the safety of women. Violence was directed at 'all foreigners': although the account suggests that the Venetians were not attacked due to a good reputation, Giustinian himself seems to have felt threatened. In this account, then, the riots represent a belief in the distinction between native and foreign, based on stereotypes of customs, and voice anger about a supposed threat to the English. This description illustrates the international reporting of the event. The presence of such sentiment suggests that the use of the foreign threat in royal rhetoric may have recognised and responded to it, but it at least demonstrates some correlation between state and popular ideas of nationhood. However, the king's response to 'Evil May Day', the punishment and execution of several participants and then the general pardon of the rest, demonstrates that the crown's encouragement of action against foreign threats was desired only when it suited its own ends, when under its strict control and directed outwards.[163]

The issue of financing war became an issue again later, as part of the protests of the 1530s, although this occasion articulated a different point of view from the people of Kent. One complaint the Lincolnshire rebels of 1536 made to the king against the collection of a subsidy was that it was not intended 'for the defence of your person and of your realm'.[164] These subjects were concerned about the wealth of the realm, but supportive of its spending for defence at least. This period of rebellion, the 'Pilgrimage of Grace' and the associated action of the 1530s, was one of the most threatening occasions of popular protest of Henry VIII's reign. Although just outside the period of interest, it had elements in common with earlier protests, and demonstrates the consistency of popular engagement with politics.

---

[163] Manning, *Village Revolts*, p. 198.

[164] Michael L. Bush, "'Up for the Commonweal': The Significance of Tax Grievances in the English Rebellions of 1536', *EHR*, 106, 419 (1991), 299-318 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/573104> [accessed 29th November 2012] (p. 303).

Furthermore, the Pilgrimage represents the response of existing attitudes to the initial changes of the first stages of the Reformation, and the use of established means of persuasion and propaganda by the crown. Reacting against perceived widespread heresy, seizure of ecclesiastical property, and changes to taxation, but also expressing concerns for the welfare of the realm, the Pilgrimage was a large-scale, organised rising, mostly in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire.[165] The motivations of the participants will be discussed below, but the governmental response to their actions further demonstrates the application of national rhetoric in the crown's communication with its subjects, and its use of long-established definitions of nationhood under new circumstances.

Henry VIII's efforts to deter the rebels came in the form of direct communication. Echoing the pardons of Henry VII, an 'address to the commons then in rebellion', October 1536, is perhaps the best expression of the notion that rebellion and Englishness were incompatible, suggesting a threat to nationhood and again demonstrating the relationship between the encouragement of war and the deterrence of rebellion.[166] The address was a direct appeal to national sentiments, and placed the risings in the wider context of the realm. From the first line, the address challenged the Englishness of the rebels: asking 'what natural Englishman is he that with himself daily doth consider…', it implied that the actions of the rebels were un-English. The damage to the realm was further expressed as the address suggested that rebellion might cause the realm to be 'divided within itself', and that the 'most strong country of England will be destroyed', echoing proclamations that outlined the destruction threatened by France and Scotland. The unity and peace of the realm was shown

---

[165] Bush, 'Up for the Commonweal', pp. 299-318; Bush, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: a Study of the Rebel Armies of October 1536* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), pp. 20-2, 25; *LPFD*, 11, no.522.
[166] TNA, SP 1/113, fols 216-221[r].

to be threatened by this attack 'ayenst your prince and countrey'.[167] The elision of the person of the king, the nation and traditional notions of commonwealth invested national safety in the monarch, and reinforced the portrayal of the king as the embodiment of his realm.

The belief that the rebels should be concerned for the realm was also expressed elsewhere, as the king, in a letter also from 1536, wondered how his subjects could rebel when they have been protected by him from outward enemies for so many years.[168] As well as articulating a belief that his subjects should care for the realm, this letter also echoed the earlier concerns for peace and the use of ever-present enemies, establishing the king as the guarantor of continuing security. The association between king and nation was also expressed more directly in the address of 1536, as it dealt with one of the main issues of the rebels, that of the king's advisors, stating that an attack on the counsellors was an attack on the king himself. The juxtaposition of the notion of an attack against the king, and the destruction of England, reinforced the suggestion of the crown representing the nation. An idea of unity, and of inclusivity as Englishmen, was emphasised by the repeated use of 'countrymen', referring to all members of the realm, including the king, who, through the address, states that 'as I call you countrymen, we be all bretherin'.[169]

An official response to the events of 1536 was also expressed through printed material, as Richard Morison, an accomplished scholar and a new addition to Cromwell's staff in 1536, was employed to defend the king's government through a series of apologist pamphlets.[170] The importance of print in influencing popular opinion was central to the

---

[167] 217r.

[168] 'Henry VIII to unknown', [October] 1536, *LPFD*, vol. 11, p. 274.

[169] 218v.

[170] W. Gordon Zeeveld, 'Richard Morison, Official Apologist for Henry VIII', *PMLA,* 55, 2 (1940), 406-25 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/458453> [accessed 6th October 2011] (pp. 406-11); Tracey

assertion of the king's supremacy, and Arthur Ferguson identifies the events of the 1530s as the first national debate to have been articulated through print, with a receptive public audience.[171] Debates surrounding the Pilgrimage of Grace, and the exploration of meanings of loyalty in print, demonstrate the potential that the medium had provided. However, the importance of printing to the portrayal of English kingship, and the definition of nationhood, had been demonstrated in the earliest occasions of Henry VIII's reign, and earlier. Although defending the changes to which the rebels were objecting, the beginnings of a reinterpretation of England's identity, Morison's work employs well-established features of national rhetoric which characterised the encouragement of celebration and participation in war.

The first tract, *A lamentation in whiche is shewed what Ruyne and destruction cometh of seditious rebellyon*, reacted to the initial uprising of Lincolnshire, and appeals fervently on behalf of the good of the nation, suggesting that, rather than acting on behalf of England, the rebels would 'traitorously make of one nation two'.[172] In common with material associated with other occasions above, the *Lamentation* associates the nation with the king, as the voice of England declares that the rebels 'seek the destruction of me, my most noble and prudent prince, King Henry VIII, and his true subjects'.[173] Although the rebels insisted upon their loyalty to the king, the tract makes no distinction between their aims and a challenge to the crown. The implication was that the participants were not the king's 'true subjects', that a rebel 'loveth not his country' and could not call himself an Englishman, thereby losing his

---

Sowerby, *Renaissance and Reform in Tudor England: The Careers of Sir Richard Morison c. 1513-1556* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 1-2.

[171] Arthur B. Ferguson, *The Articulate Citizen and the English Renaissance* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1965), p. 136.

[172] Richard Morison, 'A lamentation in whiche is shewed what Ruyne and destruction cometh of seditious rebellyon', in *Humanist Scholarship and Public Order: Two Tracts against the Pilgrimage of Grace*, ed. by David S. Berkowitz, (London: Associated University Presses, 1984), p. 85.

[173] Morison, 'A lamentation', p. 89.

status through his disloyalty. This echoes earlier material, such as the proclamations concerning the identity of Calais residents, in its implication that identity could be forfeited through an individual's actions. Also echoing proclamations associated with war, the voice of the nation asks 'if Lincolnshire seek to destroy England, what wonder is it if France and Scotland sometime have sought to offend me?'[174] Not only does this place Lincolnshire, and fellow rebellious regions, in opposition to England, it also names England's enemies and highlights the outward danger, blaming this civil unrest for England's vulnerability and potential harm. The scale and threat posed by the Pilgrimage seems to have prompted a need to reassert the right to define loyalty, and print was, by this point, viewed as an effective way to communicate and enforce a revision of popular opinion.

Collectively, then, several examples of rebellion or protest during the reign of Henry VIII, with different provocations and varying aims, all demanded a response from the crown that expressed some element of national rhetoric. Furthermore, the means employed in deterring resistance demonstrate not only the continuity in crown rhetoric but also the consistency in this rhetoric with other types of occasion. The frequent need to defend the actions of the king and the demands made of the people demonstrates the limitations and vulnerability of the English crown, and the awareness of English subjects of the legitimacy of the government's actions which ascended from them. Steven Ellis suggests that the crown was limited by the law in its response to rebellion, and that often some punishment, followed by submission and pardons, as seen in the examples above, was often the only course of action available to the king, and it seems that this was dealt with by emphasising the

---

[174] Morison, 'A lamentation', p. 89.

responsibility of the king for peace through justice.[175] This was also a prominent theme of acts of reconciliation. Morison was not alone in his written response to the uprising in 1536. William Calverley, a Yorkshire gentleman whose name appears on Lord Darcy's muster roll for pilgrims and was probably among those taken to London following their failure, also produced a piece for printing which reinforced the crown's voice.[176] Although listed as 1535, it has been identified as a work which follows the Pilgrimage in 1536-7. However, unlike Morison, Calverley's work was the result of the need for personal reconciliation, and is an apology from a former pilgrim, likely written as part of a bid for a pardon and release from prison, although others had been able to purchase their freedom.[177] As such, it is an interesting reflection of what was perceived to be a pleasing submission. The addition of the colophon 'cum privilegio Regali' when printed, along with his release, suggest that it was approved.

Calverley's work suggests that, not only did his circumstances prompt a reconsideration of his obedience, but also that the Pilgrimage itself brought his own notions of identity into a sharper focus. His *Dyalogue bitwene the playntife and the Defendaunt*, written as a conversation between a prisoner and a voice representing reason, advocates 'faythfull obeysaunce / Towardes his grace', as God commands.[178] This is followed with a portrayal of the king's virtues and the benefits of his rule. In this, Calverley demonstrates a consideration of the English community, observing that, 'in this lande', the king brings 'To al

---

[175] Steven Ellis, 'Henry VIII, Rebellion and the Rule of Law', *Historical Journal*, 24, 3 (1981), 513-31 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2638881> [accessed 6th October 2011] (pp. 524-9).

[176] Janice Liedl, 'The Penitent Pilgrim: William Calverley and the Pilgrimage of Grace', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25, 3 (1994), 585-94 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2542635> [accessed 6th July 2015] (pp. 585-7).

[177] Liedl, 'The Penitent Pilgrim', p. 588; John Bellamy, *The Tudor Law of Treason: An Introduction* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979), p. 219.

[178] William Calverley, *A Dyalogue bitwene the playntife and the Defendaunt* (London: Thomas Godfray, 1535?), in *EEBO*, [accessed 4th July 2015].

his subiectes / greatest ioye & pleasa[n]ce'. Consequently, 'Conserued is this most noble regyon'. Given the text's preceding description of Henry VIII's rule of England France and Ireland, it may be suggested that 'regyon' refers to England. Calverley is therefore prompted to reflect on his membership of the English community. This is associated with the loyalty and obedience for which the piece was written. However, although the work of an educated gentleman, with classical references, his voice may be seen as that of a participant in the Pilgrimage. With statements such as 'in this lande / false {pro}phetes dare nat byde', addressing the key question of the king's religious changes which had contributed to the Pilgrimage, the text implies that, as a pilgrim, his view of the cause would have also been in terms of 'this lande', when he may have held views which this piece seems to retract.

More broadly, the examples of war and rebellion emphasise the role of English subjects in influencing royal rhetoric and the characteristically limited nature of the English crown: participation and support was necessary. Royal rhetoric necessitated by war and rebellion encouraged the active responsibility of all subjects for the realm. Despite the intentions of the crown, this responsibility translated to certain protests, lending legitimacy and allowing the expression of political opinion and participation in protest as an effective demonstration of this duty, and of membership of the realm. This active participation in the political life of the realm influenced events of the fifteenth century. It also informed overseas, particularly French, characterisation of the English as king killers, or, as more mildly put by the *Italian Relation*, as a people who 'generally hate their present, and extol their dead sovereigns'.[179] There was, therefore, some truth to Henry VII's suggestion in 1497 that rebellion and challenges to the established king caused the 'slander and infamy of this land'.

---

[179] P. S. Lewis, 'Two Pieces of Fifteenth-Century Political Iconography', *JWCI*, 27 (1964), 317-20 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/750525> [accessed 7th October 2011] (pp. 319-20); *Relation*, p. 32.

Occasions of political protest not only provide examples of the royal definition of nationhood, but also demonstrate, in some cases, expressions of English identity and a sense of acting on behalf of the nation among protesters. In some ways, their sentiments seem to respond to, or perhaps influenced, royal definitions of nationhood. They both, therefore, contributed to the sense of nationhood. However, in expressing a sense of responsibility for the realm through protest, it may be suggested that the participants also claimed the right to speak for England that contested that of the government. Alongside the royal use of national rhetoric, the protests of Henry VIII's reign were also able to draw upon precedents, as national awareness had characterised protests from 1381 onwards.[180] As has already been shown, the riots in London in 1517 suggest awareness and definition of membership of the realm. Although Manning highlights the sense of local community in these riots, the reaction against foreign targets does at least demonstrate an ability to define between belonging and exclusion.[181] The *Great Chronicle* cites trade and competition as the motivation, the presence of the 'Estyrlyngys' affecting 'theyr Custumers thoruthowth this land'.[182] Articulating a concern that was so important to Dudley's work, that feared the permanent loss of crafts to other realms, the careers of London craftsmen and merchants seem to have given them an appreciation of the wider, nationwide effect of foreign trade.

Generally, the characteristics of at least some of the protests during Henry VIII's reign express concern and responsibility for the realm, and demonstrate sophisticated political activity. The nature of the two successful protests of Henry VIII's early reign, when, in 1513 and particularly in 1525, passive resistance was used to oppose financial burdens by 'the commons in euery place', demonstrates an ability to act in unison, but in a controlled way

---

[180] Manning, *Village Revolts*, p. 3.
[181] Manning, *Village Revolts*, p. 3.
[182] *Great Chronicle*, p. 249.

that suggests an awareness of their ability to influence change. The intensification, in some places, of the protests as a result of the rumour of the government's retreat, suggests that the participants were aware of their political power.[183] The success of these protests would have further encouraged this sense of political power. In this, English subjects seem to have felt the sense of responsibility with which the *Tree of Commonwealth*, and the nature of other occasions, invested them. In keeping with the role of a subject and member of the commonwealth outlined in the *Tree*, protesters were motivated by a need to challenge risks to the commonwealth, but were also anxious to confirm their loyalty to the king.

Again, the Pilgrimage of Grace provides some the best examples that, through protest, English subjects felt a sense of duty towards the nation. The cause of the series of uprisings in 1536-7 was multi-faceted, and although it involved the gentry, the movement originated, and was driven largely by the commons.[184] The organisation of the rebels itself suggests that, not only those articulating their complaints to the king and his representatives, but the majority of the participants were aware of the commonwealth concerns of their purpose. Bands of rebels were organised locally in a number of places but governed by oaths, varying from place to place but influenced by each other and all declaring similar sentiments, of loyalty to the king and concerns for the commonwealth, while the news of the rising reported in Yorkshire was that the people were 'up in Lincolnshire for the commonweal'.[185] The examination of Robert Aske, following the Pilgrimage, suggests that the local concerns for the abbeys and the more general concerns for religious practice were intertwined with broader sentiments. In addition to the rebels' demands concerning the king's counsellors, Aske also expressed the distress at

---

[183] Fletcher and MacCulloch, p. 23.

[184] Hoyle, *The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Politics of the 1530s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 17.

[185] Bush, 'Up for the commonweal', pp. 302-3; Bush, *The Pilgrimage of Grace*, pp. 21-2, 25-9.

the loss of the abbeys in terms of wealth of the realm as a whole, stating that they were 'on of the bewties of this realme to al men and strangers passing threw the same', suggesting their status as a source of collective pride for English subjects and a symbol of the realm to those who were not, while the practical and financial role of the abbeys in maintaining walls, bridges and sea walls was for the 'comyn welth'.[186] Aske also expressed a concern for the defence of the realm from outside threats: the rebels' call for the restoration of Princess Mary is explained through the threat of war or the prevention of trade by the emperor on her behalf, 'to the great danger and impoverishment of this realm.'[187] In this, the rebel arguments articulated central themes of royal rhetoric employed to encourage support and participation, highlighting war and trade as important threads in the dialogue between crown and subjects.

Aske's concern for the Princess is expressed as though he felt he was speaking collectively for all of England, stating that Mary was loved by the whole people. He also stated that the statutes that were 'to grievous to the people' should be reformed by Parliament 'as shulde be sene good by the hole body of the realme', further suggesting both a collective single agenda, and that the pilgrims were concerned with the England-wide relevance of their objections.[188] The suggestion that the realm could have a unified opinion was echoed by other elements of the Pilgrimage, as Lord Darcy told the king that he would marvel at the number of letters of support for the rebels' cause from all parts of the realm.[189] Here, then, Aske not only demonstrated a capacity to be concerned for the nation's welfare but also expressed a belief that protest offered a legitimate means to speak for the realm and exercise control over

---

[186] The examination of Robert Aske, 11 April 1537, *LPFD*, vol. XII, pt. I, p. 403; Document 11, Fletcher and MacCulloch, pp. 150-1; Mary Bateson, 'Aske's examination', *EHR*, 5 (1890), 550-73 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/546456> [accessed 20th July 2013] (p. 562).

[187] The examination of Robert Aske, p. 403; 'Aske's examination', p. 562.

[188] 'Aske's examination', p. 559.

[189] Darcy and Somerset Herald, *LPFD*, vol. XI, p. 435.

its fate. The Pilgrimage was an occasion during which English subjects demonstrated their nationhood through their concern for the wider realm. More importantly, the same occasion for protest prompted competing claims to speak for England, the interpretation of the rebels opposing that established by Morison. Both created a single voice for the nation, Morison as a device for speaking to the rebels, and the rebels by seeking to represent the needs of the commonwealth. Both voices also offered an interpretation of the relationship between local and national, the 'pilgrims' placing their local experience of the taxes and the loss of the abbeys in the wider context of the commonwealth, and Morison highlighting the opposition of rebellious Lincolnshire (on its own, at the time of writing) to England.

The protest did not rely solely on the use of force, but also took the form of sophisticated means of expression, aiming to 'geate ...statutes reformed first by peticion' and only afterwards 'by swerde & battaill', reinforcing the belief in the legitimacy of their venture.[190] This belief is also demonstrated in resistance to the suggestion of a pardon. As has already been shown, pardons were employed by the crown in dealing with rebels to invest the peace of the realm in the king and maintain his position. The pilgrims, however, did not believe they were rebels and did not want to be labelled as such by the acceptance of a pardon, further emphasising that they were exercising instead a right to influence the realm's fortunes.[191] Further, in challenging the decision for the crown's succession, the protesters were also expressing their understanding of the role of consent, of ascending legitimacy, in English kingship, echoing but also extending the responsibility granted by royal rhetoric and reminding the king that his crown was not his possession but that of the nation. Thus, the right to speak for England was contested as this consent was defined, for example by Henry

---

[190] Bush, *The Pilgrims' Complaint*, pp. 28-40; 'Aske's examination', p. 559.
[191] Bush, *The Pilgrims' Complaint*, pp. 28-40.

VIII in the justification of the 'fifteenth and tenth' to be collected, as expressed through Parliament, while protest allowed the right to be exercised by different representatives. Furthermore, occasions of protest demonstrated that a parallel definition existed among English subjects in which the nation transcended the person of the king.

Conclusion

The occasions discussed above provided opportunities, or created a need, for the crown to communicate and encourage definition of Englishness to subjects, during which subjects often responded, whether positively or negatively, or were even required to respond. Royal celebrations were opportunities for both public display and the production of material which sought to bind subjects to the crown, and this often took the form of an articulation of nationhood and its investment in the person of the king. The coronation of Henry VIII in particular took advantage of print, which articulated clearly the national associations of the event, but such occasions were also communicated through pageantry and bonfires, and were carried to the whole realm through messengers and commands to celebrate. The response suggests that towns did participate in these celebrations, sometimes in localised ways. This participation became particularly important when the need arose to raise funds and forces for war, again engaging with ideas of nationhood in order to create a sense of responsibility, and even implying that there were conditions to membership of the nation. War, however, also prompted the articulation of nationhood in English subjects which opposed that which invested it solely in the ambitions of the king. This debate for the good of England was strongest during periods of rebellion or popular protest. Englishmen seem to have been aware of the wider good of England, and believed in their own duty to the commonwealth, and also offered their own interpretation of their identity.

It is in the performance of celebrations and protest, and in the anticipation of conflict, that the definitions and features of English nationhood are most apparent, because of the demand these occasions created for its articulation. The frontiers of England and Englishness were emphasised through celebrations, in the marking of foreign victories, the portrayal of the king as the defence of the realm, and the investment of Englishness in the crown. During war, awareness of geographical boundaries, and frontiers marked by birth and loyalty, was heightened. The experience of war also highlighted stereotypes and expectations of enemies. The presence of the 'other' was particularly important during periods of protest, both as the target within the realm for uprisings, and as a reminder to redirect hostility outwards. England's history, too, was reinforced in the pageantry that formed a prominent part of the communication between crown and subjects. Both war and protest created a need for references to history, to ancient outward enemies. Finally, the investment of nationhood in the king which characterised the rhetoric accompanying these occasions highlights the importance of portraying the king as the personification of the nation, while the figures of the saints associated with Englishness were also prominent in the performance of both celebration and war.

These occasions were significant, because they allowed the greatest level of communication between the crown and English subjects, and also encouraged an increased level of engagement of local with national. Importantly, they also created a forum for dialogue and debate concerning the definition of true Englishness. It is evident that the need for participation also encouraged a sense of responsibility among members of the nation, which, however, legitimised a debate over the right to speak for England. The 'ascending notion of legitimacy' which characterised the role of Englishmen in the performance of the nation was part of both the official rhetoric of nation communicated to its members, and the

members' articulation of their identity. The decades leading up to the Reformation, and the initial stages of it, were characterised by a sense of popular participation and responsibility which was the result of the necessity for a reciprocal relationship between crown and subjects, greatly influenced, if not created, by the conflicts of the fifteenth century.

Conclusion

In November 1509, a proclamation appealed for 'all and every subjects…being able...to serve his highness in time war...as they have been in time past', for the 'defense of this his realm of England'.[1] It recognised, and aimed to use existing sentiments of national identity among English subjects, for the aims of the crown. It acknowledged a shared past of all subjects, assigned to them a collective vocation for military service and charged them all with the responsibility of protecting England. Prior to the 1530s, the nation was already an integral feature of the English crown's communication and direction of its subjects. National rhetoric was employed partly to encourage the ways in which the nation was already acknowledged and celebrated, in order to harness this sense of identity for the crown's objectives, and partly to refashion the way it was imagined. This investment was reciprocated, as a sense of English identity is evident in the sentiments and actions of English subjects who felt the sense of responsibility expected of them. However, their articulation of English nationhood was not simply a response to royal rhetoric, but an intrinsic feature of civic and religious aspects of their lives, which occasionally manifested itself in action against the interests of the crown.

Craig Calhoun suggests that, in order for a nation to be considered as such, it must be thought to possess, or claim to possess, a number of characteristics. Although the term 'nation' was ambiguous in its association with identity, late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century England possessed several of these features which outline a sophisticated construction of nationhood. How 'England' itself was thought of and defined demonstrates a strong, and widespread, concept of 'boundaries, of territory [and] population', both

---

[1] *TRPI*, p. 83.

symbolically and geographically.[2] England was defined not only by an awareness of its contemporary borders but also by a notion of its 'temporal depth', the assertion in historical material of England 'existing through time', giving established borders a sense of permanence in the same way that Calhoun suggests we think of modern nation-states, as 'always already there, taken as established conditions' for the world's structure.[3] These factors were also central to the definition of membership of the nation. Englishness was understood through notions of a shared culture, language, past and descent, of differentiation from neighbouring identities, and was defined by objective and even legal boundaries. Although the religious upheaval of the 1530s onwards dramatically affected what it meant to be English, the ways in which this new situation was negotiated, through the assertion of language, temporal depth and frontiers, had long been the means of articulation of nationhood.

Far from being incompatible with ideas of nationhood, the involvement of the crown throughout this period was a key element in shaping the nature of English identity. Existing sentiment and associations of England's past were invested in the crown, while England's well-being was used to gain widespread participation in the pursuits of the crown which it established as collective undertakings. The crown's priorities, particularly on the peripheries of Englishness, also served to shape elements of identity, as it emphasised loyalty as a means of confirming national membership. Overall, then, the crown's engagement with the issue of nationhood highlighted the active role that members needed to play in confirming their identity. Birth, descent, frontiers and language, to the majority of English subjects, were a matter of destiny, or at least of little or no choice. Demands of active participation and loyalty

---

[2] Calhoun, p. 4.
[3] Calhoun, p. 5, 12-13.

suggest that Englishness was thought of in terms of character, behaviour and choice, and was considered, in its official sense, to be something which could be lost. Further, the ways in which the crown sought to invest nationhood in itself demanded not just participation, but responsibility for the nation's welfare, establishing a sense of ascending legitimacy which, however, encouraged popular articulation of the voice of England which opposed that issued by representatives of the crown.

Englishness was not, of course, the only significant identity which claimed the loyalty of English subjects. Arguments which date the birth of English nationhood to the 1530s, and those which place 'nation-ness' in the modern period, maintain that the dominance of the medieval church superseded other communities, to the exclusion or restriction of nationhood. However, traditional religious observation offered a means of confirming membership of the nation by celebrating its symbols or participating in collective actions. England's membership of the wider community of the church also formed part of the developing national rhetoric: the debate of the Council of Constance led to the articulation of England's status, while a continental war could be justified as an assertion of England's superior Christian dedication. A further layer of identity which might challenge national sentiment is that of local or civic loyalty. It is difficult to suggest that, outside direct involvement in wars, protest or celebrations, nationhood was particularly significant in everyday lives. It may be said instead that more immediate local identities were stronger. However, local identity was not always incompatible with the idea of the nation, particularly when it was recognised that local rights could be protected or enhanced through engaging with a central idea. Local importance was asserted through the demonstration of the relationship of the cities to England, their place within it. Nationhood was particularly important for articulating the relationship between central rule and peripheral regions, as the presence of otherness, which was more obvious

when considering the territories of Calais, Ireland, the Welsh Marches and Berwick, served to strengthen the need for defining England or reinforcing Englishness. Therefore, when legislation, literature or travel dealt with these areas, the issue of Englishness was more prominent. The nature of the otherness encountered varied depending upon the region, and so, therefore, did the most important features of identity. However, the attention paid to Calais in particular also suggests that it was feared identity was at risk, making it more important to assert nationhood at the peripheries because of their distance.

It seems that inclusion in the nation was largely passive, for the majority of members, although there were also several ways in which they could, or were required to actively participate, and it is in this participation that the majority of the evidence of national sentiment among subjects is found. The voices of those for whom participation was limited are therefore quiet. As with many studies of this period, the voices of women in particular are difficult to find. They were (mostly) not authors, nor were they the soldiers, priests, printers or officials. This does not mean that they are necessarily excluded from membership, but the majority of the conclusions which may be drawn about their inclusion must be based upon their assumed presence at civic celebrations, as camp followers of the armies, and more generally in ideas of Englishness. Mostly, it seems that constructions of nationhood were equally applicable to both sexes, but participation and experience of it was more limited for women. They do appear occasionally, mostly as pilgrims, once receiving money from the king in the name of St George. Women are also clearly depicted among the pilgrims of the Henry VI woodcut. Of greater importance is the distinction made regarding the banishment of Scots from England in 1513, when the marriages of Scotsmen to Englishwomen allowed them to remain in England, but led to the forfeit of goods and an air of suspicion. This would have made the identity of these women a significant factor in their lives, and also highlighted

the presence of 'otherness' within local communities. Most importantly, however, it suggests that marriage, at least to a Scot, did not affect their English status.

The most obvious voices are the literate. Print was one of the most influential forces in encouraging thought and facilitating the articulation of national identity at this time. A great deal of printed material expressed a sense of belonging to the nation, through the choice of subject or the use of language. A priority of the first decades of printing in England was to publish and translate histories in particular, and so, although print provided a means of transmitting and expanding ideas, these ideas were developed from existing sentiment. It did not initiate national consciousness, but enabled its further dissemination and discussion. Printed material reflected more than the priorities and identity of the authors, translators and printers. Driven by demand, there must, therefore, have been a market for subjects chosen. Furthermore, illiteracy did not prevent communication of the ideas this material contained. Celebrations were constructed by those with access to such material, but were available for public consumption. Consequently, it may at least be assumed that wider audiences received, and had the opportunity to discuss and form opinions on nationhood.

Bibliography

Primary Sources: Archives

TNA, SP 1/113, fols 216-221^r

London, British Library, Additional MSS 29,617 and 29,618

London BL, Cotton, MS. Faustina. C. ii, fols. 15b-18b

Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Arch. Selden B. 26

Ordinance of Richard, Late Duke of York, c. 1500, Shrewsbury, Shropshire Archives, LB/1/6

Statutes and Ordinances of the Order of the Garter, 1522, London, BL Cotton MS Vespasian A XX

Primary Sources: Online Sources

Anonymous, 'Chronicle of the History of the World from Creation to Woden, with a Genealogy of Edward IV', Philadelphia, Free Library of Philadelphia, MS Lewis E 201 <http://libwww.library.phila.gov/medievalman/ShelfMarkDetailList.cfm?srch=6&shelfmark=Lewis%20E%20201> [accessed 19th July 2013]

Anonymous, *Cronycles of the Londe of Englond* (Antwerp: Gerard de Leew, 1493), fol. 126^v, in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 15th July 2011]

'The Cult of Henry VI', <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/London-Wall/Whats-on/Galleries/medieval/Objects/28965/Page+2.htm> [accessed 31st August 2012]

'Document Details, Liber Metricus de Henrico Quinto', Special Collections, University of

Glasgow, <http://special.lib.gla.ac.uk/manuscripts/search/detaild.cfm?DID=33396>

[accessed 30th August 2009]

'Genealogy of the kings of England to Edward I', Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Bodl. Rolls

3

<http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/view/search/what/MS.%20Bodl.%20Roll

s%203?q=Shelfmark=%22MS.%20Bodl.%20Rolls%203%22&sort=Shelfmark,Folio_Page,R

oll_#,Frame_#> [accessed 19th July 2013]

'Genealogy of the kings of England to Henry V', Oxford, Bodleian, MS. Bodl. Rolls 6

<http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/view/search/what/MS.%20Bodl.%20Roll

s%206?q=Shelfmark=%22MS.%20Bodl.%20Rolls%206%22&sort=Shelfmark,Folio_Page>

[accessed 19th July 2013]

'Genealogy of the kings of England to Henry VI', Oxford, Bodleian, MS. Bodl. Rolls 10

<http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/view/search?QuickSearchA=QuickSearc

hA&q=Shelfmark%3D%22MS.+Bodl.+Rolls+10%22&sort=Shelfmark%2CFolio_Page&sear

ch=Search> [accessed 19th July 2013]

'Genealogy of the Kings of England, to A.D. 1461', Oxford, Bodleian, MS e. Mus. 42, fols.

31v-32r

<http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/detail/ODLodl~1~1~44338~121622:Genealogy-

of-the-Kings-of-England,-

?qvq=w4s:/where/English;q:%3D%22Kings%2Band%2BQueens%2Bof%2BEngland%2B(Henry%2

BIV%2Bto%2BRichard%2BIII).%22;lc:ODLodl~29~29,ODLodl~7~7,ODLodl~6~6,ODLodl~14~14,

ODLodl~8~8,ODLodl~23~23,ODLodl~1~1,ODLodl~24~24&mi=4&trs=20> [accessed 19th July

2013]

Anonymous, 'Henry VI, King of England, invoked as a saint', Oxford, Bodleian, MS. Bodl. 277 fol. 376^v,

<http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/detail/ODLodl~14~14~76776~135161:Henry-VI,-King-of-England,-invoked-?qvq=q:england;lc:ODLodl~29~29,ODLodl~7~7,ODLodl~6~6,ODLodl~14~14,ODLodl~8~8,ODLodl~23~23,ODLodl~1~1,ODLodl~24~24&mi=13&trs=3107> [accessed 25th August 2013]

Anonymous, *Here begynneth the lyfe of the blessed martyr Saynte Thomas* (London: Richard Pynson, 1520), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 25th August 2013]

Anonymous, *The maner of the tryumphe at Caleys and Bulleyn* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1532), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 15th July 2011]

Map of Britain, London, British Library, MS Royal C VII fol. 5^v

<http://bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=41614> [accessed 24th June 2013]

Anonymous, Motets for Henry VIII, London, British Library, MS Royal 11 E XI, fol. 2 <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=42690> [accessed 10th January 2012]

Anonymous, *An ordinance of Parliament concerning the svbsidie of tonnage and poundage*, (London: Lawrence Blaiklock, 1642), in *The Making of the Modern World* <http://0-find.galegroup.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/mome/> [accessed 22nd August 2013]

'Pewter Pilgrim Badge of St George' <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/Collections-Research/Collections-online/object.aspx?objectID=object-28940&start=5&rows=1> [accessed 31st August 2012]

'Pilgrim Badge', <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/London-Wall/Whats-on/Galleries/medieval/objects/record.htm?type=object&id=28965> [accessed 31st August 2012]

'Pilgrim Badge: NLM-FACEC6', *The Portable Antiquities Scheme*, <http://finds.org.uk/database/artefacts/record/id/192277> [accessed 31st August 2012]

'Pilgrim Badge depicting St George and the Dragon' <http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights/highlight_objects/pe/p/pilgrim_badge_depicting_st_geo.aspx> [accessed 31st August 2012]

Anonymous, *A Relation, or rather, a true account of the Island of England: with sundry particulars of the customs of these people and of the royal revenues under King Henry the Seventh, about the year 1500*, ed. and trans. by Charlotte A. Sneyd (London: The Camden Society, 1847), in *The Making of the Modern World* <http://0-find.galegroup.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/mome/> [accessed 14th November 2011]

Rymer's Foedera Volume 11, ed. Thomas Rymer (London, 1739-1745), pp. 482-497 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol11/pp482-497> [accessed 12 July 2015]

Anonymous, 'The short version of *The Arrival of Edward IV*', ed. by Richard Firth Green, *Speculum*, 56, 2 (1981), 324-36 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2846938> [accessed 20th February 2010]

André, Bernard, *The History of the Life and Accomplishments of Henry VII*, in *The Philological Museum, The University of Birmingham* <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/library.html> [accessed 23rd April 2011]

Bale, John, *The laboryouse Iourney [and] serche of Iohan Leylande, for Englandes antiquitees* (London: S. Mierdman, 1549), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 5th August 2013]

Bourchier, John, *Here begynneth the first volum of sir Iohan Froyssart* (London: Richard Pynson, 1523), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 15th April 2010]

Calverley, William, *A Dyalogue bitwene the playntife and the Defendaunt* (London: Thomas Godfray, 1535?), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 4th July 2015]

Caxton, William, *The cronycles of Englond* (London: Caxton, 1482), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 15th April 2010]

Caxton, *Dictes and Sayengis of the Philosophres* (Westminster: Caxton, 1477), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 13th July 2015]

De Pisan, Christine, *the boke of the fayt of armes and of chyualrye* (London: Caxton, 1489), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 25th August 2013]

De Voragine, Jacobus, *Legenda aurea sanctorum* (London: Caxton,1483), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 2nd May 2011]

Fabian, Robert, *Fabyans cronycle newly prynted, wyth the cronycle, actes, and dedes done in the tyme of the reygne of the moste excellent prynce kynge Henry the vii* (London: Wyllyam Rastell, 1533), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 14th January 2011]

Hawes, Stephen, *A ioyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall souerayne lorde kynge Henry the eyght* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 29th November 2012]

Henry VIII, *Hereafter ensue certayne statut[es] and ordenau[n]ces of warre* (London: Richard Pynson, 1513), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 13th May 2011]

Higden, Ranulf, *The Cronycles of Englonde with the dedes of popes and emperours, and also the descripcyon of Englonde* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1528), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 22nd December 2011]

Hilton, Walter, *Here begynneth the kalendre of the newe legende of Englande* (London: Richard Pynson, 1516), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 14th May 2011]

Lydgate, John, *The Lives of Saints Edmund and Fremund*, London, BL, Harley 2278, in *The Canon of John Lydgate Project*, ed. by Stephen R. Reimer <http://www.ualberta.ca/~sreimer/edmund/edmund.htm> [accessed 25th August 2013]

Lydgate, *The Vertue of the Masse* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1520), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 15th July 2011]

Mirk, John, *The festyuall* (London: Wynkyn De Worde, 1508), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 20th January 2011]

Rastell, John, *The Pastyme of people: The cronycles of dyuers realmys and most specyally of the realme of Englond* (London: John Rastell, 1530), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 15th July 2011]

Rastell, *The statutes prohemium Iohannis Rastell* (London: John Rastell, 1527), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 15th July 2011]

Skelton, John, *A ballade of the Scottysshe kynge* (London: R. Faques, 1513), in *EEBO* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/home> [accessed 14th January 2011]

Skelton, 'The Latin writings of John Skelton', ed. by David R. Carlson, *Studies in Philology*, 88, 4 (1991), 1-125 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4174406> [accessed 7th December 2009]

Vergil, Polydore, *Anglica Historia* (1555), ed. by Dana F. Sutton, in *The Philological Museum* <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/library.html> [accessed 14th January 2011]

Vergil, *De Inventoribus Rerum*, (Paris, 1529), in *MOMW* <http://0-find.galegroup.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/mome/> [accessed 5th September 2013]

Primary Sources: Modern Editions

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, vol. 1, ed. by M. J. Thorpe (Edinburgh: H.M. Register House, 1858)

Calendar of Patent Rolls of Edward III, vol. 9, 1350-1354 (London: H. M. S. O, 1898)

Calendar of the Patent Rolls of Henry IV, vol. 1, 1399-1401 (London: H.M.S.O, 1909)

Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 2, 1509-1519, ed. Rawdon Brown (London, 1867)

The Chronicle of Calais, in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII to the Year 1540, ed. by John G. Nichols (London: Camden Society, J. B. Nichols, 1846)

Anonymous, *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483: Written in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Richard Taylor, 1827, reprinted, Felinfach: Llanerch Publishers, 1995)

Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London, ed. by John G. Nichols (London: Camden Society: 1852)

Chronicles of London, ed. by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905)

Churchwardens' Accounts of Ashburton, 1479-1580, ed. by Alison Hanham (Torquay: Devonshire Press, 1970)

Churchwardens' Accounts of S. Edmund and S. Thomas, Sarum, 1443-1702, with other documents, ed. by Henry James Fowle Swayne (Salisbury: Bennett Brothers, 1896)

Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, vols 2 and 3, ed. by David Wilkins (London: Gosling, Gyles, Woodward, Davis, 1737)

Coventry Leet Book, or, Mayor's register, containing the records of the City Court leet or view of frankpledge, A.D. 1420-1555, vol. 1, ed. by Mary Dormer Harris, (London: K. Paul, 1907)

Crowland Chronicle Continuations, 1459-1486, ed. by Nicholas Pronay and John Cox (London: Sutton, 1986)

Debating the Hundred Years War: Pour ce que plusieurs (La Loy Salique) and a declaration of the trew and dewe title of Henrie VIII, ed. by Craig Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

The Early English Carols, ed. by Richard L. Greene (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977)

England and France in the Fifteenth Century: The Contemporary French Tract Entitled "The Debate Between the Heralds of France and England", ed. by Henry Pyne (London: Longmans, Green, 1870)

Anonymous, *An English Chronicle, 1377-1461: Edited from Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 21068 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34*, ed. C. William Marx (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003)

Anonymous, *The First English Life of King Henry the Fifth: Written in 1513 by an Anonymous Author known commonly as the Translator of Livius*, ed. by Kingsford (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911)

Anonymous, *Gesta Henrici Quinti: The Deeds of Henry V*, ed. and trans. Frank Taylor and John S. Roskell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975)

The Great Chronicle of London, ed. by Arthur H. Thomas and Isobel D. Thornley (London: G. W. Jones, 1938)

The Heralds' Memoir 1486-1490: Court Ceremony, Royal Progress and Rebellion, ed. by Emma Cavell (Donington, Lincolnshire: Shaun Tyas, 2009)

Anonymous, *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Recouerye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI*, ed. by John Bruce (London: Camden Society, 1858, modern reprint, Milton Keynes: Kessinger, 2010)

Humanist Scholarship and Public Order: Two Tracts against the Pilgrimage of Grace, ed. by David S. Berkowitz, (London: Associated University Presses, 1984)

The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Society of Antiquaries MS 129 and British Library MS Harley 1419, vol. I: The Transcript, ed. by Starkey (London: Harvey Millar, 1998)

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 21 vols (London: Longman, 1862-1910)

Letters of the Kings of England, volume 1, ed. by James O. Halliwell (London: Henry Colburn, 1848)

Anonymous, *The Libelle of Englyshe Polycye: a poem of the use of sea power*, ed. by George F. Warner (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926)

Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII: From Orginal Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office, vol. II, ed. by William Campbell (London: Longman & Co., 1877)

Anonymous, 'Metrical Church Kalendar', *The English Register of Godstow Nunnery, Part 1*, ed. by Andrew Clark (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner and Co., 1905), pp. 13-24

The Miracles of King Henry VI: being an account and translation of twenty-three miracles taken from the manuscripts in the British Museum, ed. by Ronald A. Knox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923)

The Ordinances of Bristol, ed. by Maureen Stanford (Bristol: Bristol Record Society, 1990)

Original Letters, Illustrative of English History, series II, volume 1, ed. by Henry Ellis (London: Harding and Lepard, 1827), pp. 162-6

The Plumpton Correspondence: Written in the Reigns of Edward IV, Richard III, Henry VII and Henry VIII, ed. by Thomas Stapleton, with a new introduction by Keith Dockray (Gloucester: Sutton, 1990)

Privy Purse Expenses of King Henry the Eighth, from November 1529 to December 1532, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: William Pickering, 1827)

Anonymous, *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne*, ed. by Gordon Kipling (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990)

Records of Early English Drama: Coventry, ed. by R. W. Ingram (Toronto, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1981)

REED: Cambridge, ed. by Alan H. Nelson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989)

REED: Bristol, ed. by Mark C. Pilkinton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997)

Records of the Churchwardens of Mildenhall: Collections (1446-1454) and Accounts (1503-1553), ed. by Judith Middleton-Stewart (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011)

Records of the Gild of St. George in Norwich, 1389-1547, ed. by Mary Grace (Norwich: Norfolk Record Society, 1937)

The Sarum Missal in English, ed. by A. H. Pearson (London: Church Press Company, 1868)

State Papers: King Henry the Eighth, 1830-1852, vol. 4: Part IV: Correspondence relative to Scotland and the Borders, 1513-1534 (London, 1836)

State Papers Published under the Authority of his Majesty's Commission: King Henry the Eighth, 1830-1852, vol. 2: Part III: Correspondence between the Governments of England and Ireland, 1515-1538 (London, 1834)

Trevelyan Papers, Pt. I: Prior to 1558, ed. by John Payne Collier (London: Camden Society, 1857)

Tudor Royal Proclamations, vol. 1: The Early Tudors, 1485-1553, ed. by Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964)

Unity, Heresy and Reform, 1378-1460: The Conciliar Response to the Great Schism, ed. by C. M. D. Crowder (London: Edward Arnold, 1977)

The York House Books,1461-1490, vol. 2, ed. by Lorraine C. Attreed (Stroud: Sutton, 1991)

Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, revised edition, ed. and trans. by Leo Shirley-Price (London: Penguin, 1990)

Blacman, John, *Henry the Sixth: a Reprint of John Blacman's Memoir with Translation and Notes*, ed. and trans. by M. R. James (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1919)

Capgrave, John, *Abbreuiacion of Chronicles*, ed. by Peter J. Lucas (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983)

Capgrave, *The Book of the Illustrious Henries*, trans. by Hingeston (London: Longman, 1858)

Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, ed. by Hingeston (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1858)

Caxton, 'Prologue to his translation of *Eneydos*' (1490), in *The English Language: Essays by English and American Men of Letters 1490-1839*, ed. by Whitney. F. Bolton (Cambridge: CUP, 1966), pp. 2-4

Cromwell, Thomas, *The Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell,* vol. 1: Life, Letters to 1535, ed. by Roger B. Merriman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902)

Dudley, Edmund, *The Tree of Common Wealth,* (Manchester: Charles Simms & Co., 1859)

Fabian, *The New Chronicles of England and France, in Two Parts*, ed. by Henry Ellis (London: Longman, Hurts, Rees, Orme and Co., 1811)

Foxe, John, *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church with an vniuersall history of the same*, vol. II (London: John Daye, 1583)

Gardiner, Stephen, *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, ed. by James A. Muller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933)

Giustinian, Sebastian, 'From the Ambassador in England, Andrew Badoer, 1512,' in *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII: Selection of Dispatches*, vol. 1, trans. by Rawdon Brown (London: Smith, Elder, 1854)

Grandisson, John, *The Register of John de Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter: A.D. 1327-1369*, Part I, ed. Francis Charles Hingeston-Randolf, (London: G. Bell, 1894)

Gruffydd, Elis, *'An ill jurney for the Englshemen': Elis Gruffydd and the 1523 French Campaign of the Duke of Suffolk*, ed. by Jonathan Davies, trans. by M. Bryn Davies (Pike and Shot Society, 2006)

Hall, Edward, *Hall's Chronicle: Containing the History of England, During the Reign of Henry the Fourth, and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are Particularly Described the Manners and Customs of those Periods* (London: G. Woodfall, 1809)

Hardyng, John, *The Chronicle of John Hardyng*, ed. by Henry Ellis (London: G. Woodfall, 1812)

Henry VIII, *The Letters of King Henry VIII*, ed. by Muriel St. Clare Byrne (London: Cassell, 1936)

Hoccleve, Thomas, *Hoccleve's Works*, ed. by Frederick J. Furnivall, Early English Text Society Extra Series, lxxii (London: Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1897)

Leland, John, *John Leland's Itinerary: Travels in Tudor England*, ed. by John Chandler (Stroud: Sutton, 1993)

Malory, Thomas, *Le Morte Darthur: the Winchester Manuscript*, ed. by Helen Cooper (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

Mirk, *John Mirk's Festial: Edited from British Library MS Cotton Claudius A.II,* vol. I, ed. by Susan Powell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

Minot, Laurence, 'Songs on King Edward's Wars', in *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History composed during the period, from the accession of Edward III to Richard III,* Volume 1, ed. by Thomas Wright (London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1859, reprinted Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 58-90

More, Thomas, *The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems*, ed. by Richard S. Sylvester (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976)

Ricart, Robert, *The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar*, ed. by Lucy Toulmin Smith (London: Camden Society, 1872)

Skelton, 'A Lawde and Prayse made for our Souereigne Lord the Kyng', in *John Skelton: The Complete English Poems*, ed. by John Scattergood (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983)

Taylor, John, in R. E. Brock, 'The Career of John Taylor, Master of the Rolls (d.1534), as an Illustration of Early Tudor Administrative History', (Masters thesis, University of London, 1950)

Usk, Adam, *The Chronicle of Adam Usk, 1377-1421,* ed. and trans. by C. Given-Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

Warkworth, 'Warkworth's *Chronicle*', in *Death and Dissent: Two Fifteenth Century Chronicles*, ed. by Lister Matheson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999), pp. 93-124

Worcestre, William, *Itineraries of William Worcestre*, ed. by John H. Harvey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

Secondary Sources

Allmand, Christopher, *Henry V* (London: Historical Association, 1968)

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, new ed., (London: Verso, 2006)

Andrews, Michael C., 'The Boundary Between Scotland and England in the Portolan Charts', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, vol. 60 (1925-26), 36-66

Anglo, Sydney, 'An Early Tudor Programme for Plays and Other Demonstrations against the Pope', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutions*, 20, 1/2 (1957), 176-9 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/750157> [accessed 14th February 2011]

Anglo, 'The London pageants for the reception of Katherine of Aragon, November 1501', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 26, 1/2 (1963), 53-89 http://www.jstor.org/stable/750570 [accessed 28 June 2015]

Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992)

Baker, Denise N., ed., *Inscribing the Hundred Years' War in French and English Cultures* (New York: University of New York Press, 2000)

Bale, Anthony, ed., *St Edmund, King and Martyr: Changing Images of a Medieval Saint* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2009)

Barber, Richard, *Arthur of Albion: An Introduction to the Arthurian Literature and Legends of England* (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1961)

Barker, Juliet, *Agincourt: The King, The Campaign, The Battle* (London: Little, Brown, 2005)

Barker, Rodney S., *Legitimating Identities: the Self-Presentation of Rulers and Subjects* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Bateson, Mary, 'Aske's examination', *EHR*, 5 (1890), 550-73 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/546456> [accessed 20th July 2013]

Bell, David, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001)

Bell, H. Idris, 'A List of Original Papal Bulls and Briefs in the Department of Manuscripts, British Museum, Part II', *EHR*, 36, 144 (1921), 556-83 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/552586> [accessed 18th July 2012]

John Bellamy, *The Tudor Law of Treason: An Introduction* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979)

Bernard, G. W., *War, Taxation and Rebellion in Early Tudor England: Henry VIII, Wolsey and the Amicable Grant of 1525* (Brighton: Harvester, 1986)

Bernard, 'The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1536: Henry VIII and the Search for the Middle Way', *The Historical Journal,* 42, 2 (1998), 321-49 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640109> [accessed 23rd August 2013]

Bernard, *The Late Medieval English Church: Vitality and Vulnerability Before the Break with Rome* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012)

Bernard and R. W. Hoyle, 'Instructions for the Levying of the Amicable Grant, March 1525', *Historical Research*, 67, 163 (1994) 190-202 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2281.1994.tb01824.x> [accessed 12th August 2013]

Bodian, Miriam, '"Men of the Nation": The Shaping of Converso Identity in Early Modern Europe', *Past and Present*, 143, (1994), 48-76 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/651161> [accessed 4th February 2013]

Bradshaw, Brendan and Peter Roberts, eds, *British Identity and British Consciousness: the Making of the United Kingdom, 1533-1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Burgess, Clive, 'An Institute for All Seasons: The Late Medieval English College', in *The Late Medieval English College and its Context*, ed. by Burgess and Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2008), pp. 3-27

Bush, Michael L., "Up for the Commonweal': The Significance of Tax Grievances in the English Rebellions of 1536', *EHR*, 106, 419 (1991), 299-318 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/573104> [accessed 29th November 2012]

Bush, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: a Study of the Rebel Armies of October 1536* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996)

Bush, *The Pilgrims' Complaint: a Study of Popular Thought in the Early Tudor North* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009)

Calhoun, Craig, *Nationalism* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1997)

Carlson, 'Royal tutors in the Reign of Henry VII', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 22, 2 (1991), 253-279 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2542735> [accessed 7th December 2009]

Cavill, Paul R., *The English Parliaments of Henry VII, 1485-1504* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

Challis, Christopher E., *The Tudor Coinage* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978)

Chettle, H. F., 'Burgesses for Calais, 1536-1558', *English Historical Review*, 50, 199 (1935), 492-501 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/553556> [accessed 21st January 2011]

Coldiron, A. E. B., *Printers without Borders: Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)

Collinson, Patrick, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988)

Colls, Robert, *Identity of England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)

Colvin, H. M., *The History of the King's Works,* volume III, 1485-1660, Part I (London: H.M.S.O., 1975)

Craig, Leigh Ann, 'Royalty, Virtue and Adversity: The Cult of Henry VI', *Albion*, 35, 2 (2003), 187-209 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4054134> [accessed 30th March 2011]

Cruikshank, Charles G., *Army Royal: Henry VIII's Invasion of France 1513* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

Daniell, Christopher, *Atlas of Medieval Britain* (Oxford: Routledge, 2011)

Davies, Clifford, 'Henry VIII and Henry V: the Wars in France', in *The End of the Middle Ages? England in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. by John L. Watts (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), pp. 235-62

Davies, Clifford, 'Tournai and the English Crown, 1513-1519', *Historical Journal,* 41, 1 (1998), 1-26 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640143> [accessed 14th July 2010]

Davies, Robert Rees, 'Law and National Identity in Thirteenth-Century Wales', in *Welsh Society and Nationhood: Historical Essays presented to Glanmor Williams*, ed. by Davies (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1984), pp. 51-69

Davies, Robert Rees, *The First English Empire: Power and Identities in the British Isles, 1093-1343* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

Deeming, Helen, 'The Sources and Origin of the "Agincourt Carol"', *Early Music,* 35, 1 (2007), 23-36 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4137268> [accessed 20th February 2010]

Drinkwater, C. H., 'Four Merchant Gild Rolls of the Fifteenth Century (1450-1459)', in *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series vol V (1905), 81-100

Duffy, Eamon, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580,* 2nd edn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)

Dyas, Dee, *Pilgrimage in Medieval English Literature, 700-1500* (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2001)

Ellis, Steven G., *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: The Making of the British State* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995)

Ellis, 'Tudor State Formation and the Shaping of the British Isles', in *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, eds Ellis and Sarah G. Barber (London: Longman, 1995), pp. 40-63

Ellis, 'Civilising the Natives: State Formation and the Tudor Monarchy, c. 1400-1603', in *Imagining Frontiers, Contesting Identities*, ed. by Ellis and Lud'a Klusáková (Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2007), pp. 77-92

Ellis, 'Henry VIII, Rebellion and the Rule of Law', *Historical Journal*, 24, 3 (1981), 513-31 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2638881> [accessed 6th October 2011]

Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447-1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998)

Elliott, John H., 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', *Past and Present,* 137 (1992), 48-71 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/650851> [accessed 5th August 2013]

Elton, Geoffrey R., *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558* (London: Arnold, 1977)

Ettlinger, Ellen, 'Notes on a Woodcut Depicting King Henry VI being invoked as a Saint', *Folklore*, 84, 2 (1973), 115-9 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1260417> [accessed 5th February 2011]

Eyerman, Ron, *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity* (Cambridge: CUP, 2001)

Eyerman, 'The Past in the Present: Culture and the Transmission of Memory', *Acta Sociologica*, 47, 2 (2004), 159-69 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4195021> [accessed 15th April 2010]

Faletra, Michael A., 'Narrating the matter of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Norman Colonization of Wales', *The Chaucer Review*, 35, 1 (2000), 60-85 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25096117> [accessed 14th July 2010]

Ferguson, Arthur B., *The Articulate Citizen and the English Renaissance* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1965)

Ferguson, William, *The Identity of the Scottish Nation: An Historical Quest* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998)

Fletcher, Anthony and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, 5th edn (Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2004)

Fleming, Peter, 'Identity and Belonging: Irish and Welsh in Fifteenth-Century Bristol', in *The Fifteenth Century VII: Conflicts, Consequences and the Crown*, ed. by Linda Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 175-94

Fornasini, Ilaria, 'St Edmund of East Anglia and his Miracles through the Centuries: Variation in Literature and Art', *Quest*, 6, (2009), 34-44

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

Gat, Azar, and Alexander Yakobson, *Nations: The Long History and Deep Roots of Political Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Geertz, C., *The Interpretation of Cultures* (London, Fontana, 1973)

Gellner, Ernest, *Nationalism* (New York: New York University Press, 1997)

Gilson, J. P., 'A Defence of the Proscription of the Yorkists in 1459', *EHR,* 26, 103 (1911), 512-25 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/549840> [accessed 18th August 2011]

Good, Jonathan, *The Cult of St George in Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009)

Goodich, Michael, 'Biography 1000-1350', in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. Deborah Mauskopf Deliyannis (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 353-85

Goodman, Anthony, 'The Impact of War on the Scottish Marches, 1481-1513', in *The Fifteenth Century VII*, ed. by Clark, pp. 195-211

Goring, J. J., 'The General Proscription of 1522', *EHR,* 86, 341 (1971), 681-705 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/563926> [accessed 10th October 2011]

Griffiths, Ralph A.,*'This Royal Throne of Kings, this Scept'red Isle': The English Realm and Nation in the Later Middle Ages* (Swansea, 1983)

Griffiths, 'The Island of England in the Fifteenth Century: Perceptions of the Peoples of the British Isles', *Journal of Medieval History*, 29 (2003), 177-200

Grummitt, David, '"For the Surety of the Towne and the Marches", Early Tudor Policy towards Calais, 1485-1509', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 44 (2000), 184-203

Grummitt, '"One of the mooste pryncypall treasours belonging to his realme of Englande": Calais and the Crown, c. 1450-1558', in *The English Experience in France, c. 1450-1558: War, Diplomacy and Cultural Exchange*, ed. by Grummitt (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), pp. 46-62

Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison: War and Military Service in England, 1436-1558* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008)

Gunn, Steven, 'The French Wars of Henry VIII', in *The Origins of War in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Jeremy Black (Edinburgh: Donald, 1987), pp. 28-51

Gunn, 'Archery Practice in Early Tudor England', *Past and Present*, 209, 1 (2010), 53-81 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40960933> [accessed 10th October 2011]

Hadfield, Andrew, *Literature, Politics and National Identity, Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994)

Hardyment, Christina, *Malory: the Life and Times of King Arthur's Chronicler* (London: Harper, 2006)

Harriss, Gerald L., ed., *Henry V: the Practice of Kingship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 1-29

Harvey, Paul D. A., *Maps in Tudor England* (London: Public Record Office and the British Library, 1993)

Hebgin-Barnes, Penny, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Lancashire* (Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi, Great Britain Summary Catalogue 8; Oxford: OUP/British Academy, 2009)

Hebgin-Barnes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Cheshire* (Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi, Great Britain Summary Catalogue 9; Oxford: OUP/British Academy, 2010)

Helgerson, Richard, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992)

Hicks, Carola, *The King's Glass: A Story of Tudor Power and Secret Art* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2007)

Hoyle, *The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Politics of the 1530s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Hutchinson, John, Chris Wickham, Bo Strath, Azar Gat, 'Debate on Azar Gat's *Nations: The Long History and Deep Roots of Political Ethnicity and Nationalism*', *Nations and Nationalism*, 21, 3 (2015), 383-402

Hughes, Jonathan, *Arthurian Myths and Alchemy: The Kingship of Edward IV* (Stroud: Sutton, 2002)

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

Inglis, Erik, *Jean Fouquet and the Invention of France: Art and Nation after the Hundred Years War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011)

Jones, Edwin, *The English Nation: The Great Myth* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998)

Jones, Whitney R. D., *The Tree of Commonwealth, 1450-1793* (Cranbury NJ: Associated University Presses, 2000)

Jones, W. R., 'The English Church and Royal Propaganda and the Hundred Years War', *Journal of British Studies*, 19, 1 (1979), 18-30 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/175680> [accessed 14th July 2010]

Kesselring, Krista J., '"Berwick is our England": Local Identities in an Elizabethan Border Town', in *Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. by Norman L. Jones and Daniel Woolf (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 92-112

King, John N., *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1989)

Kingsford, 'The Early Biographies of Henry V', *EHR*, 25, 97 (1910), 58-92 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/549793> [accessed 17th September 2009]

Kingsford, *English Historical Literature of the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913)

Kisby, Fiona, '"When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year and Religious Reforms, at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547', *JBS*, 40, 1 (2001), 44-75 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3070769> [accessed 2nd March 2011]

Kohn, Hans, *The Idea of Nationalism: a Study in its Origins and Background* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 2005)

Lapidge, Michael, *The Cult of St Swithun* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Lavezzo, Kathy, ed., *Imagining a Medieval English Nation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004)

Lavezzo, *Angels on the Edge of the World: Geography, Literature and English Community, 1000-1534* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2006)

Levy, Fred. J., *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1967)

Lewis, P. S., 'Two Pieces of Fifteenth-Century Political Iconography', *JWCI*, 27 (1964), 317-20 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/750525> [accessed 7th October 2011]

Liddy, Christian D., *The Bishopric of Durham in the Late Middle Ages: Lordship, Community and the Cult of St Cuthbert* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008)

Lieberman, Max, *The Medieval March of Wales: The Creation and Perception of a Frontier, 1066-1283* (Cambridge: CUP, 2010)

Liedl, Janice, 'The Penitent Pilgrim: William Calverley and the Pilgrimage of Grace', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25, 3 (1994), 585-94 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2542635> [accessed 6th July 2015]

Llobera, Josep R., 'State and nation in medieval France', *Journal of Historical Sociology,* 7, 3 (1994), 343-62 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-6443.1994.tb00069.x> [accessed 10th February 2013]

Loach, Jennifer, 'The Function of the Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII', *Past & Present*, 142 (1994) 43-68 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/651196> [accessed 2nd March 2011]

Loyn, Henry R., *The Making of the English Nation: From the Anglo-Saxons to Edward I* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991)

Manning, Roger B., *Village Revolts: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988)

Matheson, Lister, 'Printer and Scribe: Caxton, the Polychronicon, and the Brut', *Speculum*, 60, 3 (1985), 595-614 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2848177> [accessed 14th July 2010]

Matheson, *The Prose Brut: the Development of a Middle English Chronicle* (Tempe, Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998)

McClendon, Muriel C., 'A Moveable Feast: Saint George's Day Celebrations and Religious Change in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 38, 1 (1999), 1-27 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/175838> [accessed 14th February 2011]

McHardy, Alison K., 'Some Reflections on Edward III's use of Propaganda', in *The Age of Edward III*, ed. by James S. Bothwell (York: York Medieval Press, 2001), pp. 171-92

Morgan, Rhys and Gerald Power, 'Enduring Borderlands: The Marches of Ireland and Wales in the Early Modern Period', in *Frontiers, Regions and Identities in Europe*, ed. by Steven G. Ellis and Raingard Eβer with Jean-François Berdah and Miloš Řezník (Pisa: Plus-Pisa University Press, 2009), pp. 101-28

Mottram, Stewart James, 'Reforming Nationhood: England in the Literature of the Tudor Imperial Age, 1509-1553', (PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2005)

Olick, Jeffrey K. and Joyce Robbins, 'Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices', *Annual Review of Sociology,* 24 (1998), 105-40 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/223476> [accessed 15th April 2010]

Olick, 'Collective Memory: The Two Cultures', *Sociological Theory*, 17, 3 (1999), 333-48 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/370189> [accessed 15th April 2010]

Raymond, James, *Henry VIII's Military Revolution: The Armies of Sixteenth-Century Britain and Europe* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2007)

Reynolds, Susan, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984)

Richardson, Walter C., *Mary Tudor, The White Queen* (London: Peter Owen, 1970)

Riches, Samantha, *St George: Hero, Martyr, Myth* (Stroud: Sutton, 2005)

Riches, *St George: a Saint for All* (London: Reaktion, 2015)

Ross, Charles, 'Rumour, Propaganda and Popular Opinion during the Wars of the Roses', in *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England*, ed. by Griffiths (Gloucester: Sutton, 1981), pp. 15-32

Ruddy, David, 'About the Brut Chronicle and Manuscript 225', <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/b/brut/about/> [accessed 15th July 2010]

Rundle, David, 'The Unoriginality of Tito Livio Frulovisi's *Vita Henrici Quinti*', *EHR*, 123, 504 (2008), 1109-31 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20485374> [accessed 20th February 2010]

Russell, Joycelyne G., *The Field of the Cloth of Gold: Men and Manners in 1520* (London: Routledge, 1969)

Salih, Sarah, *A Companion to Middle English Hagiography* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2006)

Sahlins, Peter, *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989)

Salomon, Brownell, 'The myth structure and rituality of *Henry V*', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 23, Early Shakespeare Special Number (1993), 254-69 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3507983> [accessed 20th February 2010]

Scales, Len, *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Scattergood, Vincent J., *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Blandford Press, 1971)

Schofield, Roger, *Taxation Under the Early Tudors 1485-1547* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004)

Schwyzer, Philip, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004)

Shagan, Ethan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven, Conn.; Yale University Press)

Shrank, Cathy, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Smith, Anthony D., *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986)

Smith, Anthony D., *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000)

Smith, Anthony D., *The Cultural Foundations of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008)

Smith, R. M., *Froissart and the English Chronicle Play* (1915, reprinted London, 2013)

Sowerby, Tracey, *Renaissance and Reform in Tudor England: The Careers of Sir Richard Morison c. 1513-1556* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)

Spencer, Brian, 'King Henry of Windsor and the London Pilgrim', in *Collectanea Londiniensia: studies in London archaeology and history presented to Ralph*

Merrifield, eds by Joanna Bird, Hugh Chapman, John Clark (London: London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, 1978)

Starkey, David, *Henry: Virtuous Prince* (London: HarperPress, 2008)

Strohm, Paul, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimisation, 1399-1422* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998)

Summit, Jennifer, *Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008)

Taylor, John, 'The development of the *Polychronicon* continuation', *EHR*, 76, 298 (1961), 20-36 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/557056> [accessed 14th July 2010]

Theilmann, John M., 'The Miracles of King Henry VI of England', *The Historian*, 42, 3 (1980), 456-71

Theilmann, 'Communitas among Fifteenth-Century Pilgrims', *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques*, 11, 3 (1984), 253-270

Thornton, Tim, *Cheshire and the Tudor State, 1480-1560* (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, 2000)

Tiffany, Grace, *Love's Pilgrimage: The Holy Journey in English Renaissance Literature* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2006)

'Worship in the Minster', in *A History of the County of York: the City of York*, ed. by P. M. Tillott (1961), pp. 343-357 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=36373> [accessed 26th August 2012]

Tooley, Ronald V., *Maps and Map-Makers* (London: Batsford, 1949)

Turville-Petre, Thorlac, *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290-1340* (Oxford: OUP, 1996)

Vale, Malcolm, *The Ancient Enemy: England, France and Europe from the Angevins to the Tudors* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2009)

Walker, Simon, 'Political Saints in Late Medieval England', in *Political Culture in Late Medieval England: Essays by Simon Walker* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 198-222

Warton, Thomas, *The History of English Poetry from the close of the Eleventh Century to the commencement of the Eighteenth Century, in three volumes, Volume II* (London: Cheapside, 1840)

Winstead, Karen A., 'Osbern Bokenham's "englische boke": Re-forming Holy Women', in *Form and Reform: Reading Across the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Shannon Gayk and Kathleen Tonry (Ohio: Ohio State University, 2011), pp. 67-87

White, Eileen, *The St Christopher and St George Guild of York* (York: Borthwick Institute, 1987)

Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Literature 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Zeeveld, W. Gordon, 'Richard Morison, Official Apologist for Henry VIII', *PMLA,* 55, 2 (1940), 406-25 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/458453> [accessed 6th October 2011]