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DOCTRINE THROUGH DRAMATURGY: A STUDY OF JOHN BAILE'S PLAYS AS THEY RELATE TO TUDOR POLEMICS AND TO THE EVOLUTION OF VARIOUS ENGLISH DRAMATIC FORMS

INTRODUCTION

In the tense and potentially explosive aftermath of Henry VIII's schism with the Roman Church, both he and his advisors were aware of a need for effective and far-reaching propaganda to promulgate Henry's position as head of both church and state. Cranmer and Cromwell early realized the contribution the popular drama could make to their cause. It was still very vital, very near to the people, and widely disseminated. Accordingly, the government encouraged and supported dramatic production enthusiastically, and as is to be expected, the dramas produced under their auspices reflect the official policy on both religious and secular matters.

Harold Gardiner sees this patronage as a major factor in the decline of the medieval religious stage as a social and cultural force, and describes the deterioration as a Reformation spirit, a Protestant sentiment which seeped down from above, which was imposed upon a people who wished still to cling to their old pageants, ...a steady undermining of the old stage was one of the means adopted by authority to shatter contact with the life and thought of former Catholic times.
But Gardiner's whole book seems an over-statement of the demise of the mysteries and here, too, he has exaggerated. The Cromwellian faction and their exploitation of the drama did not destroy the form, but rather turned it in new directions and redistributed its internal emphases.

The king was certainly no radical polemicist, but he was inclined to favor any means of strengthening his position. Thus, the new drama, insofar as it was strongly anti-Papal, received his support. Probably Cranmer first conceived of the value of the drama as a propaganda device. The stringent anti-Catholic Latin play PAMMACIUS (1538) by Thomas Kirchmeyer was dedicated to Cranmer and was translated into English by John Bale, perhaps setting the tone for later native efforts of the sort. But the form of these polemic plays changed very little. The old mysteries were still being performed, and little evidence of any attack on them as a form can be found in the 1530's.

By 1540, Henry had reversed his policy. The government now tended to suppress polemicism in both camps, and from 1540 to 1546 only one morality fragment is extant, more civil than religious in content. Propagandistic drama was seen as a potential trouble-maker, a riot-inciter. In 1542, Bishop Bonner forbade any play to be presented in a church. In 1543, all dramas which made interpretations of the scripture were
declared illegal by a Statute of the King.

When Edward VI was crowned in 1547, he repealed these restrictions and the stage saw a flood of plays written for political and religious agitation. Hostility toward the Roman Church grew increasingly specific, abusive, and irreverent. The Protestant writers were convinced of their sacred responsibility as polemicists. Foxe said

\[ \ldots \text{players, printers, and preachers be set up of God as a triple bulwark against the triple crown of the Pope, to bring him down.} \]

Finally, even Edward and his liberal advisor Somerset had to apply restraints. Tensions were so high that in 1549 all plays were banned for a two-month period, and in 1551, all troupes were required to be licensed by government office.

However, even these measures could not assuage the tensions created by Mary's coronation in 1553. Pro-Catholic plays such as *Respublica* appeared, but the anti-papal elements still found outlets. Only with Elizabeth and her refusal to tolerate extremes on either side was the drama finally disciplined, beginning to seek in other directions for new impetus.

In these polemic whirlwinds of the English Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, John Bale stands as a major figure, directing the doctrine and the diatribe of his milieu into effective propagandistic forms through the vehicle of his dramaturgy. As well as his many polemic pamphlets, he wrote,
according to his own records in ILLUSTRIUM MAIORIS BRITANNiae SCRIPTORUM SUMMARIUM, twenty-two plays. (See Appendix A for the listing) Of these, five are extant: three plays which suggest in both form and content a Biblical cycle play—GOD'S PROMISES, JOHN THE BAPTIST, and THE TEMPTATION OF OUR LORD; a morality play—THE THREE LAWS; and the early history play—KING JOHAN.

These plays reflect the New Learning in general, but their attack is most pointedly directed at papal abuse, ritual, and the monastic life. Bale was not simply a hack writer producing whatever was demanded by the Tudor apologists. His personal convictions were as zealous as the political aims of his protectors Cranmer and Cromwell. He was as ardently convinced of the rightness of what he was saying, as Cromwell was convinced of the political effectiveness of how he said it.

To convey his strong anti-papal attitudes, Bale, while keeping in large measure within the conventional dramatic forms, significantly altered the tone, the distribution of humor, the methods of characterization, the arrangement of material, and the points of emphasis. His dramaturgy, while far from subtle, was his means of effectively exploiting the existing dramatic forms as a vehicle for his own version of early Tudor Protestantism.

Although his plays were probably written early in his
career, at least one, KING JOHAN, shows evidence of late re-
vision and proof that his Protestant zeal did not greatly
diminish over the years. In fact, John Bale's life is a
microcosm of the turmoil, the variability and vicissitudes of
the English Reformation. Bale has obligingly left us several
biographical records, chiefly ANGLORUM HELIADES, THE APOLOGY
OF JOHAN BALE AGAYNSTE A RANKE PAPYST (1550), and THE VOCACYON
OF JOHAN BALE TO THE BISHOPRICK OF OSSARIE (1553). Also avail-
able are his random accounts in his catalogues of British
writers.

Born 21 November, 1495, in Suffolk, Bale was reared and
educated in the traditional faith. Much of his early training
was from the Carmelite friars in Norwich. Around 1513, he
went to Cambridge to study philosophy, and it is here, and
most likely from the influence of Robert Barnes, a classmate
and an early preacher of Lutheranism, that Bale was turned to
the New Learning. He met Cranmer here, too, as both were
members of Jesus College.

However, the liberal environment of Cambridge did not
immediately make a convert of Bale. When he left the university
it was to serve in a number of Carmelite posts, and among his
earliest literary endeavors were a history of the Carmelite
order and a catalogue of Carmelite saints and officials. Soon,
though, his unorthodox attitudes began to surface, encouraged,
Bale notes, by his acquaintance with Thomas, Lord of Wentworth,
a man high in the circles of the New Learning. We have an early account (1531) of heretical teaching on the Sacrament of the Altar while Bale was at Doncaster; and in 1533, he left the Carmelite order and underscored his repudiation of the monastic institution by taking a wife. Davies says of this action:

His conversion coincided with a conviction that his order had degenerated from its past greatness, and his interest shifted from Carmelite antiquities to national antiquities. By 1533 he was ready to support the national State against the international Church; and to him, as to others, the State was the King.¹⁴

Now a secular priest, Bale became extremely outspoken in his unorthodox views. Eventually his zeal led him first to trial under Edward Lee, Archbishop of York, in 1534, and later to prison in early 1537. However, Bale had already shown evidence of his potential value to the Reformation cause in a series of plays written during his service to John Vere, Earl of Oxford. These early plays, 14 in all, are listed in ANGLORUM HELIADES and were perhaps the bulk of the repertoire of a travelling company of players recorded in Cromwell's account books as "Bale and his fellows."⁵ At any rate, Cromwell did directly intervene to rescue Bale from prison in 1537, perhaps influenced by Bale's own plea and by John Leland's support of Bale's cause.⁶ From this moment, Bale directly concerned himself with the Tudor cause. Of the five extant plays, the cycle plays and the THREE LAWES bear a compilation date of
1538, and the earliest version of KING JOHAN is usually dated late 1538 because of a topical allusion to an event of April, 1538. Thus, Bale became a part of Cromwell's 'machine.'

His zeal was poorly rewarded, however, for after the appearance of The Six Articles in 1539 and Cromwell's fall in 1540, Bale was forced into exile on the continent for eight years. From Germany he surveyed the martyrdom of Reformers who had stayed in England (such as Robert Barnes, who was burned in 1540) and the 'apostasy' of others (such as Bishop Gardiner) who modified their views to suit Henry's conservatism. Bale continued his writing, commenting harshly on the unfolding of events in England in pseudonymous pamphlets such as "Yet A Course at the Romysh Foxe" and "Epistle Exhortatory of an Inglyshe Christian." He also compiled martyrological tracts concerning Sir John Oldcastle and Anne Askewe and more general accounts such as The Actes of Englyshe Votaryes. It was also on the continent, probably in 1547, that the three cycle plays were first printed.

Because of these writings, many of them smuggled into England and all of them proscribed, Bale became known as a leading Reformation controversialist, and it was to be expected that when he returned to England after Edward's Coronation it would be as an important figure in the new government. However, Bale was more historian than politician; and though he worked closely with such men as Foxe, Leland, and Grimald,
his reward was long in coming and short in satisfaction. Only in 1552, did Bale receive from Edward an appointment to the Bishopric of Ossory in Ireland.

Of this unhappy phase of his career Bale has left a vivid account in his VOCACYON. Ireland was still quite unbending in its Catholicism, and Bale's personality was not conducive to compromise. The Bishop insisted on strict Protestantism at every turn, making enemies all around. When Mary's accession to the throne in 1558 heartened his Catholic opponents, Bale, still adamant, performed his cycle-trilogy at the marketcross in Kilkenny and preached his old Protestantism. In spite of his perseverance, the rest of the clergy there quickly fall back to "Papism," and after a group of Bale's domestics were killed by the Irish, the Bishop himself was narrowly rescued.

After harrowing times, including capture by pirates, Bale found himself again in exile, a second time the victim of religious and political vagaries. Now his polemics bore added bitterness as he poured out his frustration and his wrath against the papists, who were once again in power.

In 1559 Bale was called home to England but rather than filling his troubled bishopric, he lived rather quietly, and certainly silently for Bale, as a prebendary at Canterbury. He was engaged until his death in compiling a history of England and is thought to have revised his KING JOHAN for
performance before Elizabeth in 1561. Thus Bale, truly a
mirror of the English Reformation, came more calmly to his
end in 1563, secure in England and concerned now more intensely
with national than with theological issues.

Perhaps because of the extremes of his fortune, Bale's
scholarship was, in the past, chiefly concerned with his life
and his historical catalogues. Critics have defined Bale's
purpose--which is certainly readily apparent--but have not paid
close attention to his technique.

The earliest contemporary survey of Bale's life and
works is W. T. Davies' A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF JOHN BALE. This
study gives us a brief account of Bale's life, several in-
formative catalogues of his works, a brief description of his
handwriting, and a quite thorough bibliography. But Davies
says little of Bale's craftsmanship, avowing that the man is
"more important than readable" (p. 203) and that his partisanship
destroyed his literary merit to the extent that "he sel-
dom succeeded in being anything but bilious. . . . At times
. . . not so much writing as barking in print." However,
Davies rather grudgingly concludes that "if only for his con-
tribution to English studies he deserves a bibliography."
(p. 203)

Jesse Harris' work in 1940, JOHN BALE: A STUDY IN THE
MINOR LITERATURE OF THE REFORMATION, claims that Bale's
drama deserves fuller consideration, especially as it relates
to "contemporary drama of the transition period." (p. 12)

Harris rightly stresses Bale's strong medieval heritage of form and the nature of Bale's contribution:

The plays of John Bale, therefore, are transitional—owing much to the past, offering a little to the future. Fundamentally they sprang from the older miracle and morality drama. But to meet practical needs, they were limited in the manner of the contemporary interludes; consequently, they have much in common with the popular plays of the period. At the same time, classical influence had begun to make its appearance. Christian-terence dramas from Germany had filtered into England, and traces of their influence are observable in Bale's plays. And finally, Bale super-imposed the subject matter and personages of history upon the framework of the morality—creating the first of the plays on King John. (p. 130)

But Harris, though he recognizes that Bale was "a dramatic innovator, an adaptor who aroused a school of controversial drama into being" (p. 65) and that "his originality lies in the field of application rather than in that of invention," (p. 99) never quite shows us how Bale managed these innovations and applications within the plays themselves.

Honor McCusker's JOHN BAILE: DRAMATIST AND ANTIQUARY adds no more to our understanding of Bale's dramaturgy. She calls the plays interludes which are much alike in structure, presentation, and versification. She, too, understands Bale's purpose:

For the first time, the morality play was being employed not merely as a sermon but
as a weapon. . . . The Purpose is not the
inculcation of ethical or religious
principles; it is to attack a specific
institution, the Catholic Church, and, more
specifically still, the papacy. (p. 78)

But she, as had Davies earlier, feels that Bale's "frenzied
protest," his constant "indulging his splenetic temperament,"
robs his plays of their dramatic force. Miss McCusker does
point out Bale's debt to Tyndale's OBEDIENCE OF A CHRISTIAN
MAN, citing a passage which Bale seems to have versified quite
directly, (p. 90) and she is the first to have made available
material from Bale's life, such as that concerning his trial
and imprisonment alluded to above.

Not until 1968 were Bale's plays alone given a full-
length treatment. 10 Mrs. Platt, in thorough analysis of each
of the extant plays, has uncovered many valuable insights into
Bale's dramaturgy, but the value of her work is badly decimated
by a most unhelpful organization which treats Structure and
Content, Stagecraft and Costumes, and Style in separate sec-
tions of the book. In addition, since her primary interest
was KING JOHAN, she gives only scant treatment to the cycle
plays, viewing them as "far removed from the miracle plays, to
which his dramas may be considered a corrective." (p. 95) Her
statement that cycle plays concentrate on story whereas Bale's
plays manifest a fundamental relationship between God and
Mankind makes a false distinction which seems to arise from an
erroneous concept of the generic characteristics of Biblical
plays. She is much better on KING JOHAN and THE THREE LAWES, and her over-all estimate is accurate:

Though Bale cannot be called an innovator of the drama, he adapted the existing theatrical tradition to represent his view of the world and the forces which governed it. He modified the genres of mystery and morality so that they became serviceable means in the campaign of the 'new learning'... The materials which he found at hand he used often indiscriminately, but always with evident zeal. He made up for his lack of invention and poetic talent with a furious sincerity that earned him the name of 'bilious Bale'. (pp. 233-34)

However, I feel that Blatt badly underestimates Bale's contribution to polemic drama when she says, "His lack of novel methods. . . . makes his expenditure of energy a failure as far as posterity is concerned." (p. 19)

There have been more limited studies worthy of note. Robert Lee Duncan has done a clear analysis of contextual motifs in an unpublished dissertation. E. S. Miller has isolated liturgical origins of several of Bale's parodic techniques, and Pineas has a series of articles on Bale's polemic techniques, especially in the non-dramatic works.

The weakness in Bale scholarship which this study purposes to shore up is its failure to deal thoroughly with Bale's dramaturgy as the means of conveying his polemic content. Before analyzing the plays I have attempted to give the reader a full account of the controversies to which Bale addressed
himself, both between church and state and between protestant and Catholic doctrine. (Chapter I) So that the reader can appreciate Bale's own innovations I have devoted Chapter II to non-dramatic literary manifestations of these issues and controversies. Then, in each subsequent chapter I have first defined the genre as received from the fifteenth century, examined contemporary sixteenth-century practices, and then analyzed Bale's work as it relates to the generic norm and to other contemporary examples of the genre. In the chapters dealing with the morality and the history play I have attempted to illustrate Bale's contribution to the evolution of the genre.

In general, I hope to provide in Chapter VI a brief appreciation of what Bale's contributions to polemic literature and to the English dramatic form actually were and to summarize the nature of his modifications of the existing forms and the significance of these modifications to the development of English drama.
FOOTNOTES


3As quoted by Gardiner, p. 58.


6See Appendices B and C for these letters.

7See Footnote 4 above.


9Honor McCusker, *Dramatist and Antiquary* (Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1942).

CHAPTER I

THE ISSUES: POLITICAL AND DOCTRINAL

The tumult and turmoil of the English Reformation which produced such an abundance of martyrs, exiles, and polemicists was not essentially the fruit of new ideas nor of novel issues. More accurately, what occurred was that old issues took on new significance as they experienced realignment in the light of Henry VIII's political exigencies and took on new impetus from continental influences. English theological and political thinking underwent a metamorphosis rather than a renaissance.

Much of the theological controversy of the Reformation had found earlier expression in the Lollard movement of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. A general anticlericalism was already prevalent in fourteenth century English literature and criticism of unworthy clergy was not considered heresy. Thus, when a period of papal weakness (such as that of the Avignon Captivity) occurred, the people were a ripe audience for Wycliff's early preaching against papal abuse. As long as he assailed simony, court abuses, and the luxurious life of monks and prelates, Wycliff commanded the sympathy of a relatively large segment of the laity. Even when his attack broadened to the entire external polity of
the Church rather than focusing on the individual evil-doers, when he questioned the hierarchy itself and the 'superstition' surrounding it, Wycliff still found wide support for the "church's coercive jurisdiction, its monetary exactions, and the unedifying lives of not a few of the clergy. . . ."

But when his attacks turned to doctrinal matters, and most especially to the sacraments, Wycliff met strong opposition. He argued the evils of celibacy, lamented the withholding of the Scripture from the laity, specified the Bible as the source of all law, and, most dangerously of all, questioned the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar, which had been made an article of faith at the Lateran Council of 1215.

When Wycliff, in 1382, presented to Parliament a series of propositions defining his principles, most of them were condemned as either heresy or error. (See Appendix D) Not only did Parliament condemn the philosophy, but it felt the threat serious enough to warrant the passage of an Act for the arrest of any vagrant preacher.

Nevertheless, Lollards' strength continued among both nobility and commons and became so serious as to necessitate Richard II's being recalled from the Irish Wars by the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London to avert danger from the Lollards. The new movement again attempted to define its principles to Parliament in The Twelve Conclusions
presented in January 1395. In the Preamble, the conclusions plead for "the reformacioun of Holi Chirche of Yngelond, the qwyche han ben blynde and leprouse many yere be mayntenaunce of the proude prelacye." These conclusions are even a more direct attack on the sacraments and stress the deterioration of the Roman Church which is accused of "Being entirely out of joint, to the perfectness of its first beginning." 4

Such outspoken heresy elicited a powerful opposing alliance of Church and Crown, and under Henry IV stringent anti-heresy measures were effected. Bishops were given the power to arrest and imprison offenders in such statutes as de Haeretico Comburendo. 5 More and more, Lollardy was conceived of as dangerous not only to the papal doctrine and hierarchy, but to the national well-being.

Then, as in the sixteenth century, the real force behind these anti-radical measures passed by Parliament was the threat to political stability. It was this, rather than doctrinal orthodoxy, which high-ranking Lollards such as Sir John Oldcastle so directly threatened. The 1406 Bill Against the Lollards was petitioned by none other than the Prince of Wales, who justified action against them on the grounds of being a threat to the kingdom. 6 After Oldcastle's heresy led to open battle in 1413, even stricter measures were passed and heresy itself generally came to be defined as "adherence to the Wycliffite movement and Wycliffite doctrine, and the
unlicensed reading of the Wycliffite scriptures, with the consequent refusal to bow to the determination of Holy Church."7

Along with legislative action, the court also encouraged anti-Lollard treatises to be written. Thomas Walden, Henry IV's confessor, wrote a lengthy Latin piece, Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei Catholicae Ecclesiae, as a refutation of ten Lollard doctrines. His was also a defence of the university colleges which Wycliff had labeled "castra Caimitica" because of "their tendency to error, scant learning, and bias."8

More important is the work of Reginald Pecock who attempted to supply in Reule of Crysten Religion (1443)9 a way of life to controvert the heresies of his time. To him must go the credit for "his appreciation of the success of the Wycliffite propaganda and his use of English in defense of the conservative position."10 Pecock gives his own reasons for choosing the vernacular:

oon is forto the peple instruccioun or doctrine. . . . An other cause is forto stir. . . the peple into love and into devotioun. . . by my writing in the comoun peplus langage. (p. 19)

Pecock insisted on the efficacy of good works as a means of salvation:

. . . and so that resoun and fei and moral vertuose dedis togidere schulden be oure meenys ledyng us into oure blisful supernatural ende, Thou seyst to us other meenys helping to these now spokun meenys, which other meenys ben the gracin. . . . (p. 135)
And he upheld the necessity of the sacraments "if a man wole falle undir his grace deservid of cristes passioun and be remedied agens the foreseid myscheewis . . . . (p. 206)

With the commons soothed by Pecock's gentle reasoning and the nobility frightened off by the movement's propensity for inciting rebellion, Lollardy subsided in England but never quite disappeared. A. G. Dickens is convinced of its continuing vitality: 11

Lollardy, so far from being...a spent force on the eve of the Reformation, survived in some strength to prepare the ground for Protestantism. The beliefs deriving from Wycliff were more radically Protestant than those of Luther himself; they seem the forerunners if not the parents of English nonconformity. (23-24)

And Clebsch attributes great evolutionary influence to Lollardy:

From the outset, English Protestantism was shaped by the waning Wycliffites whom it enguished. 12

Gairdner, however, feels that the Reformation did not develop from Lollardy nor from any protest against real abuses of the Church. What did happen was that "the ground...was prepared for a good deal of theological change if heresy, instead of being suppressed, were once encouraged by authority." 13 In 1534, that very condition occurred.

Lollardy did not suggest Royal Supremacy, but Royal Supremacy,...when the King had made up his mind to it, suggested his seeking the support of Lollardy. 14
Whatever complex of forces breathed life into the English Reformation, and surely Lollardy was one of the strongest, it would be difficult to deny Henry the role of Pygmalion. The issues had been supplied by the Wycliffite controversies, but it was only when the support of the Crown shifted from the Church to the "heretics" that the Reformation gained momentum in England.

Just as the theological issues had pre-dated their Reformation significance, so the controversy of Supremacy had long been argued, both in religious and in secular contexts.

The Henricians stood on the threshold of a brave new world. . . . They preached a revolutionary theory of Royal Supremacy to justify the great anti-ecclesiastical statutes of the Reformation Parliament. They advocated a doctrine of absolute non-resistance to preserve intact the advances made by the New Monarchy in the secular sphere. More often than not, however, they employed medieval phraseology to elucidate the new point of view.15

The Church had long recognized the presence of two powers in the world, the one spiritual and the other temporal. But the important balance of power between them was first committed to clear definition in the canons of Pope Gelasius I in the Fifth Century. His definition of the two powers and their relationship is commonly referred to as Gelasian dualism or the Doctrine of the Two Swords, and figures prominently in Reformation controversy.

Gelasius insisted that the two powers were distinct,
that it was of absolute necessity that they cooperate, and that the spiritual was always to be held superior. On his arguments rested the right of papal deposition of rulers, the Pope being *uidex superior* if secular rulers did not submit voluntarily to the Church.

To the Gelasian canons, Innocent III added elaboration of the coercive powers of the Pope. The Pope actually had two swords, one of which he conferred on the ruler. This conferred right to empire did not take away all the papal temporal authority; for instance, popes could still legitimize. Nor did it free the ruler from obligation to use his temporal jurisdiction in support of the spiritual. A king was under a moral responsibility to both administer justice to his subjects and to lead those subjects back from any apostasy into which they may have drifted. *Plenitudo potestatis*, the received technical term for this broad papal sovereignty, became the concept which had to be refuted by any ruler who desired to place his ultimate loyalty anywhere but in Rome.¹⁶

English kings had long chafed under this Roman sovereignty. Henry II had confronted Thomas Becket and been forced to do penance by the spiritual sword. His son John fared even worse, eventually driven to a temporary resignation of his very crown to a papal legate. During the Fourteenth Century, encouraged and strengthened by the weakening of the Church's universal image during the period of the Avignon
popes, English rulers fortified their right to empire with a series of statutes. Provisos limited the pope's right to dispose of ecclesiastical benefices, and statutes of Praemunire maintained the jurisdiction of royal English courts against rival claims. Evidence of the growing independence of the English kings was the declaration of Simon Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury, who renounced in 1366 all expressions in a Papal Bull "which militated against the royal prerogatives." This supplied an important precedent for Cranmer's 1533 Oath of Obedience.

The Fourteenth Century also supplied Reformation apologists for Royal Supremacy with the extremely influential work of Marsiglio of Padua. In his DEFENSOR PACIS (1324) Marsiglio held that the nation-state was omnipotent. The Church had no proprietary rights on temporal powers and the clergy were labelled mere "physicians of the soul" who could exercise only spiritual powers, potestas ordinis. The centrality of this work to Reformation controversy is perhaps best evidenced by the fact that it was Cromwell himself who financed the English translation of Marsiglio by William Marshall in 1535.

These earlier defenses of royal supremacy were valuable to those Sixteenth Century writers who were anxious not only to justify their position but to lend it the prestige of historical precedent. Their aim was

...to impress the English people with the fact that usurpation is not usurpation, and
that for centuries Christians had been deliberately misled by popes and church doctors about the proper relationship between regnum and sacerdotum. ¹⁹

To accomplish this justification of Tudor supremacy, Cromwell drew together a group of men, all to some degree Marsiglians, and most bourgeois humanists, whose task was to supply to the English reading public a stream of material, both translated and original, which by citation of historical and Biblical examples promulgated the Henrician cult of secular authority and simultaneously undermined the power of the papacy. A nation was to be re-educated. This campaign, described by Baumer as "a literary offensive sponsored by a government in alliance with all the sympathetic people of the nation,"²⁰ represents "the first awakening of government to the political uses of the printing press."²¹ More than 50 books, 28 of them from the press of Thomas Berthelet, the King's printer, and streams of pamphlets and proclamations flooded the bookstalls of England. Although there were expressions of opposition supporting the Church's supremacy, such as Reginald Pole's DE UNITATE ECCLESIAE (1536), they were suppressed by the King and the few extant examples are available only in manuscript. The partial list of pro-royal books printed between 1528 and 1539 in Appendix D reflects the abundance of such material.

The foundation of this Sixteenth Century defense of Royal Supremacy was a re-definition of Gelasian dualism, in
which the temporal power was given almost absolute sovereignty.

Sixteenth Century royalists insisted on the subordination of prelates to princes, for as Bishop Gardiner reminded them, "Did not Aaron take Moses for his sovereign lorde?"\(^22\)

Foxe clearly distinguishes between the two areas of jurisdiction:

Wherefore let every man consider the compass and limitation of his charge, and exceed no further. The office of a bishop or servitor ecclesiastical was in the old law to offer sacrifice, to burn incense, to pray for the people, to expound the law, to minister in the tabernacle, with which office it was not lawful for any prince or man to intermeddle. . .so now the office of christian ministers is to preach the word, to minister the sacraments, to pray, to bind and loose where cause urgently requireth; to judge in spiritual cases; to publish and denounce free reconcilation and remission in the name of Christ; to erect and comfort troubled consciences, with the rich grace of the gospel, whereof the one belongeth to such as be not in Christ, and come not to him, the other pertaineth to the true believers in the Son of God: to admonish also the magistrates erring or transgressing in their office.

And as these properly belong to the function of the ecclesiastical sort, so hath the civil governor or magistrate again his proper charge and office to him assigned, which is, to see the administration of justice and judgment, to defend with power the right of the weak that suffer wrong, to defend from oppression the poor oppressed, to minister with equity that which is right and equal to every man, to provide laws good and godly, to see the execution of the same as cause moveth: especially to see the law of God maintained, to promote Christ's glory and gospel in setting up and
sending out good preachers; in maintaining the same; in providing bishops to be elected that be faithful; in removing or else correcting the same being faulty or negligent. . . . Briefly, the office of civil ruler or magistrate extendeth to minister justice and judgment in all courts, as well ecclesiastical as temporal; to have correction over all transgressors, whether they be laymen or persons ecclesiastical. And finally, all such things as belong to the moving of the sword whatsoever (that is to say all outward punishment) are referred to the jurisdiction of the secular magistrate, under whose subjection the ordinance of God hath subjected all orders and states of men. 23

And by the time Latimer was preaching before Edward VI, the Doctrine of the Two Swords had been clearly turned to the favor of the temporality:

For in thys world God hath ii swerdes, the one is a temporal swerde, the other a spiritual, The temporal swerde resteth in the handes of kynges, maiestrates, and rulers under hym, where unto all subjects, as wel the Cleargy as the laite be subject, and punisheable, for anye offence contrarye to the same boke.

The spiritual swerde is in the handes of the ministers and preachers, wher unto all Kynges, maiestrates, Rulers oughte to be obediente, . . . so long as the ministers syt in Christes chayre, that is, spspakeyng out of Christes boke. 24

In the same sermon, Gardiner speaks of the English king as a deliverer who will lead his people out of their bondage to the pope in Egypt. This was a prevalent Reformation concept: the secular ruler's usurpation of the pope's role as Vicar of God.
We should not underestimate the sense of crusade which animated the best of the English Reformation. Henry proclaimed himself, and was sincerely proclaimed, as a Moses delivering a chosen people from the bondage and darkness of papal thrall-dom. He promised the restoration of the kingdom, renewal, rebuilding of the right order; and the promise, to some, rang true.25

The king, then, is ordained directly by God and owes allegiance to Him alone. Erasmus puts it thus:

God placed a beautiful likeness of Himself in the heavens—the sun. Among mortal men, he set up a tangible and living image of himself—the king.26

Gardiner explains that God, in order to help men lead more godly lives, has sent rulers "who being put in authority as his Vice-regents, should require obedience" and these princes "as representatives of his image unto men, he would have to be reputed in the suprem and most hie."27 Cranmer's doctrine of the Godly Prince is based on this precept:

All Christian princes have committed unto them immediately of God, the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of things political, and civil governance.28

Of course, as God's vicar the king had certain responsibilities. Erasmus claims only to defend the rights of a Christian prince, one who recognizes and fills the needs of his people. "A good, wise, and upright prince is nothing else than a sort of living law." (p. 221) However, Erasmus warns, "If the prince rejoices in, and is supported by evils, he is
not part of the state. He is no prince; he is a brigand." (p. 181)

Such strictures, however, were not welcome in Tudor England and the majority of writers stressed instead the theory of absolute non-resistance to royal authority, arguing that to reject a God-appointed regent would be a sin against God himself. Stephen Gardiner's *DE VERA OBEIDENTIA* is an epitome of this position. Arguing that God "setteteth more by obedience than by all oblations and sacryfyces," Gardiner cites Old Testament examples and Christ's own obedient spirit as evidence that "whosoever resisteth power, resisteth the ordnaunce of God" (D, iii). There are no limits of obedience he avows:

> We must needes haue humbleness of hart in obeing autoritie, how grevous so ever it be, for gods sake, not questioning, not inquiring. . .but if they take upon them more than right and reason is, they haue a Lorde. . .that shall one day sit in judgment even of them. (E, ii)

Neither can any laws, whether civil or canon, impose limitations on the King:

> Against the superiour. . .it is not lawful to make an i law. For inferiours prescribes not lawes to the superiours, neither do they lawfulli make penalties against their government, how wiked or intollerable soever it be. (F, vi)

Tudor Royal Supremacy, then, amounted essentially to a reversal of power allotment within Gelasian dualism and a new
emphasis upon the king as divine representative and therefore as unimpeachable by the Church or by his subjects. Thus, the two major fields of Reformation controversy—1) doctrinal and theological questions, and 2) the doctrine of Royal Supremacy—were fundamentally readjustments of and new approaches to medieval issues.

Lutheranism, then, supplied neither the matter nor the motive of the English Reformation; instead, it created an opportunity for an alliance with a force which Henry could utilize as his needs demanded. Early English Protestantism was not a widespread movement, but was confined to certain groups. Among the London merchants who had numerous continental contacts and in old Lollard centers such as Norwich, there were societies for the propagation of the New Learning known as The Christian Brethren. These reformers particularly concerned themselves with the spread of contraband books, many written by continental exiles subsidized by the Brethren. Most of these works dealt little with theology, but instead directed their appeal to latent English Lollardy by attacks on clerical worldliness and on the secular power held by the Church in general and by Wolsey in particular.

In the universities arose other groups of reformers, more indebted to Erasmus' New Testament than to the Wycliffite Scriptures. A quietly embarrassed letter from the Bishop of Lincoln to Bishop Warham attests their presence at Oxford.29
He regrets the presence of "incircumspect fools" at a university heretofore free of all heresy, but fears "great slander" if all suspected were called to London. He therefore requests a Commission of Inquiry to sit there at Oxford. And this letter led to Henry's earliest proclamation against them:

Forasmuch as the right reverend father in God, our trusty and right well-beloved councillor, the Bishop of Lincoln, hath now within his diocese no small number of heretics, as it is thought, to his no little discomfort and heaviness, we therefore, being in will and mind safely to provide for the said right reverend father in God and his officers, that they nor any of them shall bodily be hurt or damaged by any of the said heretics or their fators, in the executing and ministering of justice unto the said heretics according to the laws of Holy Church, do straightly charge and command you and every of you, as you tender our high displeasure, to be aiding, helping and assisting to the said right reverend father in God and his said officers, in the executing of justice in the premises, as they or any of them shall require you so to: not failing to accomplish our commandment and pleasure in the premises, as you intend to please us, and will answer to the contrary at your utmost perils.30

At Cambridge, the men destined to be leaders of the English Reformation were emerging. Thomas Bilney, destined to be an early Protestant martyr, was converting such men as Robert Barnes and Hugh Latimer. A favorite gathering place, the White Horse Inn, came to be known as "Little Germany." But these men, in the 1520's, were a small and imperiled minority.
As Clebsch puts it:

These Protestants repeated their professions of loyalty to country and to prince, even though the prince relentlessly opposed them by fusing intense territorialism with conservative Catholicism into a 'benevolent' despotism. For Henry VIII...always defended whatever faith he authorized in order to strengthen the royal power he exercised.31

As yet, Henry still estimated his most valuable position to be that of Defensor Fidei, which he had gained by a repudiation of Luther and which his government reflected in its staunch opposition to the New Learning. This title, diligently sought by Henry, was the fruit of Henry's ASSERTIO SEPTUM SACRAMENTARUM, printed in the summer of 1521. It was a rather obvious work, relying chiefly on assertion of the conventional sacramental orthodoxy rather than a careful doctrinal refutation of Luther's DE CAPTIVITATE BABYLONICA ECCLESIAE, but it achieved the Church's applause and was widely circulated. John Healey stresses the significance of this debate:

With the publication of Luther's scandalous Babylonian Captivity of the Church and Henry's Assertio the issue was joined; explicitly, the sacramental system of the medieval church had been attacked and defended; implicitly, the question of authority, both Scriptural and papal had been revised.32

Luther replied to Henry in CONTRA HENRICUM REGEN ANGLIAE, pleading that his opponents were not arguing fairly:
... if I always cry Gospel, Gospel, Gospel!, they can only answer Fathers!
Fathers! Custom! Custom! Decretals!
Decretals!33

Luther regrets resorting to severity and violence, but argues:

in this book I am dealing with senseless wild monsters who have despised whatever I have written calmly and in a moderate tone. . . . Anyway, at least I have abstained from poisonous slanders and lies such as abound in the king's book. (p. 31)

Henry did not deign to reply to this attack, but he had able defenders in John Fisher and Thomas More. Fisher's Latin apologetics, the ASSERTIONIS LUTHERANAECONFUTATIO (1523) and the DEFENSIO REGIE ASSERTIONIS CONTRABABYLONICAM CAPTIVITATEM (1525), were too kind, expository rather than argumentative. Luther's direct attack needed the more detailed refutation furnished later by More in RESPONSIO AD LUTHURUM. More's absolute intolerance of heresy, as well as the express needs of the situation, created a "polemic stance" described by Headley as "maximum intransigence couched in the most violent abuse."34 With More, "the art of eloquence" penetrates "the arena of dogmatic controversy and personal abuse." (p. 778) To achieve this stance and to maintain decorum, More created the persona Rosseus who refutes, in an abusive, often scatological tone, a continuous quotation of Luther's work.

In 1521, John Fisher, in a sermon at Paul's Cross, offered the first English refutation of Lutheranism.35 Luther's
heresy, according to Fisher, is "a blacke clowde" which "hath shadowed the clere lyght" and "he makith issue from hym a perylous lyghtnynge, that ys to saye a false lyght of wonge understendyng of scriptures....he thonderyth agaynst the pope's authoryte." (p. 312) Fisher tells his hearers that the Gospel offers instructions against such tempests. To the question of Moses' supremacy over Aaron, Fisher answers that Moses had ascended to heaven and left Aaron to instruct and to judge the people. He argues that faith without works is dead, for just as summer sun-rays gain strength by doubling back to the sun, so the light of faith must be strengthened by the rebounding of hope and the heat of charity. Concerning the sacraments, Fisher avers that the king's book has spoken so substantially that he need not, but he insists on their validity as part of the unwritten traditions or verities given by Christ, the apostles, and the Fathers to the Church. Luther is typical of all heretics who misconstrue the Scripture for the lack of proper Spirit: "They tourned the wonge syde of the scryptures outwarde, follwyng theyr own brayne and phantasye led by the spyrte of errore and ignourance." (p. 345)

The tone of Fisher's first sermon against Luther and of Henry's Assertio is rather mild, an expression of one who is both right and strong in his rightness. But Lutheranism continued to spread in England. By 1525, Robert Barnes was
preaching openly on Reformation themes, a profusion of Protestant books from the continent was available, and most important, Tyndale's NEW TESTAMENT translation was coming from the presses of Peter Quintel in Cologne. New lines of defense were needed.

The illicit book trade came under fire, first from the bishops and then directly from the king. In 1526, Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of London, called in all New Testament translations and other Protestant books lamenting that:

many children of iniquitie, maintayners of Luthers sect, blynded through extreme wickedness, wandryng from the way of truth and the Catholicke fayth, craftely have translated the new Testament into our English tongue, entermedlyng therewith many heretickall Articles and erroneous opinions, pernicious and offensive, seducyng the simple people, attemptyng by their wicked and peruerse interpretations, to prophenate the majesty of the Scripture, which hetherto hath remained vndefiled, and craftely to abuse the most holy words of God, and the true sence of the same; of the which translation there are many bookees imprinted, some with gloses and some without, contaynyng in the English tongue that pestiferous and most pernicious poysone dispersed throughout all our diocesse of London in great number: which truly, without it be spedely foreseene, wythout doubt, wyll contaminate and infect the flock committed vnto us, with most deadly poysone and heresie, to the grievous peril and danger of the soules committed to our charge, and the offence of gods divyne majesty.
Fisher preached another public, anti-Lutheran sermon, and this time his message was underscored by assembled bishops in full regalia, who looked on while heretics knelt, recanted, and consigned their offending books to the fire.

In 1529, the King himself issued a proclamation proscribing certain books which "induce erroneous opinions, soweth sedition among Christian people, and finally do disturb the peace and tranquility of Christian realms. 37 Offenders were to be delivered to the bishops and to suffer under canon law, but they were also promised "the King's high indignation."

A year later, Henry felt it necessary to issue a similar proclamation, adding new titles and promising his people that the Holy Scripture, shall by great, learned, and Catholic persons be translated into the English tongue on the condition that the people "utterly abandon and forsake all perverse, erroneous, and seditious opinions." 38

But still books poured from the Protestant presses of Antwerp, arguing persistently for the authority of the Scripture against the Authority of the Church, for the priority of faith over works in the justification of the sinner, and for the repudiation of certain sacramental doctrine and rituals held necessary by the Church. And then, in the fall of 1529, to this tenacious new movement came the impetus required to let it sweep the field. Henry deposed Wolsey and turned to Cromwell and Lutheranism as agents in the
accomplishment of his 'great matter.' Although Henry was still commissioning defenses of Catholicism by men such as Fisher and More, he was also in communication with Luther himself as early as 1526 and was known to have given sympathetic approval to anti-clerical works such as Fish's *A Supplication for Beggars* and to have evinced great interest in the political implications of books such as Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian Man*.

Of course there was Anne Boleyn, whose actual influence is perceptively analyzed by Scarisbrick:

> The divorce did not directly beget Henricianism, though it affected its growth profoundly. It may have carried incipient cesaropapism to its breach with Rome when otherwise the latter might have halted at a stringent concordat; conversely, Henry's discovery of the true nature of Christian kingship gave a new thrust to the divorce campaign. . . . Strictly speaking, they were autonomous, though in complicated interplay--now hampering, now accelerating one another. 39

Though not yet established as wholly in the King's favor, the reformers were now at least equally secure; their arguments became more stringent, more confident, and clearly more anti-papal; the controversy was carried on chiefly in the vernacular; and the tone of the "Romish" opposition became more defensive and more anxious. While Henry considered the political and personal possibilities of an alliance with continental Lutherans, the theological issues were being
thoroughly explored and expounded in the vernacular in treatises published both at home and abroad. The running controversy of William Tyndale and Sir Thomas More is the best example of this sort of polemical exposition of doctrine. Tyndale's New Testament and his first two original works, of 1528, Parable of the Wicked Mammon and The Obedience of a Christian Man, were cornerstones of the illicit Protestant book market. Proscribed by both bishops and by the King, they nevertheless flourished in England. On 7 March 1528, More was licensed to possess and read these books in order to refute them in the vernacular. By June 1529, More had produced The Dialogue. . . Against the Pestilent sect of Luther and Tyndale. Tyndale's An Answer To Sir Thomas More's Dialogue appeared in 1531, and More's much longer Confutacyon of Tyndale's Answer in 1532 and his Apology in 1533.

Their debate includes all of the issues basic to theological controversy during the Reformation and many of the techniques which became the staple of Reformation polemicists, but perhaps the core of the entire argument was Tyndale's assertion of the supremacy of the Scripture over the church and of the King in the state. Tyndale's Obedience of a Christian Man, arguing for a vernacular Bible, maintains that it is not the scriptures which cause trouble "but the bloody doctrine of the pope, which causeth disobedience, rebellion, and insurrection." (p. 166) In A Pathway Into Holy
Scripture Tyndale complains of "our great pillars of holy church which have nailed a veil of false glosses on Moses' face, to corrupt the true understanding of his law. . . ." (p. 28, Doctrinal Treatises)

More, defending the "unwritten verities," holds that this single-minded adherence to the Scripture is "the very foundation and ground of all his Luther's heresies" and explains the benefits derived from the patristic glosses:

It Scripture is so marvellously tempered, that a mouse may wade therein, and an elephant be drowned therein. For there is no man, . . . but if he will seek his way with the staff of his faith, . . . and have the old holy fathers also for his guides, . . . using reason and refusing no good learning, shall . . . wade through and come to such end of his journey as himself would well wish. (p. 102)

Of all Tyndale's doctrines, the most likely to have found a hearing at Henry's court was that of the absolute authority of the King. In Obedience, the King is depicted as "in this world, without law; and may at his lust do right or wrong, and shall give accounts to God only." (p. 178) His powers are God-ordained, and "whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." (p. 173) The Church has usurped the King's role and misled temporal rulers. Rather than beggar his kingdom to support this tyranny of the popes, a good king should

beware of their counterfeit keys and of their false nets which are their traditions and ceremonies, their hypocrisy and false
doctrine wherewith they catch, not souls 
unto Christ, but authority and riches 
unto themselves. (p. 206)

More, while not openly denying the King's supremacy (a concept 
he later died for rejecting), does clearly cleave to the Church 
as prime authority and urges the ruler's obligation to use 
his temporal power to support the Church, for "Princes be 
bounden to punish heretics." (Dialogue, p. 309)

Equal in importance to the Protestant cause was their 
advocacy of justification by faith rather than by works. 
Tyndale puts it succinctly: "The fruit does not make the tree 
good but testifies to the goodness of the tree." (p. 56, D.T.) 
Furthermore, works of papists are always inadequate for "canst 
thy never do to please God therewith, except thou have the true 
knowledge of God's word to season thy deeds withal." (p. 77) 
More's answer to this in Book IV of the Dialogue is an 
insistence on the presence of charity, without which faith is 
dead. He rests chiefly on Pauline scripture and he is es-
pecially critical of Tyndale's substitution of love for 
charity in the translation, for More attributes this change to 
a deliberate intent "to minish the reverent mind that men 
bear to charity" which springs from Tyndale's "confederacy" 
with Luther. (p. 200)

But the most heated controversy had always centered in 
the sacraments and especially in regard to the Sacrament of the 
Altar; More and Tyndale give these issues full treatment.
More's defense of the entire sacramental system rests on his fundamental assertion of the validity of the "unwritten verities" of the Church. And it is this assertion that Tyndale attacks; the "unwritten verities" are not, he insists, the revealed truth of God but the corruption of God's word wrought by the papists. The true sacraments, the Lord's Supper and Baptism chiefly, are **signs**:

> Our sacraments are bodies of stories only; and that there is none other virtue in them than to testify, and exhibit to the senses and understanding, the covenants and promises made in Christ's blood. (p. 358)

However, the prelates have abused these signs:

> For as soon as the prelates had set up such a rabble of ceremonies, they thought it superfluous to preach the plain text any longer. . . but got them into allegories, feigning them every man after his own brain, without rule, almost on every syllable; . . . until at last the lay-people had lost the meaning of the ceremonies. . . supposing it was nothing else to be a christian man than to serve ceremonies. (pp. 75-76)

Nowhere has the Church so distorted the true significance of sacraments as in the Sacrament of the Altar, whose true meaning Tyndale sets forth in **The Souper of the Lorde**:

> the bread, broken and eaten in the supper, nourisheth and putteth us in remembrance of his death, and so exciteth us to thanksgiving, to laud and praise, for the benefit of our redemption; and thus we there have Christ present, in the inward eye and sight of our faith. We eat his body
and drink his blood; that is, we believe surely that his body was crucified for our sins and his blood shed for our salvation. (p. 236)

As for Transubstantiation, Tyndale calls it a false miracle, for it lies to the senses:

Let our covetous converters chap and change bread and wine till we there feel, see, and taste neither bread nor wine; and then we will believe them... For as for their false juggling we feel it at our finger's-end, we see it, had we but half an eye; we taste it at our tongue's-end... (p. 261)

Furthermore, Tyndale avers, the insistence on the necessity of the sacraments is not only erroneous, but a deliberate effort by the Church to delude the people and to protect the clergy's licentious life. The pope has brought "the conscience of the people into captivity under him through superstitious fear," especially through the system of penance and purgatory.

The Romish bishop preacheth that Christ is come to do away with sins, and not yet in the flesh, but in water, salt, oil, candles, boughs, ashes, friar's coats, and monk's cowls; and in the vows of them that forswear matrimony to keep whores, and swear beggary to possess all the treasures, riches, wealth, and pleasures of the world; and have vowed obedience to disobey with authority all the laws of both God and man. (p. 181)

Throughout his Dialogue, More is at great pains to defend particularly the ritual and ceremony: image-worship, saints, pilgrimages, relics, miracles, etc. He argues that instances
cited by Tyndale are often the result of mis-use of the prac-
tice and do not justify condemning the practice itself. Since
God does not allow his Church to be deceived, no doctrine
wherein they consent can be false:

Among which doctrine, since... the
praying to saints, the worship of
images, reverencing of relics, and
going in pilgrimages is a part... we may well and surely conclude that
none of these things be damnable or
displeasing to God, but things highly
to his contention and pleasure.
(p. 175)

This passage is typical of More's primary technique: assertion
in a frame of a perhaps circular logic. He creates, in the
Dialogue, a character, the Messenger, who has been sent to him
from a friend who desires to question More concerning here-
tical matter. The Messenger, "representing neither the opinion
of you nor him," is More's straight man. He brings up, item
by item, the whole of Tyndale's teaching, and his manner is
"reformist" in that he proposes limiting faith to the
Scripture and to private interpretations of it. When More
manages to bring this Messenger, with whom those leaning
toward heresy could readily identify, to the orthodox position
at the end of the Dialogue, the effect is a suggestion that
anyone who takes the time to reason about the issues will also
be drawn back to the true Catholic faith.

Tyndale, being second, tries harder. He offers us
examples of most of the polemic techniques which came to be
the standard repertoire of the later Reformation propagandists. His dominant metaphors work to create comparisons between biblical and contemporary characters and events. Pharisees and papists are consistently equated, i.e., "Our prelates are like the Pharisees but have gotten them new names, and other garments and weeds, and are otherwise disguised." (p. 43) Just as the Pharisees punished Christ, today the prelates punish those who preach Christ's word. And as Christ in the Sermon on the Mount restored Moses Law corrupted by the Pharisees, so Tyndale, in his exposition of the same sermon, will restore Christ's law corrupted by the papists. The use of Moses and Aaron as types of temporal vs. spiritual authority has been earlier mentioned. More's tendentious role as defender of the sacraments is likened to the bulk of Goliath, and he is warned "Ye have overladen yourself with your own harness and weapons; and young David is likely to prevail against you with his sling and stone." (p. 234) Asked if Judas were a priest, Tyndale replied, "I care not what he was then; but of this I am sure, that he is now not only priest but also bishop, cardinal, and pope." (p. 259)

Particularly damning comparisons were saved for the Pope himself. In Practice of Prelates, Tyndale describes the insidious growth of the papal office:

And to see how our holy father came up, mark the ensample of an ivy tree: first it springeth out of the earth, and then
awhile creepeth along by the ground till it find a great tree. Then it joineth itself beneath alow unto the body of the tree and creepeth up a little and a little, fair and softly. And at the beginning, while it is yet thin and small, that the burden is not perceived, it seemeth glorious to garnish the tree in winter, and to bear off the tempests of the weather. But in the mean season it thrusteth its roots into the bark of the tree, to hold fast withal; and ceaseth not to climb up until it be at the top and above all. And then it sendeth his branches along by the branches of the tree, and overgroweth all, and waxeth great, heavy, and thick; it sucketh the moisture so sore out of the tree and his branches, that it choaketh and stiflieth them. And then the foul stinking ivy waxeth mighty in the stump of the tree and becometh a seat and a nest for all unclean birds, and for blind owls, which hawk in the dark, and dare not come at the light. (p. 279)

The pope's falseness is proclaimed by comparing him to Christ, the true head of the Church:

For Christ's kingdom is not of this world; and the pope's kingdom is all the world. And Christ is neither judge nor divider in this world; but the pope divideth and judgeth all the world, and taketh empire and all kingdoms and giveth them to whom he lusteth. Christ said, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.' . . .; The pope saith, 'Blessed be the proud and high-minded.' . . . so that he which was yesterday taken from a dunghill and promoted this day by his prince shall tomorrow, for the pope's pleasure curse him. . . . Christ saith, 'Blessed be the meek.' . . . The pope blesseth them that can set the world together by the ears, and
fight...for his sake...

Christ hath neither holes for foxes, nor nests for birds, nor yet whereon to lay his head... The ivy-tree, the pope, hath under his roots throughout all Christendom, in every village, holes for foxes, and nests for unclean birds in all his branches...

The nearer unto Christ a man cometh, the lower he must descend and the poorer he must wax. But the nearer unto the pope ye come, the higher ye must climb, and the more riches ye must gather... to pay for your bulls, and to purchase a glorious name, and licence to wear a mitre, and a cross, and a pall, and goodly ornaments. (p. 274)

A favorite equivalence was that of Pope and Antichrist, and examples are abundant in Tyndale. A corollary of this equation is the identification of the Church as the Whore of Babylon:

Now if the great bawd, the whore of Babylon, were destroyed, then would the brothel and stews of our prelates shortly perish. If Abbaddon, that destroyer, king of the grasshoppers, which devour all that is green, were destroyed, then were the kingdom of our caterpillars at an end. (p. 298)

Another favorite metaphor of the Reformers used effectively by Tyndale is that of the tree of faith, often seen as destroyed by papal corruption (as in the ivy image above) or uprooted by the machinations of the Pope/Antichrist: "Antichrist turneth the roots of the trees upward. He maketh the goodness of God the branches, and our goodness the roots." (pp. 295-96)
Humor also finds a place in Tyndale’s arsenal. He seems to favor puns and other word-play. Wolsey is referred to as Thomas Wolfsee (p. 310), and More’s defense is confusing as he “finds forth his unwritten vanities,—verities I should say.” (p. 237) When More claims that the heretics have fallen from the mystical body, Tyndale answers, “Ye be a mystical body, and walk in the mist...and the heretics be departed out of your mist and walk in the clear light of God’s Word.” (p. 115) And Tyndale condemns the “pharasaical glosses” of the Church, made by “Our sophisters with their anagogical and chopological sense, and with an antitheme of half an inch out of which some of them draw a thread of nine days long.” (p. 307) The humor is often sarcastic, especially when directed against the pope.

Our bishops make them a God on the earth of the kind, I suppose, of Aaron’s calf, for he bringeth forth no other fruii but bulls. (p. 212)

Since the pope has created purgatory he now "hath one kingdom more than God himself." (p. 235) And, on occasion, the sarcasm is even heavier. In arguing for the communion in two kinds, Tyndale charges that the papists "take away half the sacrament lest, if the people should have drunk the blood of Christ, they should have smelled and savour and felt the taste of wine, and so have been too weak to believe that there had been no wine." (p. 222) Hypocritical practices also invite Tyndale’s sarcasm: "if a priest marry an honest wife, they
punish him immediately. . .as though matrimony were abominable; but if he keep a whore, then is he a good chaste child of their holy father the pope." (p. 123)

Tyndale also uses alliteration in association with those persons or issues he wishes to denigrate, as in condemning those who "cavil Christ's clear words with sophisticated sophisms and. . .trifle out the truth with taunts and mocks." (p. 263) And on occasion he sinks to pure invective: the clergy are "ravening wolves" who fill the world with "whores and sodomites." (p. 123)

These doctrinal works were directed to educated readers and often devoted to a rather formal system of quotation and refutation. Thus, they are more expository and more restrained than works directed at a wider public, and designed to instigate emotional allegiance rather than understanding. And yet More and Tyndale between them have raised all the issues and utilized most of the techniques which later polemicists put to more sensational use. Perhaps their dialogues would have contained the religious controversy had not Henry created a climate which made any position untenable for any length of time.

The actual legislation of the period 1529-1539 clearly reflects Henry's shifting position in relation to the New Learning, and is more vital to the actual fact of Reformation than were the doctrinal disputes of More, Tyndale, et al.
For whereas on the continent, the reformation of doctrine preceded the separation from Rome, in England the political separation was necessary for Henry's designs, and any doctrinal change came only in its wake. Not until the reign of Edward were the doctrines of the Reformation officially embraced in England.

The Parliament which convened 3 November 1529 was full of burgesses whose hostility to the Roman hierarchy was quite open and whose loyalty to Henry was certain. It was the joint task of Henry and this Parliament to bring the English Church into line as well. By 1531 the Submission of the Clergy had been accomplished. In this act the clergy formally acknowledged Henry as "especial protector, single and supreme Lord, and as far as the law of Christ allows, even supreme head."\(^{42}\) To further chasten the English Church, Cromwell, exploiting the practical anti-clericalism of the people, brought a petition against the Ordinaries listing in 12 articles the grievances of the commons against the clergy. When the clergy replied to this petition, insisting on their independence and unfettered canon power, Henry retaliated by demanding even further submission. In May 1532 the English clergy yielded to Henry the right of legislation. For the first time, obedience to the papacy was construed openly as incompatible with civil obedience.\(^{43}\)
Severance from the Roman Church also was being effected. In 1532 the first Act of Annates was passed, halting the flow of payments to Rome for the first year of all bishoprics. In the next year, the Act of Appeals held that no appeal go beyond the Archbishop of Canterbury. Rome had been robbed of her tribute and of her jurisdiction; in July, Henry was excommunicated.

The King responded with even more stringent anti-papal actions. The Second Annates Act of 1534 forbade anyone to sue to Rome for dispensation and also rescinded the payment of Peter's Pence. The Heresy Act made it no longer heretical to attack the pope and Romish custom. Henry himself indulged; in a letter of 1532 he wrote: "The lives of Christ and of the pope are very opposite, and therefore to follow the pope is to forsake Christ." These and several other anti-papal statutes culminated in the Act of Supremacy, November 1534.

By this Act, Henry made himself virtually the Pope of England. All of any consequence were to swear fealty to him as Supreme Head of the Church of England and to repudiate Rome. The Pope's name was to be eradicated from the liturgy, and sermons were commanded quarterly commemorating Henry's deliverance of his nation from the antichristic Bishop of Rome. Almost simultaneously, Henry was moving to crush potential opposition. The Treason Act of 1534 "for the first time in English history made high treason of seditious words" and
reflected "fears of an almost unarmed monarchy, aware of the
offence it had given to conservative opinion and anxious to
nip actual sedition in the bud."45

Now Henry turned to reaping the harvest of his new
powers. In January 1535 Cromwell was vested with the title
of Vicar General in Spirituals and given the total authority
to secularize monastic property. Cromwell first compiled a
record of evaluations of each ecclesiastical benefice in
England, the Valor Ecclesiasticus. Then, he began the trans-
fer of property to the Crown. By March almost all of the
smaller houses had been suppressed and their inmates trans-
ferred or granted capacities as secular priests.

Cromwell's agents in this undertaking were perhaps more
inspired by material and political ends than by Reformation
zeal and perhaps guilty of actual falsification, as the
following letter suggests:

I would know your mynd and pleasure
concernnyng the boke whiche we drewe
out of my lord of Yorke. . . wherof
we withdrewe many things and likewise
added. And where ye willed us to
adde thereto suche substancial mater
for the purpose as we shuld thinke
convenient. . . .46

These agents returned frequent and hyperbolic accounts of
promiscuity which were collected and used by Cromwell to
justify his program. A contemporary scribe reports the method:

He (Cromwell) caused visitations to
be made of all the religious houses
. . . whereupon was returned the book
called the Black Book, expressing of every such house the vile lives and abominable facts, in murders of their brethren, in sodomies, in whoredoms, in destroying of children, in forging of deeds, and other infinite horrors of life, in so much as dividing of all the religious persons of England into three parts, two of these parts at the least were sodomites; ... This was shown in Parliament and the villainies made known and abhorred. ... 47

The agents also enthusiastically stripped the monasteries of images and relics, sending them up to London. Many were anxious to help share these spoils, and the greed evinced in the suppression of the monasteries was not all on the part of Henry and Cromwell. The courtiers, too, had ambitions, even that paragon Sir Thomas Elyot, who, after copious flattery in a letter to Cromwell, gets to his real point:

I therfor beseeche your goode lardship now to lay apart the remembraunce of the amity betwene me and sir T. More, . . . consyderyng that I was never so moche addict unto hym as I was unto truths and fidelity toward my soveraigne lorde, . . . I therfor most humbly desyre you, . . . so to brynge me into the kinges most noble remembraunce, that of his moste bounteous liberality it may like his highnesse to reward me with some conveyent porcion of his suppressid landis. . . . and whatsoever porcion of land that I shall atteyne by the kynges gift, I promyse to give to your lord-ship the first yeres frutes. . . . 48

It is easy to understand the comment of the satirist Brinklow: "The Latin Papa had been translated into the English
Pay-pay." By 1539, all religious houses in England had been ordered suppressed.

Henry had also turned to doctrinal formulation, not so much because he sought change as because he wished to achieve some sort of accommodation of Lutheran theology and his more conservative position. In July 1536 came the first Tudor attempt to fix doctrine: the Ten Articles "devised... to stablyshe Christen quietnes and unitie amonge us and to avoyde contentious opinions." The articles only deal with three sacraments and phrase remarks about the Real Presence in an ambiguous manner. These articles were supplemented by a set of Royal Injunctions addressed to the clergy regarding their responsibilities. The *Institution of a Christian Man* (1537) was essentially the same as the above, but restored the omitted sacraments.

It is typical of Henry's ambivalence that in a single proclamation he prohibited the unlicensed printing of scripture, exiled the anabaptists, deprived married clergy of their offices, and unsainted Thomas Becket. The sad plight of John Foster, a married priest, illustrates the confusion of those trying during these years to estimate what Henry really did believe. (See Appendix E)

But in 1539 Henry's natural conservatism carried the day, manifesting itself in The Six Articles, an act to suppress diversity of religious opinion. In this Bill, any denial of
the six points of faith was made punishable. The radical reformers saw the Act as nothing short of a return to papistry and many fled to the continent, Bale among them. Luther angrily commented "Let him then be a pope, as truly he is in England." An English Protestant deplored the Bill as "craftie pollicie of the clergie" to limit the spread of God's word by censoring any book which contains matter "repugnant to any of the six articles." He asks, "Are there any bookes which write against the pope's primacie, but they also write against some of the six articles?" The Bill came to be known as the Whip with Six Strings.

Though the Six Articles did not destroy Lutheranism in England, it created a climate in which further growth was virtually impossible, especially after the fall of Cromwell in 1540. Many of the Reformers who had sincerely promulgated the concept of Henry as a new Moses, a Saviour from the evils of Rome, must have shared the feelings expressed by Cromwell in a letter to Henry from the Tower:

...but on thing I am well assuryd off, that wittinglye and willinglye I haue not hadde will to offend your Highness; but harde it ys for me or any other, medlyng as I haue done, to lyve under yrur Grace and your lawse but we must daylye offends: and wher I have offendyd I most humblye aske mercye and pardon at your gracious will and plesure.

But Henry was not one to espouse causes which no longer
offered him political (or amatory) advantages. Cromwell went to death, the Protestant leaders went to Germany or Geneva, and Henry went to the bed of Catherine Howard.
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CHAPTER II

NON-DRAMATIC LITERARY MANIFESTATIONS OF THE ISSUES

Although the doctrinal treatises such as those by More and Tyndale and the formularies of faith such as the Ten and the Six Articles did much to raise and to define the central issues of Reformation polemics, their formality, their learnedness, their tedious compulsion toward total refutation, limited their scope of influence. A much greater impact on and reflection of the religious attitudes of the time were the dialogues, pamphlets, and ballads directed to a more general reading public. These works, because they both allowed and demanded more creative fictive skills of their authors, were much more directly contributors to the evolution of polemic technique as it came to be exercised in the plays of John Bale.

Just as the doctrinal and the political issues had been raised earlier, so too anti-clericalism was abundant in literature long before the Sixteenth Century. However, it was largely an "intra-mural" affair, stressing the sins and weaknesses of men rather than attacking the foundations of the institution which sheltered both accusers and accused.

From their beginning, the Franciscans were associated with debate, anti-clericalism, and programs for Church reform.
The very nature of the order implies criticism of clergy not of that order, for it is characterized by a

passionate defence of poverty against the exploitation and extravagance of ecclesiastics; an almost obsessive preoccupation with spiritual wickedness in high places; a plea for a return to evangelical simplicity; (and) . . . a monotonous insistence on sexuality as a source of sin.¹

Hostility between the mendicants and the schoolmen of Paris erupted in a "pamphlet war" in the Thirteenth Century. William de Saint-Amour, leading spokesman against the friars, wrote tracts such as De Antichristo et euisdem ministres and Tractatus brevis de periculus novissorum temporum (either title perfectly suited for a Sixteenth-Century polemic work), and was answered by such able defenders as Thomas Aquinas. Scurrilous songs against the friars were circulated and the rhetoric grew so heated that the pope expelled Saint-Amour from France.²

A century later, invective again flew, now within the order itself, concerning the true nature of poverty. One pamphlet against the 'spiritual' friars (who favored stricter interpretation of the concept of poverty) called them "not so much superstitious as pernicious, pestiferous, apostate, and heretical, the breeders of new heresies and imitators of old ones."³

This controversy resulted in continual strife, a few executions, and the eventual split of the order into
Observants and Conventuals in 1517. That faction which became the Observants were especially zealous in seeking reform and from their ranks came some of England's early protestants. One Observant friar once said to his Pope that for proper reform he must get rid of the three P's: Pecunia, Pueri, Petulantia. And these very abuses represent the prime target of attack of both Catholic and early Protestant anti-clerical literature.

Krailsheimer illustrates the sermon techniques of the mendicants' attacks on unworthy prelates, noting abundant personal invective, colloquial expressions, animal similes, proverbs and puns, and bits of popular song. Accusations of simony, lechery, hypocrisy, and a lack of religious devotion are commonplace; prelates guilty of these sins are described as the scourge of God to destroy the Church, "horned asses," and "dumb dogs who cannot bark for the bone in their mouths."

But all of these sins are sins against the order as well as against God and the laity, and represent not a false system but a failure to meet the standards of a very righteous institution. The major secular literature of the Fourteenth Century also sees unworthy clerics in this light; in fact, this anticlericalism became a sort of literary topos, making it difficult to weigh the validity of the popular literature as an indicator of the actual presence of clerical abuse. Moorman warns that
these pictures are perhaps based on the sort of literature with which intelligent readers were familiar rather than an observation of conditions in the convents or personal knowledge of individual friars.  

Most familiar are Chaucer's religious, who are either rather charmingly worldly, despicable in any terms, or ideal. All types appear in the Prologue to The Canterbury Tales, illustrating many of the abuses standard in ant clerical attacks.

Some of Chaucer's religious are guilty of worldliness, of adopting the standards of the secular society and rejecting those of their chosen orders. The Prioress, charming and over-sentimental, "peyned hire to countrefete cheere / Of court, and to been estatlich of manere, / And to ben holden digne of reverence" (ll. 139-140). Her obvious desire to gain secular approval and to achieve success in temporal modes lends dimension to the ironic ambiguity of the motto on her brooch: Amor vincit omnia. So, too, the Monk rode the country, repudiating his monastic rule

By cause that it was old and somdel streit.  
This ilke Monk leet olde thynges pace,  
And heeld after the newe world the space.  
(ll.174-76)

He owned horses, wore fine clothes, was "ful fat and in good poyntr"; in other words, "certainly he was a fair prelaat" (l.204). The Friar also is described as an admirable fellow who so surpassed all other mendicants in "daliaunce and fair
langage," that "Unto his ordre he was a noble post" (1.214). Just as the Monk had rejected the monastic cloister, the Friar rejects the vows of poverty and humility so basic to his order; instead of "threadbare cope" he dresses "lyk a maister or a pope," and instead of service to the poor, he chooses to abide "al with riche and selleres of vitaille" (1.248).

The implicit charges of unworthiness in these portraits are typical of traditional anticlericalism, but are "toothless" because of the narrator's approving attitudes. It is a different case with the Summoner and the Pardoner. Here there is more open condemnation, probably because their abuses are more directly linked with Rome and the extra-national courts of the Church, an area traditionally sensitive to Englishmen. The Summoner, diseased and lecherous, operates within the ecclesiastical court system, forgiving any sin if the bribe be sufficient, and limited in his learning to a few random Latin tags "lernd out of som decree" (1.640). Even more despicable is the Pardoner, who "streight was comen fro the court of Rome," laden with various relics and a wallet "bretful of pardoun, comen from Rome al hoot." In all pre-Sixteenth-Century anti-clerical attacks, it is the element of financial exploitation rather than the charge of worldliness that receives the harshest treatment.
Of course, both sets of unworthy Church people are judged in the Prologue by the frame of holy pilgrimage and more directly by the presence of the Parson, who supplies "noble ensample." He is the good shepherd who lives with his sheep and can "in litel thyng have suffisaunce." He draws men to heaven by good example rather than "speche daungerous" and teaches only "Christes lore and his apos-tles twelve."

Gower, in *Confessio Amantis*, laments the bad shepherds of the Church who have fallen into Simony. He recalls "the daies olde" when "Pride was a vice holde" and the clergy "were ek chaste in worde and dede," setting a good example for their people. Now it is otherwise, for "The worldes swerd on hende is take" (1.242) and "heuene is ferr, the world is nyh." (1.261) The Church has become too temporal: "In to the swerd the cherche keie / Is torned" (ll. 272-73). The Church has mis-used its wealth:

The stronge coffre hath al devoured  
Under the keye of avarice  
The tresor of the benefice  
Wherof the povere schulden clote  
And ete and drinke and house bothe.  
(ll.314-18)

This abuse has led to problems within the Church: the Avignon popes, "this newe Secte of Lollardie," and "many an heresie / Among the clerkes."

Lo, thus tobroke is Christes folde,  
Wherof the flock withoute guide
Devoured is on every side,
In lack of them that ben unware
Schepherdes. . . . (11.390-94)

The clergy have been bad shepherds who "speke and teche wel" but "don hemself therof no del." Hypocrisy flourishes within the Church, Genius tells Amans in Liber Primus. The religious orders are especially guilty of harboring hypocrisy for they "clotheth richesse. . . / Under the simplesce of povertie" and "seith in open, fy! to Sinne, / And in secre ther is no vice / Of which that hen is a Norrice" (11.616-18). Indeed, hypocrisy flourishes in the Church:

For now aday is manyon
Which spekth of Peter and John
And thenketh Judas in his herte,
Ther schal no worldes good asterte
His hond, and yit he yifth almesse
And fasteth afte and hiereth Messe:
With mea culpa, which he seith,
Upon his brest fullofte he leith
His hond, and cast upward his yhe,
As thogh he Cristes face syhe;
So that it seemeth ate syhte,
As he al one alle othre myhte
Rescoue with his holy bede,
Bot yet his herte in other stede
Among hise bedes most devoute
Goth in the worldes cause aboute,
How that he myhte his warisoun
Encresce. (11.655-672)

This single passage includes all the standard complaints: materialism, worldliness, lack of true piety, avarice. And yet Gower does not ever question the worth of Holy Church, but only the discrepancy "between the word and that thei werche." Judgment, after all, is God's and men who accuse too rashly must remember "The vice of hem that ben ungoode /
Is no reproef unto the goode" (11.489-90).

Langland's anticlericalism is not softened by the courtly polish of Chaucer and Gower; it is strong and has the impetus of personal hostility. Some even accuse him of Wycliffite heresy, but his attack is not really so fundamental as that of Wycliff. Although Langland sees much evil in clerical life, he most often depicts it as the result of external forces working to destroy the Church. As Dean Milman says,

Langland is Antipapal, yet he can admire an ideal Pope. . . . It is the actual Pope. . . ,levying the wealth of the world to slay mankind, who is the subject of his bitter invective.9

Langland does not condemn the chair of Peter, but unworthy occupants of that chair. The mendicant orders, too, are favorite targets, representing all the sins into which the religious have fallen.

I fonde Were Freris alle te foure ordres, Preched te peple for profit of hem-seluen, Closed te gospel as hem good lyked, For coueitise of copis construed it as tei wolde. Many of his maistres Freris mowe clothen hym at lykyng, For here money and merchandise marchen togideres. For sith charite had fe be chapman and chief to shryue lordes, Many ferlis han fallen in a fewe feris.  

Holy Church warns of "chastite withouten charite," explaining that many clergy are clean of body but "So harde hath avarice yhasped hem" that they lack love and will be
"cheyned in helle" (Passus I, 11.192-195).

False clerics are held responsible even for the sins of the laity because of their remissness and hypocrisy. When Antichrist's legions lay siege to the Castle of Conscience (Book XX), Sloth leads an army of proud priests against the castle and it is a friar, Father Creep-Into-Houses, who by his flattery wins access to the Castle and corrupts its defenses.

The most relevant image, for our purposes, is Langland's Lady Mede, who has usurped the position of Holy Church by catering to avarice and working in conjunction with Civil Law and Simony.

And was war of a womman, wortheli ycloathed,
Purfiled with pelure. Ye finest upon erthe,
Y-crowned with a corone. Ye kyng hath non better.
Fetislich hir fyngres,were fretted with gold wyre,
And wre on red rubyes, as red as any glede,
And diamantz of derrest pris,and double manere safferes,
Urentales and ewages, enuenymes to destoye.
Hire robe was ful riche.of red scarlet engreyned,
With ribanes of red golde,and of riche stones;

In xe popis paleys. she is pryue as my-self,
But sothenesse wolde noue it so. for she is a bastard.
For fals was hire fader. At hath a fykel tonge,
And neuer sothe seide. sithen he come to erthe.
And Mede is manered after hym. riste as kynde
axeth. (11.8-16, 23-27)

Mede the Mayde offers a quite early figure of a usurper of the True Church and her description is very much like that allotted to the Whore of Babylon, the standard epithet for the Romish Church in Sixteenth-Century Protestant tracts.
She is richly dressed, privy to the pope's palace, and of illicit lineage. However, there is an essential difference. In *Piers Plowman* Lady Meade is an external force who can corrupt the Church. In Reformation writing, especially in Bale, her successors become an evil inherent in the papal structure, usually the Roman Church itself or on occasion the Mass.

Before the Sixteenth Century, it is only in the more radical anticlerical literature of the Lollard movement that the anticlerical satire intensifies and broadens to questions of the doctrine and the sacramental system of the Church. That "The Praier and Complaynte of the Plowman unto Christe," 10 written in 1300, was brought to press in 1521 suggests its affinity with Reformation causes. The Preface, addressed "to the Christen Reader," defends its radical contents from the charge of heresy by claiming that just as the Pharisees had accused Christ of New Learning so do "oure holy bishops ... defame, sclaundre and persecute the same worde and preachers and followers of it, with the selfe same names" (p. 93).

The body of the work contains the familiar grievances against the clergy--avarice, simony, luxury--but also questions the efficacy of certain doctrines and sacraments. The sacrament of penance is attacked, for only Christ, "a priest after Melchysedekes ordre," can truly cleanse. God
is "much unworshiped" when "men trust priests' absolutions more than His" (p. 99).

Religious orders, especially the monastics, are rejected. God surely did not teach men "to forsake the world to lyven in perceccion by hem selfe in ease, and by other mennes travayle" (p. 101). Equally unnatural is clerical celibacy, for in rejecting "spoushode," the clergy have perverted it "to lykynge of the flesch" and set back examples by "maken many wymen horen" (p. 103).

Although the Sacrament of the Altar is not specifically attacked, its primacy is. After all, protests the plowman to Christ, "Prests wer ordered to go out, baptise, and teach, not to make thy body" (p. 102). They are not performing their tasks but instead "set up greet stonen houses full of glasene windows" and erect idols, while the Plowman and his brothers are "in clothes all to broken, with outen schone and hosen, and hungred and a thrust" (p. 103). The commons are also deprived of "a sword against their enemies" given them by God (the Scripture), because it is now "put in a shethe, and in prestes word" (p. 107).

The Pope, called Nabugodonosor, kynge of Babylon, is identified with Anti-Christ as the chief enemy of all Christians, and the Plowman's parting plea is that Christ deliver his people from these bad shepherds. The important difference here is that these shepherds are bad, not so much
because they do their jobs badly as because of the job they do. It is not that they fail to feed their sheep, but, in the Plowman's words, that they "feden thy schepe with swevenes" (p. 104).

Even in Lollard texts, the friars bear the large part of the total attack on the clergy. Not content with suggesting reform, Wycliff and his followers "saw the mendicants as an unnecessary and unwanted addition to the life of the church...which ought to be removed altogether." A typical pro-Wycliff poem is "The Orders of Cain," provoked by the Council of London which met in 1382 to sentence Lollard preachers. The friars are fat, worldly, lecherous. They deal in "purses, pynnes, and knyves / With gyrdles, gloves / For wenches and wyves." They are never to be trusted:

For when ye gode man is fro hame,
And ye frere comes to our dame,

He spares nouther for synne ne shame
That he ne dos his will.

Friars will forgive any sin for enough money. To the poet

It semes somat man sayne of hayme
in many dyvers londe,

That at aaytyfe cursed cayme
first is ordre fonde.

In fact, he explains, CAIM is an anagram of the frer "carmes, the frer austynes, the frer Iacobynes, and the frer menous."

Attacks on the friars continued through the Fifteenth Century in poems such as "Friars, Ministri Malorum," "The
Laymen's Complaint" accuses friars of simony, reversing God's laws, and flattery in search of money. In "The Friar's Answer," the accused friar laments his hardships "Now lewed men kun holy writ" (1.2). He continues, "I trowe be devel browit it aboute / To write e gospel in englishe." When he comes to beg, the people bid him to "worche and win my silver so." If this continues, he fears "Men schul fynde unnoke a frere / In englonde wit in a while." However, these poems are more in keeping with the mild traditional anti-clericalism of Chaucer. The friar is the butt of the joke, not the agent of Anti-Christ.

The Church in the Fourteenth Century did feel a need to defend itself against the Lollard threat, not only by legislation and doctrinal exposition such as that of Pecock, but in more popular literary forms. The ballad, for instance, could attack Lollards as easily as Friars. "Defend Us From All Lollardy," a poem c. 1415, charges that the Lollard insistence on vernacular scripture is foolish:

Ter ye bibell is all myswent
To iangle of Iob or Jeremye
Ye at construen hit after her entent
For lewd lust of lollardie.

Reading the Scripture encourages people to forget their places:

Hit ys unkyndly for a knist
Ye at shuld a kynges castel kepe,
To bable ye bibel day and niht
In restyng tyme when he shuld slepe.
In fact, it is ruinous to the kingdom when such men "crepe fro kniȝthode into clergie" forsaking "spere and bowe. . .
to be bawde of lollardie."

Hoccleve, in "To Sir John Oldcastle,"\textsuperscript{13} urges him to
repent and recant, citing precedents for obedience such as
Lancelot and Constantine. But this obedience is not that
taught by Tyndale; it is obedience to holy church:

\begin{quote}
Lete holy chirche medle of the doctrine
Of Chrystes lawes / And of hys byleeve
And lete all othir folke
Ther-to enclyne. (ll.137-39)
\end{quote}

Oldcastle and the Lollards should leave the judgment of bad
priests to God "and folwe him not / but after his techynge /
Thou oghtest do" (ll.132-33). Hoccleve defends all the
sacraments under attack, charging that when Lollards ques-
tion them their "syghte is nothyng cleer."

Things are so out of hand, Hoccleve complains, that
even women are meddling in Holy Writ. To them, he says

\begin{quote}
Lewd calates; sitteth down and spynne
And kakele of sumwhat elles. (ll.146-47)
\end{quote}

The strongest argument against Lollardy was that it
tended

\begin{quote}
To shape sodeyn surreccion
Agaynst oure leige lord kynge
With fals ymaginacioun ("Defend Us From Lollardy")
\end{quote}

Henry V had recognized this and Hoccleve praised his re-
pression of Lollardy in a poem, \textit{c. 1413}. 

\textsuperscript{13}
The feend hath maad us dronke of the poisoun
Of heresie, and lad us a wrong weye

... Our lige lord, the kyng, is Champaign
For holy chirche- Crystes Knyght is he!

... God thanke, and for thy cristen Prince preye,
Syn he fo is to this Rebellioun,
He, of thy soules helthe is lok and keye!

Thus, Hoccleve hailed a Fifteenth-Century defender of the faith against the dangers of heresy. Surely Hoccleve was not aware of the ominous prophecy of his concluding lines:

A kyng set in yat wrong opinione
Mighte of our feith be the subversion.

In an interesting reversal of ground, the earliest Sixteenth-Century satire directed at the Church made its central emphasis the weakening effect of clerical abuse on the commonwealth. All the traditional complaints are present--luxurious dress, wantonness, failure to preach, avarice, simony. But all are depicted as working toward the deterioration of England. That the clergy's bad example leads others astray is a dominant motif in "Now A Dayes," a ballad c. 1520.14

\begin{quote}
The spirituall church, their mislivyng,
To the temporall, evell ensaumple gevyng;
And thus, ether others works reprovyng,
They lyve in bate and stryfe. (ll.73-76)
\end{quote}

Clergy are nothing but "grete grosyers" now, and as a result are "withdrawing mens Devotion, / Unto the landes grete shame." (ll.87-88)
'The Ruyn' of a Ream" (c. 1520) charges that the clergy has completely subverted its role in the kingdom. The people suffer to pay for their "rich arraye, / By whose ensaumple the devyll hathe hys pray" (11.88-89). Their "covetous myndis infecte with Simony" (1.96) care nothing for preaching nor for study. Instead

in gowmus of Sylke, and Rydyng on there mulysh-whoо taketh hede, may evydently See-ys there chefe delyte, and to bere a rule
In grette mens houses of hye autoryte,
And of ther Councell nere for to be; . . .
(11.141-145)

They are "glorious folys" and bad shepherds who send English money to Rome and who seek their honor there as well by subverting English laws. As a result:

The Realme now decryeth-Preseyve hyt ye may-
By reason of their pride and grtte abusyon.
(11.71-72)

There were, of course, supporters of the Church who answered these attacks. Most often, they concentrated on showing Lutheranism as a great foreign threat to England and calling on King Henry to protect his realm from this menace. One of the most outspoken of this sort is "Against the Blaspheming English Lutherans and the Poisonous Dragon Luther" (c. 1525-26). The balladeer lends weight to his position by employing God as narrative personna. Anxiously he tells of

a poysonous Dragon / (that) hath infected my region,
Of whom yong serpentes hath sprong,
His venomous inflations
Hath infectid many nations,
and moch of my people hath stong.
(11.25-30)

This dragon is more dangerous than Cerberus, Hydra, Colcas, python, medusa, or basilisk; his name is Luther and his den is Germany. As a result of his venom:

My church is in derision
And almost in confusion
My sacraments set at nought,
Preesthoode ys despisid,
Tru Fayght ys clene dispisid,
And heresy sette alofte. (11.103-08)

The ballad enumerates particularly loathsome heresies--the denial of the sacraments and of the succession of Peter, marriage with kindred and among friars, failure to make nice distinctions such as between holy oil (and) or butter for anointment, and the rejection of Purgatory.

These errors condemnable
With other mo reprobable
These Luterions Dispersithe about
With cloked intentions
And new fongly inventions
Thei multiply there rowt.

In closing, God addresses King Henry directly, urging him as Defender of the Faith to expel from his realm "this fals frantych frensy / This stark staring ipocrisy," appending a gentle warning that if Henry does not act, God will have to, and any harm which then befalls the nation "shall be thei part."

Pamphlets, too, were becoming frequent vehicles for such controversy. Simon Fish's A Supplicacyon for the
Beggars,\textsuperscript{15} and Thomas More's rebuttal Supplicacyon of Souls\textsuperscript{16} epitomize the two polemic camps of the early English Reformation.

The appearance of Fish's book in 1525 was deemed important enough by Foxe to receive a rather full recording in the 1576 edition of Actes and Monuments, under 1531:

> After that the light of the Gospel, working mightily in Germanie, began to spread his beames here also in England, great styre and alteration followed in the harts of many: so that coloured hypocrisy, and false doctrine, and painted holynes, began to be espyed more and more by the readyng of Gods word. The authoritie of the Bishop of Rome,...was not so high, but such as had fresh wittes sparced with Gods grace, began to espy Christ from Antichrist, that is, true sinceritie from counterfait religion.\textsuperscript{17}

In his account of Fish's book, Foxe relates two tales of how the book came to the King, and then reports Henry's comment: "if a man should pull downe an old stone wall and begun at the lower part, the upper part therof might chaunce to fall upon his head" (p. viii).

The entire work is designed, as were the anti-Clergy ballads considered above, to urge the King to see the Church's operation as a direct drain on the welfare of his kingdom and of his own authority. The King's beadsmen lament "the ravinous wolves going in herdes clothing, devouring the flocke" (p. 1) who already possess more than a third of the realm and still take a tenth of everything the commons have.
"What subjectes shall be abill to helpe their princ, that be after this facion yerely polld?" (p. 3) And what does the Church do with all this wealth?

Truely nothing but exempt themselves from thobedience of your grace. No-thing but translate all rule, power, lordshippe, auctorite, obedience, and dignite, from your grace unto them. Nothing but that all your subjectes shulde fall ynto disobedience and re-bellion against your grace, and be under theym. As they did unto your no-bill predecessour King John. . . . Here were an holy sort of prelates that thus cruelly coude punishe suche a right-uous kinge, all his realme, and suc-cension, for doing right! (pp. 4-5)

Clerical celibacy is not only unnatural and conducive to immorality, but damaging to the commonwealthe, for the clery by theire absteyning from marriage do let the generation of the people, whereby all the realms at length. . . shall be made desert and uninhabitable (p. 6)

The Roman clery have "invented" Purgatory, "only to trans-late all kingdomes from other princes into them" (p. 10), and they repress Scripture

lest men shulde espie that they. . . do translate thus fast your king-dome into theyre handes, that they are not obedient unto your highe power. . . . (p. 11)

Their strength in Parliament is almost insurmoutable, for they accuse all opponents of heresy. Thus, "all the substance of your Realme forthwith. . . .rynneth hedlong ynto the insaciabill whyrlepole of these gredi goulafres, to be
swallowed and devoured!" (p. 10) Even the King's power is limited ("So weke and blunt is your swerde to strike at one of the offencers of this croked and pervers generacyon" p. 13)—because his very Chancellor is a priest!

If England is to be saved, the King must

set these sturdy lobies a brode in the world, to get theim wives of theire owne, to get theire living with theire laboure in the swete of theire faces, . . . to gyve other idell people, by theire example, occasion to go to la- bour. (p. 14)

Only then, "shal not youre swerde, power, crowne, dignite, and obedience of your people, be translated from you."

More's rebuttal, Supplicacyon of Souls, warns that the Reformers are really motivated by hatred of the Church and only "cloke theyr cruell purpose and intent under colour of a gret zele toward the comen welth" (xxiii,FV). If, as Fish suggests, the clergy were cast out, only chaos would result:

Then shall the servant set nought by theire maisters, and unruly peo- ple rebelle agaynst their rulers. (xxii)

More's petition is made by souls in purgatory and addressed "To All Good Christian People." The first part is a direct refutation of Fish's charges in which he derides Fish as "the beggars' proctor" and condemns Luther as "archeheretyke and father abbot of all that dronken felashipe" (K, ii). Then More turns to a defense of the doctrine of Purgatory
and the justification of prayers for the dead by assuming the voice of one of the souls (for which he earned the label "Proctor of purgatory") and appealing in maudlin tones to "loved ones" still on earth that they learn from the sad example before them. Those who do not believe the souls need help, lack faith; those who believe but do not contribute, lack pity. Who could reject the plea of a loved one on fire? More queries. Both "nature and crystendom byndeth you to remember us." And, More concludes, the people must remember that if they get these souls to heaven what great allies they themselves will have when purgatory is their own lot.\(^{18}\) (L,v)

Such a level of argument suggests a low opinion on More's part of the rational powers of "All Good Christian People," a dearth of defenses outside of an appeal to the strength of tradition, and most important, no real answer to the charge by Fish that the Roman Church drained both money and power away from England. Given a King just beginning to flex the muscles of his newly-expanded monarchy and impatient at all restraints and delays, there is little question which of the two tracts would have found most favor at court.

Still, Henry was officially 'Defender of the Faith' and not yet "Supreme Head of the Church of England." Consequently, attacks were often directed not at the Church
per se, but at Wolsey, as a more vulnerable representative of its defects. The most virulent of these was a dialogue by Jerome Barlowe and William Roye in 1528, *The Burial of the Mass*, frequently known as *Rede Me and Be Nott Wrothe*. The title page depicts and illustrates Wolsey's coat-of-arms and the dedicatory letter damns all who lead men astray by "dyuelysshe doctryne. . .forbyddyng to mary and commaundyng to abstayyne from metes and soche other" (p. 21). Because of "the papistical sect," the world is "an hole or denne of falce foxy hypocrites and a mancion for all ravenynge wolves disguised in lambes skynnes. . ." (p. 23).

Even though the clergy had fought to subdue it, "a sharp, two-edged sworde / Which as they saye was goddis worde / Drawne out of the holy gospell" (p. 38) has killed the Mass. A great lamentation arises from the clergy who fear that they will now lose all their pleasures: "riche arraye," "whores and harlotis," "baudis and brothels," "velvet gownis furred with sables," "forked mitres," and "crosse of gold." Their "effeminate fleshe and tender bones / Shalbe constrayned to foule into laboure" and lost will be power, lands, authority, even their pet Latin phrases such as "dominus vobiscum," "agnus dei," etc.

The body of the work is a conversation between two servants of a Strasbourg priest, Watkyn (faith in the gospel) and Jeffrey (crafty clergyman, just over from England).
In the course of their debate as to the proper burial place for the Mass, the two consider all points of Reformation controversy.

Since it was the two-edged sword of "goddis word" which had destroyed the Mass, the Scripture receives ample treatment. The clergy have perverted the gospel:

Their preaching is not scripture
But fables of their conjecture
And mens ymaginacions.
They brynge in olde wyves tales
Both of Englonde, Fraunce, and Wales
Which they call holy narracions
And to them scripture they apply
Perverting it most shamfully
After their owne opinions. (p. 73)

In addition, the clergy keep the true scripture from the people so thoroughly

That no laye man do redo or like
In any fruitful englisshe boke
Whoely scripture concernynge.
Their frantyke foly is so pevisshe
That they contempne in Englisshe
To have the Newe Testament
But as for tales of Robyn Mode
... / They have no impediment. (p. 64)

The burning of Tyndale's testament is compared to the Passion, Wolsey being Pilate and Bishop Standish, Judas, Caiphas, and Herod in one.

The Roman Church teaches "that holy mens suffrages /
Pardons, masses, and pilgramages, / For synnes make satisfaction" (p. 73). However, the truth is
That a whore or open synner
By meanes of Christ our redemer
Shal soner come to salvacion
By merits of Christis passion
Than an outward holy lyver.  (p. 47)

These religious reverence miracles, idolatries, and "shrines full of rotten bones" more than the gospel. They petition to a saint rather than to God:

Even soche a one as paynters do paynt
On walls and bordes artificially
Which with mysters, crosses, and copes
Apeare like gaye bisshops and popes
In strange fashions outwardly.
But they are ydols in effecte
Mamettis of antichristis secte.  (p. 47)

To these saints they give "superstitious offerings" and make pilgrimages leaving their own households destitute. Watkyn angrily threatens "Had we the kyng's licence / We wolde with outen diffydence / Their golden shrynes in peces breake"  (p. 111).

The religious orders are "in no use or stedde / To Christian men" (p. 70), for they live in "ydelnesse unprofytable" (p. 81) and are "two-faced dissemblers" (p. 75) whose "cloysters are the devils mewes" (p. 95). This is not surprising, for they have their origin in the Pope, who is the very Anti-Christ:

They saye that he is goddis vicary
And of Christ the leftenaunte
Makynge of a fende an angell
Christ, of anti-christ rcblle.  (p. 88)
There is very little doctrinal material, for the chief emphasis of the book aimed at embittering the commons against the prelacy. But Roye did attack the sacraments in *A Breve Dialogue Betwene a Christian Father and his Stobborn Sonne* and collaborated with Barlow in *A Proper Dyalog Betweene a Gentillman and a Husbandsman* (1530) and *A Compendious Treatise* (1530) which Clebsch describes as "aimed at consolidating Protestant and Lollard viewpoints into a demand for ecclesiastical reform and for scripture in the common tongue."

*A Proper Dyalog* contains the standard anti-clerical complaints: the church has "broughte the lande to beggary," "regarde litle the comone weale," fear the true scripture and thus withhold it, and so control Parliament that protest is futile. King John, Duke Humphrey, and Sir John Oldcastle are cited as victims of Romish oppression. To refute the Church's charge that Lutheranism is "a secte newe-fangled / With execrable heresyes entangled / Sekinge the churches perdition" (p. 150), the authors appended *A Compendious Treatise shewynge howe that we ought to have the scripture in Englyshe*, purportedly written c. 1400.

But Roye and Barlowe went too far. Even Tyndale objected to Roye's "railing rhymes," which he felt were inappropriate for the Lord's servants. And in 1533 Barlowe found it necessary to address an apology to Henry himself in order to live in England. (See Appendix F)
As soon, however, as Henry had declared his Supremacy and Cromwell had taken on the task of selling this position to the English, propagandistic works proliferated; their attack centered on the person of the Pope, now officially to be designated the Bishop of Rome. Typical of such a school of propaganda is the program discovered by Sidney Anglo in *A Discourse Touching the Reformation of the Lawes of England* (Cotton Ms. Faustina C.).

The suggestions made in this document were widely incorporated in the pamphlets of such men as Morison, Starkey, and Rastell; in plays such as those to be considered in later chapters; and in sermons of the day. Scarisbrick (and others as well) records an example of what he terms the sort of propaganda which was a "necessary concomitant of the out-pouring of anti-papal statutes, proclamations, learned treatises, and sermons" which were all designed to "heave a sluggish nation out of its past." In 1539

the aggressive, confident, anti-papalism of the regime was vividly demonstrated by a rumbustious pageant on the Thames, played before the king and a throng of Londoners. Two barges put out in the middle of the river, one manned by a crew representing the king and his Council; the other by some stalwarts dressed up as pope and cardinals. The two boats met in combat and grappled—until the papal barge was worsted and its contents pitched ignominiously into the river.
Typical of the new virulence of the attack against
the Catholic hierarchy (as opposed to attacks against abuses
of specific clergymen) is The Image of Hypocrisy, c. 1533.²⁵
In its four sections the ballad attacks the clergy in
general, preachers, bishops, pope, and cardinals, and the
mendicant and monastic orders. Special emphasis is given
their extra-national allegiance:

Some kepe their stations
In outwards straunge natyons,
Lernynge invocatyons
And craftye in-Cantatyons;
And so by enchantement
Gette theyre avauncement. (11.124-29)

They "avaunt themselves to be / No lesse then godes" and
"cast no reckonyng / Scarsely of a kynge."

Invective is here noticeably harsher and more abun-
dant. Friars are "a mangy matter" who dwell in hell:

That sett ther hole delighte
In lust and lechery
In thefte and treachery
In lowsy lewdnes,
In Synne and Shrodnes,
In crokednes acurst,
Of all people the worst,
Marmosettes and apes,
Mock us with your japes
Ye holy caterpillars. (11.2418-2428)

They are also "babes of belial"..."faste bounde and girte /
Under the devil's skirte." The greatest villain, of course,
is the Pope, the Antichrist of Rome:

For thens the sourdes springe
Of every naughty thinge,
Hide undernethe the whynge
Of the Syre of Synne. (11.763-66)
The Pope is a "farly freke" who claims authority even over
the deity and takes the Bible "for a riddle" which he alters
freely:

After his owne purpose
The text to turn and close
Like a welsh mane's hose,
Or lyk a waxen nose.  (11.812-15)

He is "fo of christes cross," the "devil's holy pryst,"
"lorde of losse." He is a type of all Biblical "badmen":
Simon Magus, Judas, Architophel, etc. and "childe of cursed
chan."

In this ballad, and in others contemporary with it,
and in the first notes of a ranting, abusive invective
specializing in name-calling and animal imagery, rather than
citing real abuse of the Roman clergy. The Reformers were
perhaps already heady with the new wine of their acceptance,
but even more relevant is that they wanted to create in the
populace not an intellectual or a theological conversion but
an emotional commitment. For this effect they had chosen
the right instruments, and between 1533 and 1539 anti-papal
polemics ran a virtually unbridled course.

After the Six Articles appeared, however, as notice of
Henry's waning appreciation of the values of Lutheranism
and of his innate theological conservatism, Protestant
polemics also reflected a modified stance, either reverting
to the old insistence on its nationalistic attributes or
stubbornly arguing certain doctrinal positions and decrying the Six Articles as of papist instigation.

There were more supplications; A Supplication to Henry, (c. 1544)²⁶ contains the old charges against the clergy—no knowledge of the Scripture, failure to preach, being bad shepherds whose shortcomings have caused that "popysh blyndenes, vayne and dead ceremoyes, mennes tradycyons be crept into the consacyences of the symple innocents." (p. 26) The edict ordering the burning of books contrary to the Six Articles is really a move to silence all who defend England and her King by writing against the Pope's primacy. In A Supplication of the Poore Commons (c. 1546),²⁷ Henry is reminded of his duties as protector of the commonwealth. The people have God's word, but there are still papists in England who fight against it by laws stipulating "none shal so hardy have the Scripture in his house onlesse he maye spend X pound by yere" (p. 64) and by attacks on Cromwell's placing the Bible in Churches. The poor plead that Henry, having banished the Pope, should now purge the vineyard.

The most outspoken of the Reformers, of course, were forced to exile (Bale among them), and from Basle, Antwerp, and other Lutheran sanctuaries watched anxiously as Anglican clergy drifted easily into the old "popish" modes. Here they learned that to root out all the old system would require a much more pronounced campaign than they had heretofore had
time to wage. Thus, recalled by Edward VI's coronation and
given potency by a pro-Reformation protectorate, the pro-
pagandists returned, now aiming their invective not only at
the personnel of the Roman Church, but at her doctrinal and
ritual schema. Cranmer's speech at the Coronation sets the
tone of Edward's reign:

Your majesty is God's vice-regent
and Christ's vicar within your own
dominions, and to see, with your
predecessor, Josiah, God truly wor-
shipped and idolatry destroyed,
the tyranny of bishops of Rome ban-
ished from your subjects, and im-
ages destroyed. These acts be the
signs of a second Josiah, who re-
formed the church of God in his days.
You are to reward virtue, to revenge
sin, to justify the innocent, to re-
lieve the poor, to procure peace, to
repress violence, and to execute jus-
tice throughout your realms. For pre-
cedents, on those kings who performed
not these things, the old law shows
how the Lord revenged his quarrel; and
on those kings who fulfilled these
things, he poured forth his blessings
in abundance. For example, it is written
of Josiah in the book of Kings thus:
'Like unto him there was no king be-
fore him that turned to the Lord with
all his heart, according to the law
of Moses.'

A Royal Visitation accomplished the putting down of all images
in every parish church in London. Walls were whitewashed
and Biblical texts substituted for the old iconography. The
doctrine of Transubstantiation, always a sensitive issue,
was subjected to ridicule: one sermon taught that to kneel to
the Host was actual idolatry; others labelled the Host "Round Robin" or "Jack-in-the-box."²⁹

A particularly interesting product of this war on the Doctrine of the Real Presence is John Bon and Mast Parson, (c. 1548) a dialogue on the Festival of Corpus Christi and on Transubstantiation.³⁰ The title page has a woodcut of a torch procession of clergy bearing the Host in an elaborate Pix and the following comment:

Alasse, poore foules! so sore ye be lade
No marvel it is, thoughe your shoulders ake:
For ye beare a great God, which ye yourselves made
Make of it what ye wyl, it is a wafer cake
And between two irons printed it is and bake.
And loke, where idolatrye is, Christ wyl not be there;
Wherforely downe your burden, an idole ye do beare.

Alasse, poore foules!

The dialogue proper is between a parson who attempts to justify the mass to John Bon, a peasant with a broad Southern dialect, who shows stupefied wonder at the mysteries of the sacrament and asks innocent (but damming) questions of the parson. In spite of the parson's patient instruction and his insistence that the Mass is "As good in every poynte as Pistell or Gospell is" (p. 19), Jon concludes staunchly:

Masse me no more messinges. The right way wil I walke.
For thoughe I have no learning, yet I know chese from chalke,
And yche can perceive your juggling, as crafty as ye walke.
But leve your devilish masse, and the communion to you take,
And then will Christ be with you, even for his promisse sake. (p. 22)

Many others attacked the Mass, often in terms earlier reserved for the whole structure of the Roman Church. Typical of this is Becon's explication of the evils of the Mass.31 His purpose is clear:

Now, that all true English hearts may understand and perceive how greatly the greatest part of them that are called Christians have been in times past, as many yet are, seduced and deceived by this glorious strumpet and gallant harlot the mass, while they only beheld and considered the outward gorgeous clapparel of that Babylonical whore; I have plucked her from all that her glorious array and disclosed her filthy nakedness, and set her forth to the eyes of all men even as she is; so that from henceforth none needeth to be deceived of her, except they will willingly cast themselves into her danger, and again be entangled and snarled with her whorish and filthy love. . . . judge. . . . this wicked idol the mass, that glorious and gorgeous strumpet. . . . and so forever flee from her, as from a most extreme pestilence. (pp. 354-55)

His conclusion is no less explicit:

What then remaineth, but that that popish mass be out of hand in all places utterly overthrown, forsaken and put to flight, with all her game-player's garments and gestures, with her feigned propitiatory sacrifice, with her transubstantiation, circumgestation, adoration, ostentation, impanation, inclusion, reservation, and such other monstrous monsters of the most monstrous whore of Babylon,
that 'great bawd,' and 'mother of all the whoredom and abominations of the earth,' that 'inhabitation of devils, that hold of all foul spirits, and cage of all unclean and hateful birds;'

(p. 395)

Becon's use of an epitaph for the Mass at his conclusion is also interesting, as Bale was to use the same technique in a work of similar intent.

EPITAPHIUM MISSAE

Praeterieus hospes vacuum mirere sepulchrum,
   Et quaenam maneat funera, forte roges,
Cunctorum genitrix et nutrix missa malorum
   Debutit hac condi, dum moreretur, humo,
E nostro tamem haec adeo disparuit orbe,
   Ut reliquam vides illius esse nihil.
Hinc aegrum patulo papatum expectat hiata,
   Fallere quem similis nos retione velim.

Cranmer's refutation of Gardiner's defence of the sacrament$^{32}$ is also typical of the strong insistence, under Edward, on doctrinal as well as political separation from Rome. Cranmer rejoices that "the superstitious sects of monks and friars... be clean taken away" but finds the purge inadequate:

What availleth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other like popery, so long as two chief roots remain unpulled up? ... The rest is but branches and leaves...; but the very body of the tree... is the popish doctrine of transubstantiation... and the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest, for the salvation of the quick and the dead. (p. 6)
His thesis is that the sacrament's meaning was once clear, but has been "overflown and drowned in all kind of superstition and idolatry" by the Roman Church. The very ambiguities and perplexities of papist doctrine bespeak its anti-Christic origins, whereas

the true doctrine of Christ and his pure church from the beginning is plain, certain, without wrinkles, without any inconvenience or absurdity, so cheerful and comfortable to all christian people, that it must needs come from the Spirit of God, . . . .

(p. 366)

Gardiner has blasphemed the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist by "niggardly pinching God's gifts, and diminishing his liberal promises made unto us in them" (p. 45). Cranmer, a pruner in the lord's vineyard and a good pastor who pities to see his flock led into corrupt pastures, warns

all that profess Christ, what they flee far from Babylon, if they will save their souls, and to beware of that great harlot, that is to say, the pertiferous see of Rome, that she make you not drunk with her pleasant wine. Trust not her sweet promises, nor banquet with her; for instead of wine she will give you sour dregs, and for meat she will feed you with rank poison. . . . Listen not to the false incantations, sweet whisperings, and crafty jugglings of the subtle papists, wherewith they have this many years deluded and bewitched the world. (p. 7)

Now the Reformation seemed truly destined to re-form the Church as a religious structure rather than merely
utilizing its political potential. But destiny would not allow such a course; in 1553 Mary's coronation once more dashed the hopes of zealous Protestants. The Lutheran threat was temporarily abated; Mary's ministers embarked on a campaign of their own, by way of both proclamation and literature, to discredit the Reformers and to herald the reinstatement of the True Church in England. Besides dramatic vehicles, such as Respublica (considered in Chapter IV), defenders of Catholicism seized upon other genre, for example, the biography of Fisher ascribed to Richard Hall which is in effect a Sixteenth-century saint's life pitting Fisher against the forces of evil led by Luther. The reader is urged to

Consider the time when Martin Luther, the most damnable and wicked Hereticke that ever was began to springe, and you shall not find a stouter champion against him. . . , then was this religious bishop, for Luther. . . began to sowe his wicked and devilish doctrine . . . in 1507. . . . At his first coming on land in England, no sleeping dogge, nor rude nor ignorant shepherd might be found, but a vigilant pastor. . . to catch the yonge cubb or foxe at his first arivall. O wicked Luther, great is the miserie and calamitie that thou hast brought into this realme of England, and much greater and sooner had yt bene, but for this worthie prelates resistance, yet never couldest thou have entered at all, had he not bene taken away by such as thou haddest infected with y pernitious poysnon. (p. 15)
Fisher was especially lauded for his diligence against "divers blasphemous books stuffed with most abominable and false doctrines" (p. 33); yet in spite of this "careful Shepherde" the people had given credence to

slanderous tales and pernicious lyes devilishly invented by Luthere upon the abuses attributed to the Clergie, and cleane carried awaye with carnall libertie, which this new fifth gospel did bring them. . . rashly and without reason, they suffred themselves to be abused by that false and wicked heretick. (p. 38)

Anne Boleyn is the villainess of the piece, and tales of her inordinate venom against Fisher are included, such as her striking his severed head after his execution. Fisher is compared to John the Baptist in that both died over a case of matrimony, both were beheaded, and both had their heads requested by an evil woman. But all evil deeds were to be punished "when the true light of justice of Christ's ancient and Catholick religion began againe to shine" (p. 141).

As always, the Protestants were more eloquent, and their forced exile and their frustration lent heat to their writings. Especially painful was the almost total reversion of the English Church to Catholicism. One exile, in a preface to his translation of an earlier Latin work by Crammer, described the situation in emotional tones:

\begin{quote}
The Lord's vineyard within the realm of England (which he had of late so strongly hedged, walled, and fenced about by the princes of most famous
\end{quote}
memory, king Henry the eighth and Edward the sixth, and planted therein the pure vine of his own blessed word by godly preachers, his gardeners) to be so suddenly broken down, destroyed, wasted, and rooted up by the roots, by the wild boar of the woods and the beasts of the field, that is, by the Romish bishop and his bloody ministers; and now in the same vineyard to see planted, take root, and prosper, brambles, briars, and hemlocks; that is, gross ignorance, naughty doctrine, false worship of God, and such other kinds of most stinking, vile, and filthy weeds. (p. 9)

False doctrines are "blown out, blustered, and yelled forth in every pulpit" and every "printer's house is filled with such ungodly baggage" (p. 10).

Becon35 interprets the Marian exile period as a punishment, and an unusually grievous one in that God "hast sent us a woman whom nature hath formed to be in subjection into man" (p. 277). Queens are always bad, warns Becon, citing Jezabel, Athalia, and Herodias; and England's queen is no exception, for since she and her "priests of Baal" have ruled, "thy vineyard is utterly rooted up and laid waste, thy true religion is banished" (p. 228).

Considerable attention was also given to refuting the Catholic claim of being the true Church. Typical of this vein of polemics is Becon's "A Comfortable Epistle to the Afflicted People of God" in which the "synagogue of Satan" (the papists) are contrasted with the "church of Christ in a list of 50
items. The two churches—one malignant, the other militant—are figured by such biblical pairs as Cain and Abel, Esau and Jacob, Ishmael and Isaac. The good are always persecuted by the bad, so the very exile of the Protestants marks them as the true people of God. Sample items are:

No. 28: The Church of Christ knoweth none other armours against Satan, but faith, prayer, and the word of God.

The synagogue of Satan teacheth that if any man will fight and prevail against Satan he must flee for succor unto holy bread, holy water, holy palms, holy candles, holy bells, holy beads, holy laces, etc. (p. 198)

No. 46: The Church of Christ studieth how to please God, and to do good to their neighbor.

The Synagogue of Satan imagineth how to please the world, and to fill their own paunches. . . . (p. 208)

This theme, the primacy of the Protestant Church, is also central to a very famous work which took its early form during the Marian exile, Foxe's Actes and Monuments. In his opening matter, Foxe recounts the history of the Church, dividing it into five 300-year periods:

1) a "suffering time" from the time of the apostles
2) a "flourishing time"
3) a "declining or backsliding" time which extended to the "loosing of Satan," c. 1000 A.D.
4) a Time of Anti-Christ during which "both doctrine and sincerity of
life were utterly almost extinguished; . . . through the means of the Roman Bishops,"
5) the Reformation, "wherein Anti-Christ beginneth to be revealed. . . . and his anti-christian doctrine to be detected. . . ."

Foxe rejects the lineage of the Roman Church from apostolic times, asking where were the Roman clergy with their "gloria mundi, cardinals and courtesans, extortions and annates, schisms and divisions in ancient times" (p. 10). Instead, the Roman Church is "a new-found religion, or paganism rather, brought in under the shadow of Christianity. . . . where remaineth almost nothing else but the name only of Christ" (p. 69). The supremacy of Peter is labelled "a popish perilous paralogism" (p. 45) and the Roman Church is censured for having "intermeddled in temporal jurisdiction" (p. 19).

All in all, Foxe concludes, the pope's kingdom is thoroughly degenerate:

And thus the church of Rome, pretending only the name of Christ and of his religion, is so far altered from the truth of that which it pretendeth, that, under the name of Christ, it persecuteth both Christ and religion; working more harm to the church of Christ, than ever did the open tyrants and persecuting emperors among the heathen; not much unlike herein to the old synagogue of the scribes and Pharisees. . . . (p. 70)

And lest any should think his criticism of their "corrupt errors and manifold deformities. . . . to proceed from any rancour," Foxe patiently refutes their imagined unwritten verities
with a list of his own composing. He also shows the falsehood of the Roman Church's teaching on the sacraments, for "especially in the supper of the Lord, their doctrine most filthily swerveth from the right mind of the Scripture" (p. 82).

Of course, the ostensible purpose of Foxe's work is to provide a calendar of martyrs, but its recurrent theme is always the cruelty of popery and the witness of the true martyrs to the verity of the ancient and the Protestant Church.

During this Marian exile there were countless such Protestant tracts, almost all characterized by vituperation and bitter derision. The non-dramatic work of John Bale is singularly exemplary of such work, showing his use of the stock materials and metaphors and also his more dramatic manner of polarizing the two camps. Although Bale works with the weapons supplied him by earlier polemicists, his writings reflect both his strong personal concern for the Protestant cause and his great awareness of the polemic effectiveness of providing his audience pairs of contrasting images or concepts between which only one choice is possible.

During his first exile (c. 1539-47), Bale's works emphasized the worth of true Protestant worship as compared with the false ceremonies of the Roman Church. Claiming Christ as example, Bale reminds readers that Jesus

\[
\text{never allowed their ceremonies. He never went procession with cope, cross, and candlestick. He never gave orders,}
\]
or sat in confession. He never
preached of purgatory or pardons.
He never honoured saints nor
prayed for the dead. He never
said mass, matins, nor evensong.
He never fasted Friday nor vigil,
Lent nor Advent. He never hallowed
church nor chalice, ashes nor palm,
candles nor bells. But such dumb
ceremonies not having express
commandment of God he called the
leaven of the Pharisees and damnable
hypocrisy. 39

Bale chooses the same technique in his martyrological
tracts 40—accounts of the trials of Anne Askew and of Jo\'in
Oldcastle—stressing the dignity and simple conviction of the
martyrs as it contrasts with the wiles and deceit of their
accusers. Anne Askew, answering all attacks with simple
faith and sincere humility, is portrayed consistently as an
innocent lamb whom the Church "compasseth like a ravening
lion to devour" (p. 158). Indeed, the persecution of the weak
by the strong was identified as one of the "express tokens
that Christ sealeth his martyrs with" (p. 193). Innocent
suffering is the hall-mark of the true martyr, claims Bale.
Oldcastle died "under the gallows, among the lay people, and
upon the profane working-day, at the bishop's procurement"
while that "popish martyr" Becket "was slain at Canterbury in
his priest's apparel, in the head church before the high
altar, among religious monks and priests, and in the holy time
of Christmas, by his own seeking" (p. 55). There have been
counterfeit martyrs, says Bale, but the distinction is made
clear to his readers:

Compare me Anne Askew and her condemned company with these clouted, canonized, solemnized, matinized, and massed martyrs, and tell me by the gospel's trial which of them seem most christian-like martyrs. (p. 192)

It is not enough, however, to show the complete supremacy of the Protestant cause in any contest; Bale would also demonstrate the total depravity of his opponent. In The Actes of Englysh Votaryes ¹⁴¹ Bale will damn the English clergy by putting "before them their abhomynable practyses and examples of fylthynesse, by their owne legendes, chronycles, and sayntes lyves" (A,i,ivb). If even in these chronicles, written by the clergy's "owne dere fryndes," such enormities may be found, the reader can imagine what has been left unsaid. Such representation of innocent, almost passive suffering at the hands of a totally vile persecutor is seen incorporated dramatically in Bale's morality The Three Lawes.

That Bale thought of himself as suffering this sort of persecution is clearly evident in his writings such as The Vocacyon.¹⁴² From exile he watched Mary's ministers set up again "the golden calves" which Edward had thrown down, but prophesied that a "faythful Asa will followe...which will dissolve these ydolatryes agayne" (p. 445). Too, he found comfort in an extended comparison of his troubles with those of Paul and of Old Testament prophets:
If Helyas...remain now in a foren
lande in penurie...whyle Baal's
chatteringe chaplaynes and sorcerouse
sacriferes fo dwell styl at home
flourishing in prosperous welth,
lecherouse ydnelnesse, and lordly
dignite, maruile not at it for so
hath he done before. (p. 440)

Bale's persecution at the hands of the Catholics in
Ossory and his frustration at seeing the revival of hated
papal practices in England give his work of this period a more
intensive invective, a more deliberately derisive tone, accom-
plished in the main by copious alliteration in a balanced
bombardment of epithets: "blind, blundering papistes"; "pilde,
peltings prestes"; "knights of the dongehill" whose lechery
sends them ever in search of "a wele papped pygion of Paules
...to coole the contagious heates of a coltish confessour"
(p. 461).

Also intensified during this second exile are the
efforts to totally discredit the Roman church by damaging com-
parisons with the "true" church and by identifying the papists
with infamous Old Testament figures. In An Image of Both
Churches43, Bale's commentary on the Book of Revelation, the
Bishop of Winchester is the "great Nimrod" of the "boisterous
tyrants of Sodom" and Gog and Magog, the enemies of Christ's
congregation, are equated with the Pope and Mahomet, "the
malignant ministers of Satan" (p. 263). Thomas More's
"prodigious tyranny to persecute the truth" is the same as
Herod's anger against John the Baptist (p. 396), and the hypocrisy of "certain false prophets at Paule's Cross in London" is the same spirit that has attended wickedness throughout history:

> From the beginning hath this beast risen up in Cain, the first murderer . . . in Cham, the shameless child of Noe, in Ishmael and Essau, . . . in Balaam and Baal's prophets, . . . in Judas, Annas, and Caiphas, . . . and now, . . . most of all in Mahomet's doctors and the pope's squiresters. (p. 437)

Just as earlier writers had seen Biblical figures as types of Christ, Bale presents others as types of anti-christ or the Pope and his papal hierarchy.

The Image of Both Churches is full of other representative techniques, many of which Bale also found dramaturgically effective. Abundant alliteration, almost always a vehicle for abuse, is found on every page. Another means of abuse is the lengthy catalogue of attributes. False prophets are

> the instruments of Satan, the deceivers, wolves, wagelings, Judases, dreamers, liars, idols, adversaries, adders, whelps, foxes, destroying the Lord's vineyard, deceitful workmen, desperate shepherds, blind watchmen, dumb dogs, devils incarnate, wicked seed, unsatiate beasts, whose god is their belly, and glory their confusion. (p. 439)

Most often no design is discernible in these lists and they seem more an exercise in inventiveness than an effective device of rhetoric. However, on occasion Bale orchestrates his
syntactical patterns to attain a skillful contrast, as in the following passage where the final clause, by virtue of its succinctness, triumphs over the frantic list preceeding it:

Let them wax mad, swell, and fret themselves to death. ... Let them persecute, fetter, stock, famish, slay, hang, head, burn, drown, yea, and very quick, with all other mischief and tyranny; yet will the truth abroad. (p. 371)

Although Bale uses many characteristic metaphors, the one most frequently and most strikingly employed is the contrast of the two churches in the figure of two women. Of course, this is a traditional juxtaposition: the true Church as the spouse of Christ and anti-Christ's church as the Whore of Babylon. Bale, however, uses the figure again and again, adding many dimensions to the two roles and achieving far more dramatic encounters between the two female figures.

The representation of the Roman Church as a scarlet woman afforded Bale opportunities to attack in his favorite areas: the lechery which vows of celibacy nurtured, the emphasis on rich and wanton outward appearance, and the deceit upon which the whole hierarchy was built. Such a figure in the Preface sets the tone for *The Actes of Englyshe Votaryes*.

In this hoke of myne is one face of Antichrist chefely dysclosed. ... wherewith he hath of longe time paynted out his whore, the Rome church, that she might to the world apere a glor-youse madame. That face is her vowed chastyte, wherby she hath deceitfullye boasted herself spirituall, beynge but
whore and thefe, and dysdayned marry-age as a vyle drasse sack and dyrtye dyshe cloute, callynge all them but lewde laye persones that were undre yt.
. . . Be not now slacke in your offyces, as in the blynd time, but throwe fourth that wretched bonde woman with her daughter, that Roman Church with her whoryshnesse. (A,ii)

And, of course, this juxtaposition of the Babylonian Whore with the True Church is basic to Bale's, _The Image of Both Churches:

Herein is the true Christian Church, which is the meek spouse of the Lamb without spot, in her right-fashioned colours described. So is the proud church of hypocrites, the rose-coloured whore, the paramour of anti-christ, and the sinful synagogue of Satan, in her just portion depainted, to the merciful forewarning of the Lord's elect. (p. 251)

Throughout the book, the two churches are described in such terms. The "malignant" church is the "cruel woman and abomminable strumpet Jezebel" (p. 282), the mistress of Anti-Christ upon whose back she appears in Bale's fullest description. (See Chapter 17 of the work) She rides the "rose-coloured beast" and is flourishingly decked with gold, precious stone, and pearls" which signify "counterfeit godliness." In her hand she bears "a golden cup full of abominations and filthiness of her execrable whoredom," the cup of false religion. In her forehead is written her name, Great Babylon, and this woman: "the very wife of the devil and of his beastly body (for the bishops are the husbands of their Romish churches) was all drunken in
the bloody slaughter of saints. . . . Besides all godly wisdom is she, and forgetful of herself through this some bloody drunkenness; so great excess hath she taken" (pp. 496-99 et passim).

The True Church, on the other hand, is "undefiled as the moon" and "beautifully decked with the shining Sun of righteousness." Her beauty "consisteth only in faith" and her ministers, too, glory in "the edification of others, and not their own pomp and magnificence." As the spouse of Christ, she is "apparelled beautifully with pure white silk." And she is called Jerusalem, "in that all her citizens are of one faith."

Thus, Bale assures the readers,

He that hath a desire to know the one church from the other, and the true from the false, may here do it well by conferring them together. Let him consider by that is said afore, that this is holy, the other blasphemous. This is new, the other is old, for Cain was the elder brother. This is called Jerusalem, the other confused Babylon. This came down first from heaven, the other rose out of the bottomless pit. This was soberly prepared to her spouse, the other apparelled herself rashly like an whore. . . . This hath but one husband, she hath done whoredom with many kings by false worshipings. This for her meekness is commended of God, the other proudly boasteth herself through holy traditions, merits, and deserving to be a rich queen. (p. 583)
The two figures remain, in this work, largely iconographic, but later Bale added dramatic weight by increasing the human element and by creating actual confrontations of the two women. In the Preface to the 1553 Roane edition of Gardiner's De Vera Obedientia, Bale attacks Gardiner for having given in to "the malignaunt Madame, the Babilonical baudi mother holi church" (A,vi). Noting that Gardiner, in De Vera, had lamented that his first wife Truth, whom he married in Baptism, had been driven away by the Bishop of Rome, Bale warns:

Thereby note that the firste craftie subtile prancke of the whorish church of Rome is to banish Truth (God's Testament) out of the country, or els she might play the single woman stil, for any husband, she could have to plight her faith and truthe...being dronken with the cuppe of her abomination. (F,lvii)

The Gospel must always be banished "or else mincing madam . . . is like to have but a fewe to daunce at her wedding in England" (Flix). This "Babilonical bawdy Romish church. . . painted and trimmed (like a minion mistres Clare with her mynceing maid Madge Mare) in her costli copes, vaine vestments" (F,lix) was very much to Gardiner's tastes and he readily rejected Truth, "olde plaine russet cote Jone of the countri," and chose instead "Rose of Rome" as his mistress.

When Truth claims him, Gardiner labels her "a babbling bethlem beast," "some runnagate beggarly hagge, and by like an
heritiike, sette on by some of my back frinds" (F,lx). Even when King Henry forces him to give up his "subtill paynted harlot," Gardiner recalls what "a fine wench mistress Rose of Rome was" and eventually casts off Truth again, and also

getteth him a mischievous whip with
vi bloody strings...and in a fume
cast a selie sorte of her weake
poore friends in the hot fyre,
(F,lxii)

In this narrative, Bale has cast the contest in terms quite clear to even the simplest reader: an alienation of affection in which the believer is lured from his plain wife Truth by the sensual wiles of Rose of Rome. Gardiner is guilty of spiritual whoredom.

The same roles are allotted in Resurreccion of the Masse, a monologue, in which the Mass itself is personified as a whorish temptress. Full of scurrilous satire, the piece attacks many aspects of Catholic doctrine and ritual. The Mass has newly come again from Rome where she had many popes for father and Idolatrie "who was common / To many a pope" for mother. She brags of her many uses—indeed, she can bring all worldly things to one who attends her and behaves properly: nodding and sighing "although ye understand nothing at all" (A,iv). However, "when my Chaplein come to the heaving of that litle great God above hys head," all must fall down and worship, "For he is a God of Pope Innocent's makynge" (A,v). The Mass recalls her unmarred reign in England before Henry's time, her
early troubles, and her salvation by prelates who supported the Six Articles in which she was "founde by an acte of Parliament / To be necessary ad salutem" (B,ii). Her defeat came when she was called to trial and harshly accused by "a certayne simple mayde called the communion" (B,iii). Unfortunately, though temporarily banished to Rome where she is welcomed by the Pope, the Mass has now returned in triumph to her 'lovers' in England and both the "simple mayde" and Bale can only look on in temporary defeat at her reinstatement.

Literary manifestations of the polemic issues of the Reformation show a certain uniformity and a consistent desire to polarize opinion. Before the Sixteenth Century, the poles tend to represent God's way and the way of the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. After Luther, the poles are the true faith and the false religion. But the techniques of polarization are much the same. Present issues and persons are compared to past figures whose worth has already been judged: Wolsey is Pilate, Bible-burning is another Passion. The good and the bad shepherd are frequent figures, and the difference between Chaucer's Parson and his Monk and Bale's persecuted Elias and his hypocritical Gardiner exists more in tone than in matter. Langland's Lady Meede is as sensual and as corrupting as Bale's Rose of Rome. Too, the same techniques serve both camps; if Roman clergy subverted a monarch's dominion, so did Lollardy, and Luther as well as the Pope was
frequently branded Anti-Christ.

The really significant development was the increasingly sophisticated creation of *persona* and *locus*, whereby these issues could be represented dramatically, thus more directly creating a polarized situation which demanded an either/or commitment of its reader. Pineas maintains that the "combination of polemical dialogue with the creation of a prejudicial dramatic situation is the basis for polemical drama."\(^46\)

In Bale's case, the truth is probably that his interest in polemic drama and his work with it influenced his style in later non-dramatic work. Either way, a knowledge of the received conventions of polemic literature affords a far deeper appreciation of Bale's dramatic work and a far more accurate appraisal of the distribution of invention and imitation in his canon.
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CHAPTER III

BALE'S USE OF THE CYCLE PLAY IN RELIGIOUS POLEMICS

Although the medieval church may have been guilty of withholding the Scripture from the laity, no one could justly accuse them of withholding scriptural narrative. On the contrary, the church fathers had long relied on sermons, iconography, confessional teaching, and other didactic modes as vehicles for the conveyance of Biblical story and patristic exegesis. And they found in the Fourteenth Century the incipient dramatic form to be a very useful tool for such instruction.

The genre which evolved—the cycle play—is primarily conditioned by this didactic function. Its goals had been from the first audience involvement and indoctrination. Thus, when John Bale adopted the genre as vehicle for Protestant doctrine and for anti-papal propaganda he had few real changes to make in the structure of the genre. Bale's modifications are primarily to be found in the subject matter, in the figural values attached to the characters, and in the amount and the nature of humor in the plays.
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To best understand the relative ease with which Bale was able to convert a medieval form to his Protestant polemic needs, it is necessary to consider the origin and the evaluation of the genre, the characteristics of the four extant medieval cycles and of other medieval Biblical drama, and the new directions taken by Biblical drama in the early Sixteenth Century. Only then can John Bale's cyclic trilogy be fairly evaluated. That Christian drama arose from a confluence of the dramatic nature of the Mass and the desire for vernacular reinforcement of Church doctrine can hardly be argued since Hardison's thorough examination in 1965 of the liturgical genesis of the early drama. What Hardison describes is the gradual amplification of an inherently dramatic ritual form and the slow replacement of liturgical elements (such as candles, processions, etc.) by more representational elements. Liturgical drama is the result of a search for representational modes which preserve a relation to ritual but fill out the form with material from other sources such as apocrypha, exegesis, and even the contemporary milieu.

Styan has also examined the relation between drama and ritual, reminding us that ritualistic participation does not necessarily exclude representational or realistic elements. In fact, in the more secular drama the celebrant of religious ritual has become a dramatic character but still is involved in participation; after all, the unity of actor and audience,
priest and congregation is the mark of a successful ritual (p. 237). The dramatist, then, more or less officiates at this ritual, seeking "to lead the spectators, detail by detail into a more deeply felt response." \(^3\)

It is this aesthetic awareness which Craig and many others have denied the mystery play and which Kolve so convincingly argues. Whereas Craig speaks of a genre "whose aim was religious, not dramatic" (p. 2), whose technique was "naive" (p. 9), and whose form came about through a "fortuitous union of action, impersonation, and dialogue" (p. 20), Kolve insists on an aesthetic identity of the genre, resting chiefly on its nature of celebration, its *ludus* quality.

However, whether aesthetically chosen or "fortuitously" demanded by the didactic elements involved, the structure of the mystery play, and especially of the cycle play in which most mysteries existed, was clearly determined by liturgical influences.

Almost from the beginning the vernacular plays became associated with the Feast of Corpus Christi. Craig explains its appropriateness:

> The service of Corpus Christi is theologically and ritualistically a consummation of the entire plan of salvation, and the grand cycle of religious themes from the Fall of Adam to the Ascension of the Saviour and the Passion-Play theme as developed at Easter were an objectivization of the same grand theme. It epitomized
schematically. . .the service of the liturgical year. (p. 133)

Just as the Feast of Corpus Christi was inclusive, so the cycle associated with the Feast was marked by its dramatic completeness and comprehensiveness. Its essential structure was the Creation, the Passion and the Judgment, and this structure was scaffolded by what Rossiter calls "a huge theological pattern." It is this pattern, rather than any specifically liturgical pressures, which shaped the genre.

In the cycle plays the medieval dramatists were concerned with God as He has allowed himself to be known in time. In fact, time itself was treated as an artifact of God and viewed with a sense of community. This created a characteristic duality in the handling of time in the cycle plays. As Craig puts it:

Time. . .did not travel horizontally from one secular event to another. Time developed here on earth and rose vertically into eternity. . . . Earthly time was permanence incomplete . . . . Time furnished the materials out of which eternity was built. (p. 16)

Mabel Buland calls this the phenomenon of double-time, in which events take on a time-extension other than that inherent in the surface plot. What this time-extension produces is a sequence of events whose chronological continuity is not simply linear. Rather than action flowing from one play to the next, the movement is usually interrupted and directed
back to God; the flow of time returning to its creator before again swirling around the rocks of yet another temporary present. The Towneley Noah ends with a prayer that God bring Noah and his family to heaven with the saints. The following Abraham has no linear link with Noah, but opens with a prayer for mercy and succor. The Chester Slaying of the Innocents ends with the angels recalling a prophecy of "a thousand yeare agoe." The following play in the Chester cycle, The Purification, must pull back the viewer's mind, and God's, to his own present: "Mightie God, have mynd on me," and then relate his time to yet another old prophecy from Isaiah.

Thus, temporality is significant only when it intersects with and because it manifests God's will, but it is given some degree of artistic attention. After all, it was the present viewers whose spiritual well-being was at stake. The dramatist "compensated for the formal unimportance of the audience moment by staging the past as though it were largely identical with present time, thereby honoring its specific audience while seeking to amend their lives."7 Thus, the pervasive anachronisms of costume, oaths, and topical allusions aim at audience involvement. One can speak of the cycle plays as characterized by both a chronology and an anachronology, the first representing God's will imposed on all Time; the second, Man's present imposed on the past. Or, as Kolve puts it, "The shape of the drama is a linear
progression. . .but the metaphysic of its structure is centrifugal" (p. 119).

Another marked characteristic of the cycle play is the juxtaposition of serious, Biblical matter and humorous, often coarse elements. There is a school which holds that these low comic elements are a deterioration, resulting from the appetite of the audience for "rural humor" and labels them as interruptions, parentheses, "having no organic relation to the structure of the individual plays."9 But more often, critics are now searching for relevance-formulas and metaphorical significance, and Rossiter sees a "recurrent tonal clash" between two rituals, devotion and defamation.9 Irene Janicka notes that all Gothic art is characterized by two contrasted styles, the sublime and the low; one aims at ideal beauty, the other at deformity.10 And Kolve carefully distinguishes two areas of audience response to the humor. There is the stupidity and pretension of those alienated from God, whose brawling (Miles), boasting (Herod), and duplicity (Annas and Caiphas) elicit rude laughter, both among themselves and from the audience. But there is also invented comic action (such as the shepherds of the Towneley plays), which serves as dramatic metaphor. The motifs of birth, health, abundance, and peace "translated into comic action" in the nativity play, "create a mimetic world for Christ to be born into."11
The introduction of humor was most often accomplished through characterization, and, conversely, a person was often characterized by the amount and quality of the humor in his role. In the mysteries the human characters are drawn so strongly that they become caricatures and grotesques. The degree of their comicality is directly related to their level of Sanctity. Herod, Pilate, Annas, and Caiphas, even Satan are one-dimensional, important more for their illustration of the ridiculous position of one alienated from God than for any naturalistic portrayal of human nature. Characters created by amplification, such as the shepherds and their boys, Garcia, Pikeharnes, the soldiers, and Noah's wife, can be used for either comic action or ridicule, and often create part of the "anglicanization" of the play. On the other hand, the holy family are never made vehicles of humor (with the exception of the Joseph plays). It would seem that a character's comic potential is directly proportionate to the degree to which he has yielded himself to God's will. In Bale's cycle play, comic potential is always a sign of papal association.

So much has been said about the staging of the cycle plays--and so much of that only conjecture--but, in truth, the essential aspect of the actual presentation of the cycle play was that it did not seek the illusion of verisimilitude. The setting was rarely located geographically, the actors
were neighbors of the area, and there was a formal stylization in both writing and acting. The aim of the play was not deception, but celebration; the dramatist did not seek to suspend disbelief, but to heighten belief. What the assembled audience saw on the pageant wagon was not a _spectacle_, but an _event_ in which they, too, shared. Although there is less direct exhortation than is found in the moralities, the familiarity of the material and the frequent "anachronisms" aided their participation in the unfolding of the cyclic story, as did the sure knowledge that just as the Doomsday wagon always concluded their participation in the play, so it would one day conclude their participation in God's present time.

Within these generic conventions, however, there was room for considerable evolution and diversity. Even the four extant cycles, while sharing the qualities considered above, manifest different emphases in subject matter and in method.

The Chester Cycle\(^13\) is generally conceded to be the oldest, having been translated and adapted from the French c. 1375. Craig feels that this cycle has retained most perfectly the original form and spirit of the play.\(^14\) And Maurice Hussey labels it "the proto-type of the English mysteries."\(^15\) The distinguishing feature of the Chester play is its direct didacticism. Although there is some humor, such
as the meal of the shepherds in the Nativity play, and the clown Gartius in the same play, the dramatist's real goal was clearly to direct his audience from the paths of sin by the force of the example set before them. The shepherds, in addition to the simple gifts given to the Child, give themselves to God, vowing to become travelling preachers, monks, and hermits from that day onward. The taverness of Play XVII (Descent into Hell) not only loudly laments her "endles paines and sorowe cruel," but warns that all taverners, tapsters, and tipsters "guilty of Hurtinge the common welth" will follow her to Hell to abide in "paine with oute Ende."

This cycle also manifests a recurrent emphasis on "keeping well your place"; Lucifer actually sits on God's throne before his fall rather than committing a more abstract act of pride; Jesus accuses Satan in Play XII of attempting to supplant Him; the Antichrist play (XXII), of course, is merely a long sequence of usurpations of Christ's place by the Antichrist; and God is frequently lauded as "greatest of degree" and "peerless of Post."

The most obvious didactic element in the play is the Expositor, who makes very clear any message which might escape the viewers. He explains the typological import of Melchisedek's actions (Play IV) and of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac; he supplements the prophet play (VI) with apocryphal miracles and quotes Augustine as authority and gloss for the
Temptation play (XII). He also gives careful explications of such matter as Balaam's Prophecies in Play V and the tokens of Doomsday in Play XXII. The Expositor does not provide continuity, but instead underscores and explains the significance of what has been seen and guides the response of the audience.

Twice as long, the York Cycle is able to let its message come more readily through the characters of the play. (The one exception is the long Prologue at the opening of the Annunciation, which replaces a separate Prophet play) The additional length consists in part of extra plays such as Transfiguration and Peter's Denial, but it also is the result of a great deal more "anglicanization" and a nearly constant stratum of realism supplied by such touches as Noah's carpenter tools, the clown Brewbarrel in the Cain play, and the domestic repartee of Pilate and Percula. The York Cycle seems a more human, more sympathetic production; the dominant motif seems not so much insistence on order and obedience, as a celebration of God's timelessness and His bountiful Nature. Of the first eleven plays, six end on a note of blessing or praise. Also of note is a shifting of balance between cyclic and linear worlds. In the first part of the cycle (prior to the Ministry and Passion plays) and in the closing plays (after Crucifixion), the cyclic sense is elevated. Events are seen as having multiple significance and God's intervention is
more directly felt. In the middle section, plays have much more natural detail and linear time dominates. Perhaps the dramatist felt that the Incarnation could be mirrored stylistically by submerging the divine beneath the linear and human world and then letting it emerge again after the Resurrection.

The Towneley Plays have close ties with the York Cycle. In fact, Pollard holds that at least in part the Towneley cycle is a "corrupted" version of the York. However, these plays are set apart chiefly by the work of a skilled dramatist and reviser generally called "The Wakefield Master." His dramatic and metrical prowess have been so fully attested that perhaps the quality of the cycle as a whole has been neglected. Although the characters contain the commonplace 'English' humor found in the York Cycle, there is even more depth to their human-ness, to the degree that the audience can identify with them more readily. Characters such as Joseph, Noah's wife, and Thomas represent human folly in such a manner that a sort of didactic catharsis occurs as the audience identify with their complaints and then see the error of their position in the true light of God's will.

Another characteristic of the Towneley cycle is the evident intentional arrangement of material to emphasize typological significance. Although there is very little
direct transition between plays, neither linear nor cyclic, a
great deal of coherence is achieved by cyclic echoing of
scenes and situations: Isaac rides a donkey to the Mount of
Vision, the Egyptian mid-wives are ordered to slay Hebrew
infants, Lucifer's seduction of Eve is made parallel to
Gabriel's Annunciation to Mary. Thus, events serve to re-
define one another by similarity and by contrast. The most
artistic use of this technique is the triple telling of the
Crucifixion: first the event itself, then the event as re-
ported to Pilate, and last as remembered by Luke and
Cleophas. Each version allows new facets of meaning to become
apparent.

The Hegge plays (or the Ludus Coventriae\textsuperscript{18} or N-towne
plays) are perhaps the most distinctly characterized cycle.
They have a strong Marian quality and are much more dependent
on extra-Biblical literary sources. Later in compilation than
the civic cycles, this play is generally thought to be the
product of a religious guild or body. The compiler seems to
have worked with many plays which had prior and separate
existence. Passion Play I, for instance, has its own Prologue
and Epilogue, and Passion Play II begins with an address by
"an exposytor in doctorys wede" who informs the audience that
"We intendyn to procede materre at we left ye last here."
Block suggests that the dramatist created the Marian sequence
by grafting the "Contemplacio" series to another series of
Marian plays of a simpler, more popular character, and also introducing material from the *Legenda Aurea, Meditationes* (or *Speculum Vitae Christi*), and the Pseudo-Matthew Gospel.

Also distinctive is the ecclesiastical cast of the subject matter, which is full of theological problems and paradoxes, and the frequent short sermons put in the mouths of various characters. There is abundant explication of doctrine: Moses explicates the Ten Commandments, Mary traces the steps from Babylon to Jerusalem, the Contemplacio explains all the benefits of Our Lady's Psalter, and John the Baptist advocates the importance of the penitential system. The most spectacular occurrence of doctrinal lore is the actual staging of the Immaculate Conception in Play #11, when the Holy Ghost descends with three beams of light which enter Mary's bosom.

There is a great deal of audience involvement in this cycle, especially if the audience were a religious community. The frequent sermons have been mentioned above and there are also other addresses to the audience, such as Herod's commands (Play #29), the Devil's plea for their love (#25), and the demons' condemnation (#42). The audience would also be drawn into the performance by the enactment of rituals such as the Purification in #19 and the frequent singing. In Play #8 Ysakar has addressed the audience as fellow-priests, and later he and all the priests sing together as they perform offerings
at the altar. In Play #10, the audience is again made a part of the action when Episcopus charges them to pray with him: "Mekely ech man ffalle down on kne / And we xal begynne. Veni creator Spiritus."

But the most interesting quality of this cycle in terms of dramaturgy is its marked allegorical penchant. Many scenes and characters in these plays are suggestive of the moralities rather than of the mystery plays. In Play #9, Mary is given seven teachers and five maidens, each identified as an abstract quality. In Play #11 there is a debate between the Four Daughters of God. Play #14 has two Detractors called Backbiter and Slander. These are not English clowns such as Pikeharnes and Garcio, but true instances of the personification of an abstract quality. They open the play with an address to the audience announcing their true nature and their specific intentions. Death is also personified in Play #20, "The Death of Herod." Play I (#26-#28) has other significant morality features. In the Prologue, the Demon mentions the use of new clothes and new names to disguise his vices. Much attention is given to the opulent dress of Annas and Caiphas as well. And great dramatic effect is achieved by the juxtaposition of the Last Supper and the Conspiracy of the Jews, with Judas as the connecting figure.

Allegory and symbolic use of dress, staging and other more sophisticated dramatic techniques, are strikingly
manifested in the *Cornish Ordinalia*, a Passion cycle of the last half of the Fourteenth Century.\(^\text{19}\) The cycle is tri-partite: I. The Old Testament Patriarchs, II. the Passion, III. The Resurrection. The material has been carefully selected to achieve a unity of theme and tone, and arranged according to a central symbol: the Oil of Mercy as signified by the Holy Rood. This symbol is rather ingeniously incorporated, especially in the Old Testament plays. Here a tree is found by Seth while he seeks the oil of mercy. The tree is later chosen by Solomon for the ridge-tree of his Temple, but does not fit and is thrown into Bethesda Pool. Later, the tree is made into a bridge over Cedron. Of course this tree then becomes the Cross itself in the Passion.

Another mark of increased dramaturgical skill is the incorporation into the plays themselves of all extra-dramatic devices. There are no Expositors or Nuncios other than the Biblical figures of the play. God opens the cycle by recapitulating the first five days of Creation; Solomon concludes Part I, instructing the audience to return the following day for the Passion. Parts II and III are also concluded by actual characters, Nicodemus and Emperor Tiberius. Even the passage of time is handled, to some degree, by dramatic action: Adam signifies the time between the conception and the birth of Seth by deliberately walking away from Eve and
then returning to her; Moses plants three seeds (from Adam's mouth) on Mt. Tabor, and they are harvested as three full-grown rods by David.

Juxtaposition and parallel scenes also lend dramatic effect. Maximilla, a virgin who calls on the name of Christ in the Old Testament play, is accused of blasphemy and killed by four Torturers, who pre-figure the torturers of the Passion. In the Passion Play the three denials of Peter are interspersed throughout the Torture of Christ, suggesting that Christ suffered equally from both sorts of betrayal. Pilate's wife's dream in Part II is sent by Lucifer and is reminiscent of Lucifer's temptation of Eve in Part I.

A last and an important evidence of dramaturgical advancement is pointed out by Markham Harris. Characterization is achieved through dialogue and language is actually used to delineate character: God speaks only Cornish, minor persons use French, Jesus and the Old Testament Patriarchs use Latin, and Middle English is chosen for low scenes, oaths, and invective.

Although the medieval cycles are of most importance as a background for Bale's trilogy, there were also mystery plays written and performed independently. Such were the Digby Plays and the Brome Abraham and Isaac. 20

The Digby Plays21 include Herod's Killing of the Children, Mary Magdalene I&II, Conversion of St. Paul, and
The Burial and Resurrection of Christ. They are a good deal longer than a single mystery in a cycle and are much more dependent on narrative completeness and continuity. Linear time dominates almost exclusively, and representational detail is abundant. In **Herod**, the slaughter of the infants is given in realistic detail, so realistic that it precludes any figural significance. The **Mary Magdalene** and **St. Paul** plays are more suggestive of saints' lives than of cyclic segments as their titular characters assume central importance; the plays are about people, not about God's ways of achieving His will through people.

Prologues and Epilogues do not direct audience attention to God, but to the play itself. In **Herod**, the Prologue dedicates the play to St. Anne and to Mary and reminds the audience that last year they had seen **The Shepherds and the Kings**. His Epilogue promises **The Temple Debate** next year and calls for a concluding dance. In the **St. Paul**, each act is concluded with an epilogue and a dance. These extra-dramatic portions are delivered, not by a Doctor, a Priest, nor an Expositor, but by Poet-reflecting, I feel, the greater emphasis on the play as artifact.

Of the Brome **Abraham and Isaac**, H. C. Schweikert has said:

*In every way it resembles the cycle plays...*  
*On the other hand, from a literary point of view it stands in a class by itself.*  
The situation is intensely dramatic, the
characters of both father and son stand out distinctly, the human interest feature is not equalled in any other miracle play.  .  .  .

This is essentially true, and this very heightening of the human is what sets the play apart from cyclic mysteries. Abraham and Isaac become too important as people and their figural significance is totally obscured. The opening of the play serves not to recapitulate God's earlier actions nor to identify Abraham with other patriarchs. Instead, it only reveals the greater importance which he attaches to his son, Isaac.

I love no-thyng so myche, I wysse, Excepe thin owyne selffe, der Fader of blysse, As Ysaac her, my owyne swete sone.

(11.13-15)

God's demand, too, is motivated only by a curiosity to "assay" Abraham's heart, "whether that he be stedfast or noo." And Isaac is all frightened, albeit obedient, child as he says after his escape:

I was never soo afayrd before
As I have byn at  yn hyll.
But, be my feth, fader, I swere
I wyll never-more cume there
But yt be a- ens my wyll.

These are hardly the words of a type of Christ.

The play has become an entertaining, and very sentimental, exemplum for the instruction of the audience in present behavior rather than an illustration of God's cyclic omnipotence. For the Doctor concludes of "thys solom story"
that

Yt ys good lernyng to lernd and lewyd

... 
For thys story schoyt owe (her)
How we schuld kepe to owr po(we)re
Goddes commawments with owt grochyng.
(11.437-440-442)

To learn and to obey "with out grochyng" is a far cry from
becoming a participant in a re-inactment of God's plan of
salvation for mankind. The Brome playwright and the Digby
as well have sacrificed vastness for verisimilitude and
divine sapience for human sentiment. Cut off from the support
of a cyclic structure, the mystery play became, of necessity,
more human, more temporal, and more detailed.

Somewhat later, in the universities, Biblical drama
took another direction. Hardison describes these university
products as "the backwaters of Sixteenth Century Latin
Biblical drama." There was the Christian Terence school,
given impetus, perhaps, by Conrad Celtes' 1501 edition of
Hrosvitha's plays and contributed to by schoolmasters such as
Macropedius, Crocus, and Gnaphæus. But more contemporary
with Bale was Nicholas Grimald, who produced two extant
Biblical plays: Christus Redivisus (c. 1539) and Archipro-
pheta (pub. 1548). His Latin Resurrection play, Christus
Redivisus, is lyric and heavily Virgilian: Magdalene's
lament is a formal elegy; Christ's Harrowing of Hell suggests
a classical descent into the underworld from whence He will
lead the human race; Cacodemon (agent of evil) sends his messenger Alecto to earth to bribe the soldiers just as Juno had sent her to create chaos in *The Aeneid*. The total effect of the play is a quiet, aesthetically pleasing and classic account which has substituted restraint for reverence. The *Archipropheta*, a Latin tragedy of John the Baptist, has more warmth, and is more reminiscent of the earlier vernacular plays in that both a Chorus and Jehovah supply extra-dramatic commentary. Grimald has added a great deal of non-Biblical matter, most from Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*. As in the vernacular non-cycle plays, the titular figure is given central importance. The Chorus comments on John's character, a Court of Inquiry about John reveals even more apocryphal matter concerning him, and he is given several speeches of high nobility and dignity. Of course, this is necessary for the creation of a classical tragedy and is so successful that Grimald is required to produce Jehovah again in Act V to dispel the air of final tragedy so incongruous in a Christian world view. Jehovah explains that John's apparent tragedy is really a triumph, but the gloom is only partially ameliorated as the disciples grieve in the concluding burial scene.

Other consciously aesthetic and classical elements are the fool Gelasimus, more Roman than English, the description of Herodias modelled on the Song of Solomon, the romanticization of the love of Herod and Herodias, and especially the
psychological motivation supplied for their behaviour.

Grimald's plays turn Biblical drama into art, but Sixteenth Century playwrights rarely followed his example. The exigencies of Reformation politics created a milieu in which the conventions of medieval Biblical drama were realigned to serve Protestant polemics as effectively as they had earlier served Catholic didactic aims. In Latin Biblical drama, Foxe's Christus Triumphans (1556) illustrates this redirection of emphasis, but more relevant here is an incomplete English play, The Resurrection of our Lord, of uncertain date and authorship. The editors cautiously warn us that although it is tempting to attribute the play to Bale, "beyond noting that in the list he has left us of his comedies in the vernacular he mentions two 'de sepultura et resurrectione Christi' it would be unsafe to go." (pp. vi-vii) Davies, however, is more convinced of Bale's authorship:

certainly the kind of play that he would have written at this time: the mild reproof of those who feared that reading the Scriptures would make them heretics, the exhortation to the people to rise from the old life as Christ rose from the dead, the sentiment that Christ is not to be feared because he appears in a new and strange form, and the expository simplicity of the other direct addresses to the audience--all these suggest a parish priest trying to dispel rural prejudice in the spirit of Henry the Eighth's reformation. The laboured didacticism and the scholarly argument also point to Bale's hand.
The play was written for performance on two consecutive days. The 'first dayes playe' recounts the actual resurrection and the second concerns itself with Christ's appearances. Although the characters are all Biblical, new associations are created. The Jewish leaders are consistently referred to as Bishops, and instead of cyclic figural significance they take on more contemporary topical reference when the Appendix (the Commentator) says of them:

Would God their were non such now which doth plaie the same which disivayes the people, for readinge of the Gospel lest it make them Heretikes, in my conceite rather whiche can reade and may, and yet will not reade them when the worde ytselfe doth ravishe much better than the wordes of them doe, which doe expounde ytt; therfore I counsell everie man, to seeke his owne profett and as Christ is risen from the deade, by his father's power so let us rise from oure oule life, to walke anew manner. (pp. 10-11)

Topical allusions are more abundant in the 'Second Dayes Playe', for here the aim of the dramatist is not to discredit the Jewish/Roman leaders, but to refute certain doctrinal positions. This requires scenes for which there is no actual Scriptural record, a situation of some embarrassment to Appendix, who apologetically offers "our invention" to the judgment of the viewers. One of these 'invented' conversations is between Christ and Peter and has as its central message Peter's denial of his Master, thus indirectly denying Peter's Supremacy. Most significant is Christ's
explicit comparison, on the road to Emaus, of Moses' Law and His own Law, and His elucidation of the 'priesthood of Melchisedek.' He defines the last supper as "a communion of the elect, and a thankefull memorye" (p. 27). And He explains the Scriptures "which have been obscured with the false glosses of scribes and pharisees, vayne Decayvers" (p. 30).

Thus, the dramatist illustrates several Protestant tenets: Christ Himself instituted the new-learning, and conceived of his Holy Supper as memorial rather than sacrifice; and the Bishops stand always as enemies of the true Way and as obscurers of the Word. Bale's play it may or may not be, but certainly the themes are those he did incorporate into the plays which we know definitely to be his, three of which form the only known Protestant cycle (#27).

The three extant plays, however, are in themselves a cycle, interdependent and unified, differing from earlier Biblical drama only where propagandistic goals required. Roston has cited Bale's plays as the first Renaissance Biblical drama but notes that they stand so close to the medieval tradition that they mark only a small, if important advance. In Chambers' estimation "Bale is simply adopting and Protestantizing the miracle play." This "Protestantizing" as far as theme and content has been analyzed by Robert Duncan, who cites five major contextual themes in Bale's drama:
1. Attack on the moral behaviour of the hierarchy
2. Satire of Papal Ceremony
3. Attack on papal doctrine
4. Protestant doctrine on the authority of the king
5. Protestant view of the Scripture and of Faith as dual means of salvation.

But how is this contextual concentration incorporated into the drama? Does the shift in doctrine create any significant differences in the form of the cycle play? A close examination of Bale's cycle plays and a comparison with their equivalents in earlier cycles are the means to answering these questions.

A Tragedy or enterlude manysting the chiefe promyses of God unto man by all ages in the olde lawe, from the fall of Adam to the incarnacyon of the lorde Jesus Christe, generally held to be the introduction to the cycle, is a series of seven dialogues between God (Pater Coelestis) and various Biblical figures: Adam, Noah, Moses, David, Isaiah, and John the Baptist. In the Prologue, Bale proclaims his purpose to be the spreading of the knowledge contained in the Scripture, without which "man must needs be lost." He warns his audience that these are weighty matters,

Of whom ye may look to have no trifling sport
In fancies feigned, nor such-like gaudy gear;
But the things that shall your inward stomach cheer,
To rejoice in God for your justification,
And alone in Christ to hope for your salvation.  (pp. 85-86)

Thus, from the beginning, Bale declares his central theme: the Grace of God and Man's Justification by Faith alone.

The play itself is quite symmetrical. In each act, Pater Coelstis expresses his dissatisfaction with Man and threatens punishment. In response to this, the central character pleads with God for a reconsideration and is granted a promise. Each act ends with an anthem of praise, and these songs have been identified by Chambers and by Miller as the great O Antiphons which precede and are repeated after the Magnificat on the seven days before Christmas Eve. These antiphons are thus quite appropriate in a play whose purpose is to see in God's Promises an anticipation of Christ, for they summarize all the prophecies about the coming Redeemer. Too, the Advent traditionally had three levels of anticipation: the historical birth, the continual birth in the hearts of believers, and the eschatological advent at the time of Judgment. Bale uses the antiphons, not only to lend coherence and intensification to his prophet play, but also to prepare his audience for the next plays where the "boming of Christ" means, in the allegorical sense, the Reformation and, in the analogical sense, the heavenly Church universal to result.  32

No earlier cycle play has exactly this cast nor this structure. Adam is always treated separately in the Creation
and Fall plays; Noah is given a play of his own; Abraham is most often depicted in the sacrifice of Isaac; Moses is represented in a play of his own, usually receiving and reporting the Ten Commandments. David and Isaiah appear only in the Prophet plays of the Hegge and Wakefield cycles and in the Prophet of the Chester Play of the Three Kings. However, combining all the Old Testament figures in one play is not a radical modification. Marius Septet's theory holds that the separate Old Testament cycle plays had originated from various scenes in a Processus Prophetarum and we have seen the same technique in the first play of the Cornish Ordinalia.

Of course, in the medieval cycles the Old Testament figures are selected because they pre-figure Christ. Bale's play is no exception, and to the traditional pre-figuration value of the patriarchs and prophets he adds a specifically Protestant element. As Roston remarks, the Protestants felt a deepened kinship with these Old Testament figures because of their personal covenants. The Patriarchs became "a theological sanction for Protestant independence and rejection of the priests' intermedation." This emphasis on covenant typology explains Bale's exclusion of such stories as that of Cain and Abel, or Abraham and Isaac, for in these the covenant motif is not dominant. Bale's only significant innovation is his inclusion of John the Baptist, for the extant cycle limit their prophets to Old Testament figures. However, Kolve points
out that the lost Norwich cycle had used a six-ages structure: Creation, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, and Christ. He suggests that Isaiah and John were substituted by Bale because Christ "could not be played in post-Reformation England." ¹³⁴

Kolve's is a singularly inadequate explanation, for Bale does indeed depict Christ in the next two plays of his cycle, written and performed at the same time as God's Promises. Bale's more likely motive in choosing Isaiah is that he saw an opportunity here for using Old Testament history to convey one of his pet theories--the role of the king. In Act VI, Pater Coeléstis complains to Isaiah that he has given the people sufficient moral guidance:

First they had fathers, then they had patriarchs,
Then dukes, then judges, to their guides and monarchs,
Now they have stout kings; yet are they wicked still.  (p. 114)

This prompts a review of the good and bad kings of the Old Testament and affords Bale a chance to deliver lines such as

When the prince is good the people are better;
And as he is nought, their vices are the greater.  (p. 115)

The inclusion of John the Baptist is more obviously functional. He is indeed a prophet of Christ's coming and he is to figure importantly in the next play, the Baptism. One of Bale's early works had been a Life of John in 14 books, and
Chambers feels that there must have been "some quaint verbal analogy" in Bale's mind between himself and the Baptist.\textsuperscript{35}

It is more likely that Bale's interest in John is the fruit of his life and education in Norwich, whose large wool-trade revered John as patron saint.

Although Bale's characters and his processional structure are not significantly different from earlier cycles, the over-all effect of the play is. Roston says that the play departs from medieval form (although he does not mean form but rather focus) in that

The Prophet Play aimed at proving from Biblical sources the authenticity of Christianity in face of the heathen, and more specifically Jewish belief. Bale's purpose is to use these same sources as justification for the Protestant claim of divine election on the basis of the covenant. . . .

behind much of the dialog (is) . . .

a theological dispute concerning the place of grace in Christianity.\textsuperscript{36}

Bale's position is quite clear and his spokesman is none other than Pater Coelestis, who reiterates the all-sufficiency of His Grace throughout.

But Grace is not the only theme of this play. Even more effective as unifying device is the pervasive light-darkness image. On the title-page of the play is an allusion to I John: "This light yet shineth in the darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not." Noah, who receives God's promise for his righteousness, says in his antiphon:
O clear sun of justice and heavenly righteousness, come hither and illumine the prisoner sitting now in the dark prison and shadow of eternal death.
(p. 97)

The image of a light in the darkness appears again in Act VII, and in the Epilogue is identified as Faith: "The light of our Faith makes this thing evident." This Epilogue makes a strong statement of the necessity of this light, faith, for justification; man's works and his will are "proved small treasure."

The very sameness of each act heightens the small differences within. Thus, each figure is in a slightly different relationship with God; each receives a promise which is an amplification of those before, and each is given a different sign as token of the promise. All build to the coming of Christ. Adam, because of his remorse, is promised that Eve's seed shall slay the serpent and clear him from all wickedness; the outward sign of this will be Eve's sorrow in child-bearing. Noah, for his righteousness, is promised salvation and given the rainbow as a sign. Abraham's faith wins the promise of patriarchal fame, of which the sign is circumcision. It is interesting that, unlike the earlier cycle emphasis on the Isaac story, here Abraham's faithfulness is depicted in his pleading for Sodom and Gomorrah, probably because this supplication could be more easily handled in the dialogue structure of this play and because it involved a
direct Man/God relationship. Moses' zeal gains for him the promise of a prophet to come whose sign is the Passover Lamb, and David's repentance brings forth a promise of a royal fruit which will issue from his body and of whom the Temple is a sign. Isaiah, for his fidelity in the face of idolatry, is given promise of a "bright blossom" from the root of Jesse, who will bring the spirit of the Lord. His sign is that "a maid of Israel / Shall conceive and bear that Lord Immanuel."

The accumulative effect is obvious. Each promise is more specifically a promise of the Messiah and each seems chronologically more imminent. In fact, Bale has re-ordered the antiphons to add to this effect. Time lapse in the play is handled in two ways. God's words at the beginning of each act indicate passage of time. For example, in Act II Pater Coelestis says "I have been moved to strike man diversely / Since I left Adam." Elsewhere the human figures often make reference to the past and summarize events which have intervened. Also, it seems that Bale intended God to exit at the end of each act, leaving the human figure alone for a final speech and an antiphon. This exit and the reappearance of God serves to convey a cyclic passage of time, the idea of the ages of man. Each act is an advent of God into the linear time of man, and each act suggests both God's atemporality by its parallelism and the eschatological progression of linear time by the incremental repetition of the antiphons and
the intensification of God's displeasure.

The structure and effect of Act VII deviates slightly.

God is not so vindictive as in his preceding opening utterances, for he says:

Rigour and hardness I have now set apart,
Minding from henceforth to win men evermore;
By wonderful kindness to break his stubborn heart. (p. 119)

John the Baptist is not exactly rewarded with a promise; rather he is elected and told that before his birth he was "endued with grace." In reaction to this John is much like the figures of the early mysteries, declaring his inadequacy and his lack of confidence. Whereas the other figures in Bale's play have debated with God in all the "rational self-confidence of a Renaissance Humanist,"37 John says "Unmeet, Lord! I am, Quia puer ego sum." John is not given a promise but the role of baptizing the fulfillment of all the Promises, and his sign is to be the Holy Ghost descending as a Dove.

Structurally, this play is a good bit more sophisticated than a true cycle play. Although its function is to introduce a cycle, it has amazing internal unity and continuity. As for dramatic effectiveness, the judgment is more difficult. As Bale promised, there is no humor, no "gaudish gear." Nor is there much other attempt at naturalistic effect. Noah is a good example. Bale's Noah does not do anything. He does not built a ship nor does he argue with his wife. All the emphasis
is on God's decision to save Noah and his family; not on the act of such salvation. The same is true of Abraham; Bale avoids the emotional potentials of the Isaac story in favor of the bargaining with God over the citizens of Sodom and Gomorrah. This, of course, serves to emphasize Bale's concept of salvation by grace and faith rather than by works. It is this sort of internal re-direction of emphasis that most characterizes Bale's modification of the received medieval form.

Audience involvement is rather openly sought in the remarks of Baleus Prolocutor in the Prologue and Epilogue and more smoothly achieved by invitations to the audience to join in the antiphons ending each act. Both Bale's account of the performance of the cycle and the MS. itself indicate the use of an organ and a chorus. This musical heightening of audience participation is not novel, for hymns were used in the Hegge plays; nor can I agree with Blatt who explains Bale's use of music as an attempt "to place his text in a framework as close to the ritual of the Church as possible, to sugar the pill of the new learning to such elements among his spectators who might not be convinced." 38 Bale, even as early as 1538, was not prone to "sugar-coating" his messages.

Perhaps the most obvious difference in this and earlier cycle plays is the heavy emphasis on doctrine. The play is pre-occupied with grace and justification by faith, and
although these plays are less overtly anti-Catholic than Bale's other works, suggestions of his ardent Protestantism are evident.

**Idolatry receives constant attack:**

**Act III:**  Ninus...by the devil's illusion
Through image-making upraised idolatry
Me to dishonour  (p. 98)

**Act IV:**  Laban to idols gave false reverence.
(p. 103)

**Act V:**  I cannot abide the vice of idolatry,
Though I should suffer all other
villainy.  (p. 109)

Act VI is devoted entirely to the sin of idolatry. And John
says in Act VII that with the coming of Christ, man will no longer be able to turn from God to idols. God's own con-
demnation of idolatry at the opening of Act VI is the strongest suggestion of topical anti-papal reference in the play:

```
I brought up children from their first infancy,
Which now despiseth my godly instruction.
An ox knoweth his lord, an ass his master's
duty:
But Israel will not know me nor my conditions.
Oh froward people! given to all superstitions-
Unnatural children, expert in blasphemies,
Provoketh me to hate by their idolatries.
Take heed to my words, ye tyrants of Sodoma;
In vain ye offer your sacrifice to me.
Discontent I am with you, beasts of Gomorrah,
And have no pleasure when I your offerings
see;
I abhor your fasts and your solemnity,
For your traditions my ways are set apart;
Your works are in vain, I hate them from the
heart.  (p. 113)
```
Superstitions, idolatries, feasts, vain sacrifices—all these accusations are the common stock of Protestant polemics against the Roman Church. Also, Isaiah laments that God's holy city is "turned upside down" because of "their fantasies" and he pleads for true prophets. These "upside-down" conditions are those always associated with the age of Antichrist, another favorite motif of the Protestant polemicists. As this Act immediately preceded the coming of Christ heralded by John in Act VII, it is likely that Bale intended an association with the Antichristic era which the Protestants liked to use as the equivalent of the age prior to the Reformation. Though it would have been anachronistic to allude more directly to the Roman Church here (and Bale is much more careful about anachronism than were earlier dramatists), these condemnations of idol-worship along with attacks on sexual perversion are the same ones openly directed at monks and priests in Bale's other work.

Another familiar Protestant theme, the doctrine of Election, underscores much of God's Promises. God's grace alone makes things possible; man's will is impotent. When God agrees to save Lot's family, He is very careful to say it is done "of me and not of them." And when John says he will accept his role of messenger, God replies "Long ere I made thee I made thee predestinate." In case the message still remained obscure, Bale ends the play with these lines:
For all the world's sin alone Christ
paid the price;
In his only death was man's life always
resting.
And not in wel-works, nor yet in man's
deserving.

... .
Where is now free-will, whom the
hypocrites commend?
Whereby they report they may, at
their own pleasure,
Do good of themselves, though great
faith be absent,
And have good intents their madness
with to measure!
The will of flesh is proved here small
treasure;
And so is man's will, for the grace
of God doth all. (pp. 124-25)

The other plays of this cycle are much simpler in
structure and even more analogous to earlier cycle plays, al-
though they, too, contain what Roston describes as "a sub-
stratum of mild anti-Catholic polemic, ... an allusive anti-
papalism."39

A Brede comedy or Enterlude of Johan Baptystes preachynge
in the wilderness, openyng the crafty assaultes of the hypo-
crites, and with the glorious Baptysme of the Lord Jesus Christ
fulfills the promise of the last act of God's Promises, for in
it John carries out the role assigned him by Pater Coelestis
and receives his sign, the Holy Spirit in the form of the Dove.
This play, like God's Promises, is prefaced by a direct state-
ment from Baleus Prolocutor. The time is established as the
present and the immediate future: "will now begin," "Christ
here submit." This play's relationship to God's Promises is explained:

The law and the Prophets draweth now
fast to an end,
Which were but shadows and figures of
his coming. (p. 129)

The preface ends on a more direct homiletic note as the audience is instructed to imitate the meekness of Christ and to despise the hypocrites' "devilish practice."

The title is appropriate, for John dominates the play. Christ appears only late in the play and his baptism serves as the culmination of John's preaching. In fact, Christ takes on dimensions which suggest that He now represents the Church Universal whose way has been cleared and whose coming heralded by the Reformation, embodied in John. The Pharisees and Saducees become those papists who oppose the Reformation and the other characters are the converts to Protestantism. It is John who argues theology with the Pharisee and Saducee and who preaches to the soldier (Miles Armatus), the publican, and the common people (Turba Vulgaris). And it is John who ends the play with an ecstatic response and an invitation to the audience to join in a song of praise to the Trinity.

Bale's play follows Luke 3:1-22 (Tyndale) almost exactly. Every major image of the gospel account has been utilized, generally in the same order, whereas each of the corresponding cycle plays (the Chester cycle has no Baptism) adds non-Scriptural
material and each seems to have a different doctrinal emphasis.

The York play is concerned with defining the role of Baptism. John questions the baptism of Christ, who is sinless, but is told that Christ is a mirror for man. After the act of baptism, Christ sanctifies the baptismal water for all time (ll.100-06) and states pointedly that Baptism will henceforth be essential to salvation (ll.162-65).

The Hegge "Baptism" has much less preliminary matter. Jesus enters quite early and is recognized and hailed by John as the Lamb of God. The Virgin Birth and the Passion to come are described and God speaks to all, whereas the Gospels seem to indicate that the Voice from heaven was heard by Christ alone. Another significant difference in the Hegge play is Jesus' prediction (ll.120-30) of his temptation, probably motivated by the absence of a Temptation play in that cycle. The Hegge dramatist has structured his play to lead up to John's homily on the necessity of "contryscion, schryfte, and penauns" which is to be exemplified by Christ in the wilderness. To emphasize the need, two images which occur much earlier in the Gospel account--the hewing down of the barren tree and the casting out of chaff in a winnowing barn--are transferred to the end of the play to serve as warnings to the unshriven.

The Wakefield play also places great importance on the sacramental aspect of Baptism. John baptizes Jesus "with oil
and cream" rather than by immersion, and adds that

This is a worthy sacrament
There are six others, no more so
The which thyself to earth has sent.

John's concluding sermon exhorts the audience to

Think how in baptism ye are sworn
To be God's servants without a nay;

In Bale's play there is a decided shift of emphasis.
The Protestants, basically opposed to the Catholic sacraments, had somehow to defend Baptism and the Eucharist without accepting the others. In this play Bale is trying to achieve this sort of distinction between a physical baptism and Christ's spiritual baptism. Thus, the play devotes much of its time to John's preaching and his own practice of baptism. In the opening scenes, John preaches to Turba Vulgeris, to a publican, and to Miles Armatus. Each confesses his sin, is baptized by John, and is given counsel for a better life. These scenes are found in Luke, and Bale makes very few changes. However, in place of the simple Gospel distinction:

I baptise you wyth water; butt a stronger than I commeth...; he will baptyze you with the Holy Ghost and with fyre,

Bale writes:

I wash in water, but remission is of him.
My baptism is a sign of outward mortifying;
A grace is his baptism of inward quickening.
The baptism of me is the baptism of repentance;
His baptism in faith bringeth full recoverance.
My doctrine is hard, and full of threatenings;
His words are demure, replete with wholesome blessings.
I fear the conscience, with terror of the law; 
He, by the Gospel, man's soul will gently draw. 
A knowledge of sin the baptism of me to teach, 
Forgiveness by faith will he hereafter preach. 
I open the sore; he bringeth the remedy, 
I stir the conscience; he doth all pacify. 
As eaaye saith, I am the crier's voice; 
But he is the word and message of rejoice. 
The lantern I am; he is the very light; 
I prepare the way, but he maketh all things perfect. (p. 137)

On hearing this distinction, a listening Pharisee suspects "new learning," and his companion, a Sadducee, proposes that they examine him in a "somewhat crafty manner."

For this scene Bale had gone to Matthew's account of the Baptism (Chapter 3). These two figures bear the brunt of Bale's anti-Catholicism. They are "false and deceitful," and have "an outward pretense of holiness." The Pharisee is guilty of corrupting the holy Scriptures with "pestilent traditions." The Sadducee, who claims lawfulness, is also condemned:

Outward works ye have, but in spirit nothing, 
Ye walk in the letter like painted hypocrites. (p. 139)

For these two, John saves his most eloquent vituperation:

Ye generation of vipers! ye murtherers of the prophets! 
Ye Lucifers proud, and usurpers of high seats! 
Never was serpent more stinging than ye be; 
More full of poison, nor inward cruelty! 
All your study is to pursue the verity; 
Such is your practice, deceit and temerity. 
And yet none more vile, nor fuller of negligence.

...
Neither your good works, nor merits of
your fathers,
Your fastings, long prayers, with other
holy behavers,
Shall you, afore God, be able to justify
Your affections inward, unless ye do
mortify. (pp. 139-40)

Unlike the common people, the publican, and the soldier,
these sinners remain unmoved by John's plea for repentance.
They will have no part of "this new-fangled school" and fear
that "this new-learning" will only lead to insurrection.

After their departure, Jesus enters and declares his
baptism by John an act to teach humility to worldly people.
This provides a clear contrast to the Pharisee who "abhors
to be of the common sort." John understands Christ as the
fulfillment of the old baptism: "Now thou art present, it is
meet my baptism cease." But Christ recommends that his
baptism be continued as a "livery token" of those who follow
Him. At this point, even God becomes partisan, insisting
that

Alone it is He that Me doth pacify;
In men's traditions look ye have no affiance;
He alone knoweth my purpose towards you,
And none else but he. . .

(p. 147)

John concludes the "day most splendiferous" with joyful
song.

The play is an obvious case of restructuring and re-
emphasizing to suit Bale's Protestant ideas.
To make the play (Bale) took his Corpus Christi model, his Bible story, his knowledge of exegesis, and his conviction that God made types of the Reformation.40

The sacraments which receive major emphasis in earlier plays are never mentioned as sacraments. The physical Baptism is merely a token, a badge. Although following Luke in every detail, Bale goes to Matthew for the villains of the play, the Pharisee and the Sadducee. The warnings and condemnations delivered to the general audience in the early plays are reserved specifically for these unrepentant figures whose pride is vigorously contrasted with Jesus' almost democratic humility and meekness.

The goal of this playwright is not an audience involvement which will lead to a better understanding of baptism or of the good life, but rather a conscious effort to turn audience reaction against figures such as the villains. The audience is given an opportunity to identify with the first sinners and to partake in their confession and remorse. Thus, they can listen in righteous anger to the arrogance of the Pharisee and Sadducee. Although nothing is known of Bale's staging, it is quite likely he would have costumed the two in clerical robes as he does the villainous figures in his other plays.

Bale also seeks to discredit the two by their use of low terms in contrast with the more stately and formal diction of the rest of the play. John is told to "Go, teach thy old
shoes!" and described as "a jolly Robin Bell" who "with a little help, of an heretic he will smell." The contrast thus achieved between their mode and John's more earnest tones is similar to that of the early moralities, such as Mankind, where Mercy's rather pompous speech is juxtaposed to the more naturalistic language of the Vice. Such lowness is indicative of a sinful (and, in Bale, a Catholic) inner state.

But Bale was not yet content. His Epilogue is a specific spelling out of the anti-Catholic allusions in the play. First, the people are warned against "proud hearts, high minds" and told that God only "regardeth the spirit of lowliness." Next, Bale points out that John did not preach "man's traditions nor his own holy life" but Christ Jesus, which message was received by "the sinful commonalty / Publicans and sinners, but no painted Pharisee." Bale deliberately rejects the traditional medieval representation of John as hermit:

The way that John taught was not to wear hard clothing, To say long prayers, not to wander in the desert, Or to eat wild locusts. No! he never taught such thing. His mind was that faith should purify the heart. My ways (saith the Lord) with men's have no part- Men's ways are all things that are done without faith; God's way is his word, as the holy Scripture saith.  
(pp. 148-49)

This is typical of Bale's anti-monasticism; he felt that the ascetic life, fasting, contemplation, etc. were only outward
subterfuges, too often substituted for true faith and a knowledge of the Scripture. And finally the audience is warned against false teachers:

Give ear unto Christ; let man's vain fantasies go,
As the father bade by his most high commandment;
Hear neither Francis, Benedict, nor Bruno,
Albert, Dominic, for they new rulers invent;
Believe neither Pope, nor priest of his consent;
Follow Christ's Gospel, and therein fructify
To the praise of God, and his son Jesus glory.  (p. 149)

This insistence on faith and the Scripture as man's only guide is further elaborated in the last play of the cycle, *A brefe Comedy or Enterlude concerning the Temptation of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, by Satan in the desert*. Bale has used Matthew 4:1-11 as his basic text, but his expansions of this material are unique. The earlier cycle plays (Wakefield has no Temptation play) of the Temptation are all much more concise, stressing Satan's reactions of frustration and defeat, and the nature of the temptations; gluttony, vainglory, and covetousness. There are no significant variations in their treatment of the story nor in their tone. The Chester play is at great pains to point out figural relations with Adam's temptation and sin, while both York and Hegge stress the exemplary value of the act and the
sufficiency of man to withstand similar temptations. Bale finds more value in the story, making of it not only an exemplar of faith as shield against the devil, but an indictment of fasting and the contemplative life and an attack on those who mis-use the Scripture.

The Prolocutor's opening lines relate this play to *John the Baptist* and remind the audience again that Christ is to be "our only teacher." After a traditional summary of events, the speaker points out explicit lessons to be learned from what is to be seen:

> Learn first, in this act that we, whom
> Christ doth call,
> Ought not to follow the fantasies of man,
> But the Holy Ghost, as our guide special;
> 
> For assaults of Satan learn here the remedy:
> Take the Word of God; let that be your defence;
> So will Christ teach you, in our next comedy;
> Earnestly print it in your quick intelligence;

(p. 154)

Whereas all earlier cycle plays of the Temptation present Satan first, stressing the urgency of his desire to forestall Christ's redemptive potential, Bale lets Jesus set the tone of the play. Christ's reasoning is consistently Protestant, middle-class, and pragmatic. He assures the audience that he fasts only to provoke Satan's intent, not as an exemplar to them. Rather he would teach
By the word of God, which must be your
defense
Rather than fastings, to withstand his
violence. (p. 155)

Only after this clarification does Bale allow Satan to appear
and to explain his motives. The tempter here appears not in
the demon cap and bifurcated feet of the medieval devil, but
in the robe of a hermit—"seeming religious, devout, and sad
in my gear" (p. 156).

The temptations begin immediately. The suggestion to
turn the stones into bread is countered with Christ's
assurance that God can provide. But Bale complicates each of
the temptations with issues more peculiar to his own doc-
trinal ends. Satan, solicitous, urges

    Ye should your body regard,
    And not indiscreetly to cast yourself
    away— (p. 157)

After all, says Satan, if you ever preach the truth "the
bishops will ye murther," a far more subtle appeal than the
assuaging of physical hunger. But Jesus quotes Scripture to
refute Satan (Deuteronomy 8) reminding him that to "recreate
my body / And neglect God's word" would be blasphemy. To
Jesus' dependence on the Scripture as his rule, Satan
responds:

    Scripture? I know none; for I am but an
    hermit, I.
    I may say to you it is no part of our
    study;
    We religious men live all in contemplation:
    Scriptures to study is not our occupation;
It longeth to the doctors. Howbeit, I may say to you:
As blind are they as we in the understanding now. (p. 159)

The second temptation also works more subtly than the traditional forthright challenge to leap from the Temple heights. Satan suggests that the Voice Christ heard at the Baptism was perhaps a deception which might be tested with the leap. Furthermore, says Satan in triumph, the precedent for this challenge is Scriptural. Jesus, still calm and pragmatic, replies to the suggestion to jump:

Truly that need not; here is other remedy
To the ground to go than to fall down foolishly.
Here are gresings made, to go up and down thereby-
What need I then leap to the earth, presumptuously? (p. 161)

It is difficult to know how Bale intended this to be played, for it reads as humor, yet humor in the role of Jesus is certainly not characteristic of Bale. Even the earlier plays confined comedy in this play to the devil, stressing his dismay and his desperation. But humor or no, the mood soon passes into a typical Balean attack on those who pervert the Scripture to their own ends:

In no wise ye ought the scriptures to deprave;
But, as they lie whole, so ought ye them to have;
No more take ye here than serve for your vain purpose,
Leaving out the best, as ye should trifle of gloss.
Ye mind not, by this, towards God to edify;  
But of sincere faith, to corrupt the innocence.  (p. 161)

Satan has quoted out of context, omitted words, and purposely stopped short of the inclusion of a phrase detrimental to his cause. Then Jesus returns to a more traditional ground and rejects the temptation with the familiar "Thou shalt in no wise tempt God presumptuously." Christ goes on to list various sorts of people who do tempt God, including those "that vow presumptuously, / Not having His gift to keep their continency." A favorite target of Bale's complaint in later writings is the vow of clerical celibacy. (His first act on leaving the Carmelites was to marry.)

Satan now prepares for the third temptation by leading Jesus up the high mountain. As always, Jesus follows meekly, a means of conveying Bale's strong conviction about passivity as the appropriate role in the face of worldly evil. As Baleus Prolocutor had said earlier, "Resist not the world, but with meek patience / If ye be of Christ." But when Satan offers the wealth of the world in exchange for worship, Jesus finally asserts himself in righteous anger "O venomous serpent! damnation is thy reward."

Although Bale's text seems to have been Matthew, he borrows from Luke 4:13 the idea of a veiled threat in the devil's departure. This affords Bale an opportunity for his most open attack on Catholicism. Satan prophesies:
Ere four years be past I shall you to your father send
If Pharisees and scribes can do anything thereto-
False priests and bishops, with my other servants no.
Though I have hindrance, it will be but for a season;
I doubt not thine own, hereafter will work some treason;
Thy vicar at Rome I think will be my friend: I defy thee therefore and take thy words but as wind.
He shall me worship, and have the world to reward;
That thou here forsakest he will most highly regard.
God's word will he tread underneath his foot for ever;
And the hearts of man from the truth thereof dissever;
Thy faith will he hate, and slay thy flock.
(p. 166)

After this the ministering angels come, comfort Christ, and remind the audience that all this is done for man, so that he might "Take the shield of faith and learn to resist the devil."
The perserverance Baleus Prolocutor fires one parting shot at the enemies who:

...from the people will have
The Scriptures of God, which are the mighty weapon
That Christ left them here, their souls from Hell to save,
And throw them headlonges into the devil's dominion?
If they be no devils I say there are devils none.
They bring in fasting, but they leave out Scriptorum est;
Chalk they give for gold, such friends are they to the beast. (p. 170)
Bale's is an unfinished cycle true, and perhaps fair judgment of it as a cycle is impossible. But it is difficult to imagine a village full of folk coming together year after year to hear John curse the Pharisee or Jesus quote Deuteronomy to Satan. It is difficult to identify with characters who talk too much and leave nothing to our empathy. The York John the Baptist who is first seen alone and deserted because his preaching has not done any good is a far more human and sympathetic figure than Bale's rather self-righteous preacher.

Especially lacking is humor, although it must be said that these particular plays are short on humor in the early cycles as well, since Scriptural narrative was so full that amplification was almost unnecessary. Bale, however, had a different situation, one in which humor was more dangerous. The early medieval dramatist wrote for a unified community of faith. His goal was the re-affirmation of already existent values; everyone knew bad from good and humor was no threat to a character's integrity. Bale, on the other hand, was attempting to create a unified community of faith by molding and directing attitudes. He had to label each character carefully; there could be no ambiguity in the value systems of his plays. As a result, his good characters are too right; his bad ones are too sinister. The ease and familiarity of the Corpus Christi plays is simply not available to the post-
Reformation writer who must closely guide his audience response, persuading rather than merely presenting.

Baleus Prolocutor is obviously a man concerned more with doctrine than with dramatic art. He is far too obvious at times, yet no more so than the Chester Doctor. However, Bale has not made any startling departures from the form of the medieval cycle play. He has been content to re-shuffle his points of emphasis, to realign the figural significance of characters, to filter out all the Marian and sacramental allusions, and to give the good characters more speeches and a more active, controlling force in the play.

Statements of anti-Catholicism within the plays proper are not greatly obtrusive and can usually be assigned to pagans and Jews as well. Probably more obvious is Bale's Protestant insistence on the Scripture and on Faith as the only means of man's salvation. In spite of this, Bale's plays are closely tied to Biblical accounts, and his major dramatic techniques are those of the medieval cycle. An early Tudor audience, seeing the original plays in 1538, might well have been bored, but never in doubt as to what was before them. Bale's doctrinal exploitation of the play affects mainly its tone and its characterization, yet does not destroy the generic identity of the plays as cycle drama.

Hardison calls Bale's Protestant cycle a "vestigial survival like the Stonyhurst pageants" and indicates that the
influence on Tudor drama was slight. However, Ruth Blackburn sees Tudor Biblical drama as a vital and productive field, producing twenty-five new Scriptural plays between 1520 and 1603 and only declining after 1570.

Unfortunately, no other plays of cyclic nature are extant, so that a final judgment is impossible. However, Bale certainly turned the medieval mystery genre to his own Protestant purposes and perhaps, had not the needs of strolling small groups of players given the advantage to the morality genre instead, he might have shown his fellow Protestant polemists a valuable means of turning the enemy's weapons against him.
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CHAPTER IV

BALE’S MODIFICATIONS OF AND INFLUENCE
ON THE MORALITY PLAY

Bale’s Contribution to the Morality

Genre: Three Lawes

The Sixteenth-Century dramatists received another
dramatic genre from the Fifteenth-Century--the morality play. Although this form, too, promulgated orthodox theology, it
is clearly distinguishable from the cycle play. Whereas the
cycle play attempted to engage the audience in a common act
of celebration and thereby to stabilize a common faith, the
morality was more directly homiletic, seeking to inculcate in
its viewers certain moral or ethical precepts. As Farnham
points out:

Where other religious drama might try
to realize the facts of sacred history,
the moral drama enforced the doctrine
preached from the pulpit and made the
preacher, in whatever guise, its
chorus.1

The cycles presented a contrast between divine order
and man’s weakness, establishing a vertical tension and
moving always toward a total and eschatological revelation of
God's will on the Judgment Day. The morality, on the other hand, concentrated on a localized contest between good and evil in an individual life, and created a horizontal and more temporally contained tension. Williams calls the form the "drama of the individual Christian," which shows the salvation of the individual rather than the race; and Craig contrasts the morality plot of microcosm with the mystery's macrocosm.

And yet, the morality is characterized by universal principles and by abstract techniques. Its hero at least in the early moralities, represents all men and his struggles are those of all Christians. The cycle play convinces man of the necessity of salvation; the morality offers a guide book for accomplishing that salvation, especially regarding the pitfalls to be encountered. Thus, neither genre aims at representational realism, but each creates its own kind of unreality. The cycle play is largely iconographic, its actions and characters supplied by pre-existing Biblical matter and significant because they reflect to some degree God's eternal and static grandeur. The morality play, however, is symbolic. Its staging, its action, and its characters, supplied by the dramatist as a means of conveying the progressive development of a single soul, create drama with a scenic rather than a panoramic focus. Each event, each character has allegorical significance, but on a moral rather than on a theological plane.
This allegorical quality of the morality is central to all definitions of the genre: characters are "personified abstractions" such as the Seven Sins, Mercy, Fortitude, Repentance, etc.; actions represent the various stages of an individual's religious experience (as in Mankind) or of his life-span (as in Castle of Perseverance). Although the writer did not suffer the limits imposed on the Biblical dramatist by his material, the over-riding dominance of a psychomachic plot resulted in a paucity of themes and a schematic and relatively rigid structure.

Basically, in a morality, the hero is seen pulled between the personified forces of Good and Evil. He succumbs to Evil at some point and must then be redeemed by the agents of Good. The early morality play, The Castle of Perseverance, offers a full example of the genre. Its hero, Humanum Genus, is tempted by each of the Seven Sins, is saved by the Virtues who secure him in the Castle, but subsequently falls again, leaves the castle and is saved only after his death by the pleas of Mercy and Peace, in a debate among the Four Daughters of God. In a full life-span play such as this, the vices usually attack at appropriate times; i.e., lust tempts a youth, but avarice works on the aged hero. In a morality which explores a soul's experience in a single phase of his life (as in Wisdom or Everyman), the Sins may be divided in another manner. In Wisdom, Pride (the Devil)
attacks the Mind; Lust (the Flesh), the Will; and Avarice (the World), the Understanding of Anima, the troubled hero. Moralities are full of this stylized, balanced alternation. Bevington attributes much of this structure to the demands of staging. But Spivack, and others, give great importance to the morality's origin in "allegorical pageantry that theatricalized the pulpit sermon." The metaphorical action is the text; the stage is the pulpit; the audience is the congregation; and the addresses in prologues and epilogues are straight sermons. Direct exhortations to the audience are also woven into the plays. In Pride of Life, the Bishop preaches at length to the general audience rather than to another character; Mercy, in Mankind, is also a prolific homilist, and the titular figure in Wisdom is given a concluding sermon in which he explains the nine points pleasing to God.

The elaborate ritualistic, processional scenes (i.e., Wisdom's regal entrance in Scene I and the dance of the Vices in Scene IV) may well have been encouraged by the demands of doubling and the physical dimensions of the playing areas, but they are dramatically effective as well. A procession of vices underscores the inexorable presence of Sin in this world, and when they come robed in contemporary dress, the audience is made doubly aware of its own immediate vulnerability in the face of temptation. Processions of good
characters, such as that concluding Wisdom, lend a note of assurance and also take on symbolic importance as they reflect the proper order of things.

The characters of the moralities, "personified abstractions" largely, are highly stereotyped. The hero, as noted earlier, represents Mankind or Humanity. The total action of the play can be explained as an external dramatization of his inward state. Even his costume reflects his state of soul, being changed as his allegiances shift or be-smirched as he succumbs to sin. He may yield to temptation readily, and without apparent cause, as does Humanum Genus, or he may be directly provoked or deluded as is Mankind when the Devil hardens the soil he must till and steals his shovel. But when he does succumb, it is totally, and there is no hint of remorse until he is called to account by an agent of Good.

The virtues are, unfortunately, a rather prosaic and anemic lot. Perhaps this lack of appeal is a reflection of man's sinful natural state wherein he prefers the riotous disorder of sin. They are quite traditional and voice orthodox doctrine in keeping with their names. This name-characterization is also true of the regular personified Sins, who, especially in the later moralities, yield their place to a Vice, a figure who acts as agent for the Seven Sins and directly manipulates the hero's fall.
In the earliest moralities this Vice figure is not present. In *Pride of Life*, a fragment, the King begins as a vainglorious boaster. In *Castle of Perseverance*, the role of temptor is allotted to various forces of evil: Caro, Mundus, Belyal, and Malus Angelus. The first three also employ lesser agents, such as Stulticia or Voluptas to achieve their ends. In *Wisdom*, it is Lucifer himself who acts as tempter. However, by the time of *Mankind*, a new figure has arisen, an agent of evil who is somehow a representation both of human weakness and of the metaphysical forces of evil. Myscheffe holds a middle ground between the Devil or Titivillus, who retains supernatural powers, and simple evil men such as Nought, Newguise, and Now-a-dayes. He is depicted as the servant of the Powers of Evil and yet often seems motivated by quite human desires to promulgate evil purely for its own sake.

Whereas the devil was traditionally humorless, the Vice figure gradually becomes the center of the buffoonery and the comedy of the morality. Humor had always had a small part in the morality. As early as *The Pride of Life*, we find Mirth, a servant of the King, who addresses the audience in a bantering tone and challenges any who dare to fight his lord. But Mirth has no manipulative role here; he is a servant of the King, not a tempter. However, by the time of *Mankind*, the comic elements seem actually to overpower the didactic
quality of the play. Many feel that the growth of the Vice and the increase in humor is a degeneration of the genre. Rossiter claims that "the Vices' buffooneries have no relation to their symbolenda" in *Mankind.*⁷ Winslow feels that

although controversial doctrinal and satirical purposes... are always main issues to which comedy is subordinate, the growing encroachments of comedy upon the allegorical themes have an altogether adequate explanation in the demands of audiences...⁸

Winslow maintains that songs, dances, brawls were added only to "prolong the comic moment" and that such action as the bridling of the horse in *Trial of Treasure* and the broom peddler in *Three Lawes* are merely "incongruous realistic elements" introduced solely for audience appeal.

Spivack is more discerning as he analyzes the comic elements first as to their variety, ranging from coarse verbal comedy to sophisticated satire, and second, as to their dramaturgical weight. All humor is dual: it entertains, but it also instructs. Levity in the moralities is always "the positive sign of virtue's absence," and reveals "the nature of moral turpitude."⁹

Whatever its origin and its literary quality, what the Sixteenth Century did receive was a highly stylized genre: a simple allegorical plot wherein the central figure, representing Humanity, was besieged by personified abstractions of evil, often embodied in a single Vice figure, succumbed
to this temptation, and was subsequently saved and instructed by personified agents of good. These changes were manifested in highly symbolic action (clothes-changing or altering, fettering, etc.) and characterization (symbolic costuming, name-changing) and the plot unfolded within a highly systematized temporal structure.

However, this received form early showed tendencies toward specialization and differentiation. It responded to the chief issues of the time and sought themes and forms which could convey educational and political concerns as well as moral precepts. This attempt at variety had certain gradual but radical effects on the genre. The morality tended to narrow its focus and the dimensions of its central figure, to show a strong movement toward secularization, and to produce less abstract characters.

The Croxton Play of the Sacrament from the late Fifteenth Century shows a specialization of the form. It is a conversion play, combining elements of all forms of early religious drama. Based on an old French legend and generally typical of anti-Semitic medieval narratives (though milder), it tells of the efforts of Jonathas, a Jewish merchant, to destroy a Host purchased from Aristorius, a Christian merchant. His attempts are foiled in a miraculous manner and he eventually is converted and baptized.
There is no Vice, no agent of evil in the play. Jonathas acts from paganism rather than from villainy; Aris-torius is perhaps the greater sinner as it is he who con-spires to sell the sacred wafer. Both men are chastened, confess, and are forgiven. The characters are not abstract, but their actions are, suggesting various events of the Passion. The conspiracy scene of Aristorius and Jonathas suggests the conspiracy of Judas and the high priests in the cycle plays. Reinforcing this parallel is the supper of wine and bread ordered by Aristorius for his priest im mediately after the conspiracy, a parody of the last supper. The Jews' maltreatment of the Host also evokes the Passion: among other tortures they give it five wounds and nail it to a post. In the torturing, Jonathas loses his hand, but just as Longinus had been healed by the blood from Christ's side, so blood from the fifth wound of the Host heals Jonathas' spiritual blindness and he is converted.

The play seems intended to combat doubt in its audience as to the Eucharistic doctrine of the Real Presence. The Jews themselves give lengthy accounts of the tradition of Communion as well as of the virgin birth, resurrection, pentecost, and judgment, and it is their "dowghtis. . .yff the Sacrament wer flesshe and blode" which motivate their sin. The play has been labelled an anti-Lollard work as it em phasizes not only transubstantiation, but the other sacraments
and doctrines which had come under Lollard attack. If this is true, the Croxton play not only exemplifies a specialization of the morality form, but an extremely early example of its use as a weapon of religious controversy, a role to which the form became almost exclusively devoted during the Reformation.

Another early morality, Hyckescorner, (c. 1513) alters the form by replacing the fully abstract hero with three figures: Fyte, Contemplacyon, and Perseverance. These three are insulted and abused by Frewyl and Imagynacyon, who have been corrupted by Hyckescorner but are later converted by the three good figures.

Hyckescorner is not a traditional Vice, since he acts for no higher forces of evil and has more human qualities. He has been reported hanged; he fears and flees from a rumor of Death. He seems to represent a spirit of the times which afflicts not only England but the whole Western world. Young men of the time "hadde hym in / Theyr bosomes" in many countries. He has only recently arrived in England, coming on a ship loaded with 5,000 rascals, among them Falshode, Favell, and Sotylte (369). They come to fill the place of all those just and good people who are fleeing England:

Trouthe and his kynnesmen,
With Pacyence, Mekeness, and Humlyte,
And all true maydens wyth theyr vyrgynyte,
Ryall prechers, Sadnes, and Charyte,
Ryght Conscycence and Fayth, with Devocyon,
And all true monkes that kepe theyr relygyon,
True byers and sellers, and almes-deede doers,
Pyteous people, that be of synne destroyers,
With Just Abstynence and good counseylers,
Mourners for synne, with Lamentacyon
And good ryche men that helpeth folke out of prison,
True Wedlock was there also,
With yonge men that ever in prayer did go.
(11.340-53)

Only after Hyckescorner had disappeared in the face of a
threat of Death can Pyte, Contemplacyon, and Perseverance
convert Frewyl and Imagynacyon. In this morality the audience
is not being lessoned in personal salvation so much as warned
about a general evil of the times. Under the influence of
Hyckescorner, Frewyl loses his proper direction and Imagina-
tion (properly, Good Remembraunce) loses restraint.¹³

Not only did the form of the morality alter under the
pressures of specialization and topicality, but it also be-
came increasingly secularized. Skelton's Magnificence (c.
1515)¹⁴ introduces a central character who represents one
class of mankind and whose problems affect the welfare of the
state rather than the soul. As Ribner notes,

In an allegory more political than
spiritual, although the familiar
morality structure is present, the
goal is not salvation, but a tem-
poral prosperity and a stable gov-
ernment.¹⁵

Skelton not only secularized the genre, but also utilized the
elements to achieve very topical satire, an important step in
the evolution of the polemic drama. Skelton's satire had
early found political and religious targets. The corruption
of the Roman clergy had been attacked in *Colyn Clout*, and Wolsey's resplendent manner and insolent ambition decried in *Why Come Ye Not to Court?* But as in all early polemic satire, the quarrel is not with the Church but with those who abuse its system and misuse its powers. Skelton has no sympathy with Lutheran heresy and those "knaves made knyghts" who "rave... agaynst the sacramentes" and "agaynst preest-hoode / Theyr malyce spread abrode."16 Rather, these heretics only find encouragement when all is not well in the state.

This need for order and degree is essentially the theme of Skelton's morality, for its hero Magnificence must learn in the course of the play that both wealth and liberty are possible only in a state "Where measure is ruler" for "Measure is treasure." The Vice Fancy is not an agent of Satan, but an enemy of Measure, for he advises Magnificence:

Measure is mete for a marchauntes hall,
But largesse becometh a state ryall.

(11.387-88)

Under the guise of regal Largesse, Fancy influences the King, and the court becomes the haunt of a variety of characters injurious to the commonweal: Counterfeit Countenance, Crafty Conveyance, Courtly Abusyon, and Cloked Colusyon. These behave in typical morality fashion, taking assumed names, boasting of their past mis-deeds, and quarreling among themselves. In this milieu, Liberty and Felicity (Wealth) vanish from the court and Magnificence is beset with troubles.
From this point on, the play assumes a closer parallel with the older religious morality, adopting the three-fold structure of penance. First, Magnificence is made to feel remorse by the afflictions of Adversity and Poverty and the moralizing of the returned Liberty. When his remorse is at its greatest, he is tempted by Despair to commit suicide, but is saved by Goodhope, who leads him to repentance, the second step of penance. Finally, he is assigned proper penance, made fully aware of the duplicity of his evil advisors, and joined by his new companions, Sad Circumspection and Perseverance, who preach to him of life's transitory nature.

Thus, Skelton's play is not quite the "transformation of the moral play into a secular allegorical drama embodying political satire"¹⁷ which Ramsay suggests. Rather, Skelton has added to the theological and moral dimensions of the genre a new secular stratum, but not as an attempt at deliberate secularization. Instead, his play suggests to the audience that the enemies of the soul and of the state are indeed much the same in modus operandi and in ill effects. Heiserman has best stated the objection to any radical distinction between the political and the theological:

The stage could not be abstracted from the moral cosmos, the vocabulary of politics and of political satire consisted of terms drawn from psychology, theology, ethics; kingship especially could hardly be described without discussing natural and revealed law. . . .
Early Tudor politics worked in the realm of theology. A much better case of deliberate departure from the theological can be made concerning the early interludes of Heywood, such as *The Four PP* and *The Play of the Wether*. Here there is no pitched battle between forces easily labelled good or evil. Instead, characters represent various positions possible in given issues and the pretensions of every position are examined and available for ridicule. The desired end is neither salvation nor political moralizing, but a plea for balance and objectivity, a concept of a rule outside and greater than any issue raised in the interludes themselves. The audience is not forced to value-placement; instead they are shown the fallacy involved in choosing between characters, professions, or ideas all of which are circumscribed by the limits of human folly. Humor can *delight* rather than *deride* since, as Merry-Report puts it, "All is one." Polemics and partisanship have very little place in this urbane and amoral atmosphere.

However, by the late 1530's the mainstream of development in the morality genre evidenced a heightened polemic quality and definite propagandistic exploitation. Rastell's *Gentleness and Nobility* shows this new polemic insistence. As in Heywood's interludes, there is a debate in which three positions are expressed (knight, ploughman, merchant), but
there is an important difference in tone. There is no ob-
jectivity, no balance. The ploughman's pretension is not
brought to the fore, his fallacies have no off-setting foil,
but rather he is made the "protagonist" and his position be-
comes the message of the play by a deliberate "distortion of
his dramatic character for ideological effect." 19

This sort of "distortion...for ideological effect"
became the order of the day as the pressures of Reformation
conflicts demanded a clearly partisan literature. Whereas
in the early Tudor era there had been only an infusion of
topical and temporal reference into the theological allegory,

With the coming of the Reformation the
morality quickly lost its gospel func-
tion...salvation gave way to vituper-
ation as all factions made use of the
morality play for controversial debate. 20

In the universities, polemics were tempered by humanism,
but nevertheless evidence of partisanship occurs. Grimaldi's
Biblical plays (discussed in Chapter III) are mild, but
Buchanan's Baptistes is much more topical, allocating the
role of John to More, Herod to Henry VIII, and Herodias to
Anne Boleyn. By far the strongest Latin play to espouse the
Lutheran cause was Pammachius by the German Thomas
Kirchmeyer, dedicated to Cranmer and performed at Cambridge.
These attacks were answered in other university drama.
Watson's Absalon is mildly pro-Rome, and John Christopherson
even turned the classical grandeur of Greek to the defense
of Catholic doctrine and ritual in *Jepthah* (c. 1544).

Far more indicative of the evolution of the popular polemic morality, however, are the vernacular plays of the period, such as Lindsay's *Satire of the Three Estates* (Spiritualitie, Temporalitie, and Merchant). Part I of this play can be called, like *Magnificence*, a *speculum principis*. King Humanity, like Magnificence, falls under the influence of evil counsellors to the detriment of his commonwealth. The significant difference is that in *À Satire*, these evil counsellors (Wantoness, Solace, and Placebo) are directly linked to Rome and to the papal hierarchy. When they introduce the King to Lady Sensuality, lechery is excused by the example of the Roman court

Whilk is the lemand lampon lechery,  
Where cardinals and bishops generally  
To luce ladies they think a pleasant sport,  
And out of Rome has banist Chastity,  
Who with our prelates can get no resort.  
(1.182-88)

Lady Sensuality, who eventually commands the allegiance of the entire Spiritual Estate, is the same figure so familiar in non-dramatic polemic literature, the Whore of Babylon, Dale's "Rose of Rome." She is the antithesis of Verity, a Puritan maid carrying a vernacular Bible, who is accused of heresy by Flattery:

What book is that, harlot, in thy hand?  
Out! Wauwaway! This is the New Testament!  
In Inglish tongue, and prentit in Inglond!  
Heresy, heresy! Fire, fire, incontinent!
When Verity is rejected by all three estates, the realm is open to the assaults of its enemies, chiefly represented by Flattery who, dressed as a Pardoner, "a wolf clad in a wether's skin," clearly states his allegiance:

    I am Sir Robert Rome-raker, / A parfite public pardoner
Admittit by the Paip. . . . / I give to the Deil with good intent,
This woeful, wickit New Testament, / With them that it translatit!
Since laymen know the verity, / Pardoners get no charity
Without that they debate it. / Deil fell the brain that has it wrocht,
Sa fall them that the Book hame brocht! / Als I pray to the Rood,
That Martin Luther, that false loon, / Black Bullenger and Melancthor,
Had been smoored in their cude! (ll. 1452-80)

Other typical anti-papal accusations are represented in various members of the Spiritual Estate: there is a Bishop who has never read the Scripture, an Abbot who boasts of his luxury and wealth, and a Prioress who rues her vows of celibacy, declaring "To Christis congregatioun / Nuns are nocht necessare." The constant issue so popular in early Tudor Protestant polemics is voiced by John Commonweal, who complains of the idleness of the clergy and of their inordinate wealth: "the land is clean demudit / Of gold and silver whilk daily goes to Rome."

One significant means of directing audience sympathy in Lindsay's play is the association of evil figures with the perversion of holy elements. The Vices take on new names in a
mock baptism, the evil Parson systematically perverts the Seven Sins, and the Pardoner acts as a devil's priest in an obscene ceremony of divorce. Another attempt at audience involvement is the judgment of Flattery, the chief Vice. When the Spiritual Estate is revealed to the others as "paintit sepultures," and the other vices have been hanged, Flattery, who agrees that his sins are the worst, is left to the judgment of the audience. And to judge Flattery is to judge the Roman Church, for by costume, by direct admittance, and by oaths and invective he has become a symbol of that church as it operates in a commonwealth.

Catholic proponents, too, were learning the efficacy of writing plays designed "to elicit a guided moral re-action." An Interlude of Godly Queen Hester, interesting because it uses Biblical narrative but adds abstractions to represent the motives of the villain, equates Hester and Katherine, Aman and Wolsey, in a defense of monasticism and the spirituality. Aman is clearly meant to be Wolsey. Not long after his appointment as counselor, Pride and Adulation meet to complain that Aman has cornered all good cloth for his rich array and has drawn all flatterers to himself. He is given license by ring and seal of the King to suppress the Jews, is called a ravening wolf, and a 'carnifex' (Wolsey's former profession was a favorite target.).
The Jews are accused of drawing the people to their ceremonies, of holding the King's laws in contempt, and of being uncharitable and voluptuous. However, when Hester moves against Aman and sets straight the false charges against her people, she warns that

Since God, therefore, hath begun their household
I advise no man to be so bold
The same to dissolve.

The satire here is not anti-Lutheran but pro-monasticism, with Wolsey, the agent of the suppression of the monasteries, acting the villain's part. The absence of larger doctrinal issues suggests a quite early date.

John the Evangelist,24 a Protestant play, does deal with more specific charges against the Church, and yet remains closer to the morality structure. The central figure, Eugenio, is instructed by St. John, led astray by Actio, and both are brought to repentance by John. A set of evil figures appear, who have no direct relation to the action but are definitely vehicles for anti-Papal material. Evil Counsel offers his services to Idleness, who has more than twenty-five wives, "But some other man keepeth them for me" (p. 362). They are joined by Sensuality, Idleness' brother, who boasts that while others work for a living "he getteth it lightly." In typical vice fashion they quarrel among themselves and exit, but have no role in the play proper.
In the main plot, Eugenio is given an allegorical map of the via recto to Jerusalem: "over the Mead of Meekness" to the "Path of Patience" into the "Land of Largeness." But he is also warned of the via obliqua et circularis which leads one to

.. the lady of confusion
That Babylon is called.
With boughs and trees it is marvellously paled.
There groweth the elders of envy
Staked with pride full high,
And the briars of backbiting with wrath wreathed about
Full of Sloughy bushes and lecherous thorns dry,
With glutinous posts and covetise railed throughout. (p. 355)

Eugenio is not convinced and is easy prey to Actio who boasts of wantoness and lying. Actio seems more a representation of debased natural vitality than an agent of evil and bears no hint of Roman lineage.

John, whose identity is remarkably garbled in the play, enters at this point as Sir William of Trentham and addresses the audience. He vows to tell of Christ's Incarnation and Passion and to preach His laws. Here John (alias Sir William) seems to represent his gospel rather than a person, and it is with a parable from the gospel (the Pharisee and the Publican) that he converts Actio and Eugenio.

Farmer, noting the "looseness of construction, deep religious feeling, the reticence and restraint," thinks it to be "of the same class. . .Bale speaks of as being played at market crosses on Sunday afternoons by way of religious
instruction. 

True, the alliteration and the "lady of confusion" figure are typical of Bale, but the association of his polemics with techniques of "reticence and restraint" is a highly unlikely proof of authorship since in Bale's polemic drama there is no looseness, no evil character who is not clearly placed in the Roman camp, and above all, there is no restraint. John the Evangelist may have been suited to Sunday afternoon religious instruction, but Bale was aiming at a total and militant indoctrination.

In The Three Lawes, Bale achieved the fullest exploitation of the morality genre for his polemic purposes. This carefully constructed vehicle for Protestant polemic has been called the bitterest play in the English language, a "tower of vituperation," a scatological attack on the clergy by a "vitriolic partisan." But what it is, in fact, is a highly skillful re-working of a medieval pattern into a comprehensive and compelling attack on Catholicism. Bale has modified every aspect of the old form so that its weight now falls solidly in the Protestant camp.

The play represents God's creation of three laws: the Law of Nature, the law of Moses, and the Law of Christ. It traces their corruption at the hands of evil forces led by the Vice Infidelitas, and God's eventual judgment of the evil and restoration of the laws. Within its five perfectly balanced acts, Bale has included both the traditional
scurrilous attacks on Catholic ritual and clerical life and far more subtly wrought attacks on Catholic doctrine and the papal hierarchy as inimical to the welfare of the State.

The very concept of Law and its relation to God and to Man was a controversial issue. Craik maintains that the play is largely a dramatization of ideas already expressed by Tyndale in his *Exposition Upon the V, VI, VII Chapters of Matthew*. Tyndale mentions in his title "Moses law corrupte by the Papistes." To this, Craik says, Bale added his own invention, the corruption of Natural Law. However, the issue was not so simple, nor was Bale's Natural Law pure invention. Foxe, in comparing the Primitive Church of Christ with the Church of Rome held the papists' concept of law to be a significant point of difference:

And so divide they the whole law after this distinction, into three parts: to wit, the law of nature, the law of Moses, and the law of Christ. And as for the gospel, they say it is revealed for no other cause, but to show to the world more perfect precepts and counsels, than were in the old law. . . .: bringing the people into a false opinion of Christ, as though he were not a remedy against the law, but come as another Moses to give a new law to the world.

Furthermore, as they make no difference between the nature of the law and the nature of the gospel, confounding Moses and Christ together, so neither do they distinguish or discern the time of the law, and the time of the gospel asunder. . . .so that Christ and law together do reign over the soul and conscience of man. Which is untrue. . . .
For both these, Christ and the law, grace and malediction, cannot reign and govern together. 28

Bale seems anxious to show that Christ and the law are indeed compatible and to clarify their relationship. His Prologue cites classical precedents for the necessity and the desirability of law in any commonwealth and reminds the audience that law is "A gift of the Lord." Deus Pater, in Act I, introduces each of the three Laws, stressing their trinitarian nature:

Our laws are all one though you do three appear,
Likewise as our will is all one in effect.
But, because that man in himself is not clear
To time and person, us now we have respect,
And as three teachers to him we you direct
Though ye be but one- in token that we are three;
Distinct in person, and one in the deity.

(pp. 5-6)

The laws are not replacements of one another but different facets of God's grace sent down to man. All three are necessary to man's salvation and all three are restored "to their first beauty" in Act V.

Bale is careful, however, to establish the superiority of Christ's Law, of which Deus Pater says:

Thou, law of the Gospel, though thou be last of all
In operation, yet thou art the principal.

(p. 73)
Christ's Law is to "Change...to the Spirit the workings of these two" and his very coming has done so. Whereas Natural Law before had only taught men to know God, now it will inspire him to worship God and to love his neighbor. Mosaic Law which had brought man to justice, now is to teach him love of God and forgiveness.

Thus, far from assigning Law to the Catholic party, Bale insists that law is of God and the perfect observation of these three laws a requirement for "the abolishment of dreams papistical" (p. 77). The villain is not Law, but that force which perennially corrupts law, Infidelity. Just as Law manifests itself in varying forms, so Infidelity attacks each law with different vices. The result is a play far more suggestive of the cyclic pattern of the mystery play than the more temporally bounded traditional morality.

Each law is assigned specific historical ages: Natural Law will be revealed in three ages--Adam to Noah, Noah to Abraham, and Abraham to Moses; Mosaic Law will exist from Moses to David, from David to the Exile, and from the Exile to the coming of Christ; Christ's Law is to remain then until the end of the world. Thus, we have the familiar Seven Ages of the World with God intervening via different manifestations of His Law. And just as temporal events in the mysteries are lifted above themselves by a constant reference to cyclic time and the coming Judgment, so here the
corruption of each law is somewhat ameliorated by a promise of coming retribution; i.e., the burning of Evangelium in Act IV simultaneously suggests Christ's Passion, the burning of Protestant Testaments, and Protestant martyrs.

Infidelity is the corrupting force in all ages and though his agents change from act to act all are clearly identified as papists. Even more subtly, Bale has managed to make each corruption an equivalent of one phase of the Catholic suppression of the True Church. In Act I we see the Primitive Church as God created it. In Act II, the papists subvert true faith and natural worship with Idolatry and Sodomy. In Act III, they suppress the Bible and subvert the power of rulers out of Avarice and Ambition, and in Act IV both the burning of the Bible and of martyrs is effected by Pseudo-doctrine and Hypocrisy. Thus, all the 'sins' of the Roman Church against the 'true' faith are catalogued, and in an eschatological frame. For with the burning of Evangelium (who represents both the Scripture and Protestant martyrs) the action reaches the present time, the Reformation, and suggests that Act V, the judgment and punishment of Infidelity and the restoration of the true believers, is imminent. The play moves toward judgment and restoration rather than toward salvation, a quality more characteristic of the mystery than the morality.
Within this very effective frame, Bale has also employed many other dramaturgical techniques designed to make the genre a sectarian rather than a religious medium. He has radically modified the characters, re-directed the emphasis of the action, and liberally larded the text with anti-papal abuse. The play has no central character representing Humanity or any segment of mankind. The three Laws are manifestations of God's grace and have no equivalent in Man as do the Mind, the Will and the Understanding in Wisdom. Thus, the audience has no figure in the play with whom to identify. Instead, they are told how to feel in a series of direct addresses. Although this direct manipulation of audiences' sympathy may be poor dramaturgy, it appears to be effective propaganda; the audience is not led to identify with any one figure, but to unite against those who are the enemies of God's Law. Taking to heart St. Paul's query, "If God be for us, who can be against us?" Bale has made Deus Pater himself partisan. When God labels Infidelity's downfall as the destruction of "the Kingdom of Babylon" and rejoices that now His people "may walk to me. Without popish dreams, in a perfect liberty," little doubt as to the proper response remains.

The Laws are more fully defined than are the agents of good in earlier moralities. All of Act I is devoted to their presentation in a highly ritualistic manner. Each is
called forth, assigned certain qualities and responsibilities, and given a sign of his role. In fact, each Law is really a personification of the sign he bears. Natural Law, who is given a heart, is in a sense the heart of man which is naturally turned to God but can become dead tissue, leprous, when corrupted by Idolatry and Sodomy. Moses' Law is the set of laws he carries on his stony tablets, which can be broken and obscured by Avarice and Ambition just as he is crippled and blinded by them. And Christ's Law, of course, is the Gospel, the Book which he carries and which, like himself, can be burned but "shall live perpetually." In Act V these symbol-characters can then easily become parts of Fides Christiana, the true faith which could only come into existence after the destruction of Infidelity. And guided by them. Fides Christiana will lead the people "to walk in the verity" henceforward.

The vice figures are treated much more conventionally. Infidelitas, the chief Vice, is ribald and irreverent, but completely open in his evil. He approaches each of the three Laws in his true guise, jesting and profane, and draws them out as to their mission. None is deceived by him; all recognize him as evil, though each must be told his name is Infidelity. The sub-vaules, too, attempt no duplicity. There is no name-changing or cloak-shifting here. They are evil (and papist) in every respect. This open and totally
malicious characterization accomplishes the placement of
total responsibility for evil with these characters. Whereas
in earlier moralities the central figure succumbed to
temptation through human folly, here the Laws are not sinners
but innocent victims. They are not deceived, deluded,
or tempted but are openly persecuted. Moreover, the perse-
cution (or corruption) is not shown. Bale is far more
interested in revealing the evil nature of the corrupters.
And when each Law appears in his 'corrupted' state, it is
always only his physical being which is affected. The
corruption does not reflect an inner change in the corrupted
Law but a condition imposed on that Law by an external
agent of evil.

There are no neutral characters, such as Frewyl in
Hyckescorner or Actio in John the Evangelist, who can become
good or evil depending on their moral environment. In
Bale, all moral weight is static. There is never conversion;
hope lies in the promise of vengeance and restoration. Such
a moral climate leaves no room for ambiguity, nor for
tolerance.

The agents of evil reveal their malignant, papistic
nature in various ways, but most obviously by their identifi-
cation with the Roman clergy. Bale himself specified cos-
tuming to this end:
Let Idolatry be decked like an old witch, Sodomy like a monk of all sects, Ambition like a Bishop, Covetousness like a Pharisee or spiritual lawyer, False Doctrine like a Popish doctor, and Hypocrisy like a grey friar. (p. 2)

Idolatry is not only a witch, but here boasts of all that she can accomplish for men "with crossings, and with kissings, / With blasings, and with blessings" suggest the promises of the Mass in The Resurrection of the Mass (See above, Chapter II, P. 107). She has a Saint as remedy for any ill, or as a means to protecting material possessions. And she is proud that

I never miss, but palter
Our Blessed Lady's altar,
With my beads once a day. (p. 19)

She will corrupt the heart, "And will the soul pervart /
From God's Obedience" (p. 24).

Her companion, Sodomy, meanwhile will corrupt "God's image / With most unlawful usage"—not simply sexual perversion, but a distortion of all man's natural impulses toward God—the spiritual whoredom of which Bale had often accused the English prelates. Sodomy has existed in all ages, but is chiefly found in "monkish sects" or among "popish priests," wherever vows of celibacy are made. He always accompanies Idolatry; they are "the ways to Hell," the one always leading the other (p. 22).
Both Avarice and Ambition are prelates, who rose "by feigned flattery and by coloured adulation" (p. 35). They corrupt judicial and ceremonial laws with "filthy glosses" and agree "to blind the rulers and deceive the commonalty." Ambition wears a mitre, which resembles "the mouth of a wolf," but Infidelity promises to make him a pope so that this will be hidden (p. 43). Avarice will confound the poor with superstition and sophistry, especially by use of Latin services. Only one work will be available in English—the new creed:

First, they shall believe in our holy father pope;
Next, in his holy decrees and decretals;
Then in holy church, with censer, cope and cross,
In the ceremonies, and blessed sacramentals;
In purgatory then, in pardons and in trentals,
In praying to saints, and in St. Francis' hood,
In Our Lady of Grace, and in the blessed rood.
They shall believe also in relics and religion,
In Our Lady's Psalter, in free will and good works;
In ember days, and in the Pope's remission,
In beads and bells, not used of the Turks;
In the golden masses against such sprites as lurks,
With charms and blessings... (pp. 42-43)

All who do not accept this creed will be burned.

Pseudo-Doctrine and Hypocrisy reveal the deepest depravity of the Roman clergy, perhaps because it is they who persecute Evangelium, the Gospel. Bale characteristically displays an almost pathological hostility toward monasticism and vows of celibacy. In Act IV, the dialogue between these
two vices resembles nothing so much as prurient beauty-parlor gossip or a too-long session of travelling salesman stories. Each tries to out-do the other with tales of a bishop's astonishing virility or of a monastery's clever means of seducing young women.

Only when Infidelity acquaints them with complaints against the clergy lodged by those who have known the Gospel are they moved to action, vowing to serve the Gospel just as they had earlier handled Christ (p. 58). Pseudo-Doctrine will appoint four knights to suppress the Gospel (just as four soldiers had guarded the Tomb): ambitious prelates, covetous lawyers, lords without learning, and unrightful judges (p. 59). Hypocrisy will infect the universities with Catholic writings, Aquinas, Bacon, Aristotle, etc. (p. 60).

In addition to costume and direct incrimination, these evil figures also deal in papist paraphernalia. Infidelity sells both brooms and candles, pax and wax images, and he arms Idolatry and Sodomy for their task:

Here is a stool for thee,
A ghostly father to be
To hear Benedicite;
A box of cream and oil.

Here is a box of relics,
Rags, rotten bones and sticks,
A taper, with other tricks. (p. 24)
All evil figures swear profusely by the Saints—whereas in the earlier plays oaths usually are devoted to pagans or devils. Infidelity also participates in several scenes which are parodies of Catholic ritual. In Act II he leads a parodic prayer:

omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram formasti laicos, da quaesumus, ut sicut eorum sudoribus vivimus, ita eorum uxoribus, filiabus et domi-cellis perpetuo frui mereamur. Per dominum nostrum Papam. (p. 25)

In Act III, he forces Avarice and Ambition to kneel and ask his blessing, and in Act IV he offers both absolution and papal bulls:

Of clean remission I have brought ye indulgence—
A pena and culpa- for all your sin and offence,

And here I bless ye with a wing of the Holy Ghost,
From thunder to save ye, and from sprites in every coast.
Lo! here is a bell to hang upon your hog,
And save your cattle from the biting of a dog.
So many as will come to this holy fraternity,
Come, pay your money, and ye shall have letters of me. (p. 64)

Bale seems particularly interested in this perversion of ceremony, for he did not condemn all ritual, but insisted that it be seen in a certain light:
Ceremonial rites are also commendable,

Which are unto Christ as figures, types,
and shadows,
As Paul does declare in his 'pistle to
the Hebrews;
These are only figures, and outward
testimonies-
No man is perfect by such dark ceremonies.

(PP. 33-34)

Like law, ceremony is beneficial to man when free of
Catholic perversion.

The depraved nature of the papists is underscored in
several instances by skillful juxtaposition of the holy and
the profane. In Act III, after hearing Moses Law carefully
explain the Ten Commandments, the audience then hears
Ambition distort each commandment to allow an abuse of the
Catholic Church. For instance,

Whereas God doth say, No strange gods
thou shalt have;
With saints worshipping that clause we
will deprave
And though he command to make no carved
image,
For a good intent yet will we have
pilgrimage. (P. 40)

In both Act II and Act III, Infidelity and his "children"
celebrate their corruption of the Law with a song. Although
it is only conjecture, effective contrast would be achieved
if these songs were presented in a cacophonous manner in
direct opposition to the song of the restored Laws in Act V,
who "ad Dei gloriam cantabunt" (p. 74).
Humor, too, is a means of derogation of the clergy. It is most often bawdy, revealing the lechery of the religious as does the Latin exchange between an old friar and Dame Isbel, an old nun, concerning his lapides preciosi (p. 29). But it also takes the form of puns or slips of the tongue as when Infidelity confuses knave and slave (p. 11), or speaks of England as over-run by Danes: "Dane John, Dane Robert, Dane Thomas, and Dane Harry" (p. 49).

One other characteristic of The Three Lawes is important: its heavy political overtones. Of course, to attack the Catholic Church as an enemy of the state was a conventional element of Protestant polemics, but never had a play so directly made this point. The Preface begins with a statement of the interrelation of law and the ruler:

In each commonwealth most high pre-eminence
Is due unto laws, for such commodity
As is had by them. For, as Cicero giveth sentence,
Whereas is no law can no good order be
In nature, in people, in house, nor yet in city.
The bodies above are underneath a law-
Who could rule the world, were it not under awe? (p. 3)

Corrupted Natural Law cautions Christian rulers
gainst an unnatural clergy (p. 27). Moses Law, who represents rulers sent by God is corrupted by Ambition, who considers himself "exempt / From prince's jurisdiction" (p. 39). Even Infidelity, gloating over his apparent victory at the end
of Act IV, knows

On these three laws all other laws depend,
And cannot prevail, now these are at an end.
If Christian governors do not these laws uphold,
Their civil ordinances will soon be very cold.  (p. 67)

Not only are Christian rulers threatened when God's Laws are subverted by the papists; they also have the power to remedy such a situation. For what required the machinations of Deus Pater himself in the play had been accomplished already in England by "valiant King Henry" (p. 78).

Thus, in The Three Lawes Bale has created a world in which all evil, both to the soul and to the state, stems from the Catholic faith and can be controlled only when a strong Christian ruler banishes this evil so that it can no longer prey on the passive agents of good. In short, Bale has given us an effective wedding of Lutheran anti-Catholicism and Tudor absolutism, a society in which Deus Pater and King Henry perform the same role. And he had given Tudor dramatists the example they needed. Pineas has said:

The writer of the post-Reformation polemical morality found in the conventions of the old play a ready-made arsenal of controversial techniques to employ against what he regarded as the contemporary manifestation of evil-Catholicism.29

Perhaps it is a more accurate account to say that Bale found the means to employ these old conventions and that those who followed armed themselves in the arsenal he had stocked. For
although polemic drama was suppressed during the last years of Henry's reign, its effectiveness was not forgotten, and, after Edward's coronation, it proliferated. These later polemic moralities developed in those directions Bale's plays had established in 1538, modifying and sophisticating techniques he had first employed.

Some of the plays were strongly Reformation oriented, voicing the traditional anti-papal accusations and promoting the basic Protestant positions. *Lusty Juventus*[^30] was written during the reign of Edward and therefore during a period of Protestant triumph; thus Wever uses many of Bale's methods to identify the evil element in his play as the Catholic Church, but adopts a structure much closer to the older morality form.

At stake in the play is the religious allegiance of Lusty Juventus, who, at first tutored by Good Counsel and Learning, is then tempted by Hypocrisy, succumbs, repents under the chiding of Good Counsel, despairs, is saved, and concludes by sharing with the audience what he has learned, so that

> All Christian people which be here present,  
> May learn by me hypocrisy to know,  
> With which the devil, as with a poison most pestilent,  
> Daily seeketh all men to overthrow. (pp. 99-100)

The tone throughout is of a cause which, though at the moment victorious, is quite aware of its still potent enemy.
and very anxious to keep up its guard.

The Vice Hypocrisy first appears in the company of the Devil, his father, who laments the lessening of his sway in the world:

I am sore in dread to show my face,
My auctority and works are so greatly despised,
My inventions and all that I ever devised.
0, 0 I know full well the cause,
That my estimation doth thus decay;
The old people would still believe in my laws,
But the younger sort lead them a contrary way;
They will not believe, they plainly say,
In old traditions and made by men,
But they will live as the Scripture teacheth them.  
(p. 62)

To remedy this, the Devil commissions Hypocrisy, who is clearly meant to represent the Roman clergy. His speech is full of Latin tags and oaths of Catholic reference, especially "by the Mass." And he boasts of what he had already accomplished:

. . . so mingled God's commandments  
With blind zeal and blind intents  
With all kinds of filthy sodomy  
To give mankind a fall:  
And I have brought up such superstition  
Under the name of holiness and religion,  
That deceived them all.  
As holy cardinals, holy popes,  
Holy vestments, holy copes,  
Holy hermits, holy friars,  
Holy priests, holy bishops,  
Holy monks, holy abbots,  
Yea and all obstinate liars:  
Holy pardons, holy beads,  
Holy saints, holy images, etc.  
(pp. 65-66)

This repetitious cataloguing of 'holy' ements had been a favorite technique of Bale, who often damned by proliferation.
The main Protestant theme of Wever's _Lusty Juventus_ is the efficacy of the Scripture. Each good character in the play is careful to give explicit Scriptural references for all his exhortations. Juventus is told

To God's word you must only incline
All other doctrine set clean apart. (p. 58)

And he understands "That he that followeth his own lusts and imaginations / Keepeth the ready path to everlasting damnation" (p. 94). The worst sin he commits in his fall is blasphemy; he has known the gospel and still has profaned it. This sort of back-sliding (obviously a great and present danger in England at the time) "Shall never be pardoned nor forgiven / In this world, nor in the world to come" (p. 94). Wever is also concerned with the old question of faith and works. Juventus is told that good works are required "as the necessary fruits of true repentance" but that "faith in Christ's merits doth alone justify" and "the reward of heavenly inheritance / Is given through faith, for Christ's deserving" (p. 56).

Humor is not so abundant, nor so ribald as in Bale. The vices are generally irreverent, prone to oaths and coarse language, and Juventus' own fall is shown by such language. Whereas earlier he speaks in pious and respectful manner, in the company of Hypocrisy and Abominable Living he coarsens:

By dog's precious wounds, that was some whoreson
I will never eat meat that shall do me 
good, villain, 
Till I have cut his flesh, by God's precious 
blood: 
Tell me, I pray you, who it was, 
And I will trim the knave, by the blessed 
mass.  (p. 89)

Clearly, Wever sees the Protestant cause as Juventus, lusty 
in its new-won triumph but painfully subject to the wiles 
of the papists. The issues must be kept clear, and the 
papists, even when they don the robes of Friendship as does 
Hypocrisy in this play, always understood to be the children 
of the Devil.

New Custom (c. 1563)\textsuperscript{31} shows much less urgency of 
attack, its tone educative rather than aggressive. Its main 
Protestant theme is the assertion of the New Learning's true 
status as the Primitive Constitution, the true Church as 
imstituted before Christ. The play is to show how this true 
Church

... is perverted by man's wicked iniquity 
To be called New Custom or New Constitution;

... by reason of ignorance which beareth 
great sway, 
And also stubborn doctrine, which shutteth up 
the way, 
To all good instruction and knowledge of 
right:
Wherefore their own fancies they set in great 
price, 
Neglecting the true way. ... (pp. 5-6)

The vices of the play, Perversc Doctrine and Ignorance, 
represent the Catholic Church as it has existed in the past.
Perverse Doctrine worries about "these new-fangled prattling elves" who "go about us ancients flatly to deface" (p. 7). He derides the demand for vernacular Scriptures: "The New Testament for them? and then too for Coll my dog!" And he deplores the Reformation:

I think all heretics in the world have taken in hand
By some solemn oath to pester this land,
With their wicked schisms and abominable sects...
Since these German doctors came so fast into this land. (p. 33)

They swear by the Mass, by the Body of God, by the sacraments, etc; and, after boasts by Cruelty and Avarice of all they have done and will do to persecute New Custom, they take new names and leave to carry out their evil schemes.

However, New Custom is not for a moment deceived or tempted. He understands that these are the very forces which have brought about the degeneration of the Church in the past:

Then brought they in their monsters, their masses, their light,
Their torches at noon to darken our sight;
Their popes and their pardons, their purgatories for souls;
Their smoking of the church and flinging of coals. (p. 17)

New Custom explains that it is Perverse Doctrine who has in truth instituted "new fashions" in religion, such as transubstantiation and Peter's supremacy, while he is not really New Custom, but Primitive Constitution who in the company of Light of the Gospel has come to dispel such evil as they have created.
To this point, New Custom has been a conventional Protestant attack, employing Bale's techniques of association of the vices with papists through their language and their self-incrimination. Also in Bale's manner, the Protestant hero never weakens in his piety and assurance, but recognizes the evil figures immediately. But New Custom does depart significantly from Bale's example and in so doing reflects the new milieu of moderation which Queen Elizabeth was so determined to establish. Perverse Doctrine is neither banished nor burned, but is converted by the preaching of Light of the Gospel and henceforward is to be known as Sincere Doctrine who, accompanied by Edification, Assurance, and God's Felicity, will assure the welfare of the church "Both here in England and in every other nation" (p. 51). Bale's conception of the papists as analogous with both Satan and Anti-christ would never have allowed such a conversion, but such absolute positions were no longer feasible in the days of Elizabethan compromise. Perverse Doctrine is even allowed to retain his rich apparel for

Wise princes...
Hath commanded the clergy in such sort to be clad. (p. 18)

The Protestant dramatist, uneasy with such laxness, does add, however, that "God weigheth not... / Of any vestiture or outward appearance a mite" (p. 19).
Oddly, this same moderation characterizes the two moralities written during the reign of Mary defending the Roman faction. It would seem natural to expect the Catholic camp, given new life by Mary's coronation, to seize the opportunity for rebuttal of a vigorous, vengeful sort. However, both \textit{Respublica} (c. 1553) and \textit{Youth} (c. 1554) avoid controversial doctrinal issues and represent the Reformation as merely an unfortunate social upheaval due to human folly rather than a program instituted by the forces of evil.

\textit{The Interlude of Youth}\textsuperscript{32} reflects the chaos in a society where "the weed overgroweth the corn" in that Youth, scorning the good influences of Charity and Humility, keeps company with Riot and Pride. Youth certainly suggests the New Learning, for he is depicted as inheriting all, but impetuously and irreverently rejecting tradition. He also suggests the young king Edward, patron of that New Learning, as Youth is described throughout in phrases such as "flourishing with royalty" (p. 7), "merry as a king" (p. 14), having "royal hair" and "royal cheer," come "of noble stock." He claims to be "heir of all my father's land" (p. 17) and demands:

\begin{quote}
look unto me, \\
And take me for your special degree, \\
By right I am king eternal. (p. 30)
\end{quote}
Riot and Pride do not represent doctrinal aspects of Protestantism, but the sinful motives which lie behind such a rebellion against tradition. Perhaps they also indicate that young Edward's actions may be blamed on bad advisors such as Lord Somerset. Charity and Humility, however, have clear theological attributes. Charity's name itself bore theological significance as Tyndale's substitution of Love for Charity had been a major point of More's attack. It is made clear that Charity rather than Faith is the chief means of justification:

For he that Charity doth refuse
Other virtues though he do use,
Without Charity it will not be, . . .
It is written Deus charitas est. (pp. 5-6)

Humility enters speaking of the Virgin and having come from "mine evensong" but, unless costuming supplemented the dialogue, this oblique reference is the only suggestion of clerical status.

However, the concluding action is strongly Catholic, for Youth is finally made to repent, re-named Good Contrition, and charged with the task of giving good counsel to others in the future. Thus, Youth incorporates the traditional penitential system of the Roman Catholic Church. Youth also is given "a new array," a prayer, and "beads for his devotion," after he has openly renounced his old companions Riot and Humility.33
The author of Respublica\textsuperscript{34} is much more explicit in identifying the evil agent of his play, especially Oppression, as the embodiment of the Reformation. Although Avarice is the founder of all the evils which prey on Respublica, he is a comic Pantalone rather than a diabolical agent of Satan. He wears the traditional miser's garb covered with money bags and worries constantly that he will be robbed. His role of Policy is a manifestation of the Catholic charge that the Protestants' motives were not theological but avaricious. It is Oppression who actually represents the Reformation. He is a "sour, rough, crabbed child" who "tumbleth whom a lust out of possession" (p. 212). He boasts of having "fledged the bishoprics."

\begin{quote}
I almost left them never a farm or grange.
I told them Respublica at their wealth did grutch;
And the fifth penny they had was for them too much,
So Authority and I did with them so chop
That we left the best of them a threadbare bishop.

\ldots
We informed them, and we deformed them;
We conformed them, and we reformed them.
\end{quote}

(p. 218)

His incompetence in his usurped clerical positions is noted, even by Avarice:

\begin{quote}
Lo, here a fine fellow to have a bishopric,
A verse of Latin he cannot understand;
Yet, dareth he presume boldly to take in hand,
Into a deanery or archdeaconry to chop.
\end{quote}

(p. 223)
He is unsuccessful in defending his programs of reform to People and Respublica (p. 230) and finally he is judged by Nemesis to be turned over to civil authority for having "spoiled innocents of all they had" (p. 271).

Written during the "blissful renovation" (p. 248), this play has an almost smug tone of assurance: trouble afflicts any commonwealth from time to time the Prologue assures us, but "time trieth all and time bringeth trust to light" (p. 180). Sooner or later,

Verity, the daughter of sage old Father Time
Sheweth all as it is, be it virtue or crime.

(p. 180)

All is under control; the Reformation has been reduced to its proper proportions and revealed as a child of Avarice and a companion of Insolence and Flattery. And God has sent Queen Mary

To reform the abuses which hitherto hath been;
And that ills which long time have reigned
uncorrect
Shall now, for ever, be redressed with effect.
She is our most wise and worthy Nemesis.

(p. 181)

This assurance that all is now restored to "the good old estate" is also detected in the easy humor of Respublica. Some humor, certainly, is polemic in purpose. There are self-incriminating slips, such as when Adulation understands the names of Policy and Reformation as Hypocrisy and Defamation (p. 198) or when Avarice declares his intention "to rake
gromwell seed" (p. 183). However, much of the humor seems included for comic value alone. People is a peasant-clown with a heavy dialect who habitually refers to Respublica as Rice-puddingcake, and many of the scenes between the vices are mere buffoonery without any polemic weight.

Whoever the dramatist, he was a man who could appreciate dramaturgy free of polemics and who understood the value of flattery. His subtest effect is that gained in scene nine when the Four Daughters of God confront and overcome the four male agents of the evil besetting Respublica. In this victory the ability of a woman to master the problems of a commonweal is clearly illustrated. This same sense of assurance, of moderation, and of increased awareness of sophisticated dramatic effect free of polemic content characterize some later Protestant plays, as well. Lewis Wager's *The Life and Repentance of Marie Magdalene*, whose primary focus is the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith rather than works, is much more designed to expound that doctrine than to discredit its opponents. Rather than showing the evil forces as proponents of justification by works, Wager simply lets Christ preach the position he would defend—a trick Bale had effectively employed in the partisan *Deus Pater of The Three Lawes*.

Christ assures Mary, "My grace shall be for thee sufficient" (p. 62) and again, "Woman, I say, thy faith hath
saved thee; go in peace" (p. 78). The place of good works in the Christian life is given careful attention. They are the "fruictes of penitance" and follow faith and forgiveness as signs of a penitent state. For, as Mary knows, she is "not able to do sufficient penance, / Except thy grace, good Lord, do helpe me thereto" (p. 72). That Wager was especially concerned about Love's role in salvation is evident in the long dialogue- sermon between Justification and Love in the conclusion. Justification explains (to Mary and to the audience) that

It were a great error for any man to believe
That your love dyd deserve that Christ should forgive,
Your synnes or trespasses or any synne at all.
(p. 83)

Man's love is never sufficient to fulfill the precepts of God's law:

But love followeth forgiveness of synnes
As a fruict of faith, and goth not before. . . .
The forgiveness of your synnes you must referre
Only to Christ's grace. . . . (p. 83)

Love, following Justification onto the stage, explains that he comes from "a conscience immaculate" and "a faith not tainted nor simulate." Mary's cleansing of Christ's feet was indeed an act of love:

But this love dyd proccede from beleve;
When Christ of his mercy dyd hir sinnes forgive,
Love deserved not forgreenesse of sinnes in dede,
But as a fruite therof truely it did succeed.  (p. 84)

The central human figure, Mary Magdalene, then does not so much gain salvation as she does an understanding of what is necessary to that salvation. The tone of the play is patient edification rather than passionate exhortation. Mary is not a figure of the Reformation (as was New Custom), but a much more human character capable of both good and evil. Like man, she is subject to pride and petulance and thus an easy prey for Infidelity and the Seven Sins. However, her evil can be exorcized and replaced by good; it is not elemental but rather an intellectual state, just as is her good. Bale, in Three Lawes, allows no such neutral battle-ground for the forces of good and evil. That Wager does is indicative not only of the greater confidence of the Protestant party in the latter half of the century but of the increasing centrality of Man in Sixteenth-Century thought. And this admission of man's dual potential was, of course, a requisite for the evolution of Elizabethan tragedy.

The Vice, Infidelity, is simpler to Bale's Infidelitas in that he represents a state antithetical to love and faith, which manifests itself in all historical eras: he is known as Prudence to Mary, but to the Jews he is Moysaical Justice and to Simon he is Legal Justification. He is, however, associated with the Roman Church in certain ways. His opening
speech, combining Latin liturgical tags and popular lyric fragments, suggests the parodies of Catholic liturgy used by Bale:

With heigh down down and downe a downa
Salvator mundi Domine, Kyrieleyson,
Ita, missa est, with a pipe up Alleluya;
Sed libera nos a malo, and so let us be
at one. (11.1-4)

He swears by the Mass and wears "a Pharisies gowne" (1.1544) and a "cape agreeing to the same." Of this apparel, another character says "that gear is very ancient; / I warrant thee
now to escape all blame" (11.1544-55). Because of the strong tradition in Protestant polemics of associating the Pharisees and the Roman clergy it is quite likely that this "geare" was clerical dress such as Bale had specified for his Vice. The agents of the Vice, Cupiditie, Carnall Concupiscence, and Pride of Life, represent the traditional evil trinity: the World, and the Flesh and the Devil. The Sins are not given specific papist attributes as they are by Bale. Cupidity remains a general avarice rather than simony or church-related graft. Carnall Concupiscence is simple lechery rather than the sodomy and sexual perversion resulting from celibatenous. Pride, too, is again a universal sin

with one exception. How like Bale this passage sounds:

The truth of God's prophets through tyrants
of pride
Hath ever unto this day been cast asyde.
The men of God pride hath spitefully reputed,
And with tyrants always the same persecuted.

(11.347-500)
In the main, the vices are once again the enemies of God rather than of Protestantism. Anarchy rather than hierarchy has become the central danger into which they lead Mary, teaching her that "Man is God to Man" (1.506), that "Man is the begynnynge of his own operation" (1.5-8), and that "All other gods beside your selfe you must despise" (1.520).

The historical character Simon the Pharisee and the abstraction Malicious Judgment most suggest the 'papist' villains of earlier Protestant plays. They plot together to entrap Christ, whom they hold to be "a beggarly wretch" and a fool who surely cannot withstand "so many bishops, priests, and Pharisees," Simon, like Mary, is human and though his mind is filled with the influences of Infidelity, he too is capable of conversion. Infidelity fears that Christ will "From Symon...drive me anon," but Simon is too full of Malicious Judgment to be moved by Christ's teachings. He accuses Christ of being "new fanged and frivolous /... Introducyng sectes perillous and sedicious." Simon is a Pharisee, one of the "fathers of the clergie," who after rejecting Christ's exhortations plots with Infidelity to spy on Christ, hoping to catch him in heresy so that he might "cause the bishops him for to examine." He represents the recusant English clergy who, although now acquainted with the true Church, choose rather to go on in their error, blinded by Malicious Judgment and Infidelity.
Wager's dramaturgical sophistication is seen in the humor, particularly in the satire on Elizabethan fashions of elegance which runs through Mary's seduction by the Vice, and in the light, non-polemic ribaldry of the three Sins and Infidelity. Wager is also attempting a psychological realism in clearly identifying the abstractions as operations of the mind, whose influence remains even when the figure is off-stage. Thus, he is not truly mingling historical and supernatural figures, but is representing the operation of such abstractions in human and historical characters—a technique Bale had earlier employed in King Johan.

Nathaniel Woodes' *The Conflict of Conscience*\(^{36}\) is equally sophisticated in its treatment of psychological operations, and at the same time retains much more obvious polemic matter. Although the central concern of the play is the danger of recanting the Protestant position, Woodes manages to give attention to several fundamental doctrinal issues and at the same time to attack the Catholic clergy in a somewhat restrained Balean manner.

Whereas Bale's primary goal appears to have been defamation of everything Catholic, Woodes (as had Wager) concentrates on teaching the audience one lesson: the sad plight of one who, once having seen the light, turns back into his error. The play is more exemplum than exhortation, using a real instance of apostasy (the case of Francis Spira, an
Italian lawyer and apostate) but changing the central figure and the outcome to insure general application. *The Conflict of Conscience* depicts the apostasy of Philologus, a teacher and student of the Gospel, who recants his Protestantism under pressures both from the papal legate and from psychological forces, but later repents and is saved at his death. Although Spira, who furnished the idea of the play, died in 1551, *The Conflict of Conscience* did not come to press until 1581. Collier suggests Woodes wrote it around 1570, but the events of the play suggest that the dramatist must at least have conceived of them during the Marian exile. The state herein depicted is one in which Catholicism has been newly restored, in which ritual and liturgical elements are being re-instituted, and in which Tyranny is enlisted to force both clergy and laity to recant. England was such a state in Mary's reign. By 1570, the danger of apostasy was not so pressing a problem and would hardly warrant such a full dramatic treatment.

Philologus, the central character, supports such an early date, for he suggests not an ordinary apostate but a clergyman who denies his faith. He is extremely learned in the Scriptures and is sought out by people in search of religious instruction. His 'heresy' as reported by the Scots priest is straight Protestant theology:

> And oftentimes he will reason with me of the Sacrament,
> And say he can prove bey the New Testament
That Chraist's body is in Heaven placed;
But ayl not believe, ay woll not be awt-faced,
He says besayd that the Pope is anti-Christ,
Fugered of John bay the seven-headed beast,
And all our religion is but mon's invention,
And with God's ward is at utter dissension;

(p. 76)

He debates the major doctrinal issues knowledgeably and is
never deluded as to the truth, knowing full well the gravity
of his blasphemy:

For sith I have received once the first-fruits
of my faith,
And have begun to run the course that leadeth
to my salvation,
If in the midst thereof I stay or cease, the
Scripture saith,
It booteth me not that I began with so good
preparation.
But rather maketh much the more unto my
condemnation:
For he alone shall have the palm which to
the end doth run,
And he which plucks his hand from plough,
in heaven shall never come.
Those labourers which hired were in vine-
yard for to moil,
And had their penny for their pain, they
tarried all while might:
For if they ceased had, when sun their flesh
did broil,
And had departed from their work, they
should have lost by right
Their wage-penny; I likewise shall be deprived
of quite
Of that same crown, the which I have in
faith long looked for.  

(p. 65)

He recants, not on theological grounds, but because of other
pressures and thus suffers a conflict of conscience.

It is these pressures and their dramatic treatment
that make *The Conflict of Conscience* worthy of note in the
evolution of dramatic characterization. Philologus is accused and tried by human characters (the Cardinal and a bad priest); is plotted against by Hypocrisy, Tyranny, and Avarice, abstractions representing external evil forces; and is tortured by yet another set of abstractions—Sensuality, Suggestion, Spirit, and Horror, who represent actual psychological aspects of his own mind. This has been described as a gradual shift from the purely idealistic treatment of the human mind in despair... to a more existential treatment of the same psychological event... This fusion of the archetypal and the human gives depth to the best Elizabethan drama. It creates a multi-dimensional drama. 37

As in Wagner's Mary Magdalene, the human central character of The Conflict of Conscience has dual potential, for whereas in early moralities the central figure's soul was a prize of war, in these later plays his mind becomes both the battlefield and the source of the warring forces. Of course, Woodes could not quite forego those other external abstractions, for it is they who provide the links between Catholicism and Philologus' torment, and this is, after all, still very much a polemic play.

Philologus' trial before the papal legate creates an opportunity for full exposition of Protestant doctrine concerning several issues, most especially the supremacy of Peter (which Philologus refutes, 11.81-82) and the nature of the Eucharist, which Philologus defines as "a sign of union" and
an analogy "That Christ feeds our souls as the bread doth our body" (p. 83). His friends Eusebius and Theologus carefully expound the relation of works and faith (pp. 132-34). The Protestant attitude toward Catholic glosses and commentary on the Scripture is apparent when Philologus is told by Hypocrisy to defend his apostasy by saying that "the reading of St. Self-love / And Doctor Ambition did your errors prove" (p. 99). And Philologus, like Bale, holds that persecution has two profits:

>The first is God's Church from the devil's to discern
The second to mark what manifest resistance
The truth of God hath, and what encumbrance
It bringeth upon them that will it profess.

(p. 42)

Anti-Catholic elements in the play are very obvious, beginning with the opening scene in which Satan himself appears to praise his chosen one--the Pope:

>Even so do I esteem and like him best,
Which doth most near my dealings imitate.

... So doth my son himself now elevate
Above man's nature in rule and dignity,
So that in terris deum sum, saith he.

(p. 36)

In the following lines Satan praises his son's institution of idolatry, and of false ritual, and applauds his two champions--Avarice and Tyrannical Practice. Hypocrisy, too, identifies the Pope as a bad Shepherd,

>seeking rather the fleece than the health of the sheep. (p. 52)
The chief Vice, Hypocrisy, identifies himself as "mercurial" but flourishing in the light of Sol, "the popish principality" (p. 47). Though once expelled from the land, he has recently returned and now divulges the conspiracy "the Pope and I have devised." First they will "inveigle the people religious" with Avarice and then enlist their aid to "win the laity" so that they will "forsake / The truth of the gospel" (p. 61).

The butt of the humor gained at clerical expense is Cacanos, a dull Scots priest who manifests almost every failing of the Roman clergy commonly catalogued in polemic tracts. He knows no Scripture,

For se lang as thea han images wharon to luke,
What need thea be distructed out of a buik?  (p. 74)

He depends on a long list of saints to handle all exigencies, and fully approves of the whole panoply of ritual and hierarchy.

There is some polemic humor in the play aside from this priest--the conventional slips of the tongue and the usual brawling among the Vice and his colleagues. But basically, the humor is seen by the dramatist not as polemic weapon but as an aesthetic balance "to refresh the minds of those who hear this too-too dolorous history" (p. 34). And though the message of the play is certainly Protestant, the medium is more aesthetically aware of decorum and of entertainment.
While playwrights such as Wager and Woodes adapted the polemic morality to more specific facets of the Protestant position, others were completely subordinating the doctrinal and polemic aspects of the genre to a new and growing concern for the welfare of the state and the citizen.

In *King Darius*, an anonymous play, this new interest in defining the good ruler and the healthy state within the old morality form creates a disabling dichotomy within the play. Scenes depicting King Darius' acting as a wise ruler are juxtaposed (but never really related) to more conventional morality scenes involving the conflict between the Vice Iniquity and the virtues, Charity, Equity, and Constancy.

The King is shown in two important roles: he entertains other rulers in a highly ritualistic scene indicating his complete control over foreign affairs, and he wisely judges a debate on the question of strength, recognizing and rejecting two flatterers and rewarding the honest speaker. King Darius is surrounded by figures who represent court types (his councillors Curiosity and Perplexity, and his servants Agreeable and Preparatus) and by more human characters such as the lords Anagnostes and Optimates and the honest speaker Zorababell. That the play is meant as a "speculum principis" seems apparent, as the Speech of Zorababell is actually a set piece in praise of women, designed no doubt to please Queen Elizabeth. The play concludes;
Pray we to God, the Lord of Might
That he would send down his clear sight
To Queen Elizabeth and send her his word.
(p. 91)

The more allegorical scenes seem to depict an
abstract conflict while the court scenes show the same con-
flict resolved by a wise king in actual circumstances. In the
masque-like banquet scene, Darius offers hospitality to the
four rulers and they praise his generosity. Thus, Darius
overcomes Iniquity (possible hostility and war) with Charity.
And in his judgment concerning the debate, Darius exercises
the quality represented by Equity. To balance the parallels,
Zorababell is associated with Constancy, a virtue made welcome
and possible only in the court of a wise ruler.

Anti-papalism in the play is confined to the Vice
scenes and is largely vestigial. Iniquity has "a cure" of his
own, gives his "blessing" to his fellows, will "play the
knave / Poll, pill and shave" (p. 60), and swears by the Mass
throughout. Most directly he is identified with Rome when he
boasts of his lineage:

   In Rome he (his father) dwelleth
   That is his common place
   Where all other bow before his face. . . .
   He doth poll poor men and liveth by
   their sweat.  (p. 67)

Equity, whom Iniquity labels "an old heretic," attacks him
along conventional Protestant lines. Iniquity and his brood
are "false people and an ignorant sect" who defraud the poor.
Attempts to convert him are futile because of "His brittle nature / And his ancient stature" (p. 76).

But Iniquity's agents, Importunity and Partiality, are more damaging to the stability of the state than to the soul, and their "Catholic" attributes are not a motivating force of their evil but seem by this time to have become vestigial characteristics of a genre now turned completely away from religious concerns.

*Trial of Treasure*, also anonymous, contains even less polemic material, being a very literal allegory depicting the superiority of Wisdom over Treasure. Lust, "the image of all wicked men" is led astray by Material Inclination and chooses Treasure as his consort, while Just, instructed by Sapience, allies himself with Trust. The entrance of Time, which changes Lust to dust and Treasure to rust makes this play again a "life-span morality" but with two protagonists. While Lust seems to be fortunate in his youth, having the company of both Treasure and Pleasure, Just is finally the more prosperous, for with the workings of Time, he gains the Pleasure which Lust loses.

Inclination, the Vice, is "very old" and, along with his companions, swears throughout "by the mass." He describes himself as "a gambolling gelding with a grey tail" (p. 223) which perhaps indicates a friar's gear. The suggestion of Just as Protestant hero is easier to establish.
He is threatened by Lust who would meet him "at Smithfield," and Inclination says

You have been so burned and fried of late,
That it were pity to hurt you any more.
(p. 222)

Elation and Greedy-gut, to whom Lust succumbs, suggest the overweening pride and the sensual indulgence attributed to the Roman clergy in earlier plays, but here have no direct papal associations. Just does lament the "Corrupting of our realm to our great decay" by Ambition, a "canker pestilent" which chiefly reigned "Among those which should be examples to others" (p. 230). These scorn their brethren, burn the "child with the mother," spill innocent blood, and "Will not greatly stick to become seditious" (p. 230). To offset such evil, Trust exhorts rulers, noblemen, and the commons to associate with her, but significantly omits the clergy.

The most striking use of a Protestant polemic technique is the contrasting of Treasure and Trust. Treasure appears as a maid "finely appareled," "a trickier, a trimmer. . . / The goddess of wealth, prosperity and bliss" (p. 226). She, like Circe, poisons men's minds. Trust, "plainly appareled" appears as a regal yet simple maid, wearing a crown. With her comes Contentation, and it is she who instructs the rulers, nobles, and commons to live "in the ways of the Just," and to "walk well in your vocation." Even
though Treasure may be meant to suggest the old Balean figure, Rose of Rome, the Whore of Babylon, Trust has lost her character of the Gospel of the True Church and here more than likely suggests Order, or perhaps Elizabeth herself.

Thus, the cause of Protestantism has been subsumed into the cause of the stable state in which citizens and rulers exercise social and moral virtues which, though they may have once characterized Protestant polemics, now are marks of the healthy commonwealth. The issues are no longer metaphysical, but concern specific problems of Tudor England. Rossiter has accurately described this phase of the evolution of the morality:

The old fideistic molds were cracking and between Medwall and Marlowe the play of abstractions is part of the struggle to establish new ones, to arrive at virtues applicable to the individual life, to man as subject in a state, and as member of a church no longer integrated in an authoritarian Christendom. 40

The Fifteenth Century morality had supplied the form and Bale had illustrated the possibilities of weighting its elements in a sectarian cause. Thus, the genre was able to be expanded and exploited as the polemic concerns of early Tudor England evolved into the political concerns of the Elizabethan Age.
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CHAPTER V

BALE'S MOST IMPORTANT
CONTRIBUTION: THE HISTORY PLAY

The Evolution of Bale's History Play

The history play created by Bale in the late 1530's was primarily an infusion of new matter from the various Chronicles of England into the existing morality genre modified to convey Protestant polemic content. Ribner finds the morality to be the original source of Tudor history plays, which

In the tradition of medieval Christian historiography sought to illustrate the providence of God in political affairs and to indicate a divine plan in human events which might affirm the wisdom and justice of God.¹

Christine Dunn reminds those who hail the Tudor histories as significant innovations that

the creation of a Tudor history play in the 1530's...was a successful enterprise because the English populace was thoroughly familiar with history in dramatic form and gradually accepted a transfer of perspective from Biblical history to that of national import.²
And Wickham holds that the raw material from which the new "microcosmic" drama was born had been supplied from a variety of fourteenth and fifteenth sources:

characters derived from the street pageants, plot structures from sequences of Miracle Plays, theme from the Morality Play and brevity from the professional interlude.3

Thus, Bale supplied neither the form nor the concept of history as content. Rather, he adapted both structure and content to his own peculiarly polemic purposes. It is this sectarian concern that so significantly shaped King Johan, and hence the later Tudor history plays. Rossiter best sums up Bale's contribution to the genre:

The specific importance of John Bale is that, by an historic accident, he extended the Morality-pattern to treat one (ostensibly) real-life story; and not in terms of the psychomachic conflict but of order and disorder within the state. From this trend in the controversial Morality there derives the writing of histories by patternizing the chronicles. . . and from that, an impulse towards a greater subtlety in the presentation of motive. . . .

As seen in Chapter IV, the morality genre lent itself easily to the polemic adjustments required by Bale, and its appropriateness as a vehicle of state and political didacticism had long been indicated in such plays as Skelton's Magnificence. Direct divine intervention in life was readily transposed into
a politically partisan God who was represented by His chosen King. The role of the King thus subsumed that of protagonist and that of God's spokesman. And the plot concerned not the King's nature (for it was ordained and static), but the quality of the reaction of others toward him. He becomes the touchstone rather than the pawn. This concept of a Christian king as agent of God had long been central to the religious dispute, and the dramatist's concern was not so much to define the role of the King or to offer a speculum principis, as to inculcate in his audience the acknowledgment that obedience to a Christian ruler was a religious duty which superseded all other loyalties.

And that particular adaptation of the morality which is the early history play began when

Under the stimulus of the Renaissance and the Reformation the form of religious polemic is applied to political polemic, when the devices used to portray one limited set of doctrines are extended to serve the needs of new doctrines which the expanding intellectual horizons of the Renaissance have made equally significant in men's minds.5

When all these elements coincided, when religious and secular exigencies required for a time similar techniques, when Tudor historiography supplied new dramatic potential, the history play, in the hands of John Bale, began to take on discernible form. A primary impetus, of course, was the strong sense of
nationalism promulgated by the Tudor search for justification of their absolutism. History was utilized rather than recorded, became a defense of current Tudor policy rather than an explanation of past events. History, in short, provided a documentation from the past for claims made in the present.

The Christian view of history had always been schematic, viewing events as a pattern reflecting the will of God. Time, as contrasted with eternity, was a linear progression in which events tended to cluster in a string of epochs. Thus, history was neither national nor factual, but a "narration of gesta Dei." Too, both medieval and Tudor Christian historians were conditioned by an apocalyptic emphasis which created a scheme of cyclic alternation and progression, such as that of the Three Laws or Foxe's later division of history into 300-year eras. To this Christian view of history, the Tudor historians added a secular emphasis—the use of history as foundation of present political theory, a deliberate attempt to make the "purposes of God coincide with the purposes of the Tudors."

Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia* is indeed a major work of English historiography, yet it is not typical of the Tudor use of history which Bale manifests in *King Johan*. Vergil was too much a humanist and too little a polemicist. Although his implicit purpose was to give a favorable account of the
House of Tudor, he moved too far away from the Christian rationale. His "over-secularization" is evident in his objective and brief account of the turmoil of the English Reformation:

Through his power Henry decreed the adoption in England of new religious observances and very different ways of worshipping God, and at the same time the reduction of monastic establishments and the diminution of the property of other priests, lest more extravagance should thereafter result. Wherefore after it seemed that sufficient provision had been made for the ratification and confirmation of all these actions, laws were enacted and the severest penalties laid down for those who acted against what was required by these laws, or who by any unlawful word of saying impugned the acts and ordinances of the parliament.  

It was instead Edward Hall who formulated the Tudor myth by providing a "marriage of the providential view of history with the secular and the pragmatic," for his work was clearly designed to promote one central theme: "to denounce the cankered crocodile of sedition and manifest the blessings of unity" (p. 51). This use of history to promote or support a concept was that which Bale and other Protestant polemicists practiced. Just as Hall could find in the past of England events to suit his present theme, the Protestants sought in the history of the primitive Church (before the papal
organization) a justification for the New Learning.\textsuperscript{11}

The distortion of the facts of history to serve these purposes was commonplace. As early as the middle ages apocryphal matter had been added to supply circumstantial detail to Biblical narrative and saints' lives. This habit "created a substantial precedent for a kind of imaginative literature which was presented not as fiction but as documented history...a quasi-historical mode."\textsuperscript{12} In the Renaissance there was still no clear line of demarcation between history and fiction. Instead, the 'truths' of history were exemplary: "paradigms of moral and political behaviour which, authenticated by famous men's experiences, provide patterns that can shape our response to perennially recurring situations."\textsuperscript{13} It is in this context that Bale turned to the historical matter supplied him by earlier English chronicles, selecting what he needed to create a play which would effectively dramatize the simultaneous destruction of secular prosperity and religious health in a land where papal influence had subverted the role of the Christian King.

To appreciate the technique of early chroniclers and the careful selectivity of Bale, it is necessary to understand the facts of John's reign. His was never an easy throne. Obscured by the fame of his brother Richard whom he succeeded, John lacked both land and personal leverage. Earlier married
to a cousin, Isabel, he divorced her on a plea of consanguinity in 1200 and married Isabella of Angouleme.

The first threat to his realm was the claim of his nephew, Arthur, to the English throne, and the ensuing wars with France, who supported Arthur's claim. In the midst of this political trouble, John found himself pitted against the Church, for he objected to Rome's peremptory selection of a new arch-bishop of Canterbury in 1205. John refused to accept Arch-bishop Langton and underscored his rebellion against papal authority by seizing (in 1207) one-thirteenth of all property in England, ecclesiastical holdings included. When his advisors were excommunicated, John countered by expelling all the monks at Canterbury and seizing their goods. When, in 1208, the Pope placed all England under interdict, John still refused to submit. Instead, he confiscated the holdings of all clergy who enforced the interdict and embarked on a series of successful wars with Scotland and Ireland.

The Pope, angered by this insubordination, absolved John's subjects of allegiance to their King and encouraged European monarchs to depose John. The coalition of France and Rome joined by disgruntled English barons, was too much for John, and in 1213, he received the papal legate Pandulph and was reconciled with the Church, agreeing to do homage to
the Pope and binding England to an annual payment to the Holy See.

However, the recalcitrant bishops and their French allies were not so satisfied, and war broke out again in 1214, was again temporarily halted by the signing of the Magna Charta in early 1215, and again erupted when John failed to honor the document. Ironically, the Pope now supported John's position, annulling the Magna Charta, excommunicating the rebel barons, and suspending Archbishop Langton, who sided with them. Although the rebels had taken London and offered the crown to Louis of France, John was beginning to recover his losses when he fell ill at Swineshead and died 19 October 1216.

Medieval accounts of John's reign were, at best, neutral and very often did deserve Bale's accusation of distortion at the hands of "malecyouse clergye." Events were often represented in a manner designed to reflect John's behaviour as in error, even brutal. His early divorce was construed as "injurious to the King as well as the Kingdom" by Roger of Wendover. And Nicholas of Trevisa records that "therefore he dide withoute children as som men weneth" (p. 177). Matthew of Westminster found that John "treated his subjects with furious rage, inventing all kinds of fictitious causes of provocation against them" (p. 100), John, Matthew
continued, "wished to turn the miseries which he had incurred by his own guilt on those who had sought to restrain his madness" (p. 115). A particular case of such harshness visited on a subject was the fate of Peter the Hermit, "a simple and upright man," according to Matthew who had criticized John's behaviour and prophesied his downfall. Peter's fate is reported in Higden's account in *Polychronicon*:

About that tyme Kyng John made honge and drewe on holy man that heet Peeris of Pointfreid, for he hadde i-warnede hym of meny myshappes that schulde falle hem for his cruelties and for his fornicacioun.

John's treatment of Arthur received varied handling, but only one writer, Roger of Wendover, gave John the better side of the situation. In this Chronicle John speaks "kindly" to Arthur whose answers are "ill-advisedly rude" and threatening. After John imprisoned Arthur, the young price "disappeared." Other chronicles, while remaining non-committal on the facts of Arthur's fate, nevertheless favor the young pretender and relate rumors of John's hand in his death. Pierre de Langtoft says of Arthur, "to whom the kingdom / Ought by right to descend," that

whether he were killed or not
My master prevents my saying in my discourse;
Nevertheless I know well his death was the cause
Whereby the uncle had the possession,
Which by right the nephew out to have.

(p. 125)
Matthew of Westminster notes that the people believed John guilty, "On which account, many people... were wholly alienated from the King, and pursued him to the death with implacable hatred" (p. 99). Even more direct, Robert of Gloucester avers, "Me sede nor is eritage that the King him let sle" (p. 492). Most direct of all, Higden openly states "Kynge John hade sleyne Arthurus" (p. 175) and elaborates:

At lammas at the castle of Myrabel,
Kync John took and slou his nevew
Arthur, and poisoned his suster
Elianore at Bristowe to hire lyves
ende. (p. 185)

Even more pervasive in the medieval chronicles is the picture of John's evil nature. No one of the Seven Sins did he escape, but lechery, gluttony and sloth were the favored ones in accusations. And his evil nature is more often argued as the cause of his domestic strife than is his trouble with Rome. Robert of Brunne's version of Langtoft's Chronicle sums up his general sinfulness and its fruits:

Jon did ay trespass, men found in him
evchesoun,
He lyved in wo and strife, and in
tribulacioun,
He was of lichérous life; orgh what
his nacioun
Partie ageyn him ches, and wild haf
him born down. (206)

Robert of Brunne charges that John "used lichorie / Both mayden and wif all wild he ligge bie" (210). The Brut adds
to the charge of lechery that John "sparede no woman at him likede forto have... even his own brothes wif" (p. 67).

Matthew of Westminster gives the most thoroughly damning estimate of John's character. The King thinks "only of rapine" and places all his hope in "treasures of money." He manifests unsatiable avarice and unappeasable gluttony and licentiousness." He lives in "luxury with his wanton queen" and because of "incorrigible torpor" and "treacherous inactivity" allows France to take his lands.

Not only evil by nature, John was also the prey of evil counsellors. Roger laments the rise of Master Alexander Mason in 1209, "a pseudo-theologist" who "incited the King to acts of cruelty" by teaching that the King was "the rod of God" to bend and shape his people and needed no interference from the Pope. Roger even implies that John was "infatuated by sorcery and witchcraft." Matthew of Westminster blames the disasters of the late years of the reign on a "detestable group of foreigners, whose leader and general was Falcas de Breaute, a man of ignoble birth and a bastard" (123).

Those who opposed John are generally shown to act only when driven to it by John's own depravity and recalcitrance. Robert of Gloucester pictures the English bishops as pleading with John to be reconciled with the Pope, "wepinde ech on /
and criende pitosliche" (495). And the papal legates sent to England come like "Godes kni̇tes baldeliche" (500). The Pope is shown to act only in the light of John's ill-treatment of the clergy. He approached John "wit gode wille and gode hert" about the Archbishop, according to [The Brut], but the King "wolde nouht grant hit for nothing" (155). The papal conspiracy with France is presented as a last resort. The rebel barons, too, are exonerated on account of John's evil. Langtoft asks:

What does the citizen do, what do the barons
Whose wife or whose daughter the king has violated?
They invade and destroy castles and cities. (131)

Matthew of Westminster is careful to note that the rebels sought not to overthrow kingship, but to find a better King:

His subjects... wishing to shake off the intolerable yoke of such a tyrant, began seriously to consider what prince there was in whose bosom they might find refuge.

Neither is blame placed on the agents of John's death. Some attribute the death to John's own bad habits. Roger says the cause of death was "a violent fever" increased by "pernicious gluttony." Matthew, always the most vindictive of these chroniclers, records that John "gorged himself with peaches soaked in new wine and cider, and being greatly
absorbed in grief for his loss became attacked with a severe illness" (128). Subsequently, John "most miserably departed from this life" but, we are reminded, "scarcely deserved to be mourned" (129). Langtoft is nicely ambiguous: "They poisoned him at Swineshead." And Robert gives no cause of death, but does hope

\[ \text{Suf eni man ther to help, God it him} \]
\[ \text{vor five} \]
\[ \text{Vor he adde er this land to muche} \]
\[ \text{wrechede idrive} \text{ } (512) \]

Robert of Gloucester does, however, include in an Appendix an account from another manuscript which names a monk, fearful for the welfare of England, as the poisoner. Higden's Polychronicon gives a more detailed version of this story, labelling it as what "\( \text{\& comune fame tell\( e \).} \)" Here, the monk overhears John's boast that a half-penny loaf will be 12s within the year and so decides to murder the King. The Brut contains the same story, but has open praise for the "heroic" monk who was absolved by his abbot and for whom

Five monks singe\( e \) for his soule,  
and shal whiles \( \text{at abbay stant.} \text{ } (170) \]

Sixteenth-century accounts\(^{15}\) also exercise license with the facts of John's reign, but in these later histories the distortions create new emphases and new alignments of sympathy, for John is judged as an English King rather than as a papal subject. All of these histories reflect the growing
nationalism and the consequent polarization of loyalties to Church and to State. Hardyng's *Chronicle* begins with the myth of the thirty sisters who named the land of Albion, rather than with the Creation. And his purpose is not to relate the acts of a Divine Providence nor to record events for their own sake, but rather to provide for his own England,

\[\ldots a\ lanterne\ to\ the\ posterite\ 
For\ example,\ what\ they\ ought\ to\ knowe,\ 
What\ waies\ to\ refuse,\ and\ what\ to\ folowe,\ 
(p. 8)\]

Grafton's *Chronicle* is consistent in making God an English partisan. When the French attempt at an English invasion is thwarted, Grafton admonishes the reader:

\[Beholde\ the\ worke\ of\ God:\ The\ English\ 
navie\ tooke\ three\ hundred\ of\ the\ Frenche\ 
kinges\ shippes.\ \ldots\ \ (p.\ 238)\]

And when the English barons sue to France for aid in their rebellion, they have rejected not only John, but God's will:

\[Such\ was\ the\ reporte\ that\ these\ wicked\ 
men\ gave\ of\ their\ Christian\ governor\ 
appoynted\ to\ them\ of\ God,\ whom\ they\ 
ought\ to\ have\ obeyed\ though\ he\ had\ 
been\ evil,\ even\ for\ very\ conscience\ sake.\ 
(242-43)\]

Foxe is the most outspoken proponent of English independence from the power of Rome. English destiny is in God's hands, and the Pope's forces are most at fault when they challenge the royal prerogatives of the English King. The decree of papal sovereignty issued at the Lateran Council is an "anti-Christian act" and John's most praiseworthy trait is
determination that there be

No more gadding and coursing any more
over to Rome, letting riches of land
be transported. Since he has so many
prelates at home, he needs no judg-
ment and justice from abroad. (p. 325)

And Foxe, even in his account of John's death, is sure to
remind the reader that a sin against the King was also
against God. Of the monks at Swineshead, he says sar-
castically,

I would ye did mark well the whole-
some proceedings of these holy vo-
taries, how virtuously they obey their
King, whom God hath appointed. (341)

However, John is not entirely exonerated by these his-
torians. That he had serious flaws in his character is
generally agreed, but his personal shortcomings have no bear-
ing on his conflict with the Church. Grafton, quoting from
Hovedon, offers a final analysis of John as

a mightie and valiaunt prince, but
not fortunate as many were...bount-
eous and liberal to strangers, but
to his owne people, for their daily
treason's sake, he was a great op-
pressor, for he trusted more to for-
eyneres than to them. (247)

Foxe consistently pictures John as victimized by forces
surrounding him. Rarely does the King initiate any action,
but instead is "driven," "enforced," "Compelled," "threaten-
tened," and finally, "poisoned."
Of specific deeds of John, condemned by medieval records, the Sixteenth-Century accounts give generally milder rebukes or even praise. Hardyng censures both John's divorce and his murder of Arthur. But Foxe depicts Arthur as answering John's "many gentle words" with "indignation" and being sent to the Tower where he "at length...finished his life" (321). As to the cause—"the Lord knoweth." John's execution of Peter the Hermit, highly condemned by early chronicles, is held by Grafton to be just, for the man had caused rumors which encouraged the French King who trusted "suche dark drowsye dreames of hippocrites" (239). The influence of Alexander Mason, who had advocated the King's supremacy and been discounted by medieval chronicles as a "pseudo-theologian," even a sorcerer, is held by Holinshed to have been a positive force in the realm, leading the people "out of the damnable sinke of rebellion" (300). His subsequent downfall is attributed to the workings of the Pope:

Thus did he procure to himselfe by telling the trueth against that beast, whose hornes were pricking at everie Christian prince, that he might set himselfe in a seat of supremacie above all principali-
ties... (301)

A facet of John's acts as King, totally disregarded by the monks, was his good works for his people. Rastell's account reminds the reader that during John's reign the first
Mayor of London was chosen and London Bridge was built.

Sixteenth-Century estimates of the actions of the clergy differ in the degree of blame placed on them for the turmoil. Hardyng presents the Pope as "kindly" and John's "misgovernaunce" as sufficient provocation for the interdict. However, a marginal note added to his Chronicle suggests the more prevalent mood:

The piteous and lamentable storye of king John, who by the Roomshe byshop and his adherents was most shamefully and vylanously abused, as by this hys-tory doeth appeare. (271)

Grafton justifies John's expulsion of the "arrogant and craftie" monks of Canterbury, for they had done "so many evils against his Princely prerogative" (234). And he labels the Pope's plea to other nations to take the cross in order to depose John "a large graunt and an unmercifull," adding in a marginal note, "Christ took the crosse, to geve all men life and not to slay any man" (238). Holinshed indulges in open derision of the Church officials, especially the papal legates and the Pope. He criticizes "the sawcie speech of proud Pandulph, the popes lewd legat" (306), accuses the legate Guallo who "upon a falkonish or woolvish appetite fleded the church" and laments the acts of Pope Innocent—"or rather Nocent, who was the root of much mischiefe and trouble, which qualities are nothing consonant to his name" (316).
Foxe is the strongest critic of the clergy, blaming them for every evil of the reign. John's action against the monks was incurred by their "dissoluteness and wilfulness" (322); Peter the Hermit was a result of the "popish prelates crafty juggling" (321); and John's pact with Pandulph is described as a submission "to that execrable monster and anti-christ of Rome" whereby England "became a sorry subject of the sinful seat of Rome" (332). The French War, too, is caused by the priests, "that they might live licentiously in all wealth and in freedom from the King's yoke" (337).

Accounts of John's death also vary in intensity, all mentioning the clergy as agents of his demise but dealing with this blame differently. Rastell retreats into the "some say" topos, as does Hardyng:

Some books sayen he poysoned was (to dead)  
Of plummes so syttyng at his meate,  
With whiche a monke there hym did rehete,  
Wenyng of God greate thanke to gette. (272)

In both Grafton and Foxe is a tale from Caxton, which suggests an association of the monk-poisoner with Caiphas, and indirectly of John with Christ. And Holinshed makes of the death an exemplum. John could have endured all his "manie anguishes and vexations" if only "the loialtie of his subjects had remained towards him inviolable" (337).

Here therefore we see the issue of domesticall or homebred broils, .., whereas no greater nor safer fortification can betide a land, than
when the inhabitants are all alike minded. (337)

The various distortions and the polarizations of loyalties characteristic of both medieval and Sixteenth-Century chronicles are illuminated by a later record of the reign found in Daniel's History of England. Daniel is able to find fault with both John and the clergy. John "governed England with as great injustice as he got it" and by virtue of "violences and oppression" led his state into trouble. In addition, the barons were at fault for their rebellion. The situation became

a miserable breach betwene a King and his people, being both out of proportion, and dis-jointed in those just ligaments of Command and Obedience that should have held them together; . . . We can excuse no part herein; all was ill, and out of order. A diseased head first made a distempered body. (36-37)

A third culprit was the Church, for

An ambitious Clergy polluted with avarice, brought Piety in shew to be a presumptive party herein, and taken advantage upon the weakness they found, for which the Roman Church heares ill to this day. (37)

Here, then, the historian deals with history, analyzing cause and effect rather than defending causes and creating prejudicial effects. Measured by this more factual account, the earlier histories reveal their highly polemic nature,
In addition to these earlier chronicles, John Bale had access to another treatment of King John, the account of John in Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian Man*; and it is here, rather than in sixteenth-century chronicles that John becomes a Protestant hero and martyr, extolled and celebrated, rather than censured. Rainer has observed that Bale's entire methodology in the polemical use of history had been provided by themes first suggested by Tyndale, especially the establishment of a Protestant martyrology. However, it was Honor McCusker who first cited the very passages in Tyndale which support John as exempt from papal obedience and as persecuted by the papal hierarchy. Tyndale offers David and Saul as exemplary of a King's inviolability:

Why did not David slay Saul seeing he was so wicked, not in persecuting David only, but in disobeying God's commandments, and in that he had slain 85 of God's priests wrongfully? Verily, for it was not lawful. For if he had done it, he must have sinned against God; for God hath made the king in every realm judge over all, and over him there is no judge, He that judgeth the king judgeth God; and he that layeth hands on the king layeth hand on God; and he that resisteth the king resisteth God, and damneth God's law and judgment. If the king sin, he must be reserved unto the judgment, wrath, and vengeance of God.

And later in the same treatise Tyndale specifically cites John as example of the Roman clergy's rebellion against such a chosen King:
Read the chronicles of England... and thou shalt find them always both rebellious and disobedient to the kings, and also churlish and unthankful;... Consider the story of King John, where I doubt not but they have put the best and fairest for themselves, and the worst for King John: for I suppose they make the chronicles themselves. Compare the doings of their holy church (as they ever call it) unto the learning of Christ and his apostles, etc. (338)

Considering these passages, McCusker surmises:

It is not unlikely that Bale, seeking a subject for an anti-Catholic play somewhat more solid than his others, found one in Tyndale's passing eulogy of King John and welcomed a plot which gave him opportunity to display both his reformed doctrine and his loyalty to the crown.¹⁹

Given a martyr-hero such as John, Bale applied many of the modifications of the morality form he had used in The Three Lawes in order to create a vehicle for the fullest possible statement of the interdependence of a strong secular ruler and a vigorous anti-Catholicism in maintaining a healthy England. In fact, Bale's King Johan²⁰ is built around two dominant themes: the Power of the Prince and the Primacy of the Scripture. Of these two, the second is definitely subservient to the first, or rather presented as a necessary concomitant of proper royal authority. Otherwise, doctrinal issues are given short shrift. As Blatt notes,
Bale's emphasis is at all times anti-papal and anti-monastic in the Wyclif-fite tradition; his attitude is more national than theological.\textsuperscript{21}

Because of this,

Religious items are never considered theologically but only as they impinge on problems of social harmony. Auricular confession, together with the whole Catholic penetrational system is thoroughly satirized...not on the basis of doctrinal dispute...but because private confession supposedly offered a threat to political stability.\textsuperscript{22}

The play is permeated with direct statements of the role and the power of the Christian King. His position is inviolable:

For he be good or bade, he is of Gode's apoyntyng (l.103)

And his duty is to his country, wherein he must:

Seke ryght to poore, to the weake and faterlesse
Defende the wydowe whan she is in dystresse. (133-34)

He must also "correcte" the clergy "for actes most ungodly" (1.349). In doing this he acts with divine guidance:

For wndowtted, God doth open soche thyngs to prynces
As to none other men in the Christyen provynces. (500-01)

In short,

For non other causse God hathe kynes constytute
And gevyn them e sword but for to correct all vyce. (1276-77)
However, John finds that when he attempts to fulfill this role, he encounters the antipathy of "persones spir-
ytuall" as had his father earlier, and confesses he has "borne them groge, therfor, / Consydryng pe pryde and the capeyose dysdayne / That they have to kynges, whych owte over them to rayne" (11.1301-03).

This hostility elicits even stronger statements of the power of the prince in the second half of the play, and a clear separation of the power of the church:

The powr of princys ys geven from God above,
And, as sayth Salomon, their hartes lord doth move.
God speketh in er lyppes whan they geve jugement.
The lawys that they make are by lordes appoyntment.
Christ wyll not his the princes to correcte,
But to ther preseptes rether to be subiecte.
The offyce of yow ys not to bere sword;
But to geve cownsell accordyng to Godes word. (11.1342-49)

And none should speak ill of the Prince, or deny his obedience:

Of thy prince, sayeth God, thou shalt report non yll.
But thy selfe applye his plesur to fulfyll.
The byrdes of ayer shall speke to ther gret shame.
As sayth Ecclesyastes that wyll a prince dyffame.
The powrs are of God-I wot Powle hath
soch sentence;
He set resyst them agenst God maketh
resystence. (11.1404-1409)

Scriptural authority is given to substantiate the King's
supremacy over the clergy:

Dauid and Salomom the pristes ded
constitute,
Commandyng ye offyces that they shuld
execute.
Iosaphat the kyng the mynsters ded
apoynt;
So ded kyng Ezechias, whom God hym
selfe ded anoynt.
Dyverse of ye princes for ye pristes
ded make decrees,
Lyke as yt is pleyn in the fyrst of
Machabees. (11.1510-15)

And the conclusion of King Johan is a triumphant re-assertion
of this same doctrine--the supremacy of God's appointed King--
as Verity charges the Estates:

For God's sake obeye lyke as doth yow
befall,
For in hys owne realme a kyng is iudge
ouer all
By Gods appoyntment, and none maye hym
iudge agayne
But the lorde hymself, in thys the
scripture is playne,
He that condemmeth a kyng condemmeth
God without dought;
He that harmeth a kyng to harme God
goeth abought;
He that a prynce resisteth doth dampe
Gods ordynaunce
And resisteth God in withdrawynge hys
affyaunce,
All subiectes offendynge are vndre the
kynges iudgment;
A kyng is reserved to the lorde
omnypotent.
He is a mynster immedye under God,  
Of hys ryghteousnesse to execute the rod.  
(11.2346-57)

To this charge, Imperial Majesty adds his confirmation,  
citing the account from II Kings of David's punishment of  
Saul's slayer and the New Testament example of Christ who  
was "vndre the obedyence / Of worldly prynces so longe as  
he was here" (11.2373-74). Finally, even Clergy is forced  
to admit that God protects his chosen rulers:

  . . .sens the tyme of Adam  
The lorde evermore the gouernours  
  preserued.  
Examples we fynde in Noe and Abraham,  
In Moyses and Dauid, from whome God  
  neuer swerued.  
(11.2611-14)

And all agree, "The administraycon of a princes governaunce /  
Is the gifte of God and hys hygh ordynaunce" (11.2634-35).

Scripture, of course, cannot defend the King's power  
if it is not available, and thus the necessity of knowledge  
of the Bible is the second major theme of King Johan. A  
major factor in England's plight is that God, as represented  
in His word, has been "exyled owt of this regyon" (1.113) and  
those who attempt to preach the Holy Gospel are called  
"heretyckes" and "sedicyous scysmatyckes" (11.280-81). The  
clergy's habit--"For your advauncement ye scriturs for to  
wrast" (466)--is illustrated in the exegetical debate of John  
and Clergy concerning the Biblical passage: Astitit regina  
a dextris tuis / In vestitu deaurato, circumpdata varietate.
Clergy identifies the queen as the Church, decked with the many Catholic orders, but John holds that the Church must be surrounded by virtues rather than "mvnkyshe sectes."

Disavowal of Scripture becomes a requisite of absolution (11.855-57) among the Vices, and John's citation of his Scriptural right to tax the clergy is ignored by them. John becomes the champion of Scripture as well as of England, angrily charging the Cardinal to

Take to ye your traysh, yowr ryngyng, and ppyng,
So that we may have the scryptrues openyng.
	(11.1392-93)

For John understands that the "kynges of the erthe" find refuge in the Scripture and that the Church has selfish interest in suppressing it:

For if that (God's Word) were knowne
than wouulde the people regarde
No heade but their pynce. . . . (11.2512-13)

Other traditional themes of Protestant polemic also appear in King Johan. The present Catholic Church is shown to be a degeneration of the early church when the four vice figures are compared to the "fower holy doctors" of the early Church: Awsten, Ambrose, Hierom, and Gregory (1.805-817). The present church is a corrupted temple where

Chryste hath no place;
Moyses and the paganes doth utterly hym deface. (11.1825-26)
From Moses came the ceremonies and from the pagans came "gylded images." Of Christ there is only the Gospel, "and that is in Latyne." Thus, just as Christ had cleansed the defiled Temple of Jerusalem, John will cleanse the Church of his own country—a flattering implicit identification.

And his desire to purge this Temple is chiefly motivated by his knowledge that it provides sanctuary for Treason. It is to this effect that Bale uses the incident of John's attempt to execute a clergyman who was denied trial in the ecclesiastical courts because his crimes were against the state. The priest in question appears as Treason, and it is from his lips that John and the audience hear of the corruption of the Roman Church and of their treasonable influences:

Twenty thousande traytour I haue made in my tyme
Vndre Benedicite betwun hygh masse and pryme.
I made Noblyyte to be obedyet
To the churche of Rome, whych most kynges maye repent.
I haue so conuayed that neyther priest nor lawer.
Wyll obeye Gods wurde, not yet the Gospell fauer.
In the place of Chryste I haue sett vp supersticyons;
For preachynges, ceremoyyes; for Gods wurde,
mennys tradicyons. (ll.1817-24)

To better adapt the traditional form to serve as a vehicle for these themes, Bale made radical innovations in the
morality structure, most marked in the role of the central character. John, while the titular protagonist and certainly the hero of the play, does not function as does the traditional morality protagonist. He is a static character who makes no moral choices between good and evil during the play. In fact, John's only choices—to defend Widow England and to submit to Pandulphus and the Church—are obligations rather than reflections of his inner rectitude. This moral stasis of John has far-reaching consequences, for Bale creates a play containing

the conventional plot of the conflict
morality, preserved in a strikingly
different context through a redis-
tribution of the functions assigned
the various characters.\textsuperscript{23}

Instead of a single protagonist involved in a series of moral choices and reverses, Bale further adopts a technique first used in Wisdom, and creates a multiple protagonist of lesser characters. Although Ribner argues for Widow England as the protagonist,\textsuperscript{24} she too is static and is given no occasion for any moral choices. Rather, it is the Estates of John's kingdom whose allegiance to their King (and hence to God) is tested during the play. Although several students of the play have noted this "tri-partite protagonist" (Blatt, Casebeer, et al.), only Adams has shown how clearly
the structure of the play enforces the function of the Estates. Having asserted that the real tension of the play is created by their shifting attitudes, Adams notes that

The kneeling called for at three strategic points in the play underlines its basic structural design by presenting visually the principal points in the moral progress of the tri-partite protagonist.25

The three scenes in question are 1) 1.506 where Clergy kneels to John in the presence of the other Estates, 2) 1.1148 where all three Estates kneel to Langton, and 3) 1.2329 where all kneel to Imperial Majesty.

Of course, this shift in function creates related changes in characterization which will be considered below. And further, it has the secondary effect of enhancing audience involvement. Whereas spectators could hardly identify with a King as "everyman," they can easily find identification somewhere in this spectrum of protagonists—including even Commonalty whose allegiance, too, is seen to waver. It is the audience's allegiance, after all, that is Bale's primary target in all his polemic writings.

A second structural innovation is the imposition of Bale's schematic view of history upon the action of the play. Adams suggests that in the old morality form, a series of reversals,

Bale must have seen, "a micro-cosmic reflection of that larger
conflict which governed the movement of history... adjusting it freely to accommodate it more effectively to his apocalyptic view of English history. 26

Blatt describes this view as

a theory of waxing and waning cycles of history, the peak coinciding with godliness and the base with iniquity. 27

What this means to Bale's King Johan is that the play's "hero" is not isolated in importance but instead serves as a type to be fulfilled at a later date in history, a character function more familiar in the cycle play than in the morality. Thus, John, the central character, can die without destroying the coherence of the play, for his type is fulfilled in the conclusion with the appearance of Imperial Majesty, a King who truly has overcome the forces of the Roman Church and who combines the regal supremacy of Henry VIII and the sure omnipotence of Deus Pater. Imperial Majesty will now be "Ye supreme head of Ye churche," not "for pleasure of my persone" but "for Gods truth." And this is so by "the auctoryte of Gods holy Wurde." Only one note jars in the triumphant resolution of the problems which John had suffered—the new threat of the Anabaptists at whom Bale, at the time of the latest revision of King Johan, felt compelled to strike:
The Anabaptystes, a secte newe rysen of late,  
The scriptures poyseneth with their subtle allegories,  
The heads to subdue after a sedicyouse rate.  

. . . .  
They haue here begonne their pestilent sedes to sowe,  
But we trust in God to increase they shall not growe.  (11,2626-31)

Of this intrusion into the order and omnipotence brought by  
Verity and Imperial Majesty, Bevington says  

Bale's party of reform, so frustratinly close to success, is on the defensive. It experiences attack from both flanks: subsequent developments on the religious left ironically force Bale. . . to conclude an anti-papist play with repeated warnings of 'The Anabaptystes'.  . . .  

. . . . The dramatic afterthought typifies the dilemma of zealous episcopal reformers like Bale or Cranmer, who never conceded and perhaps never realized that their anti-papist propaganda encouraged extremism. . . . The danger detracts considerably from the idealized vision with which Bale had hoped to end, but does not lessen the energy and inventiveness of his bilious propagandistic art. 28

The bulk of the attention given King Johan has centered on Bale's merger of abstract and historical characters, and certainly this merger is an important innovation. However, Bale's reasons for creating such characters are found in the themes he wished to convey and in the structural modifications already considered above.
John is of course the Protestant martyr-hero out of Tyndale. He first appears as the 'straight man' to England's complaints. He pictures himself as a reformer of laws, a seeker after justice, with no personal antipathies at all. In fact, England's complaint to John takes much the same stance as Fish's *Supplication for the Beggars*. When informed, John again refrains from personal ire, but acts from a sense of duty, "For God hath sett me by his apoyntment iust" (1,136) --and will rely on his Estates to succor England (11,142f). Even his later decision to submit to the Church is based on a strong sense of duty and compassion for his people (See 1,1717ff). John's function is more that of a Virtue in the older moralities; he instructs his Estates in their proper course and they only fall into error at the temptation of the evil agents. Indeed, Bale seems intent on establishing John as a Reformation saint. John is always aware of his role of servant of God. When deponent after many defeats John is not bitter, not impatient, but submissive:

> And now to the, lorde, I woulde resygne
> vp gladlye
> Both my crowne and lyfe; for thyne owne
> ryght it is,
> If it woulde please the, to take my soule
to thy blys. (11.2061-63)

England extolls his virtues and implicitly identifies him as Christ-like martyr when lamenting his poisoning:
A false Iudas kysse he hath gyuen yow
and is gone.
The halte, sore, and lame thys pitiefull
case wyll mone.
Neuer prynce was there that made to poore
people vses
So many masendewes, hospytals and spytte
howses
As your grace hath done yet sens the worlde
began. (ll.2144-48)

The juxtaposition of this speech immediately after the pic-
ture of the "false saint" Symon the Poisoner who would "to
paradyse passe" by virtue of placebo, singing and priestly
prayers after his death is quite effective dramaturgy. The
nature of true sainthood is once more expounded, this time
by Imperial Majesty, who over-hearing Sedition equate himself
with Thomas Becket makes a clear distinction:

Kyng Johan ye subdued for that he
ponnyshed treason,
Rape, theft, and murther in the holy
spirytualte.
But Thomas Becket ye exalted without
reason
Because that he dyed for the churches
wanton lyberte,
That the priestes myght do al kyndes
of inquyte
And by vponnyshed. . . . (ll.2595-2600)

With John so firmly established as Christian King and
Reformation saint, the vices can only persecute, never tempt
him. Thus, the Vice represents not a state of mind which
can be induced, such as Infidelity, but a state of affairs
which can be created among John's subjects--Sedition. In all
other respects, the Vice Sedition is traditional. He identifies himself in self-incriminatory speeches, swears in the standard vicious mode, and marshalls the other forces of evil in the play: Dissimulation, Usurped Power, and Private Wealth. It is significant that these figures represent not external forces of evil which threaten all men (i.e., Mischief, New-guisce, Folly, Lust), but sins inherent in the Roman hierarchy and harmful to the commonwealth in general and to John directly: it is the King's power which has been usurped and it is by dissimulation that John is poisoned.

The actual Clergy of England, although much under the influence of the abstract vices, functions independently of them and remains after the vice figures have been extirpated by Imperial Majesty, vowing to serve God and King in a country where "yche shall do hys functyon" (l.2649). The Roman clergy in general receive the traditional Protestant epithets and charges: they live on the work of others, are false trees not planted by God (l.33) and practice both treason and deceit, "dysgysed heads in er hoodes." Their relics are ridiculed (l.l.1215-30) as are the many orders (l.l.192-210). They rely on Latin to practice their deceit (l.l.715-19) and have left the Scripture for "manns imagynacyons" (l.335). King John best sums up the charges against them as they have offended England:
Yt is yow, Clergy, that hath her in
dysdane
Wyth yowr Latyne howrrs, sermonyes and
pogetly plays.
In her more and more Godes holy worde
decayes,
And them to maynteyn vnresonable ys pe
spoyle
Of her londes, her goodes, and of her
pore chylderes toyle.
Rekyn fyrst yowr tythis, yowr devocions
and yow offrynges,
Mortuaries, pardons, bequestes, and
other thynges,
Besydes that ye cache for halowed belles
and purgatorye,
For iwelles, for relyskes, convessyon
and cowrtes of bavdrye,
For legacyes, trentalles, with scalacely
messys,
Whereby ye haue made pe people very assys;
And over all this ye haue browght in a
rebyll
Of Latyne mummers and sectes desseyvabyll
Evyn to dewore her and eat her vpp
attonnys. (11.414-27)

Special attention, as always is given the Pope, repre-
sented as Usurped Power. He has "avtoryte / Both in heuyn
and erth, in purgatory and in hell" (11.834-35) and his
actions both as Pope in general and as Innocent III in par-
ticular are recounted in detail (11.984-1025). And Bale is
careful to remind all, through Sedition's words, that even
though Imperial Majesty has triumphed for the moment, the
Pope and his organization are omnipresent:

We lyngar a tyme and loke but for a
daye
To sett vpp the pope, if the Gospell
woulde decaye. (11.2550-51)
Bale wanted no false sense of security in his reformed England!

By far the most interesting figure of the tri-partite protagonist is Nobility. Bale is obviously distrustful of Clergy, sees Civil Order as materialistic and covetous, and shows Commonalty's behaviour as directly determined by his environment. It is Nobility's nature that Bale presents in fullest detail, and it is Nobility, of all the Estates, who shows growth of character during the play.

In the beginning Nobility, though badly mis-led by the Clergy (l.280-83) is nevertheless clear about his duty to the King and about Clergy's selfish interest in the matter. He chides Clergy (l.583-87) and avows "Yt becommyth Nobeltye his princes fame to preserve" (l.591). However, Nobility soon admits "I am vnlernd, my wyttes are sone confowndyd" and by the mid-point of the play he is forced to a choice between King and Church. Although he understands that "Yt is cleene agenst the nature of nobeltye / To subdew hys king with owt Godes autoryte" (l.1176-77), when assured of absolution he acquiesces: "Than I submyt me to the chyrches reformacyon" (l.1183). When, at the low ebb of John's authority of the play, the Estates all turn from King John, the King chides Nobility that "the false pretence of superstycyon / Shuld cause yow to be a maynteyner of sedycyon." Angered by such
defection, John is driven to re-define Nobility:

Sum thynketh nobeltye in natur to consyst,
Or in parentage; ther thow is but a myst.
Wher habundance is of vertu, fayth,
and grace,
With knowlage of the lord, nobeltye is ther in place,
And not wher as is the wylfull contemple
of thynges
Pertaynyng to God in the obeydence of kynges. (ll.1522-27)

It is this new concept of Nobility that the character assumes in the closing scene, functioning now in the service of Imperial Majesty and vowing

I thynke we can do vnto God no sacrifyce
That is more accept nor more agreynge to iustice
Than to séa that Beaste and slauterme of the deuyl,
That Babylon boore whych hath done so muche cuyll. (ll.2411-14)

And this new concept of Nobility is given final emphasis by Imperial Majesty himself:

It is a clere sygne of a true Nobilyte
To the wurde of God whan your conscyence doth agree.
For as Christ ded saye to Peter, Caro et sanguis
Non reueluit tibi, sed pater meus celestis:
Ye haue not thyss gyfte of carnall generacyon,
Nor of nobel bloude, but by Gods owne demonstracyon. (ll.2415-20)

Bale's merger of the abstract and the historical in
characterization is, then, a result of his insistence that what is true of one King is true of all Christian kings, that what is the proper role of Nobility in one nation is the proper role of all nobility, and that the anti-Christic evil which informs the Roman Church simply manifests itself in specific men from age to age.

Bale presents the Vice and his agents as traditional abstractions in the first half of the play. Only at mid-point does he let them metamorphosize into historical personages, for now they will put into effect the general scheme of evil outlined by Dissimulation (ll.984-1025). The shift in representational levels is eased by the long "Interpretour's" speech which explains the first act as "a myrrour" showing a Christian king in conflict with the forces of "Satan the Deuyll" but adds that "In the seconde acte thys wyll apeare more playne" (l.1100). The Interpretour then identifies John as "a faythfull Moyses" who led his people from "the lande of Darknesse," but could do no more. Only "that duke Josue, Whych was our late kyngge Henrye" could finish the task and "as a stronge David" strike down "Great Golye, the pope" and restore his people again to a "Christen lybertie."

Here is seen what Bevisnington calls "a more sophisticated use of dramatic time," 29 for Bale is using both the Thirteenth
and the Sixteenth centuries as well as a fictional world of his own making. In like manner, he freely shifts locus. The play opens in a rather vaguely defined English setting during John's reign, and closes with specific references to a Sixteenth-Century court of judgment presided over by Imperial Majesty. In the middle, Bale takes his audience to yet another world—an abstract level reminiscent of the mansions allotted to the Devil, the World, and the Flesh in moralities such as The Castle of Perseverance. In this scene (11,627-1120), the agents of evil, withdrawn from historical time and place, plot their malicious works. Some suggest the place here is meant to be Rome, but rather it is the abode of eternal evil out of which come the orders acted out by specific characters in historical time and place.

Other techniques worthy of mention are to be found in all of Bale's polemic drama. There are the conventional slips of the tongue, whereby an evil nature reveals itself: Sedition calls himself "a lecherous man / . . . I wold saye a lecherous relygyous man" (304-05) and Clergy hastily amends "e pope shall be my rulare" to "My prynce ys my ruler" (11. 512-14). Evil also reveals and even condemns itself in passages such as genealogy of Dissimulation and Sedition (11. 671-678). Another Balean mark is the consistent use of a running metaphor of abuse rather than isolated epithets. Early
in the play the Pope is introduced as the "wyld Bore of Rome" (1.71) who with the Church, "hys sowe," and their "pygges" wallow in the mire. These "popys pygges" will not allow God's word to be heard (1.119). The boar-sow relationship is rendered even more degrading when juxtaposed to the marriage of England and her true spouse God. Thus, Sedition rejects his true mother England in favor of the Church.

One of the most interesting techniques employed by Bale in his attack on the Roman Church is his parody of the Catholic ritual. Adams labels the plentiful parody in King Johan "an extension of the homiletic technique of self-exposure common in the traditional English morality," but Miller asserts that parodies like this in other plays than Bale's are "risible rather than polemic." There are thirteen parodies of Roman ritual which dramatize the evils of the Vices and accentuate the action, for every turn is accompanied by or embodied in a parody, Miller has shown.

Costuming, too, works in almost a parodic fashion. Clothing does not indicate any change in moral condition, as in other moralities, for it is the evil characters whose robes are specified as clerical. Bale is depicting not a process of moral growth or corruption, but a condition of internal evil in those characters antithetical to the King. Costuming merely identifies the inherent source of their evil--
their allegiance to the church. It is a case of costuming functioning not as disguise but as emblem.32

As always, Bale is insistent that his point be made quite plain to the audience. Thus, he creates interpolations throughout to underscore his message and to direct audience sympathy. When the evil agents enter in an obviously allegorical manner (l.748f), Seduction carefully explains the significance of their order. England, too, gives an explanation of the allegorical significance of Commonalty's blindness (l.1582f). Dissimulation clearly isolates the conflict between John and the Pope-Usurped Power (l.984-1025) and the Interpreter's Speech (l.1086-1120) similarly reviews roles and labels the bad and the good. Then, there are direct speeches extolling John's virtues, such as that by Verity (l.2193-2220) and chastened witnesses to the true powers of the King by the repentant Estates at the conclusion of the play. Bale never takes a chance on audience comprehension. Indeed, every technique, every adaptation of earlier forms becomes part of what Adams calls

\[\text{a calculated artistic use of a\ traditional artistic form that makes}\]
\[\text{King Johan more than a curious sur-}\]
\[\text{vival of sectarian propaganda.33}\]

However, there is wide disagreement as to exactly what role the play actually does take in the evolution of the
English history play. Some completely reject *King Johan* as a history play. Schelling holds that it is disqualified because "its consciousness is theological and polemic, not political and historical."\(^{34}\) And Tillyard, though he conceded that "little bits of history appear," finds in the play

> no reflection whatever on the way historical events take place, no philosophy of cause and effect, while political theory does not go beyond ordinary royalism, as intensified by Protestant interpretations of St. Paul, the royalism found in the Homilies.\(^{35}\)

Others insist that *King Johan* is a transitional form. Elson writes it off as "a garbled history overlaid on a substratum of morality play concepts"\(^{36}\); Saintsbury finds the play "the undeniable point of juncture between the Interlude and the Chronicle Play"\(^{37}\); and Collier gives it "intermediate place between moralities and historical plays."\(^{38}\)

Roston calls it a significant influence on the new genre for Bale's transmission of "a sense of purposeful history which he had inherited from the mysteries and which was to reach its Renaissance climax in the monarchical plays of Shakespeare."\(^{39}\) Ribner, too, labels *King Johan* a true history play, "because it deliberately uses chronicle material in order to accomplish several legitimate historical purposes"
and because for the first time in the English drama, the historical element "clearly emerges and attains a weight at least equal to that of the morality abstraction."^40

The question of Bale's play as formative agent in the later course of English historical drama is beyond the province of this study, but those contributions which Bale certainly must be credited with have been best summed up by Armstrong:

What Bale bequeathed to later writers of history plays was not a settled dramatic form, but a set of possibilities. He showed how chronic material could be adapted to illustrate the new theories of kingship, commonweal, and obedience, how it could reveal the general working of divine justice in human affairs, and how it could be linked with particular matters of moment in contemporary politics by the use of mirror scenes. ^41
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CHAPTER VI

BALE'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO ENGLISH POLEMICS
AND TO ENGLISH DRAMA

Bishop Bale's attacks on the Roman Church in both pamphlet and drama were indeed strong, and he no doubt deserved his epithet, bilious Bale. However, he wrote from a sense of conviction in a time when issues seemed to demand extremity, and he has clearly explained his methods in light of his goals:

All this I have done, good Christian reader, brotherly to admonish thee to beware of this cruel enemy and such other which seeketh by their daily crafts to rob thee of that life which thou hast in Christ Jesus. Peradventure thou wilt be moved, not because the man of sin is thus set forth in his right colours but for that it is done here with such extremity. . . . Much better it is to the Christian believer that Satan appear Satan and the devil be known for the devil, than still to lurk under a fair similitude of the angel of light. For when he is once known he may soon be avoided. . . . I know certainly I shall for this be called a thousand times heretic, but I weigh it nothing at all, for it is the old name of true Christians. 1

Although his propagandistic purposes were always foremost, Bale did, I feel, make several contributions to the evolution of dramatic polemics and in general to the course of English drama.
His fundamental contribution was his early awareness of the role drama could play in a polemic situation. He recognized in medieval dramatic genres a potential vehicle for the Protestant views, and provided those who followed him with clear examples of the changes necessary in order to turn medieval drama, traditionally an expression of the communal religious attitudes, into a force which could create views rather than express or reflect them.

By giving his characters topical as well as figural significance, Bale could bring old established attitudes familiar to his audience to bear on new targets. Thus he had only to create via his characterization an association of Pharisee and Papist, of Pope and Anti-christ, of Sodom and Rome. The antipathies were traditional; all Bale had to do was to re-assign them. These associations he achieved by clerical costuming, by the use of "papist" language and oaths, by the presence of liturgical paraphernalia and ritual among the Vice figures, and by direct incriminatory speeches.

But Bale had also to create audience confidence in those figures who represented his own Reformation position. To do so, he made them free of sin and weakness. Whereas traditional medieval drama concerned itself with the evil inherent in fallen man which makes man prey to the Vices, Bale wrote plays in which all the evil was contained in those
characters who were meant to suggest the Papist faction, and was visited upon long-suffering, saint-like victims. The battle is no longer within the protagonist, nor is his soul the important thing to be won. Instead, all values are carefully polarized and the audience's approval is the desired end.

To further assign values, Bale consistently equates Protestantism and a healthy commonwealth, so that those who persecute the good characters are enemies not only of the true faith but of their country as well. Thus, Sedition, in King Johan, not only allies himself with papist figures such as Usurped Power (the Pope), but in so doing rejects his true mother England. No Tudor audience could have missed the point.

In fact, no audience could very well miss Bale's point. He has been careful to erase any potential ambiguity and to explicate in heavy-handed fashion all of his major themes. However, polemics is a heavy-handed business, and we must judge Bale on the basis of what he set out to do rather than what we might wish he had done.

He took the mystery play as far in the direction of polemic drama as was possible. The limitations imposed by Biblical narrative and by a chronological sense of decorum were such that Bale was forced to convey most of his anti-Catholic ideas through added matter, such as the complications
of the three temptations in *The Temptation*, or through a deliberately partisan God. The genre lacked sufficient flexibility, probably the cause for its eventual obsolescence.

In the morality, however, Bale found a much wider potential. Here he could create characters suitable to his purposes, such as *Sedition* and *Sodomy*, who could represent the specific evils he chose to associate with the Roman Church. A consideration of the course of the morality in the Sixteenth Century leaves little doubt that it was Bale's techniques that were used to plow the fertile field of the genre for half a century. (See Chapter IV)

Bale's influence on polemic literature in general was probably felt even more strongly than on drama. His plays were early work and influenced his own later polemic pamphlets in that the traditional metaphors of Protestant polemic are conveyed in more dramatic terms and that this dramatic polarization of values perfected in his plays is consistently employed in later polemic literature.

Later Sixteenth Century treatments of similar matters show the mark of Elizabeth's demand for moderation, but nevertheless continue Balean techniques. Typical of the milder polemics of this era are the short pieces of Ulpian Fulwell, collected in 1575 under the title of *The Flower of Fame*. Here the central theme is Henry VIII as Protestant
hero. Forgotten are the Six Articles, and Henry is depicted as

the verye Hercules that was born to
subdue the Romysh Hydra, agaynst which
many-hedded monster, neyther King nor
Keysar could prevayle. (p. 342)

Henry is now no less than "A mate with heavenly Father's
Sonne" for

God's glorie he did much advaunce,
Repressing error, that had beene
Of many years continuance.
This was his cheefe joy and delyght
Whereby God's gospell shyneth bryght.

(p. 341)

The earlier insistence on seeing the Roman influence
as seditious still seems to have been strong, as witnessed
by such works as Thomas Knell's "A Pithy Note to Papists,"
in 1570. Knell is concerned with the execution of Felton,
a Catholic who had placed a papal bull on the gate of the
Bishop of London. Felton, he reminds his readers, had pledged
his loyalty to "his dad, the Pope" (p. 10), who cannot save
him but is merely "a blinded Romish elf" (p. 11), and even
worse, his crime is not heresy but Treason. Of the case
Knell makes an exemplum:

Beware ye papists and take heed,
I read you yet beware,
And cast all Popery from your harts;
Take heed of hellish rore:
And if you will not yet be true
To God and our good Queen,
I pray to God that all your endes
As Felton's may be seen,
And God save Queen Elizabeth
From Papists will and power,
That sharpned sword by Gospelles force
May all her Foes devour.  (p. 20)

With the growth of Puritanism came a resurgence of intensity in religious polemics. Extreme anti-Catholic works such as "News from Hell, Rome, and the Inns of Court," made great use of Bale's technique of guilt by association.

This work includes a letter from the Devil to the Pope commending the work of his "children" in "sowing discord amongst the English hereticks" and for their part in the Invasion of 1588 and the Gunpowder Treason. The Devil hopes that he may one day soon see his "kingdom of superstition re-established" by the work of

Our children the lordly bishops. . .
our servants, corrupt judges, base-minded lawyers, seditious attourneys, and wooden-headed doctors of law. . . .; whom we have caused to swarm like the Egyptian locusts, over all the land, for the sowing of discord.

(p. 214)

Ritual and liturgical items also become targets of this satire, as in Bale's work. The devil serves up a feast, part of which is a

Large Latin charger, containing 22 lordly English bishops; stewed with
the fire of contention...seasoned with the several spices of man's invention; as with the spice of mass, priesthood, holy-days, altars, candles, rails, holy-bread, holy water, holy ashes, devout prayer for the dead, invocation of saints, etc.

(pp. 218-19)

As before, both sides availed themselves of the same techniques. Pro-Catholic works used the execution of Charles I as proof of the trouble let loose in England by "that fatal Protestantcy," and from the sects which have arisen "from out the hydra of this unhappy reformation."

"Nuntius a Mortuis" reveals a repentant Henry admitting his fault: he had "snatched houses" from the Church, divorced Catherine, "excelling all her sex in virtue," for "that strumpet Anne of Bullen," and had made a vicar of one Cromwell, for which sin England now suffers under the rule of another. Elizabeth, his illegitimate daughter and a Jezebel, ruled even worse during her "womanish popeship." (p. 482)

Most numerous during the Seventeenth Century were tracts lamenting and attacking the new outbreak of extremism. Indeed, the threat of sectarian trouble found in the closing passages of Bale's King Johan by now had reached fruition. The author of "The Old Pharisee with the New Phylacteries of Presbytery" attacks both "popes and presbyters" (p. 75) as enemies of the peaceful commonwealth. He points out that the
Presbyterians maintain "Presbytery as the pope doth purgatory, only to keep their kitchen warm" (p.75) and that both sides are guilty of tyranny. It is deeply ironic to find an author not a century removed from Bale taking the Reformers to task in exactly the same terms he found appropriate to the Roman Church:

When their design prospered, by the adverse fate of the king and prelatical clergy, and they, like Pharoah's lean kine had eaten up all the fat kine; making themselves rich by others poverty, and great by their ruin; then were they, as the prophet speaks of the inhabitants of Babylon, mad upon their idols of Presbytery, compelling the prople to bow the knee to Baal, even in the picture of a lay-elder; which is the image in their kirk, and a dumb-show in their mask. (p.79)

Polemic techniques, then, as exercised by Bale with such vigor, did not disappear, nor do they seem to have lessened in their intensity even in our own times. We may look back on Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century polemic quarrels with condescension, agreeing with William Barlowe that "malice without art is unarmed bitterness, and a distempered folly," but a glance at the texts of current rhetoric must surely remind us that we have not really progressed far from the religious polemics of "bilious Bale."
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BALE'S LOST PLAYS

The titles are from Bale's own list in his 1557 catalogue. Although titled in Latin, the plays were in the vernacular.

Vitam D. Ioannis Baptistae
De Christo duodenni
De baptismo & tentatione
De Lazaro resuscitato
De concilio pontificum
De Simone leproso
De coena Do. & perfum lotione
De passione Christi
De sepultura & resurrectione
(The above seem to have been the remainder of the cycle plays)
Super utroque regis coniugio
De sectis Papisticis
Erga Momes & Zoilus
Proditiones Papistarum
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Contra Adulterantes Dei verbum
De Imposturis Thomae Becketi
Amoris imaginem
Pammachij tragoedias transtuli
APPENDIX B

BALE'S LETTER TO CROMWELL
(British Museum MS Cotton Cleopatra
E IV, F. 167)

Grace and goodness from god ye fader, and from
hys sonne Jesus crist, be euer with yow,
Amen--

Be yt knowne vnto your hyghnes (most honorable lorde)
yt I, John bale doctor of dyuynyte vnwurthye, and at ye
only desyr of faythfull cristen menne late popysh pryst
of thorndon in sothfolke, for zele of goddes wurde,
and most faythfull obedyent loue towards my prince,
haue not only forsaken myn own welth and plesur, as
god and ye worlde knoweth, but also suffered pouerte,
persecucyon, and hate of yll persons for yt. Yea, and
at yis present season soch vylenes, stynke, periurye,
colde, and other incommodyes as ye preson conteyneth,
with oppobryose rebukes of my kepars, and opyn shame
of ye worlde. But for as moch as I haue euydentlye
knowne, most ryghtose iugementes to haue place in yow
by ye gracyose gyft of god, in hys behalf I inteyrlye
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desyr you to waye my poor cause, and late me not for my faithfullnes, fare the worse. The balye of thorndon, whych maketh her ageynst me,\textsuperscript{30} ys nother goddes frynde, my princys, nor yowres, as many substancyall honest men in sothfolke can and wuld also ber wytnes, wer yt not for soch dysiplesor as yei fer to haue by my lorde of sothfolke through hys thretanynges. yea, and one honest man ys now present in the cyte, whych wuld be glad to enforme ye of yt, and also of soch langage as he had of you at lyncolne, yf yt wuld plese you to hear hym, with whom many honest men schall also wytnes. I wuld to god your honor knew of soch dohlenes as my lorde wentworth, master edward grymston, and other wurchypfull men cowde tell yow of hym Wyth gyftes and rewardes to thom whych knoweth not hys deuyllysh cawtels, he hath made stronge byldynges ageynst me, and hath grounded thom vpon lyes, supposyng through my troble and punnyshment to escape daungers, to haue hys full plesur, and to accomplisyh hys promise to certayne popysh prystes, whych haue hyred hym to
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persecute ye trewth. Of them yt hath sealed ageynst me, one lyeth bedred in hys howse and neuer harde me preche, an other sort wer at lyncolne when I preached and hath sealed only vpon the wytnes of ther wyues. Sum wer threatened to lose yr copye londe yt yei holde of my lorde of sothfolke yf yei wuld not wytnes ageynst me. Sum for yt I rebuked yr wyues for vnfaythfull langage ageynst yr prince, sealyd ageynst me, and sum of them ar knowne for common periurs. And for a conclusyon, ye mor part of them knoweth not throwghlye wherto yei haue sealed, and yei whych now knoweth yt, wyll not afferme yt. And sens cristmas, yei wer non other matters yt yei had ageynst me, than yei wuld haue clerlye dyscharged me of, before honest men, so yt I wuld haue for-saken ye towne, and nomor to have cum ther. The artycles whych yei haue gadred vpon my prechynge, wer neuer my sayngs, as I wyll answer befor god, The whych artycles yei haue twyse altred sens ye begynnynge. In one maner of style yei left them with
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my lorde wentworth to examyn me vpon them, and in
an other wurse kynde wyth syr umfraye wyndfyld.
If I haue for want of cownsell or dewe cyrcymspeccyon
takyn to moch vpon me in goddes cause and my princes,
yea when I haue harde your honor, my lorde of
caunterbury, of haly, of wurcetur, of salysbery,
saynt dauides, and others, sлаunnderoslye reported,
I schall be contented heraftor to folowe your
gracyose informacyon. My conseycence geueth me that
I haue nother offendyd god nor my prync in that I
hauc done. Yet am I not so sur, but I may be
dysseyued. wherfor I desyr your gracyose goodnes,
if I haue offended mor yan I can perseyue in my
self, gracyosoyle to ber with myn ignorant blyndnes.
And I schall not only endeouyr my self to amend yt
ys past, but also applye to my vttermost powr, from
hens forth to serue god & my prync with mor sober-
nes. who euer preserue yow, in longer helth to
contynewe. Amen.

your contynuall orator and bedeman, John
Bale

pryst
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LELAND’S LETTER ON BAILE’S BEHALF
(in Original Letters, ed. H. Ellis, III, p. 154)

Syr, I beseche you most humbely to admitte my homble writing at this tyme, seeing that the multitude of your waty maters suffre not me to haue convenient accesse unto you. Doctor Bale, sum tyme a Whight frere, and now a secular preest, ys detained at Greenwiche yn the porters warde upon certein Articles of preching. Wherin I desier your good Lordship, in the way of charite, that he may favorably make his purgation, and so to receyue as he hath merited. The world is ful of yl tunges, and yl wil can not say welle. Surely if the man be not more strungly chaunged, ther is in hym lerning, judgment, modesty, with many other goode qualities, and worthier he was, if he be not lately altered, to haue a better fortune than to be a poore paroch preste. His brother hath broughte up a certificat, subscribed by the most honest menne of the paroch wher he
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dwelled. And as for sum of the articles laide on to him be so folisch that they be worthy no lernd mannes answer. Now, my good Lord, the trouthe knowen, I most humbely beseeche you, in the name of good letters, and charite, that he may trye hym sel, and so to receyue as ye shall se the cause to require. And I shaul pray yn the meane tyme for your prosperitie. At Lordon, the xxv. day of January, by your poore louer and servantt at commandement,

John Leyland.

To the right honorable and my singular good Lorde, my Lord of the Privy Seale.
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**PRO-ROYAL BOOKS PUBLISHED, 1528-1539**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyndale</td>
<td>Obedience of a Christian Man</td>
<td>&quot;Hans Luft&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Antwerp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndale</td>
<td>Parable of the Wicked Mammon</td>
<td>&quot;Hans Luft&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Antwerp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Supplication for the Beggars</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Doctor and Student, Dialogue II</td>
<td>P. Treveris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndale</td>
<td>Practice of Prelates</td>
<td>&quot;Hans Luft&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Antwerp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Doctor and Student, Dialogue II</td>
<td>P. Treveris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Doctor and Student, Dialogue II</td>
<td>R. Redman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Doctor and Student,</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additions to Dialogue II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 editions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>A Glass of the Truth (2 editions)</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Doctor and Student, Dialogues I and II</td>
<td>R. Redman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Spirituality and Temporality</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Spirituality and Temporality</td>
<td>R. Redman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Salem and Bizance</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>Oratio</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Dialogues between a knight and clerk</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Articles devised by consent of king and council</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>De vera differentia</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinnerton</td>
<td>Muster of schismatic bishops of Rome</td>
<td>J. Byddell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Supplication to Henry VIII</td>
<td>J. Byddell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Power of the Clergy</td>
<td>T. Godfray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Constitutions Provincial and Legatine</td>
<td>T. Godfray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. German</td>
<td>Answer to a Letter</td>
<td>T. Godfray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td>De vera obedientia</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starkey</td>
<td>Exhortation to Christian Unity</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Matthew</td>
<td>Sermon at St. Paul's</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsilius of Padua</td>
<td>Defensor Pacis (English translation)</td>
<td>R. Wyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Dialogue between Julius II and St. Peter</td>
<td>J. Byddell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td>De vera obedientia</td>
<td>Franz Rhode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Hamburg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td>De vera obedientia</td>
<td>Wendelin Rihel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Strassburg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheke</td>
<td>Lamentation</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Remedy for Sedition</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Answer to Rebels in Lincolnshire</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Answer to Rebels in Yorkshire</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bekinsau</td>
<td>De supremo regis imperio</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official</td>
<td>Bishops' Book</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Protestation of pope's council</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Regis sententia de concilio et bulla</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>De vera differentia</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Epistle from Henry VIII to Emperor</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Henrici octavi ad Caesarem epistola</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Treatise concerning councils</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Protestation of pope's council</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Treatise proving by the king's laws</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Longland</td>
<td>Sermon before the king</td>
<td>T. Petyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morison</td>
<td>Exhortation to Englishmen</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morison</td>
<td>Invective against treason (3 editions)</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunstal</td>
<td>Sermon on Palm Sunday</td>
<td>Berthelet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(from F. L. Baumer, The Early Tudor Theory of Kingship, pp. 212-13)
APPENDIX E

LETTER TO HENRY VIII FROM A MARRIED PRIEST
(in Original Letters, ed. H. Ellis, III, pp. 111-112)

In my most humblyst wyse, I beyng not so bold as to appere before youre Lordshyp untyll your plesure-
ys knowyn, feere sett apartt, nede compellythe me to wrytt. Thys last Lentt I dyd no lesse then wrytt, and also to your presence I dyd approche, suyng for your lordschypys gracious servyce; but now my sute ys muche other, for my dysfortune hathe byn to have conceyvyd un-truly Goddys worde, and not only with yntellectyon to have thought yt, but exteryally and really I have fulfyllyd the same; for I, as then beyng a preste, have accompleschyd maryage; nothyng pretendyng but as an obedyentt subyect. For yf the Kyngys Grace could have founde yt lawfull that prestys mught have byn maryd, they wold have byn to the Crowne dubyll
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and dubyll faythefull, furst in love,
secondly for fere that the Bysshope of
Rome schuld sette yn hys powre unto ther
desolacyon. But now by the noyse of the
peopull I persayve I have dunne amysce,
which saythe that the Kyngy serudyte
yugementt with all hys cowncell temperall
and spyrytuall hathe stableschyd a con-
trary order, that all prestys schalbe
separat by a day; with which order I have
contentyd my selfe: and as sone as I herd
it to be tru, I sentt the woman to her
frendys iij. score mylys from me, and
spedely and with all celereye I have re-
sorted hether to desyre the Kyngs Hyghtnes
of hys favor and absolucyon for my amysce
doyng; prayng and besechyng your Lordschypps
gracyous cumfortt for the optaynyng of hys
gracyous pardon: and I schalbe your bounden
servauntt yn hartt and also yn contynnuall
APPENDIX E
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servyse ye yt schall please your gracyous
lordschypp to accept ye duryng my lyfe:
wrythyn the xviiij. day of June.

Your bounden for ever,

John Foster
APPENDIX F

WILLIAM BARLOW TO THE KING, A.D. 1533.
(From MS. Cott. Cleop. E. iv. fol. 121.)

Prayse be to God, who of hys infinyte
goodnes and mercye inestimable hath brought me
owt of darcknes into lyght, and from deadly
ignoraunce unto the quicke knowlege of trothe,
from the which through the fendes instygacyon
and fals perswasyones I have greatly swerved,
wrappynge my selfe in manyfolde erroures and
detestable heresyes agaynst the doctrine of
Chryst and determynacyon of holy churche, in
so moche that I have made certayne bookes, and
have suffred theym to be emprynted, as the
Treatyse of the Buryall of the Masse, a
Dyaloge betwene the Gentyllman and Husbandman,
the Clymbynge up of Fryers and Religious
Persones, portred with fygures, a descripccion
of Godes worde compared to the lyght; also a
convicyous dyaloge without any tytle, inveynge
specyally agaynst Saynt Thomas of Canterberye,
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which as yet was never prynted nor publysshed openly. In thses treatyses I perceyve and ak-
nowlege my selfe grevously to have erred,

namely, agaynst the blyssed sacrament of the altare, dysalowyng the masse and denyenge purgatorye, with slawnderous infamye of the pope and my lorde cardynall, and owtragious raylyng agaynst the clergeye, which I have forsaken and utterly renounced. Wherfore I beynge lately informed of your hyghnes endued with so excellent learnyng and syngler juge-
ment of the trothe, which endevored not onely to chace awaye and extyrpe all heresyes, but also to se a reformacyone of slawnderous lyvyng, for the restraynte of vyce in all estates, to the furtheraunce of vertue and avauncement of Godes worde; also considerynge the pyteous favour voyde of rygour, and mercye abhorrynge cruelte, which your hyghnes hath used towarde other of your subgettes fallen into soche lyke heresyes, as have submytted theym selves humbly unto your grace; I have made
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sute by all means possible freely without
mocyon or any man to come and present my
selfe afoire your highnes fet, to submytt
my selfe unto your mercyfull pleasure, be-
sechynge your gracuous pardone. Also as
ferre forthe as I have knowlege in all
things to acertayne your grace unfaynedly
whatsoever your highnes shall vouchesave to
demaunde of me, your unworthy subgett and
oratour,

William Barlo.
APPENDIX G

TIME AS ARTIFACT
(from Kolve, *The Play Called Corpus Christi*, p. 120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Sacred Histories</th>
<th>The Two Times</th>
<th>The Three Laws</th>
<th>The Seven Ages of The World</th>
<th>The Corpus Christi Protocycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Testament</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Law</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Creation &amp; Fall; Cain &amp; Abel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Time of Misdoining (Justice)</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Noah &amp; Flood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Law</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Abraham &amp; Isaac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>The Prophets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Sacred Histories</th>
<th>The Two Times</th>
<th>The Three Laws</th>
<th>The Seven Ages of The World</th>
<th>The Corpus Christi Protocycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Testament, Apocrypha, and Book of Revelation</td>
<td>The Time of Grace (Mercy)</td>
<td>The Law of Charity (The Law Fulfilled)</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Nativity; Passion; Resurrection; Ascension; Assumption &amp; Coronation of the Virgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CORPUS CHRISTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOMENT OF PERFORMANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seventh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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