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Milton and the Middle Ages: Poetic Analogues and Visual Representations of *The War in Heaven*, *Expulsion of the Rebel Angels*, and *Michael and the Dragon*

Steven Hrdlicka

*University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Milton is not typically connected to the Middle Ages as much as to the later Enlightenment and the Romantic periods. Yet many distinctively medieval ideas can be seen in *Paradise Lost*, especially in the scenes that are related to the War in Heaven. Milton’s account of the war displays a medieval understanding of history in terms of typology in the drama of salvation. Particular details about the war itself such as St. Michael and Lucifer’s sword fight, Jesus’ eventual ending of the war, and the human characteristics of the fallen angels all have clear parallels in longstanding Christian poetic and visual traditions which can be seen to develop in the Middle Ages. In addition, Milton’s play on light and darkness in the poem was a common technique that painters used, and also had theological significance in medieval understandings of God and evil which can be observed in as widely different contexts as Thomas Aquinas’ aesthetics and the common mystery play. These contexts are relevant to discussions of controversial subjects in *Paradise Lost*, such as Milton’s character Satan, if only because they were proverbial in Milton’s time.

*Raphael, Michael Vanquishing the Devil, ca. 1518, Louvre, Paris*
Critics and scholars have often considered Milton to be a visionary because his poetry and prose have elicited strong associations with the sensibilities of the times which follow his own. His popularity among both critics and poets of the Enlightenment as well as the Romantic period attest to this—as does his influence in both the literary and visual arts. Likewise critics often tread the fertile ground of Milton’s classicism. Copious footnotes, endnotes, and commentaries annotate Milton’s poetry for readers down to the most obscure mythological references. However, it is unfortunate that a significant aspect of Milton’s poetry, his knowledge of and use of material from the Middle Ages, has not received the critical attention it deserves. Naturally the tendency to avoid such consideration has been due to Milton’s pronounced (and well known) Protestant views observable in his prose works.¹

Recent work on this subject has however, as John Ulreich has noted, “modified our view of Milton’s relation to the Middle Ages by suggesting a number of affinities between his thinking and habits of mind that are usually thought of as distinctively medieval.”² Notably, scholars investigating Milton’s relationship to the medieval view of Biblical history, particularly in terms of typology, have found there to be much fertile ground when turning to excavate evidence of traditional iconography in *Paradise Lost*.³

This paper considers a selection of poetic and visual analogues to material in *Paradise Lost* in order to demonstrate that Milton’s use of medieval Christian tradition, poetry, and art of the Middle Ages was extensive, and also to bring such evidence to bear on the discussion of highly controversial issues in the poem. Below these

---

¹ For a concise summary of the history of scholarship concerning Milton and the Middle Ages, see Ulreich, “Milton on the Eucharist,” 32-56.


contexts are explored in relation to Milton’s character Satan. The high number of visual analogues to Milton’s iconic descriptions (of which I highlight only a small sample in this paper) suggest that the poet’s knowledge of perennial theological issues did not result entirely from personal genius, study, or “interior illumination” as is often understood and supported by the poet’s invocation to “Holy Light” at the outset of Book III as well as his (generally speaking) Protestant orientation to God. Consideration of the medieval pictorial and poetic analogues to Milton’s iconic scenes of the War in Heaven and the Fall of the Rebel Angels, crucial scenes which thrust into motion the main matter of *Paradise Lost*, offer a unique opportunity to discuss the force of the main action of Milton’s poem in relation to a longstanding established tradition Milton undoubtedly drew upon.

The War in Heaven in Milton’s poem exhibits much extra-Biblical material. Only scant material in the Bible outside of two passages exists for the war, one in Revelation 12 and the other in Isaiah 14. Due to this fact it may become an attractive prospect to look for definitive sources for Milton’s descriptions and detailed story elements in the copious tradition that preceded him in the Middle Ages. Yet in his book *Milton’s Imagery and the Visual Arts*, Roland Mushat Frye

4 For an example of how medieval theology and Milton’s poem are linked, particularly in the similarities between Milton’s Satan’s motives and the theology of Duns Scotus, see Rumrich, “Milton, Duns Scotus,” 33-49.


6 Although Milton was free to follow more obscure or non-traditional sources such as the Book of Henoch for the matter of his great epic, which would have potentially afforded him much “original” material to introduce to his audiences, he instead followed traditional accounts of the creation and the fall which can be observed to be rephrased by authors and artists time and time again from Augustine’s *De Civitate Dei* (esp. Book ix, chapter 13), to the Anglo-Saxon poem *Genesis*, and afterward observable in countless homilies, literary works, dramas, and in the visual arts through the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance.

7 For a discussion of Milton’s relationship to Christian tradition, including medieval scholastic material that he claimed contempt for, see Patrides’ *Milton and the Christian Tradition*.

8 Other possible allusions to these episodes are in Ezekiel 28: 13ff and Wisdom 2: 24.
cautioned against the idea of seeking to make definitive connections between particular paintings, drawings, or illuminations and Milton’s epic, noting that, “Where visual motifs have been long established and widely employed, as is true for most of Milton’s epic subject matter, the precise direction and line of influence is often impossible to determine.”

Even if it happens that a particular singularity of Milton’s description can be found in only one other corresponding visual analog, Frye says, “we should consider that the two artistic imaginations may have been operating quite creatively and quite independently of each other, or that they may have relied upon a common source or a common tradition, and we must be careful not to mistake analogues for sources.” The idea of definitive direct influence has, after all, accounted for much of the longtime controversy about whether Milton was familiar with the Anglo-Saxon poem *Genesis*. That said, it appears that an illumination of the *Genesis* poem very nearly parallels Milton’s account of the final episode in the expulsion of the rebel angels from Heaven, for in the illumination it is Jesus and not the archangel St. Michael who casts the angels out (interestingly this is a detail not expressed in the Anglo-Saxon poem itself). This specific parallel can also be found also in an illumination from the Ælfric manuscript.

The rich visual and poetic tradition with which Milton was familiar provides important contexts for the poet’s great epic in terms of interpretation. The visual analogues can bring much to bear on *Paradise Lost* because the composition practice of painters was very

---


11 See Frye, *Milton’s Imagery*, chapter 3: “Milton’s Awareness of the Visual Arts” for a survey of Milton’s travels and a bibliography of sources that address his acquaintance with the visual arts. In 1638-1639, during his scholarly retirement, Milton took a Continental tour. He spent months in Florence where he met with his friend and art historian Carlo Dati and also with the Gaddi and Frescobaldi families who held fine collections of art. Milton also spent two months in Rome and had a stay in Venice, and was also well received there by those he knew; Henry Wooten provided Milton with introductions in Venice and Milton was free to see the works in the Vatican in Rome. He spent a much shorter period in Paris but there he visited the Louvre.
similar to that of poets; painters like poets composed their works by having recourse to the three stages of classical rhetorical \textit{inventio}, \textit{dispositio}, and \textit{elecutio} in the discovering, arranging, and clothing of the material of a composition.\footnote{See Erwin, “Ut Rhetorica Artes” and Appendix 2, “\textit{Inventio, Dispositio, Elecutio},” in Lee’s \textit{Ut Pictura Poesis}.} Thus painters sought to tell a story through their compositions.\footnote{In \textit{De Pictura}, perhaps the foremost of all the Italian Renaissance painting treatises, Alberti says unequivocally that \textit{historia} is “the greatest work of the painter.” The word “history” comes from the Latin \textit{historia} which came from the Greek \textit{historein} meaning ‘to inquire’ and this verb developed from the Greek noun \textit{histōr} which meant ‘learned man.’ There is also a likely connection to the Indo-European root \textit{weid}- meaning ‘to see.’} In fact, there is a strong connection between the visual arts and the epic poetic mode because both take for their subjects \textit{historia}, elevated noble matter that had occurred in a bygone time. The painter and the poet both sought inspiration for a story in the Bible and in classical literature. This is to say that the visual representations of scenes such as the War in Heaven and St. Michael and the Dragon were composed to tell a story. As a literary artifact, a poem, \textit{Paradise Lost} demonstrates a complex organic imbrication of tradition out of which the poet spins a pressingly relevant retelling for his own time and place.

Generally speaking, this is a medieval idea in the most basic sense. The War in Heaven Milton depicts in Books V and VI is nothing if not urgent allusion to contemporary moments of war, full of cannons, black powder, and encampments, a force to be reckoned with like that of the New Model Army. At times Heaven seems as though it will be torn asunder like London during the English Civil War:

\begin{quote}
Someone intent on mischief, or inspired
With dev'lish machination might devise
Like instrument to plague the sons of men
For sin, on war and mutual slaughter bent. (VI, 503-506)\footnote{This and all subsequent citations from Milton are from Leonard, ed., \textit{John Milton}.}
\end{quote}

And also:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
But soon obscured with smoke, all Heav’n appeared,
From those deep-throated engines belched, whose roar
Embowelled with outrageous noise the air,
And all her entrails tore, disgorging foul
Their devilish glut, chained thunderbolts and hail. (VI, 585-589)

In the Middle Ages, the relationship between the past and the present was peculiar, so much so that Mary Carruthers notes that, “Few features of medieval scholarship are so distinctive as an utter indifference to the pastness of the past, to its uniqueness and its integrity ‘on its own terms,’ as we would say.”

Though writing early, Augustine’s ideas continued to exert influence throughout the Middle Ages and his writings, particularly the *Confessions*, detail a characteristically medieval relation between past and the present. “Augustine journeyed through his memory not to find his past but to find God, his present and future. And it is clear that Augustine assumed that the way to God lay only through the re-presenting of his past in memory; he has no interest in his past except as it provides him with a way and ground for understanding his present.”

This concept of the immediate “relation” between past and present meant for medieval and renaissance writers not that actual historical events never occurred in a past era, but rather that the import of those events, in terms of the Christian drama of salvation is, as St. Augustine’s thoughts on memory continued to be developed in the Middle Ages, a part of the living memory, “[as a] stairway of the mind to timeless and universal truth.”

The import of the past into the present can also be observed in the many medieval dramas and paintings of salvation history which represent historical characters as dressed in medieval armor or dress rather than in historically period correct attire. In the many paintings entitled *Michael and the Dragon*, St. Michael is represented in armor—in much the same way that St. George was depicted fighting a dragon. That this carried on into the Renaissance can readily be seen.


17 Müller, “Memory in Medieval Philosophy,” 122.
One example of this can be seen in Antonio Pollaiuolo’s depiction of Michael and the Dragon (ca. mid-15th century) which shows St. Michael to be on even ground with the dragon (Figure 1). The painter presents the encounter to be a decidedly earthly one between the forces of good and evil. St. Michael, dressed in a coat of armor, suggests dramatic movement through the gesture and attribute through which the painter orders the composition: The right arm held high above the head is ready to strike the dragon either with a thrust or a sweeping downward motion of the sword. If it were not for the wings of the angel which span the width of the whole painting, viewers of this piece would be justified in believing St. Michael to be a knight in a fanciful story about dragon slaying—stories which were popular enough. However, the wings instantaneously bring viewers crashing from what appears to be a contemporary medieval moment into the eternal context of the physical and spiritual struggle between the forces of good and evil. One might refer to this kind of moment as “omni-temporality,” a word that Erich Auerbach uses in *Mimesis*, and which is an apt way to describe the layers of historical, mythological, and sacred history the painter has compressed into a single frame.18 History is, in the medieval conception, not something to be thought of as “past” but instead something always present; “types” or “figures” could be readily apprehended in any time, and this grew naturally out of the reading Scripture with an eye to typology. An example of typology in the Bible would be the way in which key aspects of iconography in the story of Noah in Genesis can be understood to be present in the context of the historically much later New Testament details of Christ’s life, ministry, and

---

18 See *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality*, 73-74, “[I]f…the sacrifice of Isaac is interpreted as prefiguring the sacrifice of Christ, so that in the former the latter is as it were announced and promised, and the latter “fulfills” (the technical term is *figuram implere*) the former, then a connection is established between two events which are linked neither temporally nor causally—a connection which it is impossible to establish by reason in the horizontal dimension… It can be established only if both occurrences are vertically linked to Divine Providence, which alone is able to devise such a plan of history and supply the key to its understanding. The horizontal, that is the temporal and causal, connection of occurrences is dissolved; the here and now is no longer a mere link in an earthly chain of events, it is simultaneously something which has always been, and which will be fulfilled in the future; and strictly, in the eyes of God, it is something eternal, something omni-temporal, something already consummated in the realm of fragmentary earthly event. This conception of history is magnificent in its homogeneity, but it was completely alien to the mentality of classical antiquity.
Naturally this pattern of thinking and association would transpose a layer of Biblical history right onto the daily life and actions of faithful Christians who continually reflected upon present everyday events in terms of eternity and in terms of the supernatural significance of ordinary moments. Reflection upon the nature of salvation history in the Bible as a kind of gradual revelation of God to man through the events related in Scripture was seen congenial to everyday events which were thought to likewise reveal the mind of God. A companion painting that Pollaiuolo composed demonstrates this concept when considering the two paintings side by side. In the companion painting, Hercules labors against the Lernean Hydra standing in an identical posture to St. Michael. The attribute of the club Hercules wields represents what appears to be intentional contrast to the sword prominently held high in the painting of St. Michael, and Hercules’ scant clothing is stark next to St. Michael’s armor.

Figure 1: Pollaiuolo, Michael and the Dragon and Hercules and the Hydra.

19 Labriola, ““Christian History in Paradise Lost.”” 119, “…the account of Noah and the Deluge ‘was always considered one of the best allegorical adumbrations of the life and ministry of Christ’; it was also traditionally interpreted as ‘the story of the second creation and the first salvation.’”

20 This concept can be traced to early medieval Neo-Platonists such as Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite (ca. 5th-6th century) and can be seen to flourish in St. Bonaventure’s Itinerarium Mentis in Deum (The Mind’s Journey into God). St. Bonaventure says that the soul must begin by “reading” the Book of Nature that the Author (God) wrote.
It is interesting to note too that some 200 years before Milton wrote *Paradise Lost*, a poem famous for its numerous appropriations of pagan material into a Christian context, Pollaiuolo appears to have suggested a similar kind of association. Between Pollaiuolo and Milton also stand two formidable Renaissance mythographers, Vincenzo Cartari (1531-1569) and Natale Conti (1520-1582), who John Mulryan argues deeply influenced Milton’s understanding of the pagan stories in terms of Christian revelation.\(^{21}\) It is also notable that the two Italian epics that most closely resemble *Paradise Lost*, Antonio Alfano’s *La battaglia celeste tra Michele e Lucifero* (1582) and Erasmo di Valvasone’s *Angeleida* (1590), also depict the good angels, especially St. Michael and Gabriel, in gleaming armor and armed with swords. These poets like Milton used the medieval armor and sword to signify the nobility of the angels who fight for God while the rebel angels use cannons and the like.\(^{22}\) As reiterated by Eliot and Empson, Milton had famously incurred Samuel Johnson’s censure for his use of earthly materiality to convey supernatural realities: Johnson said, “The confusion of spirit and matter which pervades the whole narration of the war of heaven fills it with incongruity; and the book in which it is related is, I believe, the favorite of children, and gradually neglected as knowledge is increased.”\(^{23}\) Yet it seems to me that these critics miss the point of Milton’s decision to convey a historical, or more accurately, an eternal (therefore always) moment, as an event that is only accurately perceived by realizing its presence in the contemporary moment—be that what it may.

These observations find corroboration in another medieval depiction of the theme of *Michael and the Dragon* composed in 1405 by an anonymous Spanish painter. Again St. Michael is depicted in a suit of armor and again the painter uses gesture to communicate to the reader the dramatic subject matter of battle; the angel holds the sword up with the right hand in a position ready to strike.  

\(^{21}\) Mulryan, *Through a Glass Darkly.*

\(^{22}\) See Revard, *The War in Heaven,* 188. Erasmo di Valvasone’s *Angeleida* (1590) shares many similarities with *Paradise Lost* which suggests that both poems grew out of a similar tradition of the motif of The War in Heaven as well as hexameral traditions. Many precedents can be found for the fallen angels’ recourse to modern warfare, and their invention of black powder, which can be seen in Ariosto (*Orlando Furioso* Book 9) and Spenser’s *Fairy Queen* (Book 7), in addition to the scenes in Valvasone’s *Angeleida*. In fact, Frye points out that in the medieval French mystery plays cannons and black powder were so common that there were often injuries of actors and spectators (*Milton’s Imagery*, 49).

significant difference here is that the dragon is clearly in a position of defeat, recoiling on his back and bleeding from a blow that the angel presumably has landed at some point in the battle. This corresponds to Milton’s detail in Book VI in which St. Michael strikes Satan with a blow of the sword which temporarily cleaves the rebel angel and draws a blood-like substance:

Together both with next to Almighty arm,
Uplifted imminent one stroke they aimed
That might determine, and not need repeat...
...but the sword
Of Michael from the armoury of God
Was giv’n him tempered so, that neither keen
Nor solid might resist that edge; it met
The sword of Satan with steep force to smite
Descending, and in half cut sheer, nor stayed,
But with swift wheel reverse, deep ent’ring shared
All his right side; then Satan first knew pain,
And writhed him to and fro convolved, so sore
The gridding sword with discontinuous wound
Passed through him, but th’ ethereal substance closed
Not long divisible, and from the gash
A stream of nectarous humour issuing flowed
Sanguine, such as celestial Sprits may bleed... (VI, 316-318 & 320-333)

Figure 2: Anonomous, *Michael and the Dragon*, 1405
It is important to notice here that Milton’s depiction of the chief rebel angel appears angelic, in other words as one not unlike St. Michael in kind, during the battle scene in Book VI:

...for likest Gods they seemed,
Stood they or moved, in stature, motion, arms
Fit to decide the empire of great Heav’n.
Now waved their fiery swords, and in the air
Made horrid circles; two broad suns their shields” (301-305)

However, once Satan finds himself “chained on the burning lake,” Milton’s description of the chief rebel angel speaks to the ontological change that the fall has effected in the one who was once the brightest of all the angels:

...his other parts besides
Prone on the flood, extended long and large
Lay floating many a rood, in bulk as huge
As whom the fables name of monstrous size,
Titanian, or Earth-born, that warred on Jove,
Briareos or Typhon, whom the den
By ancient Tarsus held, or that sea-beast
Leviathan...(I, 194-201)

Due to the nature of poetry as a temporal mode, that is, that the essence of poetry is to unfold in time and thus folds a past, present, and future into an expression, Milton can thus depict Satan in multiple forms. The painter on the other hand attempts to tell the same epic story of the War in Heaven but all in just one frame of action. The painter is much more restricted yet still seeks to tell the same story, albeit in a condensed form and this can be seen in the use of the theme of St. Michael and the Dragon. The anonymous Spanish artist in the slide above (Figure 2) chose to focus on the conclusion of the battle: the dragon is vanquished, while Polloaiulo (Figure 1) showed the two to be in the midst of battle. Since the painter strives to tell the whole story, that is, the conflict, the climax, and the resolution, the goal for the painter was to select a moment and arrangement (dispositio) that would convey all three of these crucial elements of the story in one instant (rather than unfolding in time).24 This is actually why in the Paragone Leonardo Da Vinci argued so strongly for the supremacy of painting to poetry: Painting he said strikes one immediately and

24 See Erwin, Textual Vision, 6-11, 39-41, 49-51 and Lee, Ut Pictura Poesis, chapter IX “The Unity of Action,” 61-66, for essential background on this idea.
through a kind of shock of instantaneous revelation the viewer can comprehend the entire matter. This is also why the parallel themes of *Michael and the Dragon*, *Michael and Satan*, and the *Fall of the Rebel Angels* (sometimes called ‘The Expulsion of the Rebel Angels’) can be found to exhibit seemingly endless treatments in pictorial expression.

The specifically English tradition of visual treatment of the theme goes back quite far, beginning in the 10th or 11th century as illuminations in the Junius 11 and the Ælfric manuscripts. It is clear that as early as the late 10th to early 11th century the theme finds expression in very human-looking figures. The fallen angels’ human appearance continues, with the demons almost always falling toward Hell head-first, in paintings that continue development of this theme and tradition. In the Ælfric illumination, it is clearly Jesus who sits in the mandorla (the almond shaped enclosure at the top center of the illumination) and around God are several ministering angels. The mandorla was a sacred symbol that was often used by visual artists to communicate the essential nature of Christ as sharing the two natures of the divine and the earthly. The almond shape results when two circles, one representing Heaven and the other Earth, intersect to bring the two realms together as one.

![Figure 3: Visual Demonstration of the Mandorla](image)

Another parallel to Milton’s detail that it is Jesus who casts the rebel

25 The Ælfric manuscript is Cotton Claudius B IV at the British Library; Junius 11 is housed at the Bodleian Library.
angels out of Heaven can be found in illuminations from the Junius 11 manuscript (discussed below). These parallels are significant because in nearly every visual representation of this story following these manuscript illuminations, it is St. Michael who vanquishes the dragon, Satan, or the fallen angels.

Figure 4: 11th Century Illumination from the Ælfric Manuscript

For example, many developments on this theme can be found in the panel composed by an anonymous painter who composed *The Master of the Rebel Angels* (ca. 1340-1345). The development of certain visual details of the theme can be seen mainly in the use of color. Again it is Jesus who sits at the top of the work, although here the dominant image is the triangle, which often symbolizes
the Trinity, rather than the mandorla. The angels are depicted here as in the Ælfric illumination as close to God but in the Master of the Rebel Angels they clearly appear to be below God, armed and ready to fight. The devils are recognizably humanoid but with the dramatic addition that they appear to be in the process of changing into demons as they fall: The angels closer to the bottom of the panel have feet with claws, heads with horns, and wings that appear more bat-like than the angels nearer the top who have wings of feathers. Perhaps the most important aspect of this painting is the darkness that the painter has used to designate the fallen angels as shut out from God’s light, which alludes to a theological principle for conceiving of the life of God in human terms.

Another difference between The Master of the Rebel Angels and the
illumination from the Ælfric manuscript is that it is St. Michael who here appears larger than any of the other angels and he is positioned right in the center of the composition. Both on the continent as well as in England the tradition of St. Michael defeating the rebel angels, particularly Satan, was proverbial. Richard F. Johnson has compiled evidence of the incredible devotion to St. Michael that the English had developed throughout the Middle Ages.\(^{26}\) As a warrior angel, St. Michael’s protection was often invoked, and the sheer number of churches dedicated to St. Michael at the time of the Reformation in England numbered over 600.\(^{27}\) There were a variety of visual traditions and oral legends which developed and circulated to contribute to the living presence of this angelic saint’s influence which swept widely to appeal to the visual and literary artist as well as to the most common Englishman.\(^{28}\) One reason for the development of a strong cult of St. Michael in England was due to the association of his warrior-like presence and the saint was often invoked for protection as a guardian.\(^{29}\) Milton would have been familiar with these traditional folk and literary legends in England and his choice to depict St. Michael in extended hand-to-hand combat with Lucifer supports a link between the action sequences in Book VI of *Paradise Lost* and these larger contexts of visual and literary tradition.

\(^{26}\) Johnson, *St. Michael the Archangel*.

\(^{27}\) Johnson, *St. Michael the Archangel*, 1.

\(^{28}\) For discussion of the depictions of St. Michael in church architecture, see Lang, “St. Michael, the Dragon,” 57-60.

\(^{29}\) See Johnson *St. Michael the Archangel*, 51, one Anglo-Saxon legend (in the *Old English Martyrology*) based on the apparition of Monte Gargano, “On the twenty-ninth day of this month [September—one of St. Michael’s feast days] was St. Michael’s church consecrated in the town of Tracla in the province of Eraclae. A host of enemies came to the town and surrounded it. The citizens through a three-days’ fast steadfastly prayed to [God] for help and prayed that he make a revelation to them through St. Michael. Then on the third day St. Michael stood over the gate of the town and had a fiery sword in his hand. The enemies were gripped with terror, and they withdrew, and the citizens remained unhurt. And there was built St. Michael’s church, and it was consecrated on the day when we honor the memory of St. Michael.”
Milton’s Satan

One highly contested character in critical literature and classroom discussion is the interpretation of Milton’s character Satan. It has become commonplace to assert that Satan is the hero of the poem which is natural, it is true, if readers consider almost exclusively the Romantic, Victorian, and Modern critical heritage, societal trends, and political views that have copiously commented upon and illustrated the action of Milton’s great epic. Often it is the humanness of Satan that persuades readers to this opinion of Milton’s supposed sympathetic portrayal of the character. Yet sympathetic epithets and descriptions of Satan or any of the fallen angels are quite hard to locate in the first two books of the poem. In the first book alone the “baleful eyes” (1.66) of Satan are hateful and wicked; the associations with “Titanian...Briareos...Typhon...Leviathan” (198-201) are scarcely humanizing; and Milton’s continuous epithets such as “Infernal serpent” (1.34), “superior fiend” (1.283), and “Arch-Fiend” (1.156) restate the nature of the chief demon through varied titles. Milton’s simile too, which compares the fallen angels to the locusts which brought plague to Egypt, associates the devils with anything but what one would call “human nature”: “...in Egypt’s evil day / Waved round the coast, up called a pitchy cloud / Of locusts, warping on the eastern wind, / That o’er the realm of impious Pharaoh hung / Like night, and darkened all the land of Nile...” (1. 339-343).

Beccafumi’s portrayals (ca. 1520’s) of the fallen angels demonstrate painters had often depicted the rebel angels through the use of shockingly realistic human images well before Milton had thought to do so.
Figure 6: Beccafumi, *Fall of the Rebel Angels*, Siena Pinacoteca, ca. 1520’s.

Figure 7: Beccafumi, *Fall of the Rebel Angels*, St. Niccolo al Carmine, ca. 1520’s.
By using human characteristics to depict the fallen angels, Beccafumi does not seek to humanize them as much as to relate the conflict, climax, and most importantly, the recognition that the fallen angels have when they realize what falling from heaven means in reality. Telling a story, Beccafumi’s paintings render the drama of this cosmic event in recognizable and instantly relatable terms. The faces in both paintings can be seen to range from sheer surprise to severe anguish and terror, and this technique for dramatizing the epic story in a single frame works at stirring the viewer’s curiosity into the nature of the demons who Christian tradition understands to be able to tempt mankind with the attraction of sin. There is much to notice about both of these striking portrayals of the theme of the *Fall of the Rebel Angels*, but most visible is the overwhelming presence of St. Michael with sword in hand. In the first painting Beccafumi makes it clear that it is the Father’s Will that St. Michael perfectly (and in this portrayal solely) enacts, for both of their right hand gestures are identical.\(^\text{30}\) In addition to this, the strong contrast between light and dark again can be seen here which suggests theological implications at least as much as aesthetic ones.

The word “light” and other words like “bright,” “radiant,” and “resplendent” occur often in *Paradise Lost*. At times these words are used in the negative to describe the absence of light, such as in Book I when Beelzebub addresses the chief fallen angel: “If thou beest he; but O how fall’n! How changed / From him, who in the happy realms of light / Clothed with transcendent brightness did outshine / Myriads though bright...” (84-86). Although this adds a kind of aesthetic quality to the poem, particularly in Books II and III, Milton plays on the visual, literary, and theological traditions that associate the nature of God with light and the absence of God as a kind of darkness. In the New Testament, Jesus refers to himself as the “light,” “I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.”\(^\text{31}\) Jesus also tells parables about light, and at one point he discusses the contrast


\(^{31}\) John 8:12.
between the eyes’ physical reception of light and the spiritual significance of light: “Your eye is the lamp of your body; when your eye is sound, your whole body is full of light; but when it is not sound, your body is full of darkness. Therefore be careful lest the light in you be darkness. If then your whole body is full of light, having no part dark, it will be wholly bright, as when a lamp with its rays gives you light.”

Although many critics have been apt to connect the personal dimension of Milton’s blindness to darkness, the theological and relevant literary and visual contexts in terms of the nature of God and the nature of evil also seem pressingly relevant.

One way to get at Milton’s play on light in the poem could be to look at the Wakefield and York Corpus Christi Cycle plays. The York plays are incredibly relevant to *Paradise Lost* for the whole of Milton’s plot can be found in the first six plays of the cycle: 1) “The Creation of the Angels and the Fall of Lucifer,” 2) “The Creation through the Fifth Day,” 3) “The Creation of Adam and Eve,” 4) “The Prohibition of the Tree of Knowledge,” 5) “The Fall,” 6) “The Expulsion from the Garden.” A tradition of exactly Milton’s subject in *Paradise Lost* had been well established before the poet set his mind to his subject. The first play of the Wakefield Corpus Christi Cycle, called “The Creation and Fall of the Angels,” focuses tightly on developing Lucifer’s character, personality, and motivation before he falls. This character development of Lucifer is first mediated at second hand by Cherubyn in Heaven who says:

Lord, thou art full mych of might,  
That has maide Lucifer so bright.  
We love the[e], Lord; bright ar we,  
Bot none of us so bright as he.  
He may well hight Lucifere,  
For lufly light that he doth bere.  
He is so lufly and so bright  
It is grete joy to se that sight.  
We lofe the[e], Lord, with all oure thought,  
That sich thing can make of noght. (ll. 67-76)\(^\text{33}\)


\(^{33}\) Bevington, *Medieval Drama*. All quotations from this play are from this edition.
After the Cherubyn finishes speaking, Lucifer, whose name literally means “light-bearer,” speaks for himself. He cheerfully agrees. However, the lines he speaks also subtly add to the Cherubyn’s observations, for Lucifer says that all of the light that he bears comes from himself. In addition to this, Lucifer further asserts that he is a thousand times brighter than the Son of God:

Certys, it is a seemly sight!
Syn that we ar all angels bright,
And ever in blis to be,
If that ye will behold me right,
This mastré longys to me.
I am so fare and bright,
Of me commys all this light,
This gam and all this glé.
Agans my grete might
May [no]thing stand then be.
And ye well me behold;
I am a thowsandfold
Brighter then is the son.
My strengthe may not be told... (ll. 77-90).

Lucifer’s fall in the folk English tradition and in Milton’s account stems from a self-perceived merit communicated by his own brightness both in terms of its strength and in terms of its origin. In relation to Saint Thomas’ theology of light, this kind of recognition of one’s own brightness has physical implications as well as intellectual and spiritual ones. Josef Pieper, a scholar of Thomas Aquinas, summarizes well the medieval attitude toward claritas or “brightness,” one of the three intellectual qualities of beauty. Notably claritas is connected with intellection, with the apprehension of reality at the most fundamental level. Just as in a painting light gives the viewer the ability for physical apprehension (symbolic or literal) of the subject, light in the sense of divine wisdom is what allows for the intelligibility of any object in creation—for what one

34 This loosely corresponds to an idea that this same character expresses in Book V of Paradise Lost, in which the mightiest of all angels says to Abdiel that since he does not remember a time when he was made, then all of the angels were therefore “self-begot, self-raised” (l. 860).

35 The other two qualities are consonantia and integritas.

36 See Eco, The Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas, 114-16.
perceives when contemplating a part of creation is God’s light (God’s wisdom, beauty, proportion, integrity, justice, etc. in its essence):

...things can known by us because God has creatively thought them; as creatively thought by God, things have not only their own nature (“for themselves alone”); but as creatively thought by God, things have also a reality “for us.” Things have their intelligibility, their inner clarity and lucidity, and the power to reveal themselves, because God has creatively thought them. This is why they are essentially intelligible. Their brightness and radiance is infused into things from the creative mind of God, together with their essential being (or rather, as the very essence of that being!). It is this radiance, and this alone, that makes existing things perceptible to human knowledge. In a scripture commentary St. Thomas remarks: “The measure of the reality of a thing is the measure of its light”...[and in another work] there is a fundamental sentence that formulates this same idea in an almost mystical phrase: “Ip s a actualitas rei est quoddam lumen ipsius, the reality of things is itself their light,” the reality of things understood as created being! It is this light that makes things perceptible to our eyes. To put it succinctly, things are knowable because they have been created.  

Milton’s use of “light” and related words like “bright” in Paradise Lost participate in a visual tradition of medieval aesthetics and theology that are often found in iconographic representations seeking to communicate the tension present between good and evil. Milton uses this to great effect in Paradise Lost, for Satan’s former brightness has been utterly changed to reflect his fallen (yet still angelic) nature. The quote from Josef Pieper above encapsulates much theological material concerning the way in which “brightness” is tied to intelligibility. The irony of Milton’s character Satan comes through because his own brightness blinds him from apprehending the source of it, and the wisdom of the order of creation which is perceptible in the “light” of all creatures and things in creation. The presence of this visual, symbolic, and theological play on light and darkness in Milton’s character can be traced back through the many avenues of the medieval tradition sketched here.

37 Pieper, The Silence of St. Thomas, 55-56.
The focus of the fallen angels at the beginning of *Paradise Lost* has a close parallel in an Anglo-Saxon poem *Genesis* which Bede said the monk Cædmon wrote. Scholars and critics have puzzled over the close parallels between the two poems in terms of structure, plot, and description, especially the famous description of Hell as “darkness visible” (in line 333 of the Old English poem: “þæt wæs leohes leas and wæs liges full”).

There are also a number of similarities concerning Satan’s character traits and motivation in these two poems, but whether *Genesis* influenced Milton still remains a controversial topic. Be that as it may, there is a good chance that Milton and the Anglo-Dutch scholar Franciscus Junius had talked about the manuscript that contains the *Genesis* poem.

The philologist and art historian Franciscus Junius (1591-1677) came into possession of the Anglo-Saxon manuscript that now bears his name in 1650. Between 1650 and 1655 Junius worked to edit and publish his famous edition of the manuscript that contains the *Genesis* poem. Junius had possession of the manuscript right around the time when Milton began working on *Paradise Lost*. If the two were friends, would it not have been likely that Junius talked about the contents of the manuscript, or that Milton saw the

---

38 Meaning, “Devoid of light, filled with licking flames.”

39 See Niles, *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon*, chapters 3 & 4, esp. pp. 100-104, for a recent survey of this controversy. Niles wonders whether questions of direct influence can be put aside in order to see if any kind of connection between *Paradise lost* and the Anglo-Saxon poem can be made.


41 For scholarship on Junius’ extensive background in art theory, especially concerning his work *De pictura veterum* (*On the Painting of the Ancients*) and his annotations of Sidney’s *Defense of Poesy*, see Dundas, *Sidney and Junius*.

42 See the introduction to Peter Lucas’ edition of the Junius manuscript, *Cædmonis Monachi Paraphrasis Poetica: Genesios ac Praecipuarum Sacrae paginae Historiarum, ab hinc annos M.LXX. Ango Saxonicè conscripta, & nunc primum edita* (Atlanta: Rodopi, 2000), pp. ix-xxxvi, for background on Franciscus Junius and his (the first modern scholarly) edition of Anglo-Saxon poetry.
illuminations? It should be noted too that Milton did write a history of Anglo-Saxon England, and it is often remarked upon that he was interested in writing a medieval epic before he finally decided upon writing the Biblical epic *Paradise Lost*.

The parallels between the two poems are incredible. Much has been written on the similarities between the two poems, but the most striking parallel of all is clearly the characterization of what has come to be seen by some readers as Milton’s most complex and interesting character. Both poems open with Satan and his crew of rebel angels just now ejected from Heaven, which action is then immediately followed by a series of lengthy grand speeches led by the chief devil upon the subject of the best way to get revenge upon God. Finally the solution of perverting mankind is settled upon as the best means to gain revenge upon the Creator. Satan will escape his chains in Hell and fly to Earth because none of the other demons are up to taking on the task. *Genesis B* reads:

Nor do I further hope for that light for myself, which he intends
for Adam to long enjoy, nor for happiness among the host of angels.
Nor can we ever make it that we may soften the mind of Mighty God.
Let us now take it away from the children of men—
that heaven-realm, now we are not allowed to have it!
Bring it about so that they should relinquish his favor
so that they will give up what he has commanded by word!
Then he will become wrathful in mind, driving them from his grace.
Then they must turn towards Hell and its grim depths.
Then we will be allowed to draw them to us as disciples...(401-408)

43 For the point that Juvis and Milton talked about the manuscript as well as for some other curious parallels of *Genesis B* and *Paradise Lost*, see Bolton, “A Further Echo,” 58-61. Milton could have seen the illuminations in 1650-51.

44 In 1639, well before beginning work on the epic, Milton expresses the idea of an Arthurian epic. See Milton’s Latin poems *Mansus* and *Epitaphium Damonis. Mansus*, lines 77-85: “if ever I shall call back into songs the kings of my native land, and Arthur waging war even under the earth, or tell of the great-hearted heroes of the Table, made invincible by their fellowship; and (if only I have the inspiration) I shall shatter the Saxon shield-wall with British arms” Leonard, *John Milton*, 588.

45 All translations of *Genesis* are from the Rutgers Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry Project website directed by Dr. Aaron K. Hostetter. The Old English text reads:

Ne gelyfe ic me nu þæs leohetes færðor  þæs þe he him þenceð lange niotan,
þæs eades mid his engla crafte.  Ne magon we þæt on aldré gewinnan,
þæt we mihtiges godes mod onwæcen.  Úton oðwendan hit nu monna beamum,
þæt heofonrice, nu we hit habban ne moton,  gedon þæt hie his hyldo forlæten,
þæt hie þæt onwendon þæt hie mid his worde bebead.  Ðonne weorð he him wrað on
mode,ahwet hie from his hyldo.  Ðonne sculon hie þas helle secan
and þas grimman grundas.  Ðonne moton we hie us to giongrum habban,
þærearn on þissum fæstum clomme.  Ðogimað na ymþ þa fyrde þencean!
A little further on in the poem Satan addresses his fellow fallen angels to ask whether any one of them would be up to the task of leading man to disobey God:

If any of you could in some way rise up again so that they should forsake his teaching the word of God, soon they would be the more hateful to him. If they break his commandment, then he would become infuriated with them. After that their abundance would be altered, and torment would be prepared for them, and some harsh harm-shearing. Consider it, all of you — consider how you might deceive them! I could rest me more easily in these chains afterwards, if that realm were lost to them... (425b-31)

The chief devil says that his bondage in chains will be more bearable if the goodness of God’s inheritance were lost to man. In *Paradise Lost* it is Satan’s first mate, Beelzebub, who inquires whether anyone would be willing to go to Earth to study Adam and Eve, to find “their weakness, how attempted best, / By force or subtlety” (II, 357-8). But in both works a connection between making Hell more bearable and destroying God’s newest creation can be observed:

Some advantageous act may be achieved
By sudden onset, either with Hell fire
To waste his whole Creation, or possess
All as our own, and drive as we were driven,
The puny habitants, or if not drive,
Seduce them to our party, that their God
May prove their foe, and with repenting hand
Abolish his own works. This would surpass
Common revenge, and interrupt his joy
In our confusion, and our joy upraise
In his disturbance, when his darling sons
Hurled headlong to partake with us, shall curse
Their frail original... (II, 363-75).

46 The Old English text:

þæt me is on minum mode swa sar,
on minum hyge hreoweð, þæt hie heofonrice
agan to aldre. Gif hit eower ænig mæge
gewendan mid wihte þæt hie word godes
lare forlæten, sona hie him þe laðran beoð.
Gif hie brecðað his gebodiscipe, þonne hie him abolgen wurðeþ;
sibðan bîð him se wela onwendend and wyrð hie wite gegarwod...
Whether Milton’s poem was directly influenced by \textit{Genesis B} seems not nearly as important as noticing that Milton and Cædmon follow a similar pattern of development of Biblical material, especially concerning these key speeches. None of this material is in the Bible \textit{per se}, but both poems expand the Biblical story in order to amplify the theme of Satan’s motivation for escaping Hell and traveling to reach Earth.\textsuperscript{47}

Two illuminations of the Junius 11 manuscript contain details that Milton’s poem describes: Satan’s escape through the gates of Hell, his flight to earth, possession of the serpent, and encounter with Adam and Eve is the story told by the illumination in Figure 9. Figure 8 depicts the story of the Expulsion of the Rebel Angels. In this illumination it is Jesus (not St. Michael) who drives out the rebels. His posture is one of readiness, with the right hand extended above his shoulder. He holds what appear to be three spears (or they could very well represent lightning bolts) in his hand. This particular detail of the attribute of the spears or lightning bolts is interesting because the illumination in the manuscript does not have a corresponding set of lines text of \textit{Genesis B}. Concerning the expulsion, the poet says only that, “Then the Mighty grew anger-swollen, the Highest Wielder of Heaven, / and threw that one from the high throne” (298-300).\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{47} St. Irenaeus, a second century Father writes in \textit{Against Heretics}, Bk v, 21.2, “The pride of reason, therefore, which was in the serpent, was put to nought by the humility found in the man [Christ], and now twice was the devil conquered from Scripture, when he was detected as advising things contrary to God’s commandment, and was shown to be the enemy of God by [the expression of] his thoughts.” See also St. Justin Martyr’s (a late first to early second-century Father) \textit{Dialogue with Trypho}, 88.

\textsuperscript{48} The Old English text reads:
\begin{quote}
þe wið his waldend winnan ongynned
mid mane wið þone mæran drihten. Þa wearð se mihtiga gebolgen,
hehsta heofones waldend, wearp hine of þan hean stole.
\end{quote}
Figure 8: Presumption of Lucifer, *Genesis*, p. 3, showing the Expulsion of the Rebel Angels by Jesus.

Figure 9: Lucifer’s Escape from Hell, Junius 11 Manuscript, *Genesis*, p. 20
There existed in the Middle Ages up through the Renaissance an incredibly rich artistic tradition of poetry and visual imagery upon the theme of the Expulsion of the Rebel Angels and the battle between St. Michael and the Dragon. It seems clear that Milton’s epic draws upon these artistic traditions for the central scene (Book VI) of his great epic. Although many would argue that Book IX is the central book of *Paradise Lost*, if it were not for the War in Heaven and the resulting particularly strong characterization and motivation for the character of Satan that Milton develops there, Book IX would not be as compelling a book. Perhaps this is precisely why the Anglo-Saxon poem *Genesis B* begins with the rebel angels coming to find themselves in a dark but burning hell:

> At that moment the other fiends lay upon the fire, who before had kept so many struggles against their Sovereign. Torments they endure, heated war-surges in the middle of hell, torches and broad tongues of flame, likewise the bitter fumes, darkness and shadow....

The fall of the angels is a crucial action that, more than anything, aids the poet in his endeavor of seeking “to justify the ways of God to men,” a lofty aim that rests heavily upon the choices of characters and the essential nature of God’s premier creature man, who God “made...just and right / sufficient to have stood yet free to fall.”

According to Milton, man is given freedom, and the drama of freedom is one of choice, tension, and consequence.

49 Lines 322-325:

> Lagon þa oðre fynd on þam fyre, þe ær swa feala hæfdon gewinnes wið heora waldend. Wite þoliað, hatne heaðowelm helle tomiddes, brand and brade ligas, swilce eac þa biteran recas

50 *Paradise Lost*, III, 98-99.
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“Dwellers in Shadows” & Abbatial Jerusalem: Reformed Monastic Ideas by the Third Crusade in the Sermons of Garnerius of Rochefort and Adam the Scot

Todd P. Upton
Denver, Colorado

In the crusading era of the Twelfth Century, a majority of Latin sermons presented Jerusalem as a visio pacis (“vision of peace”) that maintained an original characterization of the city made by Pope Urban II’s 1095 sermon at Clermont that launched the First Crusade. This essay demonstrates significant ways in which Garnerius of Rochefort and Adam the Scot transformed that visio pacis by the end of the twelfth century. For Garnerius (d. 1215)—a bishop at Langres (in northeastern France) from 1193 who wrote against the Amaurian pantheistic heresy, and died at Clairvaux—the traditional Augustinian visio spiritualis of Jerusalem was reversed, in that Garnerius saw not a celestial or even idealized earthly city, but a physical Jerusalem whose “dwellers in shadows” were practicing abominations in the eyes of the Lord. Similarly, in sermons by Adam the Scot (c. 1140-1212)—a Premonstratensian abbot at Dryburgh (Borders area of Scotland) from 1184 to 1188, who wrote many tracts and sermons before retiring as a Carthusian at Witham—the writer described a Jerusalemite visio pacis that could be seen via a journey no farther than the walls of an abbey. This investigation serves a couple of purposes; first, it hopefully contributes to the study of mentalities in the Middle Ages, in that its attention to previously untranslated Latin sermons brings into relief aspects of a monastic homiletic discourse bounded almost solely by biblical typologies without reference to the multitude of contemporary sources about conditions in Jerusalem and the Latin Kingdom; secondly, it continues the necessary foundational work for an upcoming monograph on western sermon depictions of locales and peoples in the Holy Land during the Crusades from 1095-1291.

1 An early version of this article was presented at the 49th Annual Conference of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association (Grand Junction, Colorado: 23-24 June 2017); I am grateful for the comments and questions both from audience members and subsequent Quidditas reviewers.
Introduction

By the end of the twelfth century, the standard for presenting Jerusalem as a visio pacis ("vision of peace") had undergone a series of transformations by select writers of the period, reforming in many ways the original characterization of the city made by Pope Urban II’s 1095 sermon at Clermont that launched the First Crusade. This essay will use an established methodology to examine previously unassessed Latin sermons of two writers, Garnerius of Rochefort and Adam the Scot, who represented a sea change in the monastic mental landscape that informed the homiletic presentations of Jerusalem. On the one hand, we’ll see that the “shadows” that haunt Garnerius’s Jerusalem were no longer the “perfidious Saracens” of Urban II’s Clermont sermon; instead, Garnerius’s sermons share the same “enemies of Christ” that would have been very familiar to Peter the Venerable—heretics and “bad Catholics” (mali Catholici). On the other hand, changing a traditional allegorical paradigm was the last thing on the mind of Adam the Scot; rather, in a return to the kinds of perceptions expressed by Anselm of Canterbury from a century previous, Adam’s sermons reveal a complete retreat from any of the traditional perspectives of Jerusalem (heavenly, earthly, internal) in an attempt to recreate the city in his own Premonstratensian and Carthusian abbeys. Declaring an abbey as having its own efficacy as a local Jerusalem had ramifications far beyond the tra-

2 For a comparative examination of the extant sources, see Munro, “The Speech of Pope Urban II,” 231-242; for an analysis of both Munro’s assessment and the chronicles themselves, see Cowdrey, “Pope Urban II’s Preaching,” 177-188.

3 For qualified assessments of sermon evidence, this essay employs the same methodological approach used in my previous Quidditas publications in that it adapts the work of David D’Avray to: (1) identify specific topoi within an array of documents (e.g., terms such as loca sancta, visio pacis, etc), (2) assess sermons comparatively within both same period and over a given time span (c. 600-1300), with qualifying attention to (2.a) environmental factors, (2.b) intellectual milieus, and (2.c) aspects of material culture; and, finally, (3) provide a comparative counterpoint (exegetical traditions, travel literature, chronicle depictions, etc) that keeps the investigation tightly focused on the demonstrable perspectives of monastic sermon writers. [See D’Avray “Method in the Study of Medieval Sermons,” in Beriou and D’Avray, Modern Questions about Medieval Sermons, 1-27.]

4 A term used by a twelfth-century sermon writer, Honorius Augustodunensis in Sermones, PL 172: 1097A-1098A.
ditional “monastic retreat” from the world, and would have undermined Urban II’s entire logic for making an armed pilgrimage to the real Jerusalem if such an ethos had been present a century before.

**General Twelfth-Century Concepts of Jerusalem**

There were many sources of information to which sermon writers could have referred when conceptualizing Jerusalem, foremost among which was a Bible-centered exegetical tradition. Familiarity with a biblical Jerusalem was standard knowledge for European monastic writers by the twelfth century, and extensive Bible studies occurred from oblation, through monastic and cathedral education, and thence to daily familiarity in the *lectio divina*, or “Divine Reading,” an established Benedictine way of engaging the Scriptures that involved daily reading, prayer, and (potentially) mystical union with God. Novices at manuscript-producing monasteries such as Reichenau or St. Germain-des-Prés would have been just as comfortable discussing the sacral nature of Mount Zion from the Old Testament as their scholarly peers at Oxford or Chartres would have been imagining the Jerusalem Temple of the Gospels. Basic reading requirements of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and logic) depended upon a tradition of religious knowledge about Jerusalem that relied on gospel renderings and authoritative texts.

This phenomenon was a central fact of medieval monastic culture. Indeed, a cursory glance at the work of literati from previous centuries reveals a consistent expectation by authors that there existed an audience familiar with Jerusalem and eastern lands. Alcuin of York (d. 804) held as much trust in his Carolingian audience’s ability to
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5 For exhaustive introductions to Jerusalem (with extensive bibliographies) see Armstrong, *Jerusalem: One City, Three Faiths* and Levine, ed., *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality*. For eyewitness accounts through the ages, see Peters, *Jerusalem: The Holy City*. For introductions to other aspects of Jerusalem in the medieval period, see: Bous, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades* and Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*.


construct an imaginary Holy City in his *Book of the Soul’s Reason* as Liudprand of Cremona (d. 972) had in his Ottonian patrons in *The Embassy to Constantinople* where he described Saracens and Greeks in eastern Mediterranean lands. For monastic schoolmen of Godefridus of Admont’s own time, standard references such as Isidore of Seville’s seventh-century work, *Etymologies*, still provided gospel-based depictions of Jerusalem that described the city alternately as a “vision of peace” (*visio pacis*), as an emblem of Christ’s death on the Cross, or as the site of the prophesied “heavenly Church” (*coelestis ecclesiae*).

Nor were such conceptions completely static. Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* (1148-1151) demonstrates that a thorough familiarity with (and manipulation of) Hebraic and Christian authorities was *de rigueur* for scholastic interpretations of the city. In one passage, the Lombard synthesized sacral Judaic signification for Jerusalem (David’s founding of the city), Jesus’ prophesying of the city’s fall from Luke (19:45-47), and St. Augustine’s caution about interpretation from *On Christian Doctrine*. Finally, sermon writers could have turned to biblical glosses for yet more references about the city; in these, descriptions of Jerusalem sometimes went beyond tropology and achieved geographical perspective of eastern Mediterranean places. For example, Lanfranc of Bec called Jerusalem the “source of the [Christian] faith” (*ab Hierusalem doctrina fidei*) from which Apostles spread the gospel throughout the Mediterranean to Greece and Macedonia.

Sermon writers also gleaned knowledge about Jerusalem and the Holy Land from the daily material culture of western Christendom.

---

9 Alcuin of York, *De animae ratione*, PL 101, cols. 642 A-C.

10 Liudprand of Cremona, *Relatio de legatione constantinopolitana*, PL 136, cols. 924D-925A.


12 Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, PL 191, cols. 694D-695A.

13 Lanfranc of Bec, *Epistola B. Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos*, PL 150, cols. 151B-153A.
The last thirty years have seen an explosion in investigations related to the Crusades that assess the ways in which Jerusalem and its holy sites loomed large in medieval life, with topics that range from travel writing, art, architecture, iconography, charters, hagiography, coinage, and even to the manner in which monastic houses such as the Cluniacs characterized themselves by the twelfth century.  

Emphasizing just some of these examples will give us an empirical sense of how images of Jerusalem abounded in the everyday life of the medieval sermon writers. First, while architectural appreciation for buildings and sites in Jerusalem highlighted as a crucial part of the pilgrim itineraries to Jerusalem all the way back to Egeria’s late fourth-century description of the city, narratives written by late antique pilgrims gave a context and authenticity to biblical accounts of the city. Some pilgrims returned with holy relics and actually attempted to change aspects of their local environments so as to imitate physically parts of Jerusalem. This trend was reflected in Bishop Conrad of Constance’s (d. 975) replication of the Lord’s Sepulcher in his own church after his third pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and, similarly, in the host of churches and shrines that were built throughout Europe from the tenth through twelfth centuries and consecrated with the “heavenly Jerusalem” as an explicit model (e.g., the abbey church of Monte Cassino in 1075 and Cluny in 1095). Secondly, sometimes not only a church but an entire western European city or monastery became a temporary locus sanctus, wherein an entire population consciously strove to replicate a pilgrimage experience without having to make the arduous trip to Jerusalem. Such was the case when parishioners got a chance to see imitations of Jerusalem by taking pilgrim tours in Rome and Compostela (and, after
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14 For extensive bibliography see Meier, “The bible moralisée and the Crusades,” 209-210, notes 1-5.
15 Egeria, Itinerarium Egeriae, CCSL 175, VIII: 44.42-44.
16 Oudalschalk, Vita Chounradi episcopo Constantiensis, MGH SS 4.2, 432, cols. 7-10.
17 Henderson, Gothic Art and Civilization, 57-59.
1170, Canterbury), or to make their way along makeshift Stations of the Cross through both urban and rural churches that replicated a Jerusalem pilgrim’s journey and culminated in the veneration of relics that had been acquired from the Holy Land. Thirdly, charter evidence shows us that the veneration of relics and the association of them with Jerusalem were not limited to clergymen like Conrad of Constance because the nobility often qualified their endowments with explicit reference to Jerusalem and crusading. On this subject, Jonathan Riley-Smith has demonstrated that entire “troublesome castellan families” in the late eleventh century (e.g., the Monthéry, Montfort, Beaugency, et al) left charters before going on crusade that explicitly referred to Pope Urban II’s 1095 sermon about Jerusalem, and which designated the Holy City as a redemptive destination. Fourthly, as hagiographies of the tenth and eleventh centuries became increasingly concerned with saints from the Slavic and Mediterranean east, Heinz Hofmann has shown that western perceptions of the East were expanding due to saints’ tales (whose stories might incorporate elements from Otto the Great’s victory at Lechfeld to Norman battles against Arabs in Sicily). Fifthly, Jerusalem had even become an important symbolic touchstone for the way in which monastic orders characterized themselves and their missions. Peter the Venerable urged that Jerusalem should be conceptualized as the heart of Christendom and he enjoined western Christians to inform themselves about the Holy Land and Saracens lest they not ably defend themselves when fighting overseas just as if they were combating the Arian and Donatist heretics of antiquity. Finally, the Cluniac propagation of the Cult of Mary also revealed a devo-

18 Geary, Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages, 174-175.
19 Baldovin, The Urban Character of Christian Worship, 82-89.
20 Riley-Smith, The First Crusaders, 1095-1131, 60-64, and 170.
22 Peter the Venerable, “Sermo in laude dominici sepulchri,” 240.
23 Peter the Venerable, Adversus nefandam sectam Saracenorum, PL 189, cols. 663D-665C.
tion that carried with it a concomitant veneration of Jerusalem and neighboring holy sites such as Bethlehem and Nazareth – sermon authors would have been highly cognizant of the fact that all these places had been important for Jesus, who in the twelfth century was increasingly humanized as a “son,” rather than the forbidding arbiter at the Last Judgment and Harrower of Hell of earlier centuries.24

So, given that there existed such a prevalence of varied cultural manifestations of Jerusalem and the holy sites in western Christendom, the question has to be asked if our sermon writers collectively relied on scriptural accounts for their descriptions because the Bible seemed to be the only narrative source about the topics? Certainly not. There were a multitude of narrative sources about Jerusalem by the twelfth century: saints’ lives, miracle stories, exempla, myths, and pilgrimage tales all provided multifaceted complements to traditional biblical ideas about Jerusalem. When assessing medieval sermons about Jerusalem, these kinds of narrative sources have to be acknowledged as a constant contextual referent because sermons—despite their apparent homogeneity and general lack of originality—cleave more closely to literary sources than to historical ones per se (e.g., charters, diplomas, papal bulls, etc.). By keeping in mind the fact that a literary tradition about Jerusalem existed side-by-side with the better known, chronicle-based accounts of the city which emerged after the First Crusade, we should succeed in avoiding what Marcus Bull has called a “narrativizing” trap of interpreting documents from the time of the Crusades along lines that have been delimited either solely by twelfth-century chroniclers (who had their own respective agendas when recording history), or by those chronicler’s modern counterparts who are sometimes too eager to disregard the influence that literary narratives might have had in influencing popular perceptions of Jerusalem in the high middle ages.25

At present, it is enough to note that the collective influence of these literary genres on the conceptualization of Jerusalem was so perva-


sive that by century’s end the Spanish converso Peter Alfonsi’s (c. 1062-1140) collection of eastern Levantine stories, *The Discipline of Clerics*, and Jean Bodel of Arras’s (c. 1165-1210) post-Third Crusade play, *The Game of St. Nicholas*, were read and performed with authorial expectations that the audience would have some familiarity with the imagined landscapes and people of Jerusalem. Of the foregoing literary expressions, Christian pilgrimage accounts that anecdotally placed Jerusalem, its environs, and inhabitants in non-biblical situations and contexts were perhaps the most popular means of disseminating physical descriptions about Jerusalem and the Holy Land. Eusebius’s description of Christian holy places in Jerusalem, Egeria’s *Travels*, Bede’s account of Arculf’s travels in Palestine, and the Annalist of Nieder-Altaih’s report of the “Great German Pilgrimage of 1064-65” were all part of a centuries’-long pilgrimage tradition about Jerusalem. The cumulative effect of the foregoing narrative sources upon the European imagination and processes of ideation about Jerusalem can only be guessed, however, which is why a more substantive inquiry demands that we prioritize one kind of narrative that has intrinsic historical value because of its generally firsthand nature—the chronicle.

Chronicles such as Rodulfus Glaber’s (d. 1047) treatment of Jerusalem in his *Five Books of History* were another type of literary expression to which sermon writers could have availed themselves
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when imagining and describing Jerusalem for European audiences.\textsuperscript{34} After referring to the 1009 destruction of Jerusalem that occurred under the mad Fatimid caliph, al-Hakim bin-Amar Allah, Glaber highlighted the effect that the city could have on pilgrims.\textsuperscript{35} The chronicler related that, after reaching Jerusalem and going to the Mount of Olives to stretch in cruciform fashion on the ground, Lethbald of Burgundy gave praise to God, returned to a nearby hospice with his companions, abstained from the evening meal (but partook of the Eucharist later at night), and died blissfully because he had reached the land where his Savior died and was resurrected.

As to an eleventh and twelfth century perspective of contemporary conditions in the Holy City, sermon writers could have certainly learned about Levantine realities after the conquest of Jerusalem in 1099 because there was no shortage of sources.\textsuperscript{36} Chronicles began being written within ten years of the First Crusade. Specifically, after 1101, news of events in the Holy Land began returning in ways that informed Europeans in everything from the architectural designs being adapted and implemented by Franks, Venetians, and Genoese in the Levant to the maintenance of feudal relationships—albeit in forms that blended Islamic tax-collection practices with European vassalage practices—in places far removed from the Frankish homelands where they originated. Chroniclers’ tales ranged from the mundane actions (and deaths) of Jerusalem kings such as appeared in Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres, to the more salacious descriptions of horrific Frankish defeats against Muslim forces by Walter the Chancellor (for example, Roger of Salerno’s defeat in 1119 at the hands of Il-Ghazi on the “field of blood” outside Aleppo, news of which spread immediately to Jerusalem, thence the

\textsuperscript{34} For comments on distribution of Glaber’s chronicle, see The Five Books, xcvii-xcviii.

\textsuperscript{35} Glaber, The Five Books, 200-201.

\textsuperscript{36} Lyman, “The Counts of Toulouse,” in 63-80; Edbury, “Fiefs and Vassals,” 49-62; contrast here with preceding article in same volume, Reynolds, “Fiefs and Vassals in Twelfth-Century Jerusalem,” 29-48. [Both of which are responses to Reynolds’ lack of inclusion of the Latin Kingdom and its explicitly “feudal” practices in her Fiefs and Vassals]}
Continent). Reciprocal news going to the Levant from Europe was slowed only by the sailing season, but one could always count on the incessantly traveling pilgrims who journeyed in spring and summer to tell tales of their adventures in the Levant. Those pilgrims might be clergymen like Abbot Daniel who visited the tomb of Baldwin I in Jerusalem (c. 1106-08) and reported an enormous silver statue of the king erected before the Holy Sepulcher. Or, alternately, sermon authors could have learned about Jerusalem and its environs from pilgrimage accounts written and circulated throughout the twelfth century, such as that of the English merchant Saewulf (c. 1101), whose vivid descriptions of the Holy Land included his witnessing a shipwreck off the coast of Jaffa and visiting all the holy sites in Jerusalem and Palestine.

Confoundingly, however, when assessing sermons from the time of Urban II’s speech at Clermont through the Second Crusade, none of these multifaceted stories that were coming back via various agents appear in any guise in sermons. Instead, Jerusalem was persistently presented in much the same way as Guibert of Nogent had presented in his Dei gesta per Francos and, perhaps more relevant to my purpose today, in his preaching manual—he presented the Holy City as a morally charged visio pacis that used Jerusalem as a setting for biblical typology. Moreover, during this period between the First and Second Crusades, sermon writers began to get more detailed in their representation of that morality, imbuing their descriptions of Jerusalem with interpretations that were still biblically based yet somewhat more elaborate than previously seen. For example, Isaac of Stella (c. 1100-c. 1169)—an English-born Cistercian who spent much of his intellectual and religious life in France studying

37 Rubenstein, “Putting History to Use,” 131-168. [Comparative study here of Fulcher of Chartres, Walter the Chancellor, and Raymond of Aguilers.]
40 Huygens and Pryor, eds., Peregrinationes tres: Saewulf
under Peter Abelard, living at Chartres, associating with Thomas Becket, and becoming abbot of the Stella monastery (near Poitiers) in 1147—used Jerusalem repeatedly in his sermons as a symbol for sacramental penance. One of his sermons echoed Anselm of Canterbury’s concern with general irreligiosity among monks in the Church, while another described the penitential expiation one might receive if the pilgrim reached Jerusalem.

The most sustained description of Jerusalem with respect to the sacraments, however, occurred in a sermon in which Isaac used Jesus’s arrival in the city as a metaphor for the well-known Christian belief that He was a “second Adam” come to redeem the mistakes of the first. In this sermon, Jerusalem was characterized as the physician of the Church. Isaac reminded the audience that humanity throughout history had repeatedly opted for the same choice that Adam had made (succumbing to temptation), with wounds (vulnra) depicted as the Seven Deadly Sins. Isaac then asserted that the seven “infections” (plagae) of Adam’s sins were offset by the seven graces, or “remedies” (medicina), provided by Jerusalem. Isaac concluded by employing martial imagery so that his brethren should view the battle against sin as a military endeavor while they were living above the earth. He furthermore advocated that those in his congregation should live the imitatio Christi and—if unable physically to make the journey to Jerusalem—that they could always be part of the army of Christ if they were willing to accept the grace of God.

Guerric of Igny (d. 1157)—a renowned Cistercian who probably served his novitiate under Bernard of Clairvaux, became an abbot in his own right at Igny (between Soisson and Rheims), and was acclaimed as one of the “four evangelists” of Cîteaux—had in mind a

42 Isaac of Stella, *Sermo I*, PL 194, cols. 1689A-1693C.
43 Isaac of Stella, *Sermo VII*, PL 194, cols. 1713B-1716A.
44 Isaac of Stella, *Sermo VI*, PL 194, cols. 1709A-1713A.
45 Evans, *The Medieval Theologians*, 138-139.
different *visio pacis* in his Jerusalem sermons. In the first, a glorious restoration of Jerusalem comes only after violence has occurred in the surrounding lands. Guerric predicts the ultimate destruction of those who oppose the faithful in the city.\(^{46}\) He concluded that a monk should lead a guarded life as if in a fortress, in loneliness and solitude so as to focus completely on God. In another sermon,\(^{47}\) Guerric seemed to beseech God directly and asked if there was a king any longer in Jerusalem. This perception of the monastery as a fortress hearkened back to St. Augustine’s image of the two cities—\(^{48}\) the earthly Roman Empire and the heavenly Christianity—but Guerric’s sermons here must be seen as part of a uniquely Cistercian belief that monasteries were fortified strongholds that needed to be manned by spiritually armed and monastic *milites christi*, an image common in late antiquity.\(^{49}\)

While there is no direct proof that Guerric’s sermons were written before or after the Second Crusade, internal evidence in the works—for example, a destroyed Jerusalem that will somehow be gloriously restored, the need for a purer religious inhabitant than currently existed in the Levant, and a criticism of the sitting king in Jerusalem—\(^{50}\) are consistent with the criticism on record that abounded after the debacle of the Second Crusade.\(^{51}\) Regardless of the time when they were written, the attention to violence and destruction and fortified strongholds would seem to depart from a recent attempt to emphasize the generally pacifistic and pastoral nature of Guerric’s sermons.\(^{52}\)
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So, while at mid-century sermon writers who used Jerusalem as the main thematic topic for their homilies were still writing with an attention to moral imperatives that Guibert of Nogent would have approved, something different was occurring with the presentation of the city. The sermons of Isaac of Stella and Guerric of Igny demonstrated that the *visio pacis* of Jerusalem could still be used with a multitude of commonplace biblical references — and no explicit acknowledgements of the well-established Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem — but the added imagery of Isaac’s Jerusalem that served as the “physician of the Church” or Guerric’s Jerusalem as a monastic fortress definitely provided variances that will need to be explained.

“Dwellers in Shadows” & Abbatial Jerusalem: The *Visio Pacis* of Jerusalem by the Third Crusade

By the end of the twelfth century, the standard of Jerusalem as a *visio pacis* was still present, but had undergone a final series of transformations that were manifested differently in select writers of the period. To be sure, there were still the traditional depictions of Jerusalem that had remained constant from the time of Augustine. One such case was how Absalon of Springiersbach (a monk from the diocese of Trier who ended his life as an abbot of St. Victor in Paris from 1198 to 1203) depicted the city in three sermons. The texts need not be fully described here, but a commonality in Absalon’s descriptions of Jerusalem was the collective focus on a “heavenly” (*coelestis*) Jerusalem with attendant admonitions to his audience on the best ways to reach it (by fervent prayer and a retreat from the physical world in favor of a spiritual life). Conversely, there is the example of Geoffrey of Auxerre (d. c. 1188), the *notarius* of Bernard of Clairvaux who also held abbacies at Igny (near Trier), Clairvaux, and Fossa Nuova (Italy) after the saint died. Geoffrey seemed willing enough to consider the case of the “worldly” Jerusalem in two


54 Absalon of Springiersbach, *Sermo XVIII*, PL 211, cols. 108B-113C; *Sermo XXX*, PL 211, cols. 177D-182A; and *Sermo XXXI*, PL 211, cols. 182B-187D.

of his sermons. In one he briefly expressed a hope that the warfare in the region might be ended, while in the other he devoted a line that urged the audience not to be dissuaded from considering the case of Jerusalem, as troubled as the topic might be.\footnote{Geoffrey of Auxerre, \textit{Sermo XIII}, PL 184, cols. 445B-446B; and \textit{Sermo XLVIII}, PL 184, cols. 468B-468D.}

The traditional perspective of Jerusalem as a \textit{visio pacis} was transformed, however, in the cases of Garnerius of Rochefort and Adam the Scot. For Garnerius of Rochefort (d. 1215)—a bishop at Langres from 1193 who wrote against the Amaurian pantheistic heresy, and died at Clairvaux—the traditional Augustinian \textit{visio spiritualis} of Jerusalem was reversed, in that Garnerius saw not a celestial or even idealized earthly city, but a physical Jerusalem whose “dwellers in shadows”—or, in a recasting of the Jewish elders in \textit{Ezekiel} 8: 8-14—twelfth-century pagans, Jews, and false Christians were doing things in the darkness of their own cells, practicing abominations in the eyes of the Lord.\footnote{Garnerius of Rochefort, \textit{Sermon IV}, PL 205, cols. 598D-599A.} Garnerius went on to warn of the carnal and mental shadows that could figuratively cloud his listeners’ minds, and reached the end of his sermon with a solution offered from the apocalyptic Book of Daniel—namely, that he himself would interpret the problems plaguing Jerusalem and dissolve the knots that bind those problems to the city by the power of prayer.\footnote{Garnerius of Rochefort, \textit{Sermo VI}, PL 205, cols. 608D-615A.}

In another sermon, Garnerius presented the holy city with a combination of eschatology and original allegory, with elements from all biblical times that correlate with six ages of the world.\footnote{Garnerius of Rochefort, \textit{Sermo IV}, PL 205, cols. 591D-599A, here at col. 592C. […] \textit{Si ergo in visione pacis habitare vis, quoniam Jerusalem visio pacis interpretatur, et dies videre bonos, elevare a somno ignorantiae, tu pagane, elevare a somno perfidiae, tu Judae; consurge a somno torporis et ignaviae, tu false Christiane. Qui enim jacet, et in imo prostratus est, non potest intueri ea quae de longe sunt, sed ea tantummodo quae de proper sunt intuetur. Unde et illi qui in medio Jerusalem faciebant abominationes, quando statuiebant ad ostium tabernaculi idolum zeli ad provocandum aemulationem, quando adorabant picturas, plangebant Adonidem, et dorsum contra templum habentes adorabant ad ortum solis, jacere dicuntur unusquisque in abscondito cubilis sui. Unde Dominus ad prophetam: Certe vidisti, fili hominis, quid isti faciunt in tenebris, unusquisque in abscondito cubicula sui.}
Garnerius characterized Jerusalem as a city that possessed the wisdom of Solomon, the temperance of Moses, the quickness of Azael (who put away a “foreign wife”), the power of Caesar, the handsomeness of Absalom (son of King David), and the justice of Noah. Garnerius concluded here stating that the story of Jerusalem was so important, that it could be likened to a book whose pages ought to be followed in life. There followed a further lengthy exegesis on that comparison, with sustained allegorical attention to the litteras and paginae of the volume—especially when Garnerius considered how to “rebuild” the Holy City (reaedificatione Jerusalem) without suffering the sin, temptations, hunger, death, and bite of hell that had plagued it in recent times.60

Both of Garnerius’s’s allegorical depictions of Jerusalem were original in that, while relying on commonplace biblical typologies or metaphors that evoked the bookish culture of the monastic lectio divina; that is, in Sermo IV, active prayer illuminated a physically defiled city and dispelled metaphorically sinful shadows, and in Sermo VI, the city was transformed into a temporal allegory that itself became enclosed in the pages of a figurative book. These kinds of considerations made serious theological transformations to the idea of the city while still using concepts of space and time that would be validated as Christian orthodoxy at the 1203 Synod of Paris and 1215 Fourth Lateran Council, where both assemblies prioritized countering heresies (Albigensian), reforming the clergy, and drafting a new Profession of Faith that emphasized the real Presence in the event of Transubstantiation during the Eucharist.61 Against such a framework of Pope Innocent III’s attempt to rejuvenate Christendom by seeking legal justifications for both papal authority and sacramental “reality” (the Host as Christ’s Body, and Wine as His Blood), Garnerius’s conceptions of the Holy City as existing within a monastery fit within a paradigm of Church renewal that put appropriate reforming pressure on his own monastic community while remaining removed

60 Garnerius of Rochefort, Sermo VI, PL 205, cols. 614D-615A.
from the kind of rationalizing of the Christian past that condemned other theologians *cum* heretics, such as Amalric of Bene (who argued for a temporal separation of the Trinity), and David Dimant (who erred on an Aristotelian materialism of humans and creatures, rather than emphasizing the transcendence of God).  

Adam the Scot (c. 1140-1212)—a Premonstratensian abbot at Dryburgh from 1184 to 1188, who wrote many tracts and sermons before retiring as a Carthusian at Witham—wrote of a Jerusalemite *visio pacis* that went no farther than the walls of his own abbey. In sermons that were mostly devoted to the topic of Jerusalem, Adam consistently made the case that, so long as monks observed monastic poverty and provided for the poor and needy, the monastery itself fulfilled all the functions of the Holy City. In one sermon, for example, he stated that the vision of Jerusalem had become clouded, seen as “through a glass, darkly” (*videns per speculum in aenigmatic*), with a subsequent enjoining of his monks to find spiritual strength by remembering the trials of Jesus before He died, the persecutions of the early Church, the tribulations of Jacob, and power of Scripture in relation to the *visio pacis* of Jerusalem. In another sermon, Adam described Jerusalem as the living *visio pacis* of the Premonstratensian order, to which the novitiate neither will have to wait for the heavenly city nor make a pilgrimage to the earthly one; all that was needed could be found within the walls of the abbey.

The sermon drew extensively on the Old Testament—particularly the story of Abraham’s willingness to sacrifice Isaac—with the promise of spiritual rewards for these oblates and contemporary soldiers of Christ in his monastery. Lastly, unlike some of the other sermon authors whom we have seen in this study, Adam gave explicit reasons


63 For the most complete account of the life and thought of Adam the Scot (and bibliography), see Jones, *An Early Witness*.
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why his monks should seek refuge neither in the celestial Jerusalem, nor the earthly one, nor, even, an internal one. Adam wrote that Jerusalem originally had become God’s place but had been cast down by God because of its faults (proruisti ad defectum) when peaceful existence failed because the sins of the Hebrews left Jerusalem open to conquest by the Babylonians. So, too, Adam wrote comparatively, was the state of the monks who came into the abbey from an outside world to escape the triple threats of personal calamity, worldly inequity, and general human frailty. Once inside the abbey walls, the monks received the mercy of God, thence countering the harmful forces by employing three aspects of the Holy Spirit most accessible to human beings: sacredly divine visions, angelically living with one another, and courageously maintaining a Christian life. By such steps, Adam concluded, one could fully participate in a monastic Jerusalem in ways that cast back to an allegorical idea of the city and trust in the “defensive” nature of Grace that lent protection to the weak and which should make all those gathered to run out to meet (occurrere) their salvation and redemption.66

In reflecting upon the visio pacis of Jerusalem by century’s end, then, we observe that the mental landscape which informed the homiletic presentations of Jerusalem seemed to have changed completely from that with which Pope Urban II was most familiar in 1095. To be sure, authors such as Absalon of Springiersbach were still using traditional “heavenly Jerusalem” imagery to make points about repentance and attention to one’s soul in the progress to God in a way that would have been very familiar to Urban II himself, or Isaac of Stella and Guerric of Igny. An audience response of intellection about Jerusalem seems to have been expected whenever Jerusalem was mentioned, because in all the sermons that had a visio pacis theme, no attention was given to the city itself beyond merely locating Jesus in space and time, with priority reserved for a moral message. Mary Carruthers has identified this process as specific to medieval sermon authors and originating in Late Antiquity with St. Augustine and Ar-

66 Adam the Scot, Sermo IV, PL 198, col. 469C-479A, here at 476C.
nobius, in a technique that she called “fabrication”—using the term employed by ancient authors themselves when they enjoined their audiences to “build” a Jerusalem in their minds that would appear whenever the word was employed.\textsuperscript{67} Certainly, in the case of Adam the Scot, David Jones has shown that the course of the man’s life was a steady process of such building, in that his writings reveal an attempt to constantly refine and live according to a monastic ideal that eventually found its fullest realization both in a Carthusian cell, and—with relevance to the sermons assessed here—the Bible itself. That is, for Adam at the end of his life, the \textit{lectio divina} became what Jones called a “quasi-sacramental” experience, where no visitors, a constant silence, and complete focus on spiritual reflection allowed the Adam the Scot to finally become immersed in union with God, the Divine Author.\textsuperscript{68}

\textbf{Conclusion}

In conclusion, Garnerius of Rochefort and Adam the Scot represented a sea change from earlier homiletic writers in how they presented Jerusalem as a \textit{visio pacis} in the latter twelfth century. The “shadows” that haunt Garnerius’s Jerusalem were no longer the “perfidious Saracens” of Urban II’s sermon in 1095, but, instead, the heretics and “bad Catholics” (\textit{mali Catholici}) who were challenging the papacy and Church institutional beliefs at the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is hard to imagine that Pope Urban II would have been capable of believing that his own fellow Christians would present as much of a problem to the faith as the Muslims of his own time, but by 1200 it was exactly toward the failings of Christians that Garnerius directed attention in his sermons, offering a salvific interpretation of the \textit{lectio divina} that removed any kind of pilgrimage consideration from a monk’s life; henceforth, the Holy City could be found in a close study of the Bible, whose pages and letters contained the secrets of rebuilding a devastated Jerusalem during
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the era of the Crusades. Likewise, with Adam the Scot, the sermons from his life mark a steadily refined belief that monastic walls were the only Jerusalem that a monk needed to seek, for the communal and spiritual life of both the Premonstratensians and Carthusians offered a new kind of *visio pacis* that could appeal to both ascetics and (potentially) a papacy and Church that found itself challenged on many fronts when Garnerius and Adam died in the beginning of the thirteenth century.

Finally, such observations about monastic sermons are grounded in the current historiography of mentalities, and I believe that they might represent another step toward helping us understand why a majority of monastic sermon writers presented Jerusalem without any reference to real world conditions during the Crusades. At the very least, these kinds of assessments of the sermon evidence are necessary preliminaries for the main argument of my upcoming monographs: that there was a discernible and definable medieval ecclesiastical intelligentsia whose interpretations of realities such as crusader Jerusalem, the Holy Sites, Muslims, and Jews were cumulatively subordinated to a biblically inculcated, sustained and observable theological vision.
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A Dialogue on Disaster: Antichrists in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses and their Medieval Recensions

Natalie E. Latteri

University of New Mexico

This paper examines textual and iconographic representations of antichrist personae in medieval Christian and Jewish manuscripts. Through a common language of polemics, Christians and Jews conflated antichrist personae to represent a more generalized category of apocalyptic antagonist that reflected the most significant temptations and threats to each respective religious community. As will be argued here, the greatest temptation and threat for Christians and Jews alike were those posed by members of the other religious group.¹

The Johannine Apocalypse and the Sefer Zerubbabel are Jewish apocalypses that are believed to have been written in the aftermath of cataclysmic socio-political upheavals in which Jews found themselves subject to foreign domination and in hope of salvation.² The texts follow a similar storyline and share characters and tropes found in other Jewish apocalypses which proliferated in the Hellenistic and the later Roman and Christian empires.³ Both depict angelic messengers who reveal the coming of the end of one era and the beginning of a final messianic era marked, most notably, by temptations and persecutions of the faithful (executed by a series succeeding rulers and their henchmen), and a final battle between good and evil (the Messiah and his forces against anti-messiahs, or antichrists).

The Johannine Apocalypse would go on to become the standard apocalypse in the Christian tradition and the Sefer Zerubbabel would become one of the most influential Jewish apocalypses of the medieval

¹ I would like to thank the American Academy for Jewish Research, the University of New Mexico Regents, the University of New Mexico Feminist Research Institute, and the University of New Mexico History Graduate Student Association for generously funding research incorporated in the present article. I also would like to thank the generous fellowships provided by the Russell J. and Dorothy S. Bilinski Foundation and the L. Dudley Phillips estate, which have facilitated the writing of the present article.

² Portier-Young, “Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” 160, notes that historical apocalypses—a sub-category that would include John’s Apocalypse and the Sefer Zerubbabel—were borne out of similar situational contexts of persecution.

³ The Christian “empire” refers to the joining of religio-political authority and power in both the Holy Roman Empire and the more generalized Christendom.
era. Yet, even as the religious identities of the Christian and Jewish communities became increasingly delineated during the course of the high Middle Ages, the commonalities between Christian and Jewish apocalyptic literature continued to develop. This paper examines the textual references to, and images of, anti-messiah, or antichrist, personae found within a sampling of Northern European Hebrew and Latin manuscripts containing the Johannine Apocalypse and the *Sefer Zerubbabel*, respectively, as a preliminary exploration of their interrelated development. Through a common language of polemics, medieval Christians and Jews conflated antichrist personae to represent a more generalized category of apocalyptic antagonist that suited their own context—specifically, the temptations and threats each perceived as most imminent. As will be argued here, the most pressing temptations and threats for each respective religious community were those posed by members of the other.

By most accounts, the Apocalypse is believed to have been the work of an otherwise unknown first-century Jewish-Christian—John—who wrote his text on the island of Patmos, during the reign of the Roman emperor Domitian (81-96 C.E.). Based on claims that the author of the text was none other than John the Evangelist, the Apocalypse was finally included as the last book in the Catholic Canon in 419 at the Synod of Carthage. Philological arguments suggesting that the writer of the Gospel of John was not in fact the same as that of the Johannine Apocalypse have since come to dominate consensus opinion, yet the dating remains largely uncontested. One reason for this is the principle of *ex eventu* prophecy, or the recognition that authors of apocalypses commonly presented historical events that had already occurred as prophetic accounts of those yet to transpire. Based on this principle, because the earliest copies of

6 McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, Appendix D-2, n19.
the Apocalypse date to the second century, and because there appear to be striking similarities between the author’s literary stylings and the lived reality of late first-century Jewish-Christians, commentators have read some of John’s alleged prognostications as descriptions of events during the so-called First Jewish War (66-70 C.E.), such as the devastation of the Jewish community in the Levant, the sacking of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the Second Temple.9 Scholars also believe they are able to read allusions to specific individuals into the author’s depictions of the chief persecutors of the faithful.10 This is no easy task as there are numerous antagonists in this text, including ravenous locusts,11 frogs,12 Gog and Magog,13 the rabble-rousing woman of Thyatira, Jezebel,14 the whore, Babylon the Great,15 a dragon,16 a seven-headed beast,17 a secondary beast,18 and an unnamed man who spreads deceit.19 Even more problematic, the features of these antagonists often overlap. Jezebel and Babylon, for example, both incite lust and come to their demise after being violently gang raped20; Jezebel and the unnamed man of deceit are both depicted as false prophets21; it is sometimes unclear if the roles

9 See Slater, “Dating the Apocalypse,” 252-58, for a contrarian position that John wrote before the destruction of the Temple, around 68-70 C.E.

10 Slater, “Dating the Apocalypse.” 252-54.

11 Apoc. 9:3-11.

12 Apoc. 16:13-14.

13 Apoc. 20:8.

14 Apoc. 2:20-2.


17 Apoc. 13:1-10; 17:3, 7-8, 11-12, 16.


20 See Selvidge, “Powerful and Powerless Women,” 159-61, 164. See also Glancy and Moore, “How Typical,” 568, who conclude that sexual violence is envisioned for Babylon the Great, though they do not mention the similar treatment of Jezebel.

of the two beasts are synonymous or merely complimentary in instances where descriptive adjectives—such as “seven headed”—are lacking and the unidentified beast’s roles of forcing idolatry through iconography, emitting foul, frog-like spirits, and spreading lies, could reasonably be applied to either;\(^{22}\) and, in further conflation, the secondary beast is said to have spoken in the manner of a dragon and is depicted as marking individuals with the first beast’s sign in the same way the man of deceit would later on.\(^{23}\)

Overlap withstanding, scholars have commonly interpreted each antagonist as some specific element of vice found in the empire. The persona Jezebel, for instance, might be understood as a derogatory characterization of either temple prostitutes and/or vestal virgins who, rather than serving as chaste oracles, utter false prophecy and seduce men from right religion. The secondary beast who only permits those with his mark to buy and sell and, along with the opulence of the whore, represents the greed and capitalism of the empire.\(^{24}\)

The seven-headed beast is symbolic of some combination of seven Roman emperors thought to range from either Julius Caesar (d. 44 B.C.E.), Augustus (27 B.C.E.-14 C.E.) or Caligula (37-41 C.E.) to Domitian (81-96 C.E.), each of whom had forced the imperial cult on their subjects.\(^{25}\) Babylon the Great is none other than the Roman Empire, or its capital city, who proffered power and prestige.\(^{26}\) The unnamed man of deceit is the solitary embodiment of the multiple antichrists mentioned in the Epistles whose teaching, like that of the many philosophers and religious sectarians in Rome, amounted to heretical doctrine.\(^{27}\) And the dragon is intertextually identified as

\(^{22}\) See Apoc. 15:2; 16:13; 19:19-20.


both a serpent—an allusion to the serpent in the Garden of Eden of Genesis—and the Satan of Job, the grand architect who eternally challenges God and tempts those who would follow Him.\textsuperscript{28}

To presume to know with surety which specific individuals or entities John intended to represent through his characterization of antagonists is problematic, to say the least. As Thomas B. Slater has pointed out, if the seven-headed beast were to represent those emperors who had insisted on imperial worship, the numbers would need to be fudged to excuse lesser-known emperors Galba (68-69 C.E.), Otho (69 C.E.), and Vitellius (69 C.E.) to enable a plausible interpretation of Domitian as the last emperor to rule before the coming of the new and final era.\textsuperscript{29} Even so, relating the enemies of the faithful to various elements of the Roman empire is suggested by John’s use of Babylon the Great as a prominent antagonist. The literary trope is part of a rich tradition found in Jewish biblical and post-biblical texts in which the faithful are cautioned against succumbing to pressures to assimilate to the cultures of the empires that had conquered them and, in the process, abandoning God in favor of the allure of fleeting creature comforts—such as: tasty foods, a heavy purse, or a casual tryst.\textsuperscript{30}

Such a collaboration of evil is iterated time and again within the biblical text as well as in the iconographic program in medieval manuscripts. In John’s Apocalypse, this concept is evident when the dragon is said to have given his authority to the seven-headed beast so that the whole earth would worship him; when the secondary beast is said to exercise “all the authority of the first beast on its behalf, and it makes the earth and its inhabitants worship the first beast . . .”; and when the seven-headed beast is said to carry Babylon the Great and parade her before the nations that they may lust after her.\textsuperscript{31} In illuminated manuscripts dating from the central through

\textsuperscript{28} Apoc. 20:2.

\textsuperscript{29} Slater, “Dating the Apocalypse,” 253.

\textsuperscript{30} See, for example, Hos. 4:10-15, 9:1; Isa. 1:21; Jer. 1:20, 3:1; Ezek. 23.

\textsuperscript{31} Apoc. 13:4, 12; 17:7.
late Middle Ages and originating in Northern Europe, the relationship between apocalyptic antagonists is underscored by depictions of physical contact which aligns antichrist personae beyond what the biblical text suggests. Examples of this are found in depictions of hand—or, rather, paw-claw touching—between the dragon and beast to symbolize the transference of power from the former to the latter. In Apocalypse 13:1-2, John relates that he “saw a beast rising out of the sea, having ten horns and seven heads; and on its horns were ten diadems . . . And the dragon gave it his power and his throne and great authority,” but without mentioning any contact (see Illustrations figure 1). And, physical association is reinforced by the illuminators’ employment of similar poses for different personae as an indication that they performed the same actions—such as images depicting both beasts seated in an upright position like a human, preaching to a crowd of followers and effectively functioning to lead them astray (see Illustrations figures 2 and 3).

Yet, the clearest example of association is found in the conflation of anti-messiah, or antichrist, personae. This can be seen in depictions of the secondary beast figured as a being with the face of a human, adorned as a king, with a crown and wearing chain mail (see Illustrations figure 4). Not only does this presentation prove a creative addition to the biblical description of the beast, it also bears striking similarity to standardized iconographic representations of other apocalyptic provocateurs—the savage locusts, which John described as “horses equipped for battle. On their heads were what looked like crowns of gold; their faces were like human faces, their hair like women’s hair, . . . they had scales like iron breastplates . . .” (Apoc. 9:7, 9) (see Illustrations figure 5). An even greater example of conflation may be seen when the secondary beast is portrayed as seated on waters and carried by the seven-headed beast in

33 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Tanner 184, p. 24, 28.
a stance described in the biblical text as belonging to Babylon the Great: “Come, I will show you the judgement of the great whore who is seated on many waters . . . a woman sitting on a scarlet beast that was full of blasphemous names, and it had seven heads and ten horns . . .” (Apoc. 17: 1-3) (see Illustrations figures 6, 7, and 8).  

And, when both beasts are depicted as emitting “foul spirits like frogs” from their mouths in contrast to the explicit statement in the Apocalypse that these creatures issued forth from “the mouth of the dragon, from the mouth of the beast, and from the mouth of the false prophet.” (Apoc. 16:13) (see Illustrations figure 9).

The concept that each of the antagonists is related to the others, united in efforts to corrupt the faithful through sex, money, or power calls into question the individuation of anti-messianic, or antichrist, personae that some modern readers have imposed on the text. The amalgam of evil in these medieval manuscripts suggests that commissioners and illuminators may have, at times, been more interested in distinguishing between benevolent and malevolent forces than in identifying specific individuals as harbingers of the End. Hindsight reveals that doing so afforded each generation the possibility of interpreting John’s Apocalypse as referring to their own time and place rather than to first-century Roman Empire. As many scholars have shown, this interpretive freedom had especially negative consequences for Jews who, by the polemical turn of the long twelfth century, were increasingly associated with the vices of the apocalyptic antagonists viewed as threats to Christendom.

36 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Tanner 184, p. 26, contra the images on pp. 46 and 47.


38 See especially McGinn, Antichrist, for a focus on an individual Antichrist persona.

39 Emmerson, Antichrist, 66-71, notes a tradition of multiple antichrists in exegetical and popular medieval understanding, beginning with Church father, Augustine (354-430); yet, he claims that this position was much less prevalent compared to the idea of a singular Antichrist persona. Palmer, “Apocalyptic Outsiders,” 307-20, emphasizes the common tendency for medievals to vacillate between historic (one Antichrist operating within a specific context) and symbolic (multiple antichrists who threatened the moral turpitude of Christendom) understandings of apocalyptic antagonists.

40 See, for example, Emmerson, Antichrist in the Middle Ages, 46, 62-3, 76-100, 127-36, 165; Lewis, “Tractatus;” Hill, “Antichrist,” 99-117; Lipton, Images of Intolerance, especially 113-40.
For instance, some Jews—including the famed French rabbi, Rashi (1040-1105)—had risen to positions of authority within Christendom and they and their exegetical works were regularly consulted by ecclesiastics.\footnote{Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 103-04, 119, 126; Grabois, “The Hebraica Veritas,” 613-34; Berndt, “Les interprétations juives,” 199-240; Moore, *Jews and Christians*, 57-8, 62, 64-5, 70-1.} Yet, by the late twelfth century, Jewish consultation would become less common within Christendom as ecclesiastics increasingly began to view Jews like the false prophet of the Apocalypse.\footnote{Cohen, “The Jews as the Killers,” 1-27; Timmer, “Biblical Exegesis,” 309-21.} And, like John’s imagining of the locusts with a man’s face and women’s hair, ecclesiastics began to both feminize and dehumanize Jews as part of a drawn out exercise in mental acrobatics in which the biblical interpretive mode of literalism most associated with Judaic practice rendered Jews “carnally” minded—the equivalent of women and beasts—in contrast to Christian men’s spiritual understanding of Scripture. Thus, in an abuse of Aristotelian philosophy, Jews became flesh to Christian spirit, Jewish female to Christian male, Jewish beast to Christian human.\footnote{Cuffel, *Gendering Disgust*, 175-82, 200-04, 211-12.} The metaphors worked beyond religious association alone and, though incorporated in a religious text, would color secular social relations as well. For disgruntled Christians who felt left out of the burgeoning monetary economy, Jewish merchants with capital became like the beast who controlled the market.\footnote{Lipton, *Images of Intolerance*, 87, 93, 138-39; Cuffel, *Gendering Disgust*, 211-12.} And, like Babylon the Great, Jews incited lust and greed in Christians who were too easily bought by the mirage of borrowed wealth and the power it could procure.\footnote{See Strickland, “Antichrist and the Jews,” 23, 32.}

But medieval Christians were not alone in associating antichrists with their nearest neighbors. Northern European, or Ashkenazic Jews, looked equally askance at Christians as apocalyptic antagonists who continuously tempted the faithful to assimilate to the dominant culture and religion, and thus abandon proper Jewish observance. In this regard, the function of anti-messiahs in *Sefer Zerubbabel*, and...
texts sharing some of the motifs found therein, provide ample comparisons to John’s Apocalypse and its medieval incarnations.

*Sefer Zerubbabel*’s apocalyptic antagonists include a Persian ruler, Siroy, who is described as king “of fierce countenance.”46 This is a rare descriptor that literally means “goat face” and is found only twice in the biblical text: Moses is presented as having used it in his Deuteronomic prophecy of the Babylonian forces who would destroy Jerusalem and exile the Judean elite in the sixth century B.C.E.; and, the editor of the book of Daniel applied it to the final evil king who would emerge when transgressions were at their height to serve as God’s scourge and met out divine retribution.47 Joining Siroy is another king, a Roman ruler named Armiilos and his unnamed mother, a stone statue of a beautiful woman. In addition to these, Satan and the demon, Belial, are referenced in passing, and bet ha-toref48—a term that could be translated as “vagina,” or the related “brothel,” or “church”49—also plays a role in tempting, if not fully corrupting, Jews.

As in John’s Apocalypse, the relationship between the antagonists is pronounced and sometimes carries over to conflation. For instance, the title character first encounters the awaited Messiah filthy, downtrodden, and imprisoned in a bet ha-toref, located in a city that is

46 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Opp. 603, f. 33a, line 11; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Heb. d. 11, f. 248b, line 9. The latter manuscript, MS, Heb. d. 11, contains the fullest and best-known version of the *Sefer Zerubbabel*, and I am incredibly grateful to Dr. César Merchan-Hamann, Director of the Leopold Muller Memorial Library and Curator of Hebraica and Judaica at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, for permitting me access to this restricted manuscript and for taking time out of his busy schedule to patiently supervise me as I photographed it. I am also grateful to Judah Bob Rosenwald for his help and patience with transcribing and translating difficult passages in MS, Opp. 603.

47 Deut. 28:50; Dan. 8:23. Illuminated manuscripts of Christian apocalypses often depict the eschatological “beast” as a goat. Whether or not this representation is based on an interpretation and application of the biblical Hebrew used to describe Moses’s and Daniel’s apocalyptic antagonists is unknown, but may be worth further exploration.

48 The manuscripts actually read ירוחיה תיב, bet ha-horef, or “the winter palace.” Reeves, *Trajectories*, 52 n86, notes that this orthography has been addressed at length and that the consensus opinion is that the term should be read as ירוחיה תיב, bet ha-toref.

49 Biale, “Counter-History,” 139-40, was the first, to my knowledge, to call attention to the multiplicity of meanings of bet ha-toref within the context of the *Sefer Zerubbabel*.
identified as both Nineveh and Rome. The stone statue too is found in a *bet ha-toref*. Armilos takes his mother from this *bet ha-toref* to parade her before the nations so that they may bow to her and, thus showing their devotion, be marked as eligible to conduct business within the realm. And, the demon Belial is presented as synonymous with Satan in his role as paramour to the stone statue—“This statue is the wife of Belial . . . Satan will come and lie with her . . . .”—though at the conclusion of the text, Satan is identified as Belial’s father. In these examples, location, relation, and function all speak to a collaboration among antichrist personae.

Similarities withstanding, there is less consensus when it comes to the dating of the *Sefer Zerubbabel* than that found in regard to John’s Apocalypse and so it has been somewhat more difficult to link each of the antagonists to specific individuals. In the early twentieth century, Israel Lévi argued what has since become the dominant position; namely, that the references to apocalyptic personae and, thus, the likely context of composition, pointed to seventh-century Palestine which, at the time, was located within the eastern half of the Roman Empire and ruled by the emperor Heraclius (610-641).

Lévi based his argument on the mention of Siroy, who, according to the *Sefer Zerubbabel*, would be an early persecutor of the Jews before Armilos, the second, more powerful apocalyptic antagonist emerged. Siroy was the name of the Sassanid shahansha, or emperor, who took the regnal name Kavad II (628), and briefly ruled Palestine after colluding with the Roman Emperor Heraclius by

50 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Opp. 603, f. 32b, line 11 and f. 33a, line 1; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Heb. d. 11, f. 248a, lines 14, 25-6 and f. 249b, line 21.

51 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Opp. 603, f. 32b, line 11 and f. 33a, line 1; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Heb. d. 11, f. 248a, lines 14, 25-6 and f. 249a, line 21.

52 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Heb. d. 11, f. 249a, lines 24-5; see also, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Opp. 603, f. 34a, line 2.

53 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Heb. d. 11, f. 251a, lines 9-10.

54 See Reeves, *Trajectories*, 47-8.

55 See Lévi, “L’apocalypse de Zorobabel,” 129-60; 69 (1914): 108-21; 71 (1920): 57-65. Subsequent references to these articles will be distinguished by (1), (2), and (3).
staging a coup against his father, Chosroes II (590-628). Based on this information, Lévi interpreted the other main apocalyptic antagonists in the text—Armilos and his mother—as the Roman Emperor Heraclius and the Virgin Mary. He came to this conclusion by understanding Armilos as a transposed version of the mythic founder of Rome—Romulus—and applying it to the ruling Roman Emperor at the time he assumed the text was written. Lévi, and more recently Martha Himmelfarb, especially, have interpreted the stone statue as a foil of the Christian doctrine of the Blessed Virgin Mother and her divine impregnation, as well as a Jewish critique of the emperor’s well-known devotion to Mary, which extended to taking an image of her into battle.

In addition to perceiving the apocalyptic antagonists to suit his reading of Siroy as the Sassanid emperor Kavad II, Lévi also adjusted his reading of specific numeric references to match the seventh-century compositional context he had in mind. The clearest example of this can be found when, despite unanimity among the extant textual recensions that describes a duration of forty years that the faithful would be able to worship in Jerusalem before the onslaught of attacks from Siroy and later Armilos, Lévi declared that the number of years should be read as four in order that the context he imposed be more closely aligned to Siroy’s and Heraclius’s respective rules.

The majority of scholars have accepted Lévi’s position, even though the earliest extant remains of the Sefer Zerubbabel date to tenth-century fragments and may represent early versions of the text rather than reflecting a pre-existing tradition. Unfortunately there is not a standardized text of the Sefer Zerubbabel, or even, for that matter, a standardized title or iconography by which to judge all other

---

56 Lévi, “L’apocalypse,” (1) 152; See Reeves, Trajectories, 58 n128.


58 Lévi, “L’Apocalypse,” (1) 151n3; Reeves, Trajectories, 57 n125.

59 Reeves, Trajectories, 48.
recensions. The longest of the versions, contributing to the fullest and best known modern transcription and translation, is included in a compilation manuscript dating to the early fourteenth-century Ashkenazic Jewry. Moreover, it is not at all apparent that mention of Persia or Rome in the *Sefer Zerubbabel* served any other purpose than a symbolic allusion to the Jewish demise and conquest by foreign powers. That is, the significance of the name Siroy is not necessarily in the importance of the minor Sassanid ruler who bore it, except in the fact that his rule effectually marked the end of the old Persian empire that was often conflated with the Babylonian empire that had preceded it and that bore responsibility for the destruction of the First Temple and the Exile. The same principle may be applied to Armilos. If actually meant to represent Romulus, this antichrist persona could merely symbolize the eventual succession of the Roman empire, which had also conquered Israel and was responsible for the destruction of the Second Temple. Moreover—as in the case of interpretations of the antichrist personae in John’s Apocalypse as depictions of actual Roman emperors, culminating with Domitian—the numerical references do not quite add up when considered along with the principle of *ex eventu* prophecy noted above. For, if we were to consider textual references to the destruction of the Second Temple as an indication of an event that had already past, acknowledged by the author who presented himself as prophesying the coming of the Third and final Temple, along with a beginning date for the battles leading up to ultimate redemption occurring 990 years after the destruction of the Second Temple, compositional context would figure centuries after Heraclius, to the eleventh century.

60 See, for example, the title in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Opp. 603, f. 32b: רפסה הז לבברז יהיו והליאמ contra Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 236a, f. 13a: תריהב לאיתלאש יב לבברז רפס ליחתא. Many thanks to Martha Himmelfarb for pointing out the oddity of the title in MS, Opp. 603 and sharing her preliminary thoughts on its significance.


62 See note 46 above.

63 Speck, “The Apocalypse of Zerubbabel,” 187-90, has challenged both the plausibility of Lévi’s identification of the historical personae Heraclius and Siroy, as well as his dating of the *Sefer Zerubbabel* to the early seventh century.
In the nineteenth century, Heinrich Graetz, based on this same mathematical claim, dated the Sefer Zerubbabel to sometime around the 1050s-1060s. This is understandable as the text indicates that the Messiah would initially present himself 990 years after the destruction of the Second Temple, c.1068, and the references to warfare and the significance of Jerusalem seemed to coincide with events occurring in the latter half of the eleventh century. Graetz’s, rather than Lévi’s, interpretation of compositional context is further supported in light of contemporary messianic and eschatological trends in eleventh- and twelfth-century Europe. For instance, in his seminal early twelfth-century work, Lekach Tov, R. Tobiah ben Eliezer (1050-1108) alluded to the popular Jewish belief that the Messiah was to come around the time of the First Crusade, and the prominent apocalyptic antagonists in Sefer Zerubbabel are depicted through ethno-national terms—Romans and Persians—that could readily be applied to Christians and Muslims in both the decades leading up to and during the crusades. After all, the Holy Roman Empire based its authority on association with the Roman empire of antiquity; and, the casual reference to the early eleventh-century Muslim caliph al-Hakim (985-1021) as the “Prince of Babylon” by Cluniac monk and chronicler Ralph Glaber (985-1047) suggests the commonality of the metaphor. Moreover, the so-called Chronicle of Solomon bar Samson (c. 1140), composed in Hebrew by an anonymous Ashkenazic Jew, described the anti-Jewish pogroms in the Rhineland at the close of the eleventh century and depicted other familiar figures known from the Sefer Zerubbabel to suit an eleventh-century context. In it, crusaders, like the Persian King, Siroy, are depicted as ‘azey fanim, or “strong of face,” Satan is none other

64 Graetz, “Das Buch Zerubabel,” 59. Many thanks to Matthew Carver for providing me with a translation of Graetz’s work.


67 Salomo bar Simson (Chronik I, Hs. E) in Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 248 n14 (hereafter, Haverkamp); The Chronicle of Solomon ben R. Samson, in Roos, God Wants It! Appendix 6 (hereafter, Roos); and Chazan, God, Humanity, 62, have each noted the biblical reference in Deuteronomy 28:50, but not in Dan. 8:23. As suggested by Haverkamp’s and Roos’s titles, there are numerous variations in scholarship in regard to both title and transliteration of the author’s name of the text cited above. Throughout this paper, and in the remainder of the notes, I refer to the text as The Chronicle of Solomon bar Samson.
than *ha-papius shel Rumi ha-rasha* “the Pope of wicked Rome,”68 and the Virgin Mary as *ha-niddah* “the menstruant”69 and *ha-Zonah* “the whore”70—essentially defined by vaginal impurity alluded to in the *Sefer Zerubbabel*’s placement of her in a *bet ha-toref*. Solomon described a prominent crusading duke, Godfrey of Bouillon, as having been led astray by a *ruah zenunim* “spirit of whoredom”71 in his desire to heed the Pope’s call and go on crusade, suggesting that the author’s use of vaginal impurity was intended to convey impure religious beliefs as well as physical impurities. And Count Emicho of Flonheim—an individual considered by contemporary ecclesiastical authors to harbor a desire to be the Last Roman Emperor foretold of in the popular Christian apocalypse, the *Tiburtine Sybil*,72 was cast as a type of other apocalyptic antagonists in Israel’s past, including the ninth-century B.C.E. King Hazael of Amram and further unidentified agents sent by God to lay waste to Israel’s sinners and purify the community.73

To conclude, the types of apocalyptic antagonists in John’s Apocalypse and the *Sefer Zerubbabel* transcended whatever the context of composition may have been. Receivers and transmitters of both adjusted their interpretations of these apocalypses to suit their own context, reading the highly symbolic agents of temptation and threat as their closest neighbors who had the ability to offer the most and harm the worst. While this speaks to inter-confessional xenophobia, it also hints at inter-confessional proximity and a desire, however repressed, to integrate further still.


69 *The Chronicle of Solomon bar Samson*, Haverkamp, 253, 333; See, in contrast, Roos, A9n16, 47.


73 *The Chronicle of Solomon bar Samson*, Haverkamp, 309; Roos, A36.
Illustrations

Figure 1: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Auct, D. 14, f.34b

Figure 2: Oxford, Bodleian Lan Library, MS, Tanner 184, p. 24
Figure 3: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 184, p. 28

Figure 4: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Auct, D. 14, p. 28
Natalie E. Latteri is a doctoral candidate in the Department of History, University of New Mexico where she is finishing her dissertation entitled “Pesher, Hazanah, and Teshuvah in Solomon’s Apocalypse: Text and Context of The Chronicle of Solomon bar Samson.” Her research interests include Jewish-Christian relations in medieval Europe, Messianism and Apocalypticism, and Gender and Religion.

Bibliography


The volumes of the Records of Early English Drama show that there was a lively tradition of local, religious performances throughout England in the late medieval and early Tudor period. Parishes, large and small, rich and poor, supported plays, processions, ales and other activities like Robin Hood celebrations. Great care, money and time went into creating costumes and staging for these events. Most of these local performances disappeared by the middle of the sixteenth century. A few, notably at York, Chester, Coventry and Norwich, continued into the early 1570s, but focus on these performance “giants” of English theatrical history fails to show how they stood virtually alone by that time. Theatre historians like Glynne Wickham point to these survivals as evidence that the Protestant reforms of Edward VI minimally affected the demise of local theatre. The REED volumes and parish records show that revivals of local theatre under Catholic Mary were tepid, most coming near the end of her reign, and even the theatrical “giants” were waning by the first 10 years of Elizabeth’s reign. The lackluster restoration under Mary of what had been performance traditions imbedded in English communities for generations led me to turn to non-dramatic records at the local level, especially churchwardens’ accounts. I created a sampling of published churchwardens’ accounts for 34 parishes in 19 separate counties. I established a time frame of 1530 to 1565-70—spanning the time period just before the Henrician reforms began and the time by which the so-called Elizabethan settlement was in place. What this sampling suggests is that the costs of reform (Henry and Edward), restoration (Mary), then reform (Elizabeth) consumed much of what we call “disposable income” of virtually all of the parishes—“disposable income” that had financed traditional, religious, performances.

As more and more of the volumes of the Records of Early English Drama (REED) are published, they confirm a lively and extensive tradition of local performance activities throughout most of England in the late medieval and early Tudor period.1 Records from Devon, for example, reveal that several parishes—large and small, rich and poor—supported passion plays, and plays about the

1 Hutton, Rise and Fall, 1-120.
saints, processions, Hocktides, Plow Mondays, and Robin Hood celebrations, as well as church ales that often included many of these same activities.²

Details from provincial and parish records give evidence of great care, money and time that went into creating costumes and properties for these events. For instance, between 1484 and 1501 Exeter’s costume costs averaged 453 pence per year, enough money to buy 75 pigs, or 64 pairs of children’s shoes, or pay 7 years’ wages to the parish clerk of St. Mary, Reading (Berkshire).³ Various parishes list expenditures for velvet and fur-trimmed gowns, satin robes, devils’ heads, tormentors’ costumes, wigs and beards, and payments for the mending and altering costumes.⁴ Records from Coventry note payments of 332 pence (2 ¾ years’ salary for Reading’s clerk) to repair two swords and furnish silver and gilt for their scabbards, and 181 pence to trim a velvet cap with gold lace, fringe, and buttons.⁵ Other parish expenses note the repair and creation of mechanical devices such as angels descending to the Easter sepulcher and Norwich’s famous dragon, Snap.⁶ Such expenses in churchwardens’ accounts demonstrate that substantial numbers of costumes, properties, and set-pieces were created for parish plays, processions, pageants, St. George and Robin Hood celebrations, and Morris dances. The REED records show that the costume inventories of some parishes were so extensive that they rented costumes to neighboring parishes.⁷

² Lancashire, *Dramatic Texts*, 349.

³ Byrne, *Elizabethan Life*, 308-09 notes a price of 6 pence for a pig and 7 pence for a pair of child’s shoes claret; Garry and Garry, *Reading*, 42 lists 120 pence as the wages of the parish clerk.

⁴ *Records of Early English Drama* (REED) Devon, 403; REED Cornwall, 471-3; REED: Coventry, 257, 299; REED: Dorset, 2; Osborne, *Chagford*, 184, 246, 190; Malone Kent, 191-98, 207-11; Malone Norfolk/Suffolk, 119, 131-32; Cox, *Churchwardens*, 277.

⁵ REED Coventry, 299.


data suggest that productions in smaller municipalities may have rivaled those of the larger cities. And before the reign of Henry VIII many parishes took their plays on tour to neighboring towns. For instance, over a 30-year period the Kentish towns of New Romney, Lydd, and Hythe regularly toured their respective plays.

The REED volumes reveal that most of these parish performances disappeared by the mid-1500s. To be sure, the play cycles at York, Chester, Wakefield, Lincoln, and Coventry, and Norwich’s St. George’s Day pageant continued into the early 1570s. Yet despite all efforts to adapt these performances to Elizabeth’s religious injunctions, her government and church suppressed them all in the mid-1570s. Focus on such late survivals, however, fails to notice that after 1560 or so these performance giants stood virtually alone like a few ancient redwoods left scattered in a clear-cut forest.

Focus on the great cycle plays leads to flawed assumptions by historians like Glynne Wickham and Patrick Collinson. They, and others, assert that religiously based, local performances withered away gradually because of increasing production costs and lack of cohesive management. Ronald Hutton states that during Edward’s reign there was a government attack on local performance activity, but he asserts that it speedily revived during Mary’s reign. Yet the REED volumes show that revivals under Mary were tepid, most coming near the end of her reign, and lingering survivals under Elizabeth tended to be in areas far from London such as Devon, Chester, Lancashire, and York.

---

8 Forse, “The Flow and Ebb,” 47-68; Malone Kent, 120, 122, 125, 127-29, 133; REED Kent, 733-35, 742, 752.


10 REED: Chester, 27, 47-68; REED: York, 289-95, 320-93; Malone Society Lincolnshire, 47-68; Wickham, Early English Stages, v.1, 115-16, 135-6, 346-7; and his The Medieval Theatre, 221. For attempts to preserve York’s, Chester’s, and Norwich’s performance traditions see Forse, “Pleasing the Queen;” “Secularizing the Saint;” and “Some Show Must Go On.”


12 Hutton, Rise and Fall, 89-119.
Whether or not one subscribes to the traditional view that English parishes welcomed “protestantization,” or to the revisionist view that most parishes simply obeyed orders from “the top down,” probably is not entirely relevant to questions of parish performances. The Pilgrimage of Grace under Henry VIII, The Prayer Book Rebellion under Edward VI, and the abortive rebellion of the northern earls under Elizabeth all show that substantial portions of the population wished to continue at least some of the old ways, if not the adherence to Rome. But Hutton’s assertion that substantial parish performance activity quickly revived during Catholic Mary’s reign is not borne out by financial records found in the REED volumes and elsewhere. New Romney (Kent), for example, had a long tradition of an elaborate passion play and boy-bishop celebrations before Edward’s government stopped such activities. Yet the town did not try to revive its passion play until 1559, the first year of Elizabeth, and just before her injunctions to return the English church to the practices of Edward VI. Other communities reveal similar lags in time, or tepid attempts, at revivals of traditional performances during Mary’s reign.

The New Romney example—and other evidence in the REED volumes suggesting that many, many other communities were slow to restore venerable performance activities—puzzled me. I began to think that attention needed to be paid to non-dramatic records at the parish level, especially the financial records found in churchwardens’ accounts. Such are moderately available in printed form, depending upon the extant manuscripts, and upon the interest of local historians and historical societies. Some are not complete for long stretches of time during the Tudor period. Nonetheless I was able to find published churchwardens’ accounts for 35 parishes in 21 counties. Interlibrary loans, trips to the libraries of University

13 Duffy, Stripping, 248, 399, 466-68 583-84; Haigh, Reformations, 143-49, 173-74; Brigden, New Worlds, 127-29,185-88, 236-37.
14 REED Kent, 2: 733-812.
15 Malone Kent, 207-11.

Along with variety in geographic location, the sample also yielded variety in the size, wealth, and setting of parishes. There are accounts from larger, urban parishes in Cambridge, Canterbury, Gloucester, London, Ludlow, Norwich, Northampton, Oxford, Reading, and York; middling sized market towns such as Ashburton, Boxfield, and Lewes, and smaller rural parishes like Ashwell, Halesowen, Pyrton, and Smarden. The sample includes average annual incomes ranging from £37 for the large, well-endowed, urban parish of St. Mary, Reading to less than £1 for the relatively small and poor, rural parish of St. Mary, Baldock.

To analyze the figures from these parishes I chose a time period from 1530 to 1570—beginning just before the Henrician reforms and ending when most of the so-called Elizabethan settlement was in place. Some records do include the entire forty-year span, but even those accounts that cover relatively few years still reveal insights into the effects on local parishes of the Tudor monarchs’ religious injunctions. To manage the data, I created a spreadsheet for each parish with the following fields: year, parish, county, liturgical expenses (vestments, communion wine, candles, etc.), maintenance expenses (repairs, priest’s, clerk’s, schoolmaster’s, and sexton’s wages), reformation expenses, such as new English language Bibles, communion cups, new liturgical books, remodeling the church, and now that the monarch was head of the church, royal rent (or instance, in 1543 St. Mary’s, Yatton first notes an expense of 159 pence for the Kyngs subside, and 1547 St. Martin’s, Leicester first mentions an expense of 40 pence for the king), visitations by royal visits.

16 Hobhouse, Yatton, 156; North, S. Martin’s, 33.
and ecclesiastical officials and incomes and their sources (funerals, bequests, rents, performances, candle sales, etc.), total expenses, and total income. Table 1, below is a simplified version of an individual spreadsheet.

Table 1: St. Mary’s, Bishop’s Stortford, Hertfordshire: There is little detail for most sources of income and expenses. Large incomes for 1547 and 1548 reflect the sale of vestments, plate, etc. There are no reform costs after 156317

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>Ref. Exp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>3390</td>
<td>12217</td>
<td>1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>22527</td>
<td>14963</td>
<td>7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, S Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, St Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, St Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, St Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, St Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Bishop’s Stortford, St Michael</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I combined the individual spreadsheets into a master spreadsheet. From that spreadsheet I computed averages for the years included in the individual parishes’ records, and created a spreadsheet with the following fields: parish and number of years averaged, county, average expenses, average incomes, average reformation expenses, and the ratio of reformation expenses to total expenses and total income as a percentage. For reasons of ease in computation all amounts are given in pence.

17 Glasscock, Bishop’s Stortford, 40-55.
Prior to the Tudor reformations, all of the parishes examined derived some annual income from performance activities—plays, processions, Hocktides, Plow Mondays, Robin Hood celebrations, and especially church ales. Many derived substantial amounts. For example, in 1553 St. Mary’s in Devizes (Wiltshire) received 24% of its annual income from a Robin Hood play. Ashburton (Devon) received 28% of its total income in 1538 from church ales. In 1554 Hocktide accounted for 5% of St. Mary’s, Lambeth, parish’s income; and in 1555 it accounted for 19%. Between 1532 and 1538 Hocktide receipts in the small parish of St Andrew’s, Lewes (Sussex) accounted for 19% to 35% of income.18

A so-called “stoke play” in Boxford, Suffolk, where records are extant from 1530 to 1561, was toured in neighboring towns in 1535 to pay for a new church steeple. The term “stoke play” is undefined in the records. Boxford’s “stoke play” visited 22 towns and collected a whopping 4,047 pence, an average of 184 pence per town.19 That total, 4047 pence, would buy 1/2 quarts of white wine, or 250 pounds of gunpowder, or be almost 17 years wages for the schoolmaster at St Michael’s Smarden.20 The play provided the parish with about 75% of its total income that year. The records suggest that this traveling play, whatever it was, was intended solely as a one-time moneymaker rather than a continuing parish activity. A “stoke play” is mentioned sporadically in Boxford’s accounts before that date, but no sums spent or received are mentioned.

Plow Mondays are mentioned less frequently than plays and church ales in parish records, but these community events also yielded revenue. Swaffham in Norfolk gathered 456 pence from Plow

18 McNabb, Devises, 6-10; Hanham, Ashburton, 101-03; Drew, Lambeth, 68-9, 81-6; Whitley, Lewes, 45-7.
19 Malone Norfolk/Suffolk, 136-137
20 REED: Chester, 187, lists a cost of 6 pence for a quart of white wine. Hanham, Ashburton, 189 lists a cost of 48 pence for 3 pounds of gunpowder, Haselwood, Smarden, 228 lists 240 pence as the schoolmaster’s wages.
Mondays from 1536 through 1538, averaging 152 pence per year. Shipham (Norfolk) had a consistent and lengthy run of Plough Mondays, collecting 1,082 pence (40 pence per year average) from 1511 through 1538.

Church ales—which often included performances—were the most common parish activities, appearing frequently in records from all over England. Records from Suffolk parishes, Boxford and Cratfield, show that in Boxford, ales made up 12% of total income between 1530 and 1560. In Cratfield, ales composed 21% of income between 1490 and 1561. However, before 1547—the year in which Edward VI’s reforms began—ales were Boxford’s and Cratfield’s largest single source of income. Boxford received 22% of its income from ales, and Cratfield 40%. After 1547 church ales in Boxford and Cratfield ales virtually disappear from parish records. Boxford held an ale in 1549, and another in 1560, after which church ales disappear in its records. There is no mention of a church ale at Cratfield’s records after 1552.

Other parish records reveal similar figures. In 1530, the small parish of St. Michael’s, Oxford, received 37% of its total income from its annual church ale. Ales yielded the small parish of Holy Trinity, Minchinhampton (Gloucester) 49%, 56%, and 70% of its annual income respectively in the years 1555, 1558, and 1560. Records for the small parish of St. Michael’s, Mere (Wiltshire) show the following percentages of income from ales: 1556-98%, 1557-44%, 1559-82%, 1561-84%. Ales and other performance activities obviously provided substantial parts of the annual income for parishes not richly endowed with rents. But even wealthy parishes

21 Malone Norfolk/Suffolk 100-1.
22 Malone Norfolk/Suffolk 79-82.
23 Northeast, Boxford, 3, 4, 6, 10-16, 20-23, 31-35, 38, 40-46, 48, 54, 72-76; Holland and Raven, Cratfield, 52, 54, 57-58, 82.
24 Bruce, “Minchinhampton,” 422-27.
with substantial rental incomes benefited from them. For example, All Saints, Tilney (Norfolk), raised between 7% and 14% of annual income from Plow Mondays and Mayday celebrations.\footnote{Stallard, *Tilney*, 139-45, 147-57, 161-69.}

Henry VIII’s break with Rome, along with his new requirements for parishes to purchase English Bibles and to pay rent to the king for the church buildings\footnote{See for example: Hanham, *Ashburton*, 111-13; Amphlett, *Bedwardine*, 13, 14, North-east, *Boxford*, 43-44; Stallard, *Tilney*, 162; Worthy, *Ashburton*, 16.} had small effect on parish performance activities. Nor did Henry’s new regulations require much in additional costs to the parishes.

However, within the first 18 months of Edward VI’s reign, with rare exceptions, local performance activities ended. Edward’s government instituted wide-sweeping Protestant reforms backed up by a vigorous program of episcopal and royal visitations.\footnote{Duffy, *Stripping*, 426-35; Haigh, *Reformations*, 168-72, 181.} Corpus Christi Day, St. George’s Day, and processions, even Rogation Processions, were particular targets, as was the ringing of church bells, and so too were Mayday celebrations and Church ales. Plays and interludes touching on religious matters deemed “popish” were banned.\footnote{Duffy, *Stripping*, 452, 486; Haigh, *Reformations*, 181.} That ban included plays about the sacrament and patron saints. New Romney’s passion play ceased, as did Ashburton’s. What had been important sources of revenue for parishes came to an abrupt halt.

At the same time, parishes were expected to bear the high costs of reform. That included buying expensive new Bibles and liturgical books, and complete renovation of churches—removing all images and altars, whitewashing walls and painting verses from Scripture on them, covering stained glass windows, and removing church bells.\footnote{Duffy, *Stripping*, 478-87; Haigh, *Reformations*, 176-77, 180-84.} For example, in 1547 All Saints, Tilney (Norfolk) spent 599 pence, 60% of its annual income, on removing altars and images, putting a
communion table in the middle of the church, whitewashing walls, taking down the rood and rood loft, and buying several of the newly prescribed liturgical books.\textsuperscript{31} Between 1547 and 1550 St. Michael’s, Bishop’s Stortford (Hertford) spent 9,820 pence for reform costs, an amount that could buy over 800 “ready made’ shirts, or page the wages of the curate of St. Michael’s, Oxford for 40 years.\textsuperscript{32} The sum equaled 34\% of its total income and 36\% of expenses for those years. The small parish of St. Michael’s, Bedwardine (Worcestershire) spent 668 pence on Edward’s reforms between 1547 and 1549. That sum represents 18\% of its total income and 26\% of all expenses. By 1551 the small parish of St. Mary the Virgin in Morbath (Devon) had spent so much on Edward’s reforms that the incoming churchwarden found no funds left over in the church’s accounts.\textsuperscript{33}

Royal officials were expected to confiscate vestments, chalices, jeweled gold and silver crucifixes, and plate—anything smacking of traditional Catholicism. Anticipating confiscations, some parishes sold off vestments, plate, baptismal fonts, crucifixes, tabernacles, and other Catholic paraphernalia. Those sales helped offset some of the costs imposed by Edward’s reforms, especially in wealthier parishes.\textsuperscript{34} In 1548 the church of Sts. Andrew and Martin, Lewes (Sussex) received 4,197 pence from the sale of church goods; in 1548. St. Martin Spurriergate, York received 3,327 pence. St. Martin’s Church (Leicester) received a total of 3,146 pence for the sale of its Catholic paraphernalia, and even sold off its organ pipes. The sale of those goods accounted for almost all the church’s income for 1547 and 1548. To give some context to the 3,146 pence received by St. Martin’s, an amount that would pay17 years salary

\textsuperscript{31} Stallard, \textit{Tilney}, 169-72.
\textsuperscript{32} Byrne, \textit{Elizabethan Life}, 309 lists the price for a “ready made” shirt as12 pence. Salter, \textit{Oxford}, 218 notes the payment of 240 pence as wages for the curate.
\textsuperscript{33} Glasscock, \textit{Bishop’s Stortford}, 45-52; Amphlet, \textit{Bedwardine}, 17-26; Duffy, \textit{Stripping}, 500.
\textsuperscript{34} Duffy, \textit{Stripping}, 480-88; Haigh, \textit{Reformations}, 181-83.
for the priest at St. Mary’s, Yatton (Somerset) or pay for 450 pairs of children’s’ shoes, or more than 500 pigs. But the income from the sale of Catholic paraphernalia was short-lived and not renewable.

In Ashburton (Devon) the total cost Edward’s reforms to St. Andrew’s parish for the 5 years between 1548 through 1552 was 3,960 pence, enough to pay the annual wages of Yatton’s priest (180 pence) for 22 years. The amount comprised 14% of the parish’s income and 23% of its expenses. St. Andrew’s average annual income for those 5 years was 5,549 pence; the average annual expense was 3390 pence. Comparing those figures to the last 18 years of Henry VIII (1530-1547): St. Andrew’s annual income averaged 7,325 pence and average expenses were 6,951 pence. In 18 years St. Andrew’s laid out 388 pence complying with Henry’s injunctions, amounting only to 0.003% of total income and total expenses. Note also that the average annual income for Edward’s years was almost 47% less than Henry’s. Most of that loss reflects the prohibition against church ales.

It is important here to reiterate the significance of church ales to many, if not most, parishes in Tudor England. For example, in 1532 the churchwardens of St. Mary’s, Yatton noted that the church ales were “very fruitful,” yielding a total of 4,180 pence, enough money to pay its parish priest for 23 years. In Ashburton from 1530 to 1535 St. Andrew’s church ales accounted for from 29% to 35% of the parish’s annual income.

St. Andrew’s was a large, prosperous parish. Smaller, less wealthy parishes faced greater financial burdens. To give a few examples: in the years 1547 through 1550, at St. Michael’s parish in Bishop’s

35 Duffy, Stripping, 431-84; Haigh, Reformations, 182-83; Whitley, Lewes, 51-54; Webb Spurriergate, 328; North, S. Martin’s, 26, 29-38; Hobhouse, Yatton, 157; Byrne, Elizabethan Life, 308-09.

36 Hanham, Ashburton, 120-128.

37 Hanham, Ashburton, 83-119.

38 Hobhouse, Yatton, 146; Hanham, Ashburton, 83-87, 93-95.
Stortford (Hertford) Edward’s reforms cost 34% of its income, and accounted to 37% of all its expenses;\(^{39}\) from 1548 through 1553, St. Michael’s, Smarden (Kent) Edward’s injunctions accounted for 55% of its expenses, and exceeded its income by 11%.\(^ {40}\) At St. Laurence’s parish in Ludlow (Shropshire), conforming to Edward’s injunctions amounted to 94% of the parish’s expenses, and comprised to 91% of its total income.\(^ {41}\)

And there were new parish expenses resulting from Edward’s reforms. With the dissolution of monastic institutions under Henry and the closing of chantries under Edward, what we call the “safety net” for the poor was transferred to the local parishes.\(^ {42}\) Before the reign of Edward VI, only rare instances of poor relief appear in churchwardens’ accounts; afterwards it becomes a regular liability in many parishes. In 1547 churches were ordered to install poor boxes.\(^ {43}\) The year 1549 is the first time the accounts of St. Mary’s Church, Yatton (Somerset) note an expense for poor relief (156 pence). The first year the churchwardens of St. Martin’s, Leicester record expenses for poor relief is 1547, when they named 80 people to whom they distributed 744 pence; it is not until 1554 that poor relief is mentioned in the accounts of London’s St Michael’s Cornhill, London, though amounts distributed are not specified.\(^ {44}\)

Also, some parishes now were expected to bear military costs. Between 1547 and 1570 St. Andrew’s, Ashburton laid out 1,604 pence for arrowheads, traveling costs for soldiers, and for buying and cleaning pieces of armor. That sum would pay the annual salary of the curate at St. Michael’s Oxford, for 6 and one half years.

\(^{39}\) Glasscock, Bishop’s Stortford, 45-50.

\(^{40}\) Haslewood, Smarden, 226-29.

\(^{41}\) Wright, Ludlow, 35-55.

\(^{42}\) Duffy, Stripping, 455; Haigh, Reformations, 171-2; Fideler, “Poverty,” 194-222.

\(^{43}\) Duffy, Stripping, 487.

\(^{44}\) Hobhouse, Yatton, 161; Haslewood, “Smarden,” 228; North, S. Martin’s, 26-29. Overall, St. Michael Cornhill, 109.
Beginning in 1563 accounts from St. Michael’s, Cornhill includes costs for armor and weapons.\textsuperscript{45} To be sure parishes continued to collect incomes derived from rents of church properties (mostly farmlands and pews), collections, burials, and bequests, but what had once been only part of the parish income now became almost the total income. Nor is there any indication these sources increased.\textsuperscript{46}

All of these costs meant that parishes needed time to comply with the monarchs’ injunctions, especially since in some cases, like St. Michael’s, Bedwardine, parish, expenses for some of those years exceeded the parish income.\textsuperscript{47} Parish expenditures show that well over half of the parishes in this study—perhaps because of decreases in income and the new high costs of reform, perhaps because of foot-dragging, perhaps both—only reached full conformity with Edward’s reforms just before his death in 1553.\textsuperscript{48} The prosperous parishes of St. Martin’s, Leicester, St. Michael’s, Gloucester, and the small parishes of St. Michael’s, Smarden, and St. Mary’s, Pyrton, serve to demonstrate this fact. In all four parishes, after large expenditures to comply with Edward’s injunctions in the first three years of his reign, such expenses shrunk dramatically in Edward’s last year: St. Martin’s in Leicester only spent 179 pence; St. Michael’s in Gloucester only spent 30 pence; St. Michael’s in little Smarden spent 29 pence, and St. Mary’s in Pyrton had no reform expenses.\textsuperscript{49}

Mary’s accession reversed Edward’s reforms. Parishes were ordered to restore what had been expunged under Edward. And so again


\textsuperscript{47} Amphlett, \textit{Bedwardine}, 19-34.

\textsuperscript{48} Duffy, \textit{Stripping}, 478, 484-93.

parish expenses swelled to reinstall altars, images, Roods, Rood lofts, and to restore the mass books, vestments, chalices, and other Catholic paraphernalia. For the four parishes noted above, the costs of restoration matched or exceeded their average annual incomes. In 1554 St. Martin’s, Leicester (average income 3,003 pence) laid out 3,575 pence, St. Michael’s, Gloucester (average income 2,039 pence) spent 2,000 pence, St. Michael, Smarden (average income 267 pence) spent 1,024 pence, and St. Mary’s, Pyrton (average income 476 pence) spent 690 pence.  

To give a few more examples: from 1554 through 1557 St. Andrew’s, Ashburton, spent 2,948 pence—8% of total income and 12% of total expenses—in restoring the church and liturgy to its pre-Edwardian form; St. Michael’s, Bishop’s Stortford, spent 1,033 pence in 1554 to conform with Mary’s injunctions, an amount that accounted for 98% of expenses; at Ludlow’s St. Laurence the costs of restoration from 1554 through 1558 accounted for 16% of its income and 15% of expenses; in 1554 the wealthy parish of St. Mary Woolnoth, London, spent 5,193 pence on restorations—99% of its total expenses, and 1,533 pence more than that year’s income.  

While some parishes benefited from pious members who freely returned, or sold back at low cost, church goods they had purchased during Edward’s reign, in other cases parishes reported that vestments and other paraphernalia had been stolen, and some parishes had to go to court to get back church goods surrendered or sold under Edward—for instance, in 1554 St. Paul’s, Prescot (Lancashire) spent 780 pence, 78% of its average income, on law suits to recover church paraphernalia dispersed under Edward.  

Since restoration usually is more expensive than demolition, it is not surprising that costs under Mary often were higher than under

54 Brooke and Hallen, *St. Mary Woolnoth*, xviii-xxi.  
Edward. To be sure, the old revenue-raising activities such as ales, plays Hocktides, and processions began to reappear in some parish records, but the records also reveal that incomes from these activities were reduced from what they had been prior to Edward’s reforms. As in Edward’s reign, parish records under Mary reveal that it took about five years before most parishes had fully restored their churches to the “old religion.” Records for 1558 from the same four parishes used above for Edward’s reign show that St. Martin’s, Leicester, only spent 67 pence to conform to Mary’s injunctions, St. Michael’s, Gloucester, spent 21 pence, and St. Michael’s, Smarden, and St. Mary’s, Pyrton, had no expenses.57 And then, of course, Mary died.

In less than a year into her reign, Elizabeth ordered the re-instatement of most of the Edwardian reforms, and so the process of re-renovation began all over. For the most part initial expenses were not as massive in the first year as had been the case under Mary; like in Edward’s reign, demolition was not as expensive as restoration. Also, as in Edward’s reign, parish incomes were augmented temporarily by the sell off of Catholic paraphernalia, especially in the wealthier parishes. Yet spread out over Elizabeth’s first five years the amounts spent to comply with Elizabeth’s injunctions were not insignificant. To use our same four parishes as before, in Elizabeth’s first five years St. Martin’s, Leicester, spent 1,233 pence, an amount that was 11% of the parish’s total income for those years, and 15% of its total expenses. St. Michael’s, Gloucester spent 4,181 pence, 32% of total income and 27% of its expenses. St. Michael’s, Smarden spent 465 pence, 24% of total income and 82% of expenses, and St. Mary’s, Pyrton spent 135 pence, 10% of total income and 11% of expenses.58

Records from other parishes show similar expenses. St. Andrew’s, Ashburton, spent 2,238 pence complying with Elizabeth’s

57 North, _Leicester_, 82; Litzenberger, _Gloucester_, 238; Haselwood, _Smarden_, 233; Weaver and Clark, _Pyrton_, 74.

58 North, _Leicester_, 82; Litzenberger, _Gloucester_, 236-38; Haselwood, _Smarden_, 233-34; Weaver and Clark, _Pyrton_, 74-76.
injunctions, an amount comprising 35% of its income and 27% of its expenses.\textsuperscript{59} The 548 pence spent by St. Michael’s, Bishop’s Stortford, accounted for 26% of its income and 88% of its expenses.\textsuperscript{60} As in the previous two reigns, it took five years or so before parishes were in compliance with Elizabeth’s injunctions and reform costs disappear from their records. Again using our four parishes from above we find: payments for reform costs at St. Martin’s, Leicester disappear from the churchwardens’ accounts in 1567; for St. Michael’s, Gloucester reform such costs disappear in 1565; for St. Michael’s, Smarden none appear after 1565, and for St. Mary’s Pyrton no expenses for reform appear after 1560.\textsuperscript{61} A sampling of other churchwarden’s accounts reveals a similar pattern: payments for reforms at St. Paul’s, Prescot (Lancashire) cease in 1567, at St. Michael’s, Mere (Wiltshire) in 1567, at All Saints, Tilney (Norfolk) in 1564, at St Andrew’s, Ashburton (Devon), and at St. Martin in the Fields, Westminster, in 1565\textsuperscript{62}

Table 2, below, is derived from the master spreadsheet, covering the entire period from 1530 to 1570. It is meant to give an impression of the overall financial situations in the parishes used for this study. The table lists averages of the incomes, expenses, and costs of reform for the churchwardens’ accounts of the individual parishes used in this study. Averages are based on the number of years for which there are churchwardens’ accounts. Amounts listed are in pence for ease in computation.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{59} Hanham, \textit{Ashburton}, 141-156.

\textsuperscript{60} Glasscock, \textit{Bishop’s Stortford}, 54-57.

\textsuperscript{61} North, \textit{Leicester}, 113; Litzenberger, \textit{Gloucester}, 238; Haselwood, Smarden, 234; Weaver and Clark, \textit{Pyrton}, 75.


Table 2: Parish Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Av Exp</th>
<th>Av Inc</th>
<th>Av Ref. Exp</th>
<th>% Exp</th>
<th>% Inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton, S. Andrew [ave. 25 yrs]</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>5176</td>
<td>6294</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashwell, S Mary [ave. 10 yrs]</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldock [ave. 3 yrs]</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>215.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedwardine, S Michael [ave. 4 yrs]</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's Stortford, S Michael [ave. 23 yrs]</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford [ave. 23 yrs]</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great S Mary's [ave. 24 yrs]</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>2443</td>
<td>3806</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, S Andrew [ave. 20 yrs]</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, S Dunstan [ave. 14 yrs]</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cratfield, S Mary [ave. 20 yrs]</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devizes, S Mary [ave. 14 yrs]</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham, S John the Baptist [ave. 13 yrs]</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester, S Michael [ave. 17 yrs]</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesowen, S Michael [ave. 12 yrs]</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth, S Mary [ave. 10 yrs]</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>3006</td>
<td>3019</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leves, S Andrew [ave. 12 yrs]</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, S Michael Cornhill [ave. 22 yrs]</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, S Mary Woolnoth [ave. 13 yrs]</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester, S Martin [ave. 21 yrs]</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>2229</td>
<td>3003</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow, S Laurence [ave. 26 yrs]</td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marston, S Nicholas [ave. 12 yrs]</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mere, S Michael [ave. 16 yrs]</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michinhampton, Holy Trinity [ave. 7 yrs]</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, S Michael [ave. 11 yrs]</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yatton, S Mary [ave. 25 yrs]</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>5194</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough, S Peter [ave. 17 yrs]</td>
<td>W'hampton</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>2198</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston, S Mary [ave. 15 yrs]</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perton, S Mary [ave. 18 yrs]</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, S Mary's [ave. 14 yrs]</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>4603</td>
<td>8769</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Newington, S Peter ad Vincula [ave. 5 yrs]</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snarey, S Michael [ave. 18 yrs]</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwell, S John Baptist [ave. 6 yrs]</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilney, All Saints [ave. 24 yrs]</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, S Martin-Fields [ave. 30 yrs]</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>3547</td>
<td>3662</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York, S Michael Spurriergate [ave. 10 yrs]</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>4298</td>
<td>4737</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe the table suggests why parishes were slow in restoring their traditional plays, pageants, and other performance activities when Mary restored Catholicism. Even if parishes had wished to resume traditional performance activities, the costs of Edward’s and Mary’s religious injunctions left most parishes without the disposable income to do so. And by the time the parishes had reached a point where sufficient income become available, the process of “protestantization” started all over again under Elizabeth. That pattern is clearly illustrated in the churchwardens’ accounts from St. Michael’s, Bishop’s Stortford, concerning its rood loft. In 1547 the parish paid 164 pence to take down the rood loft. Then, in 1553 it paid 246 pence to rebuild the rood loft, and in 1560 it paid 120 pence to take down the rood loft again. Hence, we can understand why St. Andrew’s, Ashburton, for instance, only got around to creating a new stock of costumes in 1556, and why payments for costumes ceased in 1560. And why New Romney did not attempt to remount its passion play until 1559, and why, despite detailed plans and stupendous expenditures of 11,985 pence to revive its play—an amount that would pay the priest’s salary of 180 pence at St. Michael’s, Yatton, for over 66 years (to use again our cost comparison)—the play was presented once in 1560 and never again.

So Wickham, Collinson, and others may be correct, in a roundabout way, that costs were the death knell for most local performance activity. But they fail to mention the religious basis of those costs—cost resulting from the religious policies of successive Tudor monarchs. Larger municipalities like York, Chester, and Norwich had mayors, city fathers, and guilds providing organization and money. Those circumstances meant these prosperous communities quickly revived their performance traditions under Mary, and carried them into the reign of Elizabeth. The smaller towns and parishes of Tudor England had no such support systems.

---

64 Glasscock, Bishop’s Stortford, 45, 53, 54.
65 Hobhouse, Yatton, 157.
66 Malone Kent, 210-11.
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“Me thinks if I Were a Man”: An Analysis of Dorothy Leigh’s 
*Mother’s Blessing* as a Response to Joseph Swetnam

*Julia Combs*  
*Southern Utah University*

As one of the first and most popular female-male authored conduct manuals of the seventeenth century, Dorothy Leigh’s *The Mother’s Blessing* is usually placed in the company of private, domestic literature. However, it does not sit comfortably there. Leigh claims to forget herself, as she rhetorically navigates her way through the constraining but enabling genre of the conduct manual. In this paper, I position Leigh as one of the initial respondents to Joseph Swetnam’s pamphlet *The Arraignment of Lewd, idle, froward and unconstant women*. Swetnam also claimed forget himself, as he stirred up the ire of writers in the early seventeenth century. Critics usually note the responses of Constance Munda and Rachel Speght. Munda and Speght outwardly attacked Swetnam; Leigh is less obvious, but perhaps more effective at dismantling Swetnam’s culturally disruptive pamphlet. Invested with the powerful ethos of a dying mother, Leigh moves beyond the traditional role of a seventeenth-century mother. She transcends boundaries of genre and gender in her gentle and moving—but also somewhat seditious and scathing—*The Mother’s Blessing*. In it, Leigh admits, “[I] forget my selfe,” as she confidently enters the discourse of Early Modern society as if [she] were “a man and a preacher.”

In 1599, audiences saw Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* at the Globe Theater. In one scene Antony suggests, “But were I Brutus . . . There were an Antony / would ruffle up your spirits” (III.i.230-32). Antony claims that if he could speak as Brutus spoke, he would move the crowd to action. After hearing Brutus’s stiff and formal rhetoric, the crowd is moved to mutiny by Antony’s passion. Antony, not Brutus, “ruffles” their spirits. In *The Mother’s Blessing*, Dorothy Leigh uses the same strategy Antony used. She admits, “[I] forget my selfe,” and she boldly enters the debates of her day. She

---

1 Throughout this paper original spelling, punctuation, and capitalization have been preserved as they appear in the second edition of *The Mother’s Blessing* published in 1616. I have, however, silently inserted an apostrophe in the title: *The Mother’s Blessing*, and I have replaced *v* with *u* for readability. I have also used chapter numbers rather than page numbers when referring to *The Mother’s Blessing*.
tries, I argue, to “ruffle up” the spirits of her readers. Indeed, she claims “Me thinks if I were a man and a preacher . . . I should bring many to pray rightly.”

This was bold claim for anyone to make during the early seventeenth century, as any instruction on prayer had a political edge. As one of the most popular conduct manuals of the early seventeenth century, Dorothy Leigh’s *Mother’s Blessing* is often categorized as private, domestic literature. However, I argue that it deserves to be analyzed as a social text that responds to and actively engages early seventeenth-century discourse, including Joseph Swetnam’s *Arraignment of Lewd, idle, froward and unconstant women*.

Although her *Mother’s Blessing* is often described by scholars as a maternal “advice book,” it does not fit neatly into that category. Leigh gives motherly advice, but she also assumes various roles throughout her writing that take her into the realms of political and clerical debate. Leigh is mother who has a divine commission, as well as her deceased husband’s last will, as her motivation. She feels obligated to offer her children “spiritual manna.” She draws on the rhetoric of female legacy and the *Artes Moriendi* tradition. Her husband’s will directed her to spiritually train their children. In addition, nature tells Leigh “that [she] cannot long bee here to speake” to her sons, so she leaves a written blessing that will speak long after she is gone. She has the authority of the church as a “fearefull, faithfull and carefull Mother,” a commission from her deceased husband to “see [her sons] well instructed,” and the immediacy of her own death “seeing [her] selfe going out of the world, and [her sons] but

2 Leigh, *Blessing*, Budge, chapter 32.

3 Duffy, *Marking the Hours*, 166.


6 Wayne, “Advice for Women,” 57.
comming in” to give her words credit. The title page of the book states: “The Mother’s Blessing. OR The godly counsale of a gentle-woman not long since deceased, left behind for her children.”

Critics comment on the popularity of the *Artes Moirendi* tradition as a platform for sermonizing in early modern conduct books. Kristen Poole notes that *The Mother’s Blessing* is styled as last will and testament, the legacy of a dying mother. This allows Leigh to write freely, and it also confers authority on her words. Her death “affords an idealized, almost sacred dignity to the maternal, literary voice.” Leigh insists she must write. She has a duty to fulfill the terms of her husband’s will. Poole also claims that Leigh’s intended audience was her intimate family, but the title page indicates a broader audience of “all parents.”

A more precise way to consider the text, however, might be to recall that women’s roles had evolved substantially in response to Renaissance humanism and the Protestant reformation. A woman’s role in early modern England included duties such as actively attending sermons and re-teaching the content of the sermons to children, servants, and other family members, including straying husbands. Ample evidence exists that women recorded and responded to sermons in their commonplace books. *The Mother’s Blessing*, rather than being viewed as a traditional deathbed performance, could be considered a lifelong compilation of Christian ideology that Leigh has carefully assembled with the intent of publication after

---

7 Leigh, *Blessing*, introductory section.
8 Leigh, *Blessing*, title page.
9 Poole, “The Fittest Closet,” 69.
10 Davis, “Redemptive Advice,” 63.
As such, Leigh probably intended for her words to join a chorus of voices that responded to the events of her time, especially events that might influence her sons whose parents would not be there to guide them. Historical evidence indicates that Dorothy Leigh had three sons who were of marriageable age when she died. Leigh begins her book by addressing her sons, but she soon quickly transitions to intentionally and specifically address a much broader audience.

“My Children,” she begins, “marvel” not that “in such a time, when there bee so manie godly bookes in the world. . . [that I] for get my selfe in regard of you.” In other words, she apologizes for forgetting herself and doing something so unusual as to write a book of instruction with the intent of having it published. She claims that

14 Yovonne Day Merrill points out that writers who do not use transitions cannot establish hierarchical reasoning very well. Merrill, _Social Construction_. 183. Leigh provides transitions between her chapters. For example, at the end of a chapter about prayer, she writes, “Therefore, if you would alwaise have [prayer], you must alwaise use it, and then you will bee humbly, faithfully, & familiarily acquainted with God” (107). She begins the next chapter with “Oh heavenly and happy acquaintance! For the longer thou usest it, the stronger will be thy faith, the humbler thy heart, the earnest thy zeal, & the holier thy life” (108). Transitions in the early chapters are especially effective because they connect the early, short chapters. Because they are so short, the early chapters risk appearing choppy or haphazard, perhaps like a disorganized commonplace book. However, Leigh’s carefully crafted transitions give her early chapters a strong sense of coherency.

15 Leigh’s biographical information is sketchy. As a young woman, Dorothy Kempe married Ralph Leigh, who is described as a “Cheshire gentleman and soldier under the Earl of Essex at Cadiz” (Davis, _Redemptive Advice_,” 291). Although little is known of Dorothy Leigh’s early years, some information regarding her husband Ralph is available. Ralph was the fourth son of Thomas Leigh and his wife Sybil. He had four brothers and five sisters. One of Ralph’s brothers, Uriam, was knighted after a battle in 1597. We also know a little about Ralph Leigh’s death. According to one source, Ralph Leigh was slain in 1597 in Newry, Ireland while in the service of the Earl of Essex (Gray, _Women Writers_ 52). Ralph and Dorothy Kempe Leigh had three sons: George, John, and William. Leigh addresses _The Mothers Blessing_ to them. In addition, Jennifer Heller notes a possible connection between William Leigh (Dorothy Leigh’s son) and the Winthrop family, who had the rectory at Groton Suffolk before the Winthrops immigrated to New England and joined the Congregational church. William Leigh was possibly beneficed as a parson by the Winthrop family (111). If the biographical information from Gray is accurate, then Leigh’s husband was killed in approximately 1597. This means that at the time of her death Leigh would have been a widow for approximately twenty years, and assuming her sons were fairly young at the time of their father’s death, they would have been raised exclusively by their mother. They would have been young men of marriageable age (or perhaps already married) at the time of Leigh’s death and the publication of _The Mothers Blessing_. There is no record that Leigh remarried.

16 Leigh, _Blessing_, chapter 2.
“godly bookes” are molding like old garments that have been locked away in chests, while children in the streets need clothing. No one reads these “molding” conduct books. Why is no one reading these books? She does not answer that question. She states simply that they are not being read. Nearly all of the conduct books for women before Leigh’s *Mother’s Blessing* were written by men. Perhaps she is saying, “but were I the author of such a book, then perhaps they would be read.” She justifies deviating from the “usual custome of women” in writing, “a thing that is so unusual” among them. Indeed, she had few precedents. *The Northern Mother’s Blessing* was written anonymously and republished is 1597. A long, rambling poem, it has almost nothing in common with Leigh’s book; it is a book of instructions about how a woman should behave. Another book entitled *The Mother’s Blessing* was published in 1602, but it was written by Nicholas Breton, a man who assumes a mother’s persona. Breton’s text is a debate by men among men about the proper conduct of women. Leigh sets up the audience to expect a “godly” book, a book usually written by men, but in her case, written by a woman. She responds to the culture of her day by doing something similar to what James I had done a few years earlier.

James I wrote *Basilikon Doron His Maiesties Instrvctions to his Dearest Sonne, Henry the Prince*, which was published in 1603. It is a conduct book filled with practical advice dedicated “to Henry my dearest sonne, and natural successour.” In 1599, while James was James VI of Scotland, he privately published seven copies of *Basilikon Doron*. The initial seven copies came into the hands of some Scottish Presbyterians who criticized some of the content. In response, James wrote a *proem* or *exordium* for the book and had

17 Hall, *Certaine worthy manuscript poems, of great antiquitie reserved long in the studie of a Northfolke gentleman. And now first published by I.S. 1 The stately tragedy of Guistard and Sismond. 2 The northren mothers blessing. 3 The way to thrifte*, document image 29.

18 Breton, *The mothers blessing*, 1602.

it published. Arriving in London in 1603 shortly before James got there, *Basilikon Doron* served as England’s introduction to its new king. It was wildly popular, going through at least ten editions between years of 1599 and 1604. The English people were anxious to get a glimpse of their new king.

James tried to reassure his audience that he was Protestant and that he would not seek revenge for the execution of his mother, Mary Queen of Scotts. James Doleman maintains that the conduct book was presented back to the king in a variety of ways and that people quoted from it for nearly one hundred years, often using it for their own political ends. Doleman notes that people saw in it what they wanted to see and probably what they hoped was the “trew” mind of their new king. James had initially published only seven copies, and he sought to take the “middle road” in his writing, but this opened him to interpretation and ambiguity. After the initial 1603 edition, it was re-published once more in 1616 by James Montagu along with a collection of James’s other writing in a commemorative edition. And by 1616, the English people no longer needed an introduction to their king. James often referred to himself as “Solomon,” but by 1616, he had also acquired the title of “The wisest fool in Christendom.”

A “spin-off edition” of *Basilikon Doron* entitled *The Father’s Blessing* appeared in 1616. It elaborates on the advice James ostentatiously offers to his son. Catherine Gray convincingly illustrates how *The Mother’s Blessing* responds to but at the same time “offer[s]...
mild opposition to” James’s “patriarchal hegemony.”

Leigh’s text was accepted as being in a dialogue with The Father’s Blessing. In an edition published in the 1620s, the two were found bound together in what might have been considered the ultimate handbook for parents in the early 1600s. However, the texts make a rather odd couple. In The Mother’s Blessing Leigh responds to several of James’s arguments, but the authors seem at odds in the discussions about individual scripture reading, restriction of Sabbath-day activities, and the reverence of ministers. Leigh responds specifically to each of those issues in The Mother’s Blessing.

More commonly than being associated with James I, however, Leigh’s name is usually coupled with the names of other writers of conduct books. For example, Sylvia Brown links Dorothy Leigh with Elizabeth Jocelin and Elizabeth Richardson. Leigh has very little in common with either author. Their names can be linked only to show the influence Leigh had on later writers. Such comparisons do little to help us understand Leigh’s text. Elizabeth Jocelin’s Mother’s Legacy was written while Jocelin was pregnant with her first child. She had what turned out to be a correct premonition that she would die in childbirth. She died of childbed fever nine days after the birth of her daughter. She writes poignantly and privately to her unborn child: ‘It may... appear strange to thee to receyue thes lines from a mother that dyed when thou weart born.’ The only audience she imagines is her ‘littell one’ who would need ‘religious trayning’ in the form of moral and spiritual guidance. Her husband found the manuscript and had it published after it had been carefully edited by Thomas Goad, who claimed to have known Joscelin personally.

In contrast, The Mother’s Blessing is written to a much broader audience and with a much more public purpose. Elizabeth Richardson’s text, published in 1645, is a book of instruction for her daughters and perhaps for a broader audience, but with a very direct

and limited purpose. It gives instruction on how to pray, offering specific types of prayers outlined for every day of the week and several other occasions. It includes such chapters as “A Prayer to God the Father for Thursday night,” and “A Prayer for Friday at first awaking to God the Son.” Intended as a devotional aid, Richardson’s *A Ladies Legacie to her daughters* has almost nothing in common with *The Mother’s Blessing*. I argue that neither of these texts has anything more than motherly advice in common with Leigh.

Leigh has more in common with a very “vngodly” book. I argue that not only is she responding to James I’s *Basilicon Doron*, but Leigh is also responding to *The Araignment of Lewd, idle, froward and unconstant women*, written by the fencing master/writer Joseph Swetnam in 1615. Although I agree with Kristen Poole and Sylvia Brown that Leigh’s text is a motherly advice book, *The Mother’s Blessing* should also be examined as a response to Swetnam’s text and as a precedent for several later texts, not exclusively mother’s advice manuals. Joseph Swetnam’s, *Araignment* (1616) was a particularly disruptive early modern pamphlet. Deidre Boleyn states that the “Swetnam Controversy” lasted primarily between the years of 1615 and 1620. She describes the pamphlet as “a Jacobean addition to *the querelle des femmes*, a genre rooted in medieval, continental, scholastic soil, which was fed by classical satire on women, most obviously *Satire 6* from Juvenal’s Satires, Aristotelian, and patristic ideas about the nature of women”.

Boleyn claims that by 1615 the debate had died down considerably until Swetnam published his pamphlet. She also notes that writers who participated in these kinds of “exercises of wit” sometimes attacked and defended the identical position purely for rhetorical showmanship. The uniqueness of Swetnam’s pamphlet, she stresses, lies in its “startling success.”

---


29 Boleyn, “Because Women Are Not Men,” 49.
First published under the name of Tome Tell-Troth, *The Araignment of Lewd, idle, forward, and unconstant women* was quickly identified as being written by Joseph Swetnam, a Bristol fencing master.\(^{30}\) It is a particularly comprehensive attack on women “combined with an unprecedented level of vituperation.”\(^{31}\) Swetnam’s book, “sarcastic in its ridicule, was by far the most popular and oft re-reprinted” of the *Querrele des femmes* pamphlets.\(^{32}\) He portrayed women as nagging, disobedient, garrulous, overdressed, oversexed, drunken, and bawdy. Commentators note that Swetnam’s writing is “pretty feeble stuff,”\(^{33}\) “verbal diarrhea,”\(^{34}\) and that his writing created an uproar. They note that it is incoherent in places, often disorganized, lacking in any kind of logical argumentative structure, and they note that he opens himself to attacks.

The *Araignment* invites the audience to see the “Beare-bayting of women.” Swetnam advises women not to read further because they may “bark more at [him] than Cerberus the two-headed dog did at Hercules,” and “if they shoot their spite at [him], they may hit themselves, and so [he] will smile at them, as the foolish Fly which burneth her selfe in the candle.”\(^{35}\) The book is divided into three chapters and ends with an “exhibition” entitled “the bearebayting, or the vanity of widdowes.”

Dorothy Leigh, who was a widow, would have been familiar with Swetnam’s best-selling text. It survives in thirteen seventeen-

\(^{30}\) Butler, Introduction, vii. In 1617, Swetnam wrote *The School of the Noble and Worthy Science of Defence*, a manual of instruction about fencing. He claims that he was the tutor of James’s son Prince Henry and that although it was not published until after Henry died (He died in 1612), Swetnam maintains that Henry requested the publication (Lucky“A Mouzell” 116).

\(^{31}\) Butler, Introduction, vi.


\(^{33}\) Jones, “Counterattacks on ‘the Bayter of Women,” 45.

\(^{34}\) Woodbridge, “Dark Ladies: Women, Social History, and English Renaissance Literature” 63.

\(^{35}\) Swetnam, *The Araignment*, “To the Reader.”.
century manuscripts, five eighteenth-century manuscripts, and in Dutch translations. Several pamphlets were written in response to Swetnam, including Rachel Speght’s *A Mouzell for Melastomus*, published in 1617; Constance Munda’s *The Worming of a madde Dogge*, published in 1617; Ester Sowerman’s *Ester hath hang’d Haman* in 1617, and the anonymously written play *Swetnam, the Woman Hater, Arraigned by Woman*, performed in 1620. *The Mother’s Blessing* was first published 1616. Placing Leigh’s name alongside these other writers may seem strange, but the connections should be examined. Speght, Munda, and Sowerman did not write motherly advice literature. Swethnam’s and Leigh’s texts were both extremely popular, much more popular than Speght, Munda, or Sowerman’s texts. None of those texts were reprinted. Leigh’s text, which was published the same year that she died, went through at least nineteen editions from 1616 - 1640. This means that Leigh’s book was a best seller by any standards. It was certainly the best-selling book written by a woman of her day, but it was a runaway best seller in general. It is strange that it has been ignored and misinterpreted by scholars. I should note here that Swetnam’s *Araignment* was probably more “culturally disruptive” than Leigh’s Mother’s Blessing. My point is not, however to discuss which text was more disruptive, but to evaluate how these texts interacted with each other.

Many critics focus their attention on what Leigh claims as her first consideration for writing. She claims her first “cause” for writing is her motherly affection and Christian duty. However, her second “cause,” after motherly devotion, is to admonish her reader to write, a strange request for a mother who is intent on offering godly counsel. She tells all readers to write legacies for their own children. Joscelin and Richardson could have taken the advice of this

38 Davis, “Redemptive Advice,” 64.
39 Harde, “Jane Anger,” 106; Poole, “The fittest closet,” 2.
popular book. They each wrote books. She tells them to “remem-
ber to write a booke unto your children, of the right and true way
to happinesse.” Leigh emphasizes the power of books to inform
the mind and the memory. Books, she claims, will live on after the
author is gone, extending across generations and history.

She claims that her third “cause” is to “encourage women” to show
how carefully and quickly women put sin out of their own lives and
the lives of their posterity. Here she suddenly speaks to “women”
instead of her sons, and she actively enters the debate over original
sin (chapters 5 and 9). She could be responding here to an earlier
defense for women: Jane Anger Her Protection for Women. Jane
Anger (probably a pseudo name for a gentleman) claims that “wom-
an are more excellent than men.” Men are made of “filthy clay”
which God “purified” by transforming it into flesh so when He made
woman from man’s flesh, He used a more refined and purified sub-
stance, so logically woman is purer than man. This type of rhetoric
became very common in the writings of early modern polemical
and religious writings. Using similar rhetoric, Leigh claims that
since women have renounced their appetites and passions, and sub-
jected their will to their husbands, they are actually spiritually supe-
rior to men. Even though Leigh does not mention Swetnam’s text
specifically, she could be responding to him here. Rachel Speght’s
A Mouzell for Melastromus is usually touted as the first “female-
authored” text to respond directly to Swetnam. However there
is reason to question this claim. Not all texts overtly name the text
to which they directly respond. Speght is given prominence for a
couple of reasons. First, she directly engages Swetnam. Second,
she is female. Despite those reasons, Dorothy Leigh’s writing is a
more rational text for comparison to The Araignment.

40 Leigh, Blessing, chapter 4.
41 Davis, Redemptive Advice,” 66.
43 Davis, “Redemptive Advice,” 65.
44 Lewalski, Writing Women, 156.
First, critics like to showcase Speght because she directly attacks Swetnam. However, not all rhetors name their rhetorical opponents. For example, Daniel Tuvil’s *Asylum Veneris: or, A Sanctuary for Ladies* (1616) may be intended partly as a rebuttal of Swetnam’s arguments, but Tuvil never names Swetnam. In addition, some of the pamphlets in the popular pamphlet wars of the early seventeenth century do not directly identify their “opponent” pamphlet. Instead, writers trusted that the reading public would make the connections. For example, James made a similar move in 1616. In his “Speech in the Star Chamber,” he criticized Sir Edward Coke without ever mentioning Coke’s name: “Another sort of Justices are busie-bodies, and will have all men dance after their pipe, and follow their greatnesse, or else will not be content. . . . These proud spirits must know, that the country is ordained to obey and follow GOD and the King, and not them.” James expected everyone to know that he aimed his criticism directly at Coke. In the same way, perhaps not all respondents to Swetnam identified him specifically in their writing. Leigh did not have to name Swetnam to engage his writing. She probably expected audiences to make the connections.

Second, Speght is supposedly the first female to respond to Swetnam’s pamphlet. Not only is she a female, but she also appears to have received some training in rhetoric, and she publishes a contentious pamphlet, getting down in the ring with Swetnam, so to speak, to argue against Swetnam’s claims and to attack Swetnam personally. Swetnam’s pamphlet is unique in the number of responses that it generated. Perhaps some respondents chose not to encounter Swetnam in the ring. I argue that Leigh refuses to stoop to Swetnam’s contentious and “carnavelesque” level in responding to his pamphlet. She chooses the conduct manual genre, and she never

46 qtd. in Sommerville, “James I,” 222.
47 Munda and Sowerman are probably pseudo names and not female authors. Speght is the only positively identified female respondent to Swetnam out of the three first responders that are usually listed.
mentions his name. In that way, she answers him with a form of silence. Women had to carve out an appropriate space to respond, or they could be branded as scolds.48 Leigh’s silence in this regard increased her credibility.

Speght could have been responding to both Leigh and Swetnam. Speght certainly would have read Leigh. Leigh’s text was, after all, an immediate best-seller, and Speght wrote a year after Leigh was published. Both Leigh and Speght respond to the disparaging remarks Swetnam makes about women. Speght, however, directly attacks Swetnam. Speght’s pamphlet was published only once. In The Mother’s Blessing, Leigh strongly encourages women to write. Speght may have gathered courage to respond to Swetnam after reading Leigh’s advice. In any case, Leigh’s writing provides a more balanced response to Swetnam in many ways. Speght was the eighteen-year-old daughter of a minister. Her attackers claimed she was young and lacked experience about marriage and the role of women. Leigh, on the other hand, was a widowed mother of three children writing at the end of a long and pious life.

Swetnam compares all women since Eve to eagles. However, he reminds readers, “Eagles eat not men till they are dead, but women devour them alive.”49 Clearly, Swetnam is not the only author or the first writer to make such a comment. However, based on the proximity of time in which they both wrote, the popularity of Swetnam’s text, and the parallel arguments, Leigh could be responding to him. Swetnam claims:

> Women are called night Crows for that in the night they will make request for such toys as cometh in their heads in the day, for women know their time to work their craft. For in the night, they will work a man like wax and draw him as the adamant doth the Iron. . . A man must take all the pains, and women will spend all the gains.50

50 Swetnam, The Araignment, 12.
Leigh assumes the persona of *all* women, not only mothers as she enters the debate on original sin: “But wee women may now say, that men lye in waite every where to deceive us.” She uses Judas as an example of a man who betrays his master with a kiss. Even so men betray their mistresses “with a kisse & repent it not: but laugh and rejoyce, that they have brought sinne and shame to her that trusted them.” She turns the tables on Swetnam. She claims that even though Eve brought sin into the world, Mary took the “wofull shame” away. Indeed God “working in a woman” brought salvation to women and to all of their “posterity,” including man, and “man can claime no part in it.”

She also identifies who is really misbehaving at night. She claims that men “in the night” when they should be meditating on the Laws of God are “thinking of some earthy thing or other, either of this bargain or that purchase.” She then modifies the wording of scripture to support her arguments in opposition to James I, who admonishes his readers to leave the interpretation of scriptures to those who are more qualified. Leigh recommends that all parents should teach their children to read before they are four years old, “be they Males or Females,” so they can read and interpret the Bible for themselves, having read it “in their owne mother tongue.” She claims that “no woman is so senselesse, as not to looke what a blessing . . . EVE our Grandmother brought us to.” Then she references and interprets John 6:53, which in the King James Version published in 1611 reads “Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” She makes some changes to the text. She claims “except they feed on the *seed of the woman*, they have no life.” Earlier in the chapter, she explains that the “*seed of the wom-
an hath taken down the Serpents head.” Then she substitutes “seed of the woman” for “flesh of the Son of Man.” Swetnam claims that all women are wasting men. Leigh claims that a woman saved all men—or at least made salvation possible for all men.

Women, she writes, should be subject to their husbands, but then she paraphrases “God.” She writes, “As if God in mercy to women should say; [you] shall be subject to your husbands.” In other words, if God were here he would say it this way. . . But then she gives some very interesting wifely counsel. In direct opposition to Swetnam’s *Arraignment*, she claims it is “almost incredible to be believed” how many chaste matrons have cared less for their lives than they did for their chastity. Swetnam identifies all women as being the deceivers. She identifies women as having to “endured all those torments, that men would devise to inflict upon them.”

Swetnam claims that no woman is free from at least “one idle part.” All women share at least that common that common flaw and have “filthines in her.” Leigh, in contrast, offers specific suggestions of strong, productive, and virtuous women, possibly as a refutation to Swetnam. She notes five wives whose names form an acrostic for Mary: Michal, Abigail, Rachel, Judith, and Anna. She lists one sentence about each woman. Leigh would probably expect a “godly” audience to know the details. She credits “some goodly and reverence men of the Church for having gathered this,” but she does not say who those men were or where the material is “gathered.” Critics attribute the acrostic to Leigh instead of to an outside source.

Leigh’s virtuous women were not always submissive, silent, and obedient. Michal, according to Leigh, “saved David from the fury of Saul, “but Michal was also very headstrong when she felt that David was not being humble enough as he danced before the Lord.

58 Gray, “Feeding on the Seed,” 570.
In fact, she openly defied David. Abigail, Leigh says, was “wise.” Abigail was also the wife of Nabal, a fool. When her husband “railed on” David’s messengers, she diffused the situation by preparing two hundred loaves and two bottles of wine for David. She told David her husband was a fool, but in a way, she made an intercession for him by her diligence and humility, and she probably saved many lives. After Nabal died, she became David’s wife (I Samuel 25:3). Rachel was “amiable in the sight of her husband” according to Leigh. He worked fourteen years before he could have Rachel for his wife. Judith, according to Leigh, is “stout and magnanimous in the time of trouble.” That is an understatement. Judith, according to the apocrypha, was a beautiful widow who inspired her people to fight back against the Assyrians, not to surrender. She cut off the Assyrian general’s head. Her actions motivate her people to rally against the Assyrians. Finally, Anna is “patient and zealous in prayer.” Anna, a prophetess in the temple when Jesus was presented, was one of the few who recognized Him as the chosen Messiah. These women, Leigh claims, should persuade all women to “imbrace chastity.” They also give some Swetnam some examples to consider.

Leigh offers the most interesting example of virtue, however, in Susannah. Even though Susanna is “not cannoical,” Leigh claims Susanna is famous throughout the world as a virtuous woman, among heathens and infidels as well as the people of God. A beautiful and chaste wife, Susanna remains virtuous even when two elders spy on her and try to trap her into having sex with them. When she refuses, they tell her they will expose her as an adulteress, but she still refuses. She calls out, and people come running. The elders say they saw her making love to a young man, and based on the elders’ testimony, she is condemned to die. Because of discrepancies in their stories, however, Susanna is freed. Interestingly, this is the story of a woman who was stalked after, lusted after, and falsely accused by those professing to be pious religious leaders. Susanna has to defend herself against them, and she remains virtuous. Leigh
supplies Swetnam with yet another virtuous woman whom he must have overlooked. She adds Susanna to the list of women who did not try to seduce and waste men, women who were pursued, harassed, and corrupted by men.

The Mother’s Blessing in this regard has much more in common with Speght, Munda, and Sowerman than with Jocelin and Richardson, but she appears to be responding even more directly to Swetnam. Leigh not only describes godly wives, but she also illustrates how to choose them and who is ultimately responsible for the success of marriage. In this, of course, the subject of earlier conduct books. In fact, Robert Cleaver (and John Dod) wrote A Godlie Form of Household Government, published in 1598. They focus, like Swetnam, on the physical and material consequences of obtaining a good wife, not on the spiritual consequences. Swetnam thinks wives try to “devour” their husbands before they are dead and that they try to spend all that the husband makes. Similarly, Cleaver and Dod warn that a husband who is not beloved by his wife “holdeth his goods in danger, his house in suspicion, his credit in balance, and also his life in peril.” Although it was published a few years later, George Herbert’s requirements for a wife are not work noting. He claimed that a man should certainly have a godly wife, and if she were not godly, he should be doing all he could to make sure she becomes godly. He then lists the three criteria for a wife. First, she must train her children and servants in the ways of God. Second, she must know how to cure wounds. Third, she must be able to provide for the family so they will not lack “sustenation,” nor that “her husband be brought in debt.” He stresses that these qualities are not “outward qualities.” In addition, the clergy preached about how men are more careful about all other “purchases” or investments than they are about choosing a wife. They compared wives to an

59 Leigh, Blessing, chapter 12.
60 Cleaver, A godly forme of household government, 1621.
"artificial and equivocal limb" or "a wart" and even to "a cancer, that consumeth the flesh, wasteth the vital parts, and eateth to the very heart."\textsuperscript{62}

Leigh seems to be responding directly to such sermons and pamphlets, of which Swetnam’s was one of the most popular. She places the responsibility for choosing a godly wife and for ensuring a successful marriage squarely on the shoulders of the husband. She offers guidelines for choosing a wife. She has two basic rules: seek a godly wife, and love her. She uses some of her strongest language in exhorting her sons to marry for love and never to change in those feelings. "Let nothing" she writes "after you have made your choice, remove your love from her."\textsuperscript{63} She claims that a man is "very foolish" to dislike his own choice, especially since God "hath given a man much choyse among the godly." She claims never to have seen such "senseles simplicity" as to "mislike" one’s own choice, especially when a man has "almost a world of women to choose him a wife."\textsuperscript{64}

She presents four more guidelines to follow in choosing and living with the choice of a wife. So her guidelines appear like this. First, marry someone godly. Second, marry someone you love. Third, not to be so stupid as not to like your own choice. Fourth, if you chose unwisely, use discretion to cover up your own stupidity. Fifth, if you have no discretion, you should have "policy." Policy meant using prudent conduct or expedient behavior, even if you have made an unwise choice. Finally, if you lack all of these, you are unfit for any woman. She boldly declares, "If you get wives that be holy and you love them, you shall not need to forsake me," but she warns "If you have wives that you love not, I am sure I will forsake you." She continues, "If shee be thy wife, she is always too good to be thy seruant, and worthy to bee thy fellow."\textsuperscript{65}

\textsuperscript{62} Miller, "‘Hens,’" 165.

\textsuperscript{63} Leigh, \textit{Blessing}, Chapter 12.

\textsuperscript{64} Leigh, \textit{Blessing}, Chapter 13.

\textsuperscript{65} Leigh, \textit{Blessing}, Chapter 13.
Towards the end of her text, Leigh enters yet another popular debate. She begins her final chapters by warning against idleness, and she spends the entire last chapter preaching a sermon about preachers who are idle. Earlier texts also warned against idleness. Swetnam claims it is the fault all women share. Leigh agrees with Swetnam that idleness is to be condemned. Clearly, Swetnam is not the only one condemning idleness. Protestants uniformly condemn idleness. George Herbert refers to idleness as “the great and national sin of this land.” But Leigh adds a very interesting twist. She claims that a certain amount of time and solitude is essential for people to please God. Remember the books “molding” in people’s chests? She claims that even preachers are too busy with things of the world to tend the flocks as they should. This supports her claim of the power of the written word. Leigh indicates that reading, writing, and meditating/interpreting are essential, and that a certain amount of leisure is necessary for that.

It seems to be quite a modern idea. She includes prayer as a form of meditation. The most dangerous “let” of prayer is “a thing that carrieth some colour of goodness.” She notes that the Saints are “troubled with their marchandize . . . buying & selling . . . coueting to grow rich . . . [using] . . . riches unlawfully”. Their heads are “so busied about earthlie thinges that be lawfull, that [they] forget to meditate of the Law of God.” Leigh believes that “the world is with us too much, late and soon.” She identifies such behavior as a “dangerous disease, of which many die.” She points directly at the man who is too busy to remember the Law of God.

She writes, “Labour for learning . . . that is a thing which I cannot buy for you; you must get it by your own industrie and diligent studie.” Ronald Cooley claims that Herbert’s *Country Parson* is

---

66 Swetnam, *The Araignment*, A3


68 Adapted from Wordsworth, “The World is too much with us; late and soon.”

reminiscent of Francis Bacon, with its parallel, pithy phrases. The following phrase from Dorothy Leigh could be compared to Bacon as well. Regarding learning, she says, “It will be a wise master to teach you, a diligent seruant to attend you, a discreet Counsellour to admonish you.”

Leigh then composes her own parable about the devil’s “poysonous baits.” The devil tailors his baits to attract and catch certain fish. He uses great bait for a great fish. He alters baits and lines according to his prey, and then he “poysoneth” the bait. “Satan” she says, “will sawce it with sweet poison, that hee will deceiuv the wisest worlding in the world.” Then she changes the image: “for Satan hath spred his net, as the spider doth her webbe. Now the spider lieth close hidden in a darke hole, untill the sillie flie bee entangled, and then hee comes and taketh her as his owne: euen so Satan lieth close, vntill hee see you entangled within the things of this world, and then he claimeth . . . you . . . for his own.”

Helen Razovsky justly accuses of Leigh of not only interpreting scriptures, but also of writing her own gospel.

She spends the last chapters addressing the problem of preachers who are idle, those who neglect their duties. She proposes a democratic response. “Moue the people,” she admonishes, “to prouide themselvues a Preacher . . . speake to the Magistrates, mourne to see the Alehouses full, and the Church of God emptie.” Although she does not call for a mutiny, she does present here a form of dissent. Authorities fined people for not attending church. Puritans, however, often participated in a controversial and illegal practice of “gadding.” Leigh exhorts the people to go gadding, which meant moving from

71 Leigh, Blessing, chapter 37.
72 Leigh, Blessing, chapter 39.
73 Razovsky, “Remaking the Bible,” 19.
74 Leigh, Blessing, chapter 42.
one congregation to another in search of an effective preacher. They would try to avoid fines by attending their own congregation, but then they would visit other congregations as well in search of a more effective preacher, someone who could feed their spiritual hunger, so to speak.\textsuperscript{75} This type of behavior challenges James’s \textit{Basilicon Doron}, which insists that the public reverence ministers.\textsuperscript{76} Leigh says, “remoue you, where you may haue and heare the Word.”\textsuperscript{77} She accuses preachers of being too busy seeking their own and neglecting their duty to the Church. She quotes Isaiah 56:10 that refers to negligent preachers as “dumb dogs that will not barke.”

Her final chapter is reserved for instruction of preachers. She accuses the preachers of “darkening” the “Gospell” with “thicke clods of this earthen world.” Then she corrects herself: “Did I say darken their light? Nay they . . . drue many from Christ by loue of their owne . . . & by idlenes & negligence in preaching.” She has already identified men who were too busy for the things of God, but here she points directly at idle preachers, accusing them of the sin Swetnam assigned to all women. She closes her \textit{Mother’s Blessing} with a rousing call to pray for “the Preachers” to be firm and steadfast.

In most “dying parent” legacies, and in the most popular funeral sermons of women who died exemplary deaths, the final scenes usually retell the epic battle of the dying person (woman) with Satan.\textsuperscript{78} In contrast, Leigh’s final words seem oddly out of place for a dying-mother legacy. Indeed, she turns the entire deathbed battle-scene

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{75} Gray, \textit{Women Writers}, 50.

\textsuperscript{76} Gray, “Feeding on the Seed,” 574.

\textsuperscript{77} Leigh, \textit{Blessing}, chapter 43.

\textsuperscript{78} Phillippy, \textit{Women, Death and Literature}. For example, in the conduct manual \textit{The Crystalle Glass}, Philip Stubbs relates his young wife’s final moments as she conquers the enemy, surrounded by her family and the preacher. They witness her valiant battle to the end. Her last words indicate her disregard for the world and her desire to be with God. She gives her child to her husband’s care and rejects the world in order to join God (Phillippy, 104). Katherine Brettergh is another example of a woman whose death promoted her life story as one of vigorous anti-Catholic activism. She provides “yet another example of an early modern woman whose faith, which was more deeply rooted and felt than that of her husband’s, gave her the strength to take on the dominant religious role in the family” (Phillippy, 105).
\end{footnotesize}
upside down. Instead of being surrounded by ministers who are praying for her as she fights her last great battle with Satan, Leigh appears genuinely concerned with what is going on in the world she claims to be leaving. She is not fighting any kind of climactic battle with Satan. Indeed, she describes a constant battle, one she has fought throughout her life. Now, at the close of her Blessing, instead of having preachers pray for her, Leigh is praying for the preachers. Not only that, she is telling everyone else to pray for them “and all such as are in high places.”

This highly unusual occurrence concludes her Blessing with a rousing call to action, a plea for everyone to pray for spiritual leaders whom she has claimed may be leading people astray. This is not the usually emotional scene of a dying mother. Leigh knew her Mother’s Blessing would not be published until after she died. The Mother’s Blessing is very much about living. There is no ultimate last epic battle with Satan. Indeed, her last sentence sounds like much more like a sermon, in this case a sermon to “all,” including preachers.

All in all, she says exactly what she would say if she were “a man and a preacher.” She “forgets her selfe,” and hopes that for a moment her readers will hear a man, a preacher, an obedient wife, a dying mother, a voice of authority. In response to Swetnam, she seems to exclaim, “O judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts, / And men have lost their reason (Julius Caesar III.ii.109). Like Antony, she invites a comparison of words, in her case words published by other early modern authors. She preaches to, and perhaps moves, her readers by her words. Certainly, she did not single out one text and respond to it. The Mother’s Blessing echoes the debates raging across her early modern English society. She took up her quill and responded to those debates in one of the only forums available to a woman. I think she expected her Blessing to “ruffle up” their spirits.
Julia Combs is Assistant Professor of English at Southern Utah University. Her research interests include early seventeenth-century women writers and the history of women’s rhetoric. In addition to teaching various courses, Dr. Combs is the director of the Writing Center at SUU.

Bibliography

Primary Texts

Anger, Jane. *Iane Anger her Protection for vyomen To defend them against the scandalous reportes of a late surfeiting louver, and all otherlike Venerians that complaine so to bee ouercloyed with womens kindnesse. Written by Ja: A. Gent.*, At London: Printed by Richard Iones, and Thomas Orwin, 1589.

Breton, Nicholas. *The mothers blessing*, Printed at London: By T[homas] C[reede] for Iohn Smethick, and are to be sold at his shop in S. Dunstons Churchyard in Fleetstreet, 1602. Date: 1602.


Hall, Joseph. *Certaine worthye manuscript poems of great antiquitie reserved long in the studie of a Northfolke gentleman. And now first published by I.S. 1 The statly tragedy of Guistard and Sismond. 2 The northren mothers blessing. 3 The way to thrifte*, Imprinted at London: [By Robert Robinson] for R[obert] D[exter], 1597. Date: 1597.


Leigh, Dorothy. *The Mothers Blessing. Or The Godly Counsaile of a Gentle-woman not long since deceased, left behind her for her children containing many good exhortations, and godly admonitions, profitable for all parents to leaue as a legacy to their children, but especially for those, who by reason of their young yeeres stand most in need of instruction. By Mrs. Dorothy Leigh.* 1616

Munda, Constantia. *The vvorming of a mad dogge: or, A soppe for Cerberus the iaylor of Hell No confutation but a sharpe redargution of the bayter of women.* London: Printed [by George Purslowe] for Laurence Hayes, and are to be sold at his shop neere Fleet-bridge, ouer against St. Brides Lane, 1617.

Sowerman, Ester. *Ester hath hang’d Haman: or An ansvvere to a lewd pamphlet, entituled, The arraignment of women With the arraignment of lewd, idle, froward, and unconstant men, and husbands. Divided into two parts. The first proweeth the dignity and worthiness of women, out of diuine testimonies. The second shewing the estimation of the foeminine sexe, in ancient and pagan times; all which is acknowledged by men themselves in their daily actions. Written by Ester Sowernam, neither maide, wife nor widdowe, yet really all, and therefore experienced to defend all.* London: Printed [by Thomas Snodham] for Nicholas Bourne, and are to be sold at his shop at the entrance of the Royall Exchange, 1617.

Speght, Rachel. *A Mouzell for Malastomus, the cynical bayer of, and foule mouthe[d] barker against Euahs sex. Or an apologetical answere to that irreligious and illiterate pamphlet made by Io. Sw. and by him intituled, The arraignement of women.* London, 1616. Print.


Swetnam, the vvoman-hater, arraigned by women *A new comedie, acted at the Red Bull, by the late Queenes Servants.* London: Printed [by William Stansby] for Richard Meighen, and are to be sold at his shops at Saint Clemens Church, ouer-against Essex House, and at Westminster Hall, 1620.


**Secondary Texts**


Gray, Catharine. “Feeding on the Seed of the Woman: Dorothy Leigh and the Figure of Maternal Dissent.” ELH 68.3 (2001) 563-592.


DElNO C. WEST AWARD

The Delno C. West Award is in honor of Professor Delno C. West (1936-1998), one of the founding members of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association. Professor West was Professor of History at Northern Arizona University where he served for a time as Chair of the History Department and Director of the Honors Program. Professor West was a president of the Association and the general coordinator of three annual meetings that were held in Flagstaff and at the Grand Canyon. His teaching centered around medieval Europe, and he published widely on the history of Christianity. His numerous books and articles include *The Librio de las Profecías* of Christopher Columbus (1991).

The West Award recognizes the most distinguished paper given by a senior scholar at the annual conference.

Recipient of the West Award for 2017

**Kristin M.S. Bezio**

University of Richmond
Although scholars of both literature and history have made arguments for Christopher Marlowe’s religious belief in Catholicism, the Church of England, and even atheism (which could have been conflated with both by different parties during his lifetime), few consider the belief system of the Polish Brethren, a precursor to Unitarianism established by one Faustus Socinus. This essay uses historical and social network analyses to suggest a close tie between Marlowe’s acquaintances and believers in Socinianism. Clues in Doctor Faustus and Massacre at Paris suggest Marlowe’s skepticism concerning the doctrines of Catholicism, Lutheranism, and Calvinism. Furthermore, repeated references to Poland and the beliefs of the Socinians suggest Marlowe’s familiarity with the doctrine of the Polish Brethren. Finally, the complex ties between the Elizabethan Secret Service—of which Marlowe was a member—and the early modern royal courts across Europe provide evidence that the Reformation in England was shaped by far more complex—and even modern—ideas of religious diversity than we typically credit. For Marlowe, these influences produced a deep-seated resentment of organized religion and its impact on the anti-Catholic policies of the Elizabethan government during the 1580s and early 1590s.

Anti-Catholicism formed a significant part of the Elizabethan government’s religious policy in the latter half of the sixteenth century, and frequently appeared in sermons, pamphlets, and plays throughout the 1580s and 1590s. Christopher Marlowe’s drama—especially Doctor Faustus and Massacre at Paris—participates in this anti-Catholic tradition, but also introduces his audience to a perspective which is a good deal more unorthodox. In his plays, Marlowe injects the influence of an obscure form of Protestantism which arose in Poland in the 1560s and which encouraged the radical and dangerous idea that politics and religion should be kept separate. When viewed through the context of Marlowe’s life, death, and work—both on and off the stage—it is clear that, whether or not Marlowe personally subscribed to this doctrine, it certainly influenced his writing and thought; by the end of his life, Marlowe’s drama openly condemned the religiously-motivated violence being perpetuated by the Elizabethan government.
On May 18, 1593 the Privy Council issued an arrest warrant for Marlowe on the charge of atheism. Although Marlowe was immediately released when he presented himself two days later, ten days after that, the young playwright was dead, stabbed near the eye by Ingram Frizer in a supposed argument over the “reckoning.” A search of the apartments he shared with Thomas Kyd yielded an “atheistic tract” which Kyd identified as belonging to Marlowe. The tract was Arian, an anti-Trinitarian sect which drew a distinction between Christ as the Son of God and God, and avowed that Christ was subordinate to God (unlike traditional Protestantism and Catholicism, in which Christ, God, and the Holy Spirit were considered a unified trinity). These papers were “copied from John Proctor’s book, The Fall of the Late Arrian, published in 1549, the year in which Archbishop Cranmer had examined John Assheton, who forthwith recanted.” What is noteworthy about these papers is not simply that Kyd avowed them to be Marlowe’s, but that “Marlowe possessed or copied the heresies,” notes Kenneth Muir, “but not Proctor’s painstaking refutations.” Muir concludes that Marlowe must therefore have “shared the views of Assheton, who had sought to demonstrate that Jesus was not divine;” A.D. Wraight posits that “Presumably Marlowe would have used the treatise as a basis for serious discussion, point by point, with the members of Ralegh’s circle.”

Nine days after Marlowe’s death, the Privy Council released a transcript of the so-called “Baines Note,” a documentation of the testimony of Richard Baines against Marlowe listing many of Marlowe’s supposed heretical beliefs, including the infamous statement “that Moyses was but a Jugler & that one Heriots being Sir W Raleghs man Can do more then he” and “That Christ was a bastard and his mother dishonest”:  

1 Muir, 120.  
2 Buckley, 123; Muir, 120.  
3 Muir, 120; Wraight, 262.  
4 Qtd. in Kendall, 332.
That the beginning of religion was only to keep men in awe.

... That if there be any God or good religion, then it is in the Papists, because the service of God is performed with more ceremonies, as elevation of the mass, organs, singing men, shaven crowns, etc. That all Protestants are hypocritical asses.

... That Saint John the Evangelist was bedfellow to Christ and leaned always in his bosom; that he used him as the sinners of Sodoma.

... That the angel Gabriel was bawd to the Holy Ghost, because he brought the salutation to Mary.¹

Certainly—as many scholars have remarked over the years—the reliability of Baines’s account is somewhat suspect, but there are reasons to believe that the Note, even if exaggerated, might reflect the unorthodox nature of Marlowe’s beliefs.²

In addition to the testimony of Baines, we have the assertion of one Richard Cholmley, who

saith and verily believeth that one Marlowe is able to show more sound reasons for atheism than any divine in England is able to give to prove divinity, and that Marlowe told him that he hath read The Atheist lecture to Sir Walter Ralegh and others.³

Another of Marlowe’s (more friendly) acquaintances and fellow-playwright George Greene pleaded with Marlowe in his deathbed treatise Greene’s Groatsworth of Wit bought with a Million of Repentance in 1592, warning him to repent:

Wonder not, (for with thee wil I first begin) thou famous gracer of Tragedians, that Greene, who hath said with thee (like the foole in his heart there is no God, should now give glorie unto his greatness: for penetrating is his power, his hand lyes heavie upon me, hee hath spoken unto me with a voice of thunder, and I have felt he is a God that can punish enemies. Why should thy excellent wit, his gift, bee so blind, that thou shouldst give no glorie to the giver?⁴

5 Qt. in Kendall, 332.
6 Muir, 118.
7 Muir, 119.
8 Qt. in Muir, 123.
Greene even appears to borrow some of his imagery from *Doctor Faustus*: of God’s heavy hand from its conclusion, in which Marlowe writes “hide me from the heavy wrath of God!” (*DF* 5.2.85) and the image of God’s voice like thunder from Marlowe’s line “Fearful echoes thunder in mine ears” (*DF* 2.3.20).

In addition, after Marlowe’s death, Thomas Beard, in his 1597 *Theatre of Gods Judgements*, condemns Marlowe—and only Marlowe—by name, writing,

> Not inferior to any of the former in Atheisme and impiety, and equal to all in maner of punishment, was one of our own nation, of fresh and late memorie, called Marlin, by profession a scholler, brought vp from his youth in the Vniuersitie of Cambridge, but by practice a Play-maker.10

Taken all together, we must recognize that Marlowe’s beliefs must have been unconventional at the very least, and were likely heretical, although I share Buckley’s conclusion that “we have no choice but to conclude that [Marlowe] did not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ.”11

Taking Marlowe’s plays into consideration reveals—in *Tamburlaine* and *The Jew of Malta*—at least some cursory knowledge of Islam and Judaism, as well as disdain for the hypocrisy of both Catholics and traditional Protestants. *Doctor Faustus*, in particular, is often viewed by scholars as an indicator of Marlowe’s religious orientation, yet none of the aforementioned religions provide an adequate framework for the metaphysical problems facing Faustus throughout the play.

Prior scholarly arguments typically attempt to reconcile the play’s most problematic moments as Calvinist, Lutheran, or Catholic, but are always unable to fully do so. C.L. Barber argues that *Doctor

---

9 Text of *Doctor Faustus* quoted throughout: Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen. Unless otherwise noted, quotations are taken from the A-text. It is worth noting that the B-text revisions do not significantly impact this thesis; if anything, later revisions reinforce my argument (as will be seen in the section on references to Poland).

10 Qtd. in Buckley, 90-91.

11 Buckley, 136.
Faustus “dramatizes blasphemy as heroic endeavor...a fable of modern man seeking to break out of religious limitations” following the model of Martin Luther. Although Barber perhaps exaggerates the level of Faustus’s heroism, particularly given both his tragic ending and his reduction to farce throughout the play, the central focus of Doctor Faustus is a struggle against religious dogmatism.

David Bevington notes that the play presents a dichotomy between “Marlowe’s fascination with Lutheran-Calvinist determinism and with Italian humanism.” This struggle appears early in the play, as Faustus debates his course of study:

FAUSTUS Settle thy studies, Faustus, and begin
To sound the depth of that thou will profess.

... Bene disserere est finis logices.
Is to dispute well logic’s chiefest end?
Affords this art no greater miracle?
Then read no more, thou hast attained the end.
A greater subject fitteth Faustus’ wit.
Bid On kai me on farewell. (1.1.1-2, 7-12)

Bevington notes that “Faustus’s supposedly Aristotelian definition of logic...turns out to be from Ramus, and On kai me on (line 12) is from the skeptic sophist Gorgias.” Furthermore, “Faustus willfully misinterprets Ramus’s idea that disputing well is ‘logic’s chiefest end’ (I.i.8) to mean that disputation should be an end in itself rather than a means to salvation.” When juxtaposed against Marlowe’s depiction of Ramus’s death in Massacre at Paris (about which more will be said later), this speech suggests that Faustus fails to understand the importance of intellectual inquiry—his desire is for power rather than knowledge.

This humanist influence clashes almost immediately with Faustus’s turn away from philosophy, medicine, and law to divinity:

12 Barber, 246.
13 Bevington, “Marlowe and God,” 289.
14 Bevington, “Marlowe and God,” 291.
FAUSTUS When all is done, divinity is best.
Jerome’s Bible, Faustus, view it well.
[He reads.] \textit{Stipendium peccati mors est.} Ha!
\textit{Stipendium,} etc.
The reward of sin is death. That’s hard.
[He reads.] \textit{Si peccasse negamus, fallimur}\n\textit{Et nulla est in nobis veritas.}\nIf we say that we have no sin,
We deceive ourselves, and there’s no truth in us.
Why then belike we must sin,
And so consequently die.
Ay, we must die an everlasting death. (DF 1.1.37-48)

Here, we see Faustus engaging in what Luciano García García describes as the inherently Protestant introduction of dogmatic possibilities, “opening the door to the risks of interpretation.”\textsuperscript{16} In \textit{Doctor Faustus}, interpretive failure leads Faustus first down the path toward conjuration and necromancy, and, eventually, toward damnation.

Yet before we reach that juncture in the play, Faustus must first choose to pursue the art of conjuration and enter into a necromantic pact with the devil-qua-Mephistopheles. Faustus takes this course of action because, he explains,

\begin{quote}
FAUSTUS Emperors and kings
Are but obeyed in their several provinces,
Nor can they raise the wind or rend the clouds;
But his dominion that exceeds in this
Stretcheth as far as doth the mind of man.
A sound magician is a mighty god. (DF 1.1.59-64)
\end{quote}

Faustus’s argument for conjuration and necromancy is not religious or spiritual in nature; rather, he is interested in the political power he can gain by means of magic.

In Marlowe’s world, power—whether secular or spiritual—was frequently aligned with oppression and violence. Faustus’s crime in \textit{Doctor Faustus} is thus not religious heresy, but the wish to rule over emperors, kings, and even the weather; his bargain with Mephistopheles condemned because it is Machiavellian rather than heretical. Although Marlowe himself was accused—by Greene—of being both, what we see in Marlowe’s plays suggests that while

\textsuperscript{16} García García, 102.
he was keenly aware of the short-term success of Machiavellian tactics (Faustus in Doctor Faustus, the Guise in Massacre at Paris, Mortimer in Edward II, Barabas in Jew of Malta), ultimately his Machiavellian characters suffer the loss of both power and life (usually at the same time). In the case of Faustus, the formula is the same: Faustus seeks power for its own sake, exploits that power unwisely, and is destroyed by his own inability to manage that same power.

Once Faustus has made the determination to conjure a devil, the play passes from academic to practical arguments against his choice, although, it is worth noting, not from any belief of Marlowe’s in the dangers of witchcraft. As Jay Zysk suggests, “the conjuror’s circle and spells pronounced over it can be seen as parodies of sacramental rituals if not wholesale rejection of God himself,” although I would suggest it is dogma rather than deity which Marlowe here rejects.17 Certainly, Marlowe’s willingness to explicitly stage a conjuration suggests his deep-seated skepticism of the supernatural. Suzan Last instead proposes that Marlowe seeks “to question its doctrinal representations and the ideal of conventionally-

17 Zysk, 349.
18 Last, 33.
conceived human interaction with it,” but I would argue that Marlowe is far more likely representing a skeptical picture of both witchcraft and miracles, instead focusing on the petty cruelty of the very human people behind the tricks in this play, like those engaged in war, murder, and other violence in *Massacre at Paris, Tamburlaine,* and *The Jew of Malta.*

As the play continues, Marlowe moves from the frame of philosophical discussions of religious belief, disbelief, and doctrine to a more humorous attack on Catholicism. During the encounter between Faustus, Mephistopheles, and the Papal court in act three, Faustus steals dishes and beverages from the Pope, mocking him as he does so, and drives the party from the room after boxing the Pope on the ear (*DF* 3.1.80.2). When they return, a collection of friars sing a ridiculous dirge of exorcism:

> FRIARS Cursèd be he that stole away his Holiness’ meat from the table.  
> *Maledicat Dominus!*  
> Cursèd be he that struck his Holiness a blow on the face.  
> *Maledicat Dominus!*  
> Cursèd be he that took Friar Sandelo a blow on the pate.  
> *Maledicat Dominus!*  
> Cursèd be he that disturbeth our holy dirge.  
> *Maledicat Dominus!*  
> Cursèd be he that took away his Holiness’ wine.  
> *Maledicat Dominus!*  
> *Et omnes sancti.* Amen. (*DF* 3.1.89-100)

The scene ends rather dramatically as Faustus and Mephistopheles “beat the FRIARS, and fling fireworks among them, and so exeunt” (*DF* 3.1.100.1-2). In addition to mocking the ritual of exorcism and Catholic prayer in general, the utter failure of the dirge to dispatch either Faustus or the demon from the room suggests Marlowe’s dismissive—albeit orthodox—attitude toward Catholicism.

As Judith Weil observes, Marlowe’s farcical representation of Catholic praxis and clergy serve to permit his subsequent, and more oblique, condemnation of Protestantism. The ending of the play,  

19 Last, 33.  
20 Weil, 69-70.
in particular, raises the question of predestination versus free will, pitting the doctrine of Calvinism against the free will of Lutheranism. Critics of the play have historically argued over whether Faustus is ultimately damned because he was always so (predestination), or because he chooses to be so (free will). Critical arguments situate the moment of damnation across the play, ranging from the signing of the contract, to the kiss with Helen, to the final moment of damnation itself, with T.W. Craik arguing that there is in fact no moment “at which Faustus is irrevocably damned; the struggle for damnation or salvation runs throughout the play.”

The argument for Calvinist predestination in *Doctor Faustus* focuses on the idea that Faustus fails to repent because, as Faustus himself argues, “Faustus’ offence can ne’er be pardoned. The serpent that tempted Eve may be saved, but not Faustus…nothing can rescue me” (*DF* 5.2.15-16, 59). Faustus’s insistence that he cannot be saved—particularly, that even the serpent who caused Original Sin can be saved but he cannot—comes from the Calvinist doctrinal argument that “God hardens the hearts of those whom he rejects,” making them unable to repent:

> As Faustus sees it, this difficult issue leads in Calvinist theology to a non-answer: we must accept God’s unfathomable will. Because grace is God’s gift, he may give it or withhold it as he wills in perfect justice. Faustus embodies all the characteristic failings of the reprobate; his deeds are manifest signs of his ungodliness, and they deserve the punishment they receive.22

According to Calvinism, Faustus’s actions throughout the play are predetermined by God (as is the fate of the character Faustus by Marlowe), and, thus, he is always already damned, and his decision to conjure Mephistopheles and sign a pact with the devil are the consequences rather than the determinants of that fate.

However, García García, among others, argues that despite the play’s determinism, Faustus’s damnation cannot be Calvinistically

21   Bevington, “Marlowe and God,” 297; Craik, 189-196.
22   Bevington, “Marlowe and God,” 310.
predetermined “unless we suppose that the Good Angel is vicious enough to torment the poor reprobate for what he had never the chance to get.”23 Instead, according to García García, the deterministic language which appears in the play belongs almost entirely to the “Evil Angel, Mephostophilis, and Lucipher’s discourses,” which suggests that Calvinist doctrine feeds into Faustus’s despair and is the tactic by which evil convinces Faustus that he has no free will.24 Thus, in Doctor Faustus, any attempt at arguing for predestination or early damnation runs up against the problem of dramatic failure; as Bevington and Eric Rasmussen argue, “to award Faustus irrecoverably to the devil at some earlier point” other than the ending “satisfies Calvinist theology at the expense of dramatic tension and uncertainty.”25 If Faustus’s fate were determined from the beginning, there would be no specific dramatic tension produced by the question of his damnation or salvation. If there were no choice to be made, there would be no tragedy, yet the play’s end also refuses to align with the Lutheran doctrine of salvation through faith.

In his final speech, Faustus oscillates between his desire to repent and his fear of the power of hell, his language switching between the discourse offered by the Old Man and that threatened by Lucifer. First, he calls upon God and Christ:

FAUSTUS The devil will come, and Faustus must be damned.  
O, I’ll leap up to my God! Who pulls me down?  
See, see where Christ’s blood streams in the firmament!  
One drop would save my soul, half a drop. Ah, my Christ!  
Ah, rend not my heart for naming of my Christ!  
Yet will I call on him. (DF 5.2.76-81)

Yet Faustus’s cry of faith is inadequate, as God or Christ (or both) does not (or cannot) save him. Faustus therefore turns back to Lucifer:

23 García García, 101.
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FAUSTUS O, spare me, Lucifer!
Where is it now? 'Tis gone; and see where God
Stretcheth out his arm and bends his ireful brows!
Mountains and hills, come, come and fall on me,
And hide me from the heavy wrath of God!
No, no!
Then will I headlong run into the earth.
Earth, gape! O, no, it will not harbour me.

... My God, my God, look not so fierce on me!

Enter [LUCIFER, MEPHISOTHELES, and other] Devils.

Adders and serpents, let me breathe a while!
Ugly hell, gape not. Come not, Lucifer!
I'll burn my books. Ah, Mephistopheles!

[The Devils] exequunt with him. (DF 5.2.81-88, 120-123.1)

What matters in Doctor Faustus is not that the audience determines whether Faustus’s damnation came from God or from his own free will, but the fact that both theological options are insufficient. As G.M. Pinciss suggests, both are equally plausible: “His inability to give up the pursuit of magic or break his agreement with Lucifer, then, can explain, according to anti-Calvinist teaching, why he is ultimately damned or, according to Calvinist teaching, why he was born damned.”

Last claims that “This neat division [between critical interpretations] is, perhaps, statistical proof supporting the idea that the play is basically constructed of contradictory impulses, each simultaneously reifying and undermining an orthodox worldview.”

If Faustus’s will—the Lutheran interpretation—we run up against the problem of the failure of Christ’s blood to redeem Faustus, despite his calling upon Christ for salvation (the faith which Lutheran doctrine argues is sufficient for redemption). Critical dismissals of Faustus’s turn to Lucifer in the subsequent line as the reason for his damnation skip over his initial summons of God and Christ, leading to the more common critical argument for a deterministic, Calvinist theology.

Yet in arguing for interpretations of either Calvinist or Lutheran theological constructs, most critics, King-Kok Cheung argues, “ignore a third, existential, view which is beyond religion and

26 Pinciss, 257.
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This “third” viewpoint seems to be vaguely deistic in Cheung’s terms, but I suggest that it may be found in a somewhat obscure anti-Trinitarian sect which rejects both predestination and the divinity of Christ espoused by Catholics and most Protestant denominations (including Calvinists and Lutherans).

Founded in 1563 in Poland, the Polish Brethren were also known as Socinians, after their most notorious member, Faustus Socinus. First, and most obvious, is the coincidence of names: Marlowe’s play is modelled on the story of Johan Faust, but he calls it *Doctor Faustus*, perhaps in acknowledgment of the prominent Socinian of the same name . . . although this could be nothing more than happenstance.

I am more convinced by the way in which Socinian doctrine resolves the stickiest theological problems in the play. Socinus’s most influential works, *De auctoritate scripturae sacrae* (1570) and *De Jesu Christo servatore* (1578), lay out the essence of his theology, which combined rational humanism with Reformation focus on Biblical exegesis. The three central tenets of Socinianism deny the trinity, describe Christ as “mortal…one whose office was by precept and example to point the way that leads to eternal life,” and reject the doctrine of predestination. Politically, Socinus “stood for the separation of Church and State and declared himself against the civil punishment of heretics by exile, prison, or execution.” These tenets, although not stated explicitly in *Doctor Faustus*, help explain some of the theological paradoxes in the play.

For instance, Mephistopheles’s description of hell is, Last explains, of “a state of mind, not the physical place of literal fire and torment that held popular imagination for so long,” a description which is strongly suggestive of a skeptical worldview which dismisses the reality of hellfire encouraged by the doctrines of Catholicism and
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Calvinism. Instead of a place of eternal torment, Socinian doctrine taught that those unworthy of heaven were instead annihilated, given eternal death rather than an eternity of torment. Such a description more closely aligns with Mephistopheles’s description of hell as an absence from God rather than a physical place: “Why, this is hell, nor am I out of it” (*DF* 1.3.78), as well as Faustus’s claim that “I think hell’s a fable” (*DF* 2.1.130) and his earlier assertion that “we must die an everlasting death” (*DF* 1.1.48).

The play’s uncertain conclusion also makes more sense when viewed through a Socinian lens. As H. John McLachlan explains, perhaps the most central tenet of Socinianism was its doctrine on repentance:

> the condition of God’s forgiveness of sins was not punishment but repentance…Together with this attack upon the doctrine of vicarious atonement went Socinus’s rejection of predestination and his assertion of free will…it was only a step to the repudiation of the doctrine of original sin…he promulgated a new conception of the Christian religion as primarily the saving knowledge of God, mediated through Christ, which gives to men eternal life. 

In short, Christ was an example of how to achieve salvation, not the source of salvation, and even, as Faustus remarks, the serpent—a repudiation of original sin that is also quite Socinian—can be forgiven.

Furthermore, the lack of Christological centrality throughout much of the play suggests Christ’s relative lack of importance. Bevington remarks that at the play’s end, “We are left nonetheless with the perception that God (Christ) is starkly absent from the play.” Interestingly, we find accordance with Socinian doctrine in the inability of Faustus to be saved by the streaming of Christ’s blood in the firmament, because, according to Socinus, Christ’s blood is not divine. What we—and Marlowe’s audience—are left with, then,
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at the play’s end, is a mingled sense of uncertainty and finality; although, as the Chorus tells us, “Faustus is gone” (Epilogue.4), the play itself provides few clear theological answers, complicating instead of clarifying the predominant doctrinal debates of the day. Instead, Marlowe presents a conundrum in which none of the dominant English religions provide an adequate doctrinal answer to Faustus’s situation, cloaking his heresy in the ostensibly orthodox ending in which Faustus must be damned.

Despite these clues, we nevertheless need to know whether or not Marlowe could have even known about the beliefs and doctrines of the Polish Brethren before this hypothesis can be considered plausible. The search for an answer takes us out of England and into Eastern Europe and the reign of the Polish Emperor Sigismund II, a ruler known, in particular, for his toleration of unorthodox religious dogma.

Socinianism, established in Kolosvar, Transylvania—a province of the Polish Empire—in 1563, eventually became quite popular in England in the years leading up to the Civil War. Dmitry Cizevsky explains that English Socinianism grew in influence from the mid-sixteenth to the early seventeenth centuries, so much so that the Socinians in Krakow dedicated their *Racovian Catechism* to King James I in 1606, and it was addressed by thinkers such as John Locke, John Milton, and Isaac Newton. At this historical point, explains Stanislas Kot, “The Raków prints, though everywhere banned, were in demand and were snapped up, especially in Germany, France, Holland, and England.” By the time the theaters closed in 1642, observes Nigel Smith, “Anti-Trinitarianism was more pervasive and spread more diversely in Europe and in England than any other single orthodox view.” But was it present and known in England by 1589, when Marlowe composed *Doctor Faustus*?
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Certainly, the presence of the “atheistic” tract in Marlowe’s apartments suggests that Marlowe would have been sympathetic to Socinian teachings. In addition, according to McLachlan, one of Socinus’s disciples, Simon Budny, was brought to England in 1574 by a merchant named Ralph Rutter and introduced to John Foxe (of martyrological fame). Rutter worked for the Muscovy Company, a Anglo-Russian trading outfit partially bankrolled and managed by the Elizabethan spymaster, Sir Francis Walsingham.40

Further research into Rutter reveals his name appearing in letters between Queen Elizabeth I and the Russian Czar Ivan the Terrible, also written in 1574. In these letters, Ivan makes reference to “the business of Thomas Glover and Ralph Rutter and their confederates,” men who came to Russia as merchants, but “who did not trade according to our privileges.”41 In response to Elizabeth’s inquiries after their health and safety, the Czar replies that

> those your subjects for their evil practices and spying have come to deserve even death; but we, being a Christian prince and not wishing to see the blood of such wretches, and did not order them to be put to death. As regards Ralph (Rutter) and Thomas (Glover) we sent them to you before this and you ought not to write to us any more about them.42

What is particularly interesting about this for our purposes is that as a spy, Rutter may well have been known to Marlowe—at the very least, they would have had mutual acquaintances in the Elizabethan Secret Service—a connection which provides us with a possible link between Marlowe and Socinian doctrine.

In addition—for the above is, after all, circumstantial at best—Marlowe was at Cambridge with a known Socinian named Francis Kett who was executed for heresy in Norwich on January 14, 1589, just before Doctor Faustus was produced. His beliefs, explains Muir, matched those of Socinus:

40 McLachlan, 25
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Kett claimed that there was no church in England, ‘neither have the ministers any power or authority to excommunicate, to bind or loose’. He argued from the parable of the Tares that ‘no man ought to be put to death for heresies, but that the wheat and tares should both grown together till the time of harvest—a valid interpretation of the parable, but one which stripped the church of the power of persecution. It was natural for the Bishop to be outraged. Kett knew what his fate would be, because three Socinians (Hamond, Lewes and Cole) had been sent to the stake in Norwich, not long before.43

Until the end of his life, Kett continued to maintain that “Christ is not God, but a good man as others be,” the core of anti-Trinitarian theology.44 The likelihood that Marlowe would have known of, if not directly been acquainted with, Rutter and (especially) Kett suggests that he would at the very least have been exposed to Socinian beliefs. When coupled with the records of his interest in Arianism and other anti-Trinitarian sects, his own supposed statements, and—finally—the clues within his plays, it seems likely that Marlowe was influenced by Socinianism, whether or not he ultimately believed in its doctrines. (See image below)
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In addition to *Doctor Faustus*, Marlowe’s other plays reinforce this thesis. Anita Gilman Sherman, in an extensive examination of Shakespeare’s allusions to Poland, birthplace of Socinianism, points to why Marlowe might have been drawn to do the same. One essential reason, Sherman suggests, “was religious toleration. Poland had a long tradition of toleration thanks partly to the quotidian practice of rubbing shoulders with people of different origins and creeds.”45 Even more explicitly, explains Smith, this “toleration was associated from an early stage with Socinianism.”46

In *Massacre at Paris*, Henri of Navarre returns from Poland to claim his brother’s crown in France, abdicating the Polish throne which he inherited from Sigismund Augustus, the same Sigismund II who appears in *Tamburlaine* and who was known historically for religious toleration.47 Edgar C. Knowlton also notes that the B-Text of *Doctor Faustus* also contains a reference to a “princely Sigismond” (*DFb* 3.1.146), whom Bevington and Rasmussen gloss as Emperor Sigismund of Germany. However, the full line reads “Pope Julius swore to princely Sigismond” (*DFb* 3.1.146), and the Pope at the time of Sigismond of Germany’s rule would not have been a Julius (Sigismond lived from 1368 to 1437, and the three Juliuses reigned in the fourth century and the sixteenth).48 Sigismund Augustus (II) of Poland, however, held the Polish throne from 1548-1572, and his reign did overlap with that of Pope Julius III, to whom he swore he would uphold religious toleration in Poland. This, however, would be anachronistic to the lifetime of Johann Faust—but, Knowlton argues, Sigismund I of Poland (who reigned 1506-1548) not only overlapped with Pope Julius II from 1506-1513, but also received support prior to his accession from Julius II against the Grand-Master of the Teutonic Knights in 1505, enabling Marlowe to include yet another reference to “Sigismond” and Poland in his play.49
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47 Kot, xiv. It may also be worth noting that Socinus himself worked for Cosimo di Medici, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, cousin to Catherine di Medici, whom Cosimo married to Francis I and who bore Henri III of Valois, the same Henri who abdicated the Polish throne following Socinus’s flight to Poland.
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Finally, Sherman points out the influence of Polish literature from the mid-16th century over other authors and dramatists in England:

Marcin Kromer’s popular chronicle *Polonia* (1555/1577) may have reached some English readers, especially the grisly legends adapted in Sebastian Münster’s *Cosmographia* (1572), François de Belleforest’s *Cosmographie Universelle* (1575), Anthony Munday’s *Brief Chronicle* (1611), and Thomas Beard’s *Theatre of God’s Judgments* (1597).⁵⁰

Again, we see circumstantial evidence which suggests Marlowe was likely also exposed to Polish ideologies: Anthony Munday was an acquaintance, fellow-spy, and fellow-playwright (with the Admiral’s Men) whom Marlowe undoubtedly knew well, and Beard’s treatise includes a condemnation of Marlowe in addition to references to Poland. Although both works postdate Marlowe’s death, the other texts listed here were published long prior, and would have been both accessible and attractive to a Cambridge-student-turned-spy interested in politics and religion.

In addition to these repeated allusions to toleration in accordance with Socinian politics, Marlowe’s last play is a direct condemnation of religious violence. *Massacre at Paris*, produced in 1593 by the Admiral’s Men at the Rose, displays a deep anxiety about the conflict between Catholics and Protestants through the lens of the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre. The play opens with a wedding mass, which “links the Catholic sacrament with the impending slaughter of the massacre,” since, John Guillory claims, “the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre and the Catholic mass can be understood as joined at the root, socially if not linguistically.”⁵¹ The events of the play themselves contain a connection to Poland and toleration, as only one year after the historical Massacre, “The Warsaw Confederation of 1573 famously codified freedom from religious persecution,” partly in response to the violence in France, which led to the influx of “refugees from all over Europe, including the British Isles…from Catholics to Anabaptists, Mennonites, Hussites, Shwenkfeldians, and various anti-Trinitarians,” including Socinians and Arians.⁵²
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As Massacre at Paris unfolds, the Duke of Guise and Queen Mother Catherine di Medici propose the Massacre to King Charles IX as a means “to seek your country’s good” \((MP\ 3.19)\), using language shockingly similar to English justifications of anti-Catholicism:

\[
\text{GUISE with this weight I'll counterpoise a crown}
\]

\[
\text{Or with seditions weary all the world;}
\]

\[
\text{For this, from Spain the stately Catholics}
\]

\[
\text{Sends Indian gold to coin me French ecues;}
\]

\[
\text{For this, have I a largess from the Pope,}
\]

\[
\text{A pension and a dispensation too;}
\]

\[
\text{And by that privilege to work upon,}
\]

\[
\text{My policy hath fram'd religion.} \quad (MP\ 2.55-62)^{53}
\]

Although this speech “smacks strongly of propaganda, situating Navarre (Elizabeth’s ally) in direct opposition to the Guise and Spain,” like the Guise, Elizabeth’s government chose their “country’s good” rather “Than pity or relieve these upstart heretics” \((MP\ 4.20)\).^{54}

Following this cursory introduction, the play turns to the Massacre itself. Joan of Navarre is Marlowe’s first victim—via a pair of poisoned gloves—but the Admiral’s death in scene five is “officially” the first death in the Massacre as he is stabbed and his body thrown into the street per the Guise’s command. The next victim is a preacher—Loreine—“perhaps a reflection of the Elizabethan government’s active pursuit of Catholic priests,” followed by Seroune, and then the scholar Ramus.\(^{55}\)

As Maryann Feola notes, “it is the attack on Peter Ramus, the most extended Huguenot murder in the play, that forms the heart of Marlowe’s satire of the tension between the reformed and the unreformed.”\(^{56}\) In the scene, the play joins Ramus in his study, commenting that “I fear the Guisians have pass’d the bridge / And mean once more to menace me” \((MP\ 9.3-4)\). At that moment, his colleague Taleus—a Catholic—bursts into the room, crying, “Fly, Ramus, fly, if thou wilt save thy life!” \((MP\ 9.5)\). Taleus and Ramus thereby serve—as both John Ronald Glenn and Guillory have
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noted—as an example of cross-religious friendship and cooperation. When asked by Gonzago, one of the Guise’s followers, “What art thou?” (MP 9.13), Taleus replies with a courageous assertion of Christian ecumenism: “I am as Ramus is, a Christian” (MP 9.14). Retes (another of the Guise’s followers) explains that Taleus “is a Catholic” and they should “let him go” (MP 9.15), and Taleus escapes, although Ramus is not so fortunate.

The philosopher begs Anjoy to give him a moment before death, and uses it to make a final statement on the nature of philosophy, linking the French Aristotelian scholars—“blockish Sorbonnists”—to Faustian overreach: “the blockish Sorbonnists / Attribute as much unto their works / As to the service of the eternal God” (MP 9.50-52). Following this, the Guise orders his death, as much, Feola suggests, for his unconventional philosophy as his Protestant theology. Interestingly, Marlowe’s Ramian connection is quite personal: Ramus was living in Paris (and was killed during) the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre in 1572 at the same time as Sir Philip Sidney, a Ramian supporter; Ramus had met with Sidney’s father-in-law, the Elizabethan spymaster Sir Francis Walsingham (who was also, notes Glenn, “cousin of Marlowe’s patron Thomas Walsingham”), twice in 1571; Ramus was also a friend and colleague of the Elizabethan “Arch-Conjuror” John Dee who associated with Sidney, Northumberland, Raleigh, and other members of the School of Night; and Marlowe studied Ramist logic at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in 1581, which heavily “shaped Faustus’s rhetorical method” in Doctor Faustus.

Ramus’s function in the play, then, is two-fold. First, the scene clarifies that the religious distinction between Catholic and Protestant need not culminate in violence; Ramus and Taleus serve as a microcosm meant to demonstrate the possibility of international (as well as personal) cooperation across religious lines. Secondly, and

57 Glenn, 371-372; Guillory, 695.
58 Feola, 10.
59 Glenn, 368-369; Parry, 20; Pinciss, 254.
perhaps more importantly, the scene of Ramus’s death showcases the inevitably tragic consequences of mingling politics and religion. As Glenn notes,

Ramus was a conscientious Protestant whose break with the Roman Church cost his career and ultimately his life. Yet, in his attitude toward religion there was a certain tolerant independence distinguishing him from the Protestants Marlowe called “Hypocriticall asses.” He abandoned the Catholic Church because of its authoritarianism and refusal to correct abuses, but he never fully accepted the Geneva church, in which similar tendencies were increasingly visible.⁶⁰

Similarly, Marlowe’s inclusion of Ramus’s death in *Massacre at Paris* criticizes the authoritarianism of not only the Catholic Church (qua the Guise), but also the religiously-motivated anti-Catholic policies of the Elizabethan government, which just as militantly (if more surreptitiously) purged its colleges—Oxford and Marlowe’s own Cambridge—of religious dissidents as the Guise in this scene.

After Ramus’s death, the Guise orders the extermination of “a hundred Protestants / Which we have chas’d into the river Seine” (*MP* 9.56-57):

```
GUISE My Lord of Anjoy, there are a hundred Protestants
Which we have chas’d into the river Seine
That swim about and so preserve their lives:
How may we do? I fear me they will live.
DUMAINE Go place some men upon the bridge
With bows and darts to shoot at them they see,
And sink them in the river as they swim. (*MP* 9.56-62)
```

Next, the Guise and his men kill the two tutors to Prince Condy, followed by “five or six Protestants with books” (*MP* 12.0.1). The demographics of Marlowe’s Massacre victims, those in the Seine aside, are noteworthy: the vast majority are either scholars or clergy.⁶¹ Marlowe, as a government agent, held a certain amount of cynicism for both scholars—as those likely to defect to Rheims—and preachers as the counterpart to the Jesuits hunted by Walsingham’s agents, including Marlowe.

It is noteworthy that Marlowe returns to the idea of the “country’s good” following these scenes; at Henry III’s coronation, Lorainne presses Catherine to “insinuate with the King / And tell him that

---
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’tis for his country’s good, / And common profit of religion” (MP 14.57-59). Lorainne’s syntax summons the tenor of the English government’s attempts to secure the loyalty of their noble subjects:

The Cardinal’s language mimics the sentiments contained in the Elizabethan Bond of Association (1584)—requiring Elizabeth’s subjects to defend her with their lives, targeted specifically at Recusants and, particularly, at Mary Queen of Scots, whose death it assured. The Bond, like the Cardinal’s exhortation, prioritized the sovereign not only as the head of the nation, but—as Elizabeth herself reminded Parliament at its closing in 1585—of “the Church, whose overruler God hath made me, whose negligence cannot be excused if any schism or errors heretical were suffered.”

The linkage of prosecutorial language with governmental security would have been intimately familiar not only to Marlowe as an agent, but to anyone in the popular audience familiar with anti-Catholic treatises or sermons.

The play then skips forward more than a decade to the deaths of Henry III and the Guise in 1588-1589, as General Joyeux is killed offstage in retribution for the Massacre, and the Protestants, under the leadership of Navarre, rise up against their erstwhile Catholic oppressors. In scene eighteen, Marlowe makes the play’s first direct reference to England, turning the audience’s view on an ostensibly happier scene of Protestant victory:

  NAVARRE But God, we know, will always put them down That lift themselves against the perfect truth, Which I’ll maintain so long as life doth last, And with the Queen of England join my force To beat the papal monarch from our lands. (MP 18.12-17)

In 1593, the alliance between Elizabeth and Henri IV (Navarre, in the play) was an historical fact, one seemingly celebrated by Marlowe’s characterization here. However, its close proximity to Lorainne’s speech in scene fourteen and its syntactic similarity to both Lorainne and the Guise problematizes this relationship. Furthermore, Penny Roberts explains,

Henry of Navarre was to embrace Catholicism the year after Marlowe is thought to have written the play...It may be argued that Marlowe, anticipating the conversion which was widely rumoured, was demonstrating yet again the cynical use of religion as a cloak for personal political gain.
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As I have argued elsewhere, if “Marlowe was aware of these rumors, then his mitigation of Navarre’s heroism makes sense.”\textsuperscript{64} Yet Henry III’s sudden turn against the Guise further complicates Navarre’s heroism by linking him—through Henry III—to the Guise and his Catholic faction.\textsuperscript{65}

When he openly rejects the Guise, Henry III specifically invokes his enemy’s allegiance to the Pope and Spain through the failed Armada invasion of England:

\begin{verbatim}
KING HENRY This is the traitor that hath spent my gold
In making foreign wars and civil broils.
Did he not draw a sort of English priests
From Douai to the seminary at Rheims
To hatch forth treason ’gainst their natural Queen?
Did he not cause the King of Spain’s huge fleet
To threaten England and to menace me? (MP 21.99-105)
\end{verbatim}

For Elizabethans—as for most of Europe in the period—religion and politics were inextricably intertwined, and the “dichotomization of loyalty to religion verses loyalty to the state was commonplace.”\textsuperscript{66}

In Socinian doctrine, however, church and state were kept separate, and religious toleration—even to the point where proselytization was not actively encouraged—formed an essential part of the Polish Brethren’s teachings. Henry’s speech, by aligning nation and religion, illustrates the negative consequences of state religion, just as the fact that the Guise acted “for the Pope’s sake” (\textit{MP} 14.23) makes him a “traitor to the crown of France” (\textit{MP} 14.21) and echoes official English policy.

In the final scene of the play, Henry is stabbed by a Jacobin Friar in retaliation for the deaths of Guise and Lorraine. Henry’s dying proclamation acts as much as a warning to the Elizabethan government as it is an historical observation of France:

\begin{verbatim}
KING HENRY Tell her, for all this, that I hope to live,
Which if I do, the papal monarch goes
To wrack, and antichristian kingdom falls.
These bloody hands shall tear his triple crown
And fire accursed Rome about his ears.
I’ll fire his crazed buildings, and incense
\end{verbatim}
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The papal towers to kiss the holy earth.
Navarre, give me thy hand: I here do swear
To ruinate that wicked Church of Rome
That hatcheth up such bloody practices,
And here protest eternal love to thee,
And to the Queen of England specially,
Whom God hath bless’d for hating papistry. (MP 24.57-69)

That Henry’s last words are to Elizabeth through her Agent—“Salute the Queen of England in my name, / And tell her, Henry dies her faithful friend” (MP 24.104-105)—further suggests the parallelism between French and English religious policies, while “The injection of an Anglo-Gallic alliance thus serves as yet another indication of Marlowe’s distrust of the Elizabethan government’s religious policy.” 67 Similarly, Matthew Martin argues that Marlowe’s audience, who would have embraced the propaganda of the Elizabethan government, was being asked “to recognize its own complicity in the historical trauma [the play] dramatizes.” 68 If the audience were complicit in the religiously-motivated violence perpetrated (and perpetuated) by the government, then Marlowe, an agent of that very same government, was far more than merely “complicit.”

In the play’s final scene, Marlowe acknowledges this role through the presence of the unnamed English Agent, present for Henry III’s death. Although there are some who “suggest that the Agent is meant to be Marlowe” himself, it is more historically accurate to argue that the Agent is in fact meant to be Marlowe’s spymaster, Walsingham, who was in residence in Paris as Ambassador to France at the time of the Massacre, and who was personally responsible for rescuing multiple English and French Protestants. 69

The final lines—Navarre’s promise that “Rome and all those popish prelates there / Shall curse the time that e’er Navarre was king / And rul’d in France by Henry’s fatal death” (MP 24.109-111)—end the play with a promise to continue the same violence with which it began. Even more importantly, this profession rings hollow when we consider that between 1589 and 1598—when Marlowe himself was an active agent moving between France, England, and the
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Netherlands—Henri struggled to hold on to the crown, failing to recapture Paris from Catholic forces in 1591 and losing Rouen in 1592, finally abjuring Protestantism on July 24, 1593, just over six months after Marlowe’s play appeared at the Rose and under three months after Marlowe himself met a violent end.70

It can therefore come as no surprise that Marlowe’s plays are deeply cynical about religion and the role of faith in state-sanctioned (and perpetrated) violence. Although in his work Marlowe does not explicitly demand a separation of church and state, his drama nevertheless makes clear the potential for extreme violence contained in a theocratic system. Although he does not explicitly say so, the alternative offered by Socinian doctrine—the division of the spiritual and political spheres, and religious tolerance—is nevertheless painfully clear. For Marlowe—who would be dead at the hands of a fellow-spy within six months of Massacre at Paris’s appearance at the Rose—religion, or, more specifically, religiously-motivated violence, was central to both life and work. From Canterbury where he was born to Cambridge, Rheims, the Netherlands, and London, the conflict between Catholic and Protestant formed the essential backdrop to his careers as both spy and playwright. Perhaps because of his experience with the former, Marlowe came to be jaded by both religion and politics, revealing in the latter—particularly Doctor Faustus and Massacre at Paris—a deeply-felt anger at intolerance and religious persecution, whether abroad or at the hands of his own government.
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Apocalypse Then, Apocalypse Now:
Rethinking Joan of Arc in the Twenty-First Century

Timothy M. Thibodeau
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Joan of Arc has stood alone among legendary figures of the Middle Ages in her capacity to be appropriated and employed for a host of modern noble causes. However, a fresh examination of Joan’s words and deeds reveals that her aims and objectives were not the universal “greater goods” of modern activists who have used her story to craft their own narratives. I propose that Joan’s continued attractiveness as a cultural icon now faces two major obstacles. First, in the wake of the rapid secularization of modern western society and the evolution of social mores related to gender identity and sexuality, the piously motivated gender-bending career of this androgynous “virgin crusader” might lose its popular appeal. Second, in the post-9/11 world of global terrorism, the apocalyptic nature of Joan’s political agenda and her passionate call to arms are especially problematic. The modern geopolitical landscape is plagued with religiously inspired acts of terror and sectarian violence. Joan’s conflation of her political agenda with God’s will, and the violent rhetoric and methods that she used to accomplish her mission can no longer reasonably serve as a guide for cultural or political discourse, either in domestic or international politics.¹

Introduction

No figure from late medieval European history has generated as much modern popular interest, scholarly ink and as many cinematic portrayals as the illiterate “Maid of Lorraine,” Joan of Arc.² A key player in the final stages of the Hundred Years War (1337-1453),

1 A version of this article was presented at the New York State Association of European Historians Conference at the State University of New York, Albany (October, 2016).

2 In her own tongue, her name was Jhenne, Jehanne or Jhanette. Joan also called herself “la Pucelle” (“The Maid”). As Warner notes, pucelle is a complex term denoting both “virginity” and “nubility.” Warner, Joan of Arc, 22-23.
Joan’s short yet spectacular life (1412-1431) provides rich opportunities to analyze the conflicts of social class, gender identity and religious conformity that her career embodied. As Robin Blaetz has shown in her trenchant analysis of the many “faces” and “uses” of Joan, the martyred saint has had a long afterlife as a cultural icon and as the dramatic subject of the stage and screen. In the last century, Joan has also found her rightful place in the serious and critical scholarship of academia.

This article is a reflection upon my recent experiences teaching a new class titled, “Joan of Arc: Myth, History and Representation.” This undergraduate course primarily focuses on Joan’s portrayal in the medium of mainstream film, since as with most historic figures, this is how she is primarily known to modern audiences. The first part of the semester is dedicated to a rigorous historical inquiry into the travails of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century France and the devastation of the Hundred Years War that framed Joan’s brief career and fueled her anti-English passion. The second half of the semester

3 The bibliography for Joan of Arc studies is voluminous and multilingual. This article is directed to a broad audience, including non-specialists in the field of medieval studies. I have mostly limited my references to texts that are readily available in English or translation.


5 David Byrne, the lead singer of the pop band, The Talking Heads, recently premiered a rock opera called, “Joan of Arc: Into the Fire,” in March of 2017. This opera features a spirited performance by Jo Lampert, who plays the musical role of Joan (see note 71). Ron Maxwell, director of the well-known Civil War films, Gettysburg (1993) and Gods and Generals (2003), has been laboring on an epic Joan of Arc trilogy for more than two decades. His film has the working title, Joan of Arc: Virgin Warrior. As of this writing, it is difficult to find any current information on the state of this project (Maxwell reportedly has had difficulty funding it).

6 There is also a vast religiously focused literature on Joan. In this article I generally have not included references to works whose primary purpose is the cultivation of personal piety, devotion or spirituality.
focuses on the historical record of Joan’s life, her enduring popularity as a cultural icon and her portrayal in select mainstream dramas. Since she is the most depicted female character in the history of cinema, I narrowed the time frame and selected some of the best known film portrayals of Joan, beginning with Carl Theodor Dreyer’s classic silent movie, *La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc* (1928), and ending with the most recent work of Philippe Ramos, *Jeanne Captive* (2011).

As I researched this course, I began to wonder if the bloody historical events of the early twenty-first century would force a paradigm shift in the popular image of Joan as the heroic cultural icon who has been appropriated for a number of seemingly noble causes since the end of the nineteenth century. Beginning with the catastrophic terrorist attacks on U.S. soil on September 11, 2001, there has been a new wave of religiously motivated violence on a global scale that has yielded disturbing levels of “divinely inspired” bloodshed and mass killing. In the past few years, it has become a tragically familiar media narrative that terrorists wielding assault rifles, suicide

---

7 Dreyer’s silent film, which features the legendary performance of Maria Falconetti, is one of the greatest films (silent or spoken) of the twentieth century. Focusing on the trial and death of Joan, it combines attention to historical detail with the highest levels of spiritual and aesthetic discourse. As David Bordwell argues, Dreyer’s movie played a critical role “in changing people’s attitudes about cinema, particularly because of its decisive demonstration that film could be an art in its own right,” and Dreyer’s film “convincing many viewers that cinema could be intellectually respectable.” Bordwell, *Filmguide to La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc*; cited by Harty, “Jeanne au Cinéma,” in *Fresh Verdicts on Joan*, 245. Most scholars and film critics concur that Luc Besson’s well-known film, *The Messenger* (1999), features one of the worst interpretations of Joan, here played by Besson’s wife, Milla Jovovich. For a critical assessment of the most famous Joan movies, including Dreyer’s and Besson’s, see Finke and Shichtman, “The Politics of Hagiography: Joan of Arc on the Screen,” *Cinematic Illuminations*, 109-155.

8 The most recent portrayal of Joan in a mainstream drama is by Clémence Poésy. Directed by Philippe Ramos, *Jeanne Captive* (2011) subtly positions itself in the post-9/11 world of Joan studies. Far from being a religiously inspired icon of female courage and fortitude, Poésy’s Joan appears to be a despondent, suicidal girl who is driven to despair by her captivity. Aside from a dramatic opening, the film loses its focus early on and meanders without any convincing spiritual or aesthetic vision.

9 The connection between self-proclaimed jihadists who commit these atrocities and mainstream Islam is a hotly disputed topic. Many of the victims of these terror attacks are themselves Muslims, living in predominantly Muslim countries that are war-torn or racked with political, cultural, and sectarian strife. A recent, nuanced analysis of the roots of modern terrorism is Juergensmeyer, *Terror in the Mind of God*. 

---
vests, or knives shout, “God is great,” and then unleash their apocalyptic violence on victims whom they identify as the enemies of their righteous cause. The terrorists also invariably perish in the carnage they create, achieving the status of martyrdom in the eyes of their sympathizers. It is a horrifying irony that two ISIS-inspired terrorists beheaded eighty-four-year-old Roman Catholic priest Jacques Hamel while he was celebrating Mass in Rouen on July 26, 2016. His murder took place in the very city where Joan of Arc was burned at the stake almost six centuries ago.

Mindful of these terrifying events, I began to reflect critically upon the popularly accepted representation of Joan as the divinely guided, courageous warrior for a noble cause who met an unjust, tragic end. Will this image survive the renewed scrutiny of historians who will compare recent acts of religiously inspired violence to Joan’s fanatical quest to tip the scales of history? While I cannot offer a definitive answer to this question, I can put forth some challenges for future research and offer some exploratory insights into where Joan studies might collide with the social, cultural and religious realities of the early twenty-first century.

I propose that Joan’s continued attractiveness as a cultural icon now faces two major obstacles. First, in the wake of the rapid secularization of modern western society and the evolution of social mores related to gender identity and sexuality, the piously motivated gender-bending career of this androgynous “virgin crusader” might lose its popular appeal. Second, in the post-9/11 world of global terrorism, the apocalyptic nature of Joan’s political agenda and her passionate call to arms are especially problematic. The modern geopolitical landscape is plagued with religiously inspired acts of terror and sectarian violence. Joan’s conflation of her political agenda with God’s

10 For a good recent attempt to understand western (i.e., European and American) conceptions of warfare and how they are linked to Christian theories of regenerative violence and holy war, see Buc, Holy War, Martyrdom, and Terror. A compelling study of the religious roots of modern terrorism can be found in Lincoln, Holy Terror: Thinking About Religion After September 11. But a very different approach to this subject is taken by best-selling author Armstrong, Fields of Blood: Religion and the History of Violence. Armstrong argues against the assumption that religion is the root cause of modern violence.
will, and the violent rhetoric and methods she used to accomplish her mission can no longer reasonably serve as a guide for cultural or political discourse, either in domestic or international politics.  

The Life and Death of Joan

The volume of academic literature related to Joan is staggering, covering a variety interconnected topics: the Hundred Years War; the life of Joan; her military exploits; and her trial, including the surviving records of her original trial in 1431, and the so-called “nullification trial” that exonerated her in 1456. While scholars continue to debate various aspects of Joan’s career, the basic facts of her brief and tumultuous life are not in dispute. Born to a peasant family in Domrémy (1412), Joan had a conventional childhood

11 The stunning, decisive victory of political newcomer Emmanuel Macron in the French presidential election (May, 2017) serves as an example of the futility of using Joan as a political rallying point. The opponent whom Macron defeated, the ultra right Marine Le Pen, ran on a platform of ardent French nationalism, and she frequently deployed stadium-sized images of Joan of Arc at campaign rallies.

12 One of the most basic histories of the war is Seward, The Hundred Years War. For a more recent, exhaustive treatment, one should consult Villalon and Kagay, The Hundred Years War: A Wider Focus. One cannot adequately grasp Joan’s career without placing it within the context of Henry V’s (r. 1413-1422) renewal of the war and his famous, bloody victories on French soil. See, for example, Barker, Agincourt: Henry V and the Battle That Made England. The most complete biography of this English king is Allmand, Henry V.

13 Castor, Joan of Arc. Castor’s new biography has become one of the best known interpretations of the life of Joan in the English language. But another recent work that should be consulted is Taylor, The Virgin Warrior. The pioneering work of Pernoud also continues to be relevant: Pernoud and Clin, Joan of Arc: Her Story. Though dated, Warner’s Joan of Arc is still an extremely valuable resource, presenting both a traditional biography and an analysis of Joan’s cultural significance. For a collection of important essays on various aspects of Joan’s life, see Wood and Wheeler, Fresh Verdicts on Joan of Arc. For an analysis of Joan’s relationship with the political and ecclesial structures of France and England, see Wood, Joan of Arc and Richard III.

14 DeVries, “A Woman as Leader of Men: Joan of Arc’s Military Career,” in Fresh Verdicts on Joan, 3-18; DeVries, Joan of Arc: A Military Leader.

15 The original Latin manuscripts were first edited into a modern form by Quicherat, Procès de condamnation de Jeanne d’Arc. For the nullification trial, see Pernoud, The Retrial of Joan of Arc.
until around the age of twelve or thirteen, when she began to have visions and “hear voices” from God.\textsuperscript{16} She claimed that these voices implored her to go to the exiled and disinherited Dauphin,\textsuperscript{17} Charles Valois (1403-1461), with the message that he was the rightful king of France. About four years later, Joan abandoned her family and enlisted the help of Robert Baudricourt, the captain of a local garrison loyal to Charles to gain an audience with the Dauphin. She eventually embarked, with an armed escort, on an eleven day journey of several hundred miles that was as unlikely as it was dangerous. Joan’s persistence led to a memorable audience with Charles in Chinon. Joan disappeared for a private meeting with him and impressed the Dauphin with some mysterious revelation about his legitimate right to the throne. Soon thereafter, she had to submit to a gynecological exam to prove her virginity, and then she was subjected to intense questioning by learned theologians in Poitiers\textsuperscript{18} to prove her orthodoxy. Only then was she allowed to accompany an army that would march with her to liberate Orléans.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16} Sullivan makes a convincing case for ambiguity on the part of Joan on the precise nature of her visions and voices. She spoke of receiving voices “from God” and declared herself to be “God’s messenger” early in her career. It was only during her condemnation trial that her inquisitors pushed her into specificity on the identity of her visions and voices, that they came from Saints Margaret, Catherine, and Michael. Margaret of Antioch (c. 289-304) and Catherine of Alexandria (c. 287-305) are apocryphal saints that were honored in the medieval Church as virgin martyrs who rebuffed marriage proposals by pagan Romans. St. Michael is the angelic warrior who was patron of the famous Norman abbey that was never captured by the English in the Hundred Years War, Le Mont St. Michel. Sullivan, “I Do Not Name to You The Voice of St. Michael,” in \textit{Fresh Verdicts on Joan}, 85-111. The cult of all of these saints was extremely popular and widespread in Joan’s time. See Warner, \textit{Joan of Arc}, 132-133.

\textsuperscript{17} The French word, \textit{Dauphin}, means “dolphin” in English and was the term used to designate the heir to the French throne, beginning in the mid-fourteenth century. Charles the Wise (r. 1364-1380) was the first crown prince to use that designation before he became king. The heraldic symbol of the crown prince was a dolphin and the fleur-de-lis, the traditional symbol of the French monarchy.

\textsuperscript{18} The interrogations of Joan at Poitiers were lengthy and detailed, lasting about three weeks (March-April, 1429). She referred to the answers that she gave in Poitiers several times during her condemnation trial a few years later. Regrettably, this important record, referred to as the “Book of Poitiers,” has not survived. It was likely destroyed after Joan was convicted of heresy and executed. Wood believes that Charles VII himself might have been behind its destruction since Joan’s original “mission” might have only referred to the liberation of Orléans, not his coronation in Reims. Wood, “Joan of Arc’s Mission and the Lost Record of Her Interrogation at Poitiers,” in \textit{Fresh Verdicts on Joan}, 19-29. See also Fraiali, \textit{Joan of Arc: The Early Debate}, 45-54.

\textsuperscript{19} This examination may have been designed not only to determine her virginity but her gender as well. If she had been found not to be a female virgin, as she claimed, her “visions” would have been immediately discredited in the eyes of Charles’ court.
Convinced of her rectitude, orthodoxy and virginity, the Dauphin and his court equipped her with armor, a horse, a banner that she designed and a sword. In May of 1429, “The Maid of Lorraine” lifted the seven-month siege of Orléans, within about ten days of her arrival. And despite being seriously wounded by an arrow from a crossbow, the seventeen-year-old Joan celebrated an unlikely victory over the English army, which to date had scored multiple lopsided victories over the demoralized French. Within a few months, she made the dangerous trek with the Dauphin through enemy occupied territory to the cathedral of Reims, the traditional site for the consecration of French monarchs.20 Dressed in a full suit of armor, clutching her famous banner, and armed with her sword, she witnessed his solemn coronation as King Charles VII, on July 17, 1429. Joan was the only female in the retinue who stood in the immediate presence of the king when he was crowned. She had reached the apogee of her career.

Joan’s impatience with the slow pace of Charles VII’s diplomacy with the Burgundians and English soon led her to make impetuous decisions that cost her life. Having gained the crown of France, the new Valois king seemed to have lost all interest in continuing the war; he would rather engage in subtle negotiations than wield a sword. But the fact that Charles lived in exile from his capital city of Paris, which was occupied by his Burgundian enemies, was more than Joan could bear. In her divinely sanctioned zeal to drive every last Englishman from France,21 Joan continued to prosecute her own

20 According to legend, this cathedral was also the original site of the baptism (496) of the first Catholic Merovingian King of France, Clovis (r. 481-509). The bishop who baptized him was St. Remigius (also known as Remi or Remy). The cathedral also possessed the Holy Ampulla, a glass vial that contained holy oil used for the consecration of French kings since the twelfth century.

21 Joan’s deep animosity towards the English and Burgundians must be situated within the full context of the Hundred Years War. This conflict produced its own share of atrocities against civilians and non-combatants by marauding English and Burgundian armies. As Seward notes, English commanders often used the tactics of “total warfare” to bend the will of the French monarchy and princes of the blood, whom they could not always engage in the open field of battle. The French term, chevauchée, describes a scorched earth policy employed by English commanders that led to the burning of villages, the pillaging of churches and food stores, and the rape and murder of civilians. Such actions were done in violation of medieval Christian codes of warfare and certainly would qualify as war crimes in any modern western tribunal. Joan’s own village had been subjected to such a terror raid by the Burgundians in 1428. Seward, The Hundred Years War, 84-85; 172-179.
war with a dwindling army, while her enemies in the King’s court grew in strength. She led an embarrassing, failed siege of Paris in which she was seriously wounded, and suffered a very public and humiliating defeat (September 3-8, 1429).\(^{22}\)

Joan was eventually captured by the Burgundians, after making another disastrous calculation, when she attempted to lift the siege of Compiègne (May 23, 1430). Her defeat and imprisonment took the luster off Joan’s brief military career and allowed her enemies to challenge the miraculous nature of her political claims and military exploits.\(^{23}\) The pattern of catastrophic military failure after the “Miracle of Orléans” now embarrassed the Valois court and undermined her credibility as God’s Messenger. When she was captured, Joan may have had the naïve belief that she was a prisoner of war, and that she was therefore entitled to some sort of ransom.\(^{24}\) But she was eventually abandoned by the man whom she had made king, Charles VII. When the Burgundian Duke, Philip the Good sold Joan to the English,\(^{25}\) she must have realized that she was not being held hostage as a soldier but would face inquisitorial justice in a politically motivated English trial.

From January until May of 1431, Joan stood before an ecclesiastical tribunal in the Norman city of Rouen. After months of inhumane

\(^{22}\) This outcome was all too predictable since Charles VII had reluctantly given her a nominal army and only one day to capture a large, heavily fortified city. Known for his weakness and vacillation, Charles was, however, rightly concerned that he lacked the financial and logistical resources to mount a successful campaign against the capital city.

\(^{23}\) As Gordon perceptively notes, Joan spent more time in prison than she did as a soldier. Gordon, Joan of Arc, xxi.

\(^{24}\) Joan was initially held by the Burgundians in Beaurevoir Castle. She made several attempts to escape, including a jump of more than seventy feet from a castle tower. This incident is the opening scene of Philippe Ramos’ movie, Jeanne Captive (2011). It is something of a miracle that she did not die from that fall. It is also possible that this was a failed suicide attempt (as Ramos’ movie implies). When she recovered, Joan was then moved to the town of Arras and transferred from the care of Jean de Luxembourg (a member of Philip’s council) to the English when they delivered payment for her.

\(^{25}\) Philip had little reason to show Joan any mercy since the Dauphin whom she helped crown as Charles VII was complicit in the treacherous and brutal murder (1419) of his father, John the Fearless, the previous Duke of Burgundy.
confinement and relentless interrogation, Joan was convicted of heresy and apostasy. The penalty was death by burning at the stake. Before the sentence could be carried out, her chief inquisitor, bishop Pierre Cauchon of Beauvais (1371-1442), gave her one last chance to recant and put her mark on a formal statement of abjuration. This she did on May 24, renouncing her visions and promising to wear women’s clothes.\(^{26}\) She now received a life sentence in prison. This twist of fate must have enraged the English. When they brought her back to her cell, they supposedly stripped her of her female garments and subjected her to some form of sexual abuse. Four days later, Joan was found wearing the men’s clothing that the English had thrown in her cell after stripping her of her dress. She then told Cauchon that she regretted the abjuration; that in rejecting her “voices” she had in effect damned herself to save her life.\(^{27}\) Cauchon was now compelled to put her to the fire. According to contemporary estimates, as many as eight-hundred English soldiers witnessed her horrific execution on May 30, 1431. The fire was briefly extinguished so that the crowd could see that her charred, dead body was actually that of a female.\(^{28}\) A rekindled fire obliterated her earthly remains.\(^{29}\)

\(^{26}\) Joan’s abjuration continues to attract rival interpretations. There are a number of possible explanations. They include her fear of being executed in such a horrible fashion, or her being tricked into signing a false statement that promised her better conditions in prison which was later amended with more damning admissions of guilt after she was killed.

\(^{27}\) Pernoud and Clin, *Joan of Arc: Her Story*, 133. Joan held Cauchon personally accountable for the abuse she endured at the hands of the English after her abjuration and her condemnation to the stake. A Dominican friar named Jean Toutmoillé witnessed the last conversation she had with Cauchon, where she declared: “Bishop, I die because of you.” Pernoud, 134.

\(^{28}\) Meltzer sees this final degradation of Joan’s body as emblematic of her entire public life: “No part of her body or mind, in other words, was safe from the eyes and hands of the authorities. It is as if her *occulta*—mental and physical—were constantly being dragged into the light and violated…” Meltzer, *For Fear of the Fire*, 201.

\(^{29}\) A box of ashes found in Paris in 1867 was revered as containing relics of Joan’s burning in Rouen; the box was transferred to Châlons in 1876 and became an important part of the memorabilia of the Joan of Arc museum. But DNA testing in 2006-2007 proved that the ashes belonged to an Egyptian who was mummified almost 2,000 years before Joan was born. Coll, “How St. Joan of Arc Was Sniffed Out.”
How Joan died is as important if not more important than how she lived. Her dying words, as a cross was thrust above the smoke and flames of her pyre—“Jesus! Jesus!”—even gave pause and elicited sympathy from some of her enemies who had eagerly sought her death. As one eyewitness at her nullification trial recalled, “[O]nce in the fire she cried out six times and more, ‘Jesus!’ and even with her last breath she called out so loudly on Jesus that all those present could hear her; almost everyone wept with pity.”

Her piercing cries of faith and her reduction to ashes after her tragic death began a process of backformation that soon rehabilitated her from condemned heretic to martyred saint. Joan’s final earthly moments—following a well established trope in medieval hagiography—were turned into a lasting testimony of the purity and righteousness of her entire short life, and inspired the French historian Jules Michelet to view her as a female Christ figure.

Having witnessed her pitiable end and the genuine sorrow felt by the throng that watched her die, Joan’s chief prosecutor and judge, Pierre Cauchon, still seemed confident that he followed proper procedure and rendered a just verdict at her trial. To that end, he ordered the creation of five official copies of its transcript (three of which survive to this day in Paris). In fact, her trial is one of the best documented legal proceedings in all of medieval history.

30 Pernoud, _The Retrial of Joan of Arc_, 252. Multiple eyewitnesses who testified for the nullification tribunal remembered the details of her death in roughly the same way. Even her executioner declared, later that day, that he feared that he had damned himself to hell. Pernoud and Clin, _Joan of Arc. Her Story_, 136.

31 Meltzer, _For Fear of the Fire_, 202. Astell provides a detailed analysis of 19th-century literary reconstructions of Joan in her chapter on Mark Twain’s novel, _Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc_ (1896). She links Twain’s vision of Joan to Michelet’s earlier work from 1841. Astell, _Joan of Arc and Sacrificial Authorship_, 77-108.

32 It is important to note that Cauchon had a long history of service to the English monarchy that preceded Joan’s trial. And Joan’s successes threatened to undo all of the work Cauchon had done to establish a lasting peace between the English and the French. For example, he helped to negotiate the Treaty of Troyes (1420), which arranged a marriage between the French princess, Catherine Valois and Henry V of England. Their son, Henry VI, would then be King of both England and France and the Dauphin Charles would be formally disinherited. But the death of Henry V, and Catherine’s father, Charles VI (both in 1422), provided an opening for the Dauphin to pursue his claim to the crown of France.
But despite the meticulous care with legal protocol and the scrupulous record keeping of Cauchon, Joan’s heresy trial has long been viewed by the general public as one of the greatest miscarriages of justice in western history. As her own mother Isabelle Romée lamented in her testimony for Joan’s nullification trial, Cauchon’s inquisition was a “perfidious, violent and iniquitous trial, without shadow of right.”33 The depredations and abuses of her imprisonment, the violation of the seal of her confession to a priest, the lack of bona fide legal counsel during the proceedings and the likelihood that she was sexually assaulted by her English captors shortly before her death cast a long shadow over the whole sordid affair in Rouen.

Modern scholars continue to debate the legal validity of the process to which Joan was subjected. In addressing some of those criticisms, Daniel Hobbins argues that the trial was anything but a slipshod affair and that Cauchon was exceptionally fastidious with following canonical procedure.34 On the other hand, Henry Ansgar Kelly constructs a compelling argument that Cauchon went out of his way to create the appearance of an impartial process: “He disguised the fact that he and his English paymasters were mortal enemies of Joan, and that he did not allow her any counsel or support from her allies.”35 But even if the impossible had happened—that Joan was found not guilty by Cauchon’s inquisition—the English would have immediately taken possession of her and put her to death.

33 In perhaps the most moving episode of the nullification inquiry, Joan’s mother Isabelle Romée (1377-1458) made the journey to Paris with a group of citizens from Orléans to address a delegation of prelates who represented the pope. As Regine Pernoud describes it, on November 7, 1455, this elderly peasant moved the crowd to pity with her words. She described her daughter’s impeccable piety and orthodoxy as a child and then declared that “certain enemies…betrayed her in a trial concerning the Faith, and…without any aid given to her innocence in a perfidious, violent and iniquitous trial, without shadow of right…they condemned her in a damnable and criminal fashion and made her die most cruelly by fire.” Pernoud and Clin, Joan of Arc: Her Story, 156-157.

34 Hobbins, The Trial of Joan of Arc, 18-19. Much to the anger of the English, Cauchon allowed Joan to recant and face a sentence of life in prison.

When a lasting peace was made (1435) between Charles VII and his nemesis the Duke of Burgundy, and the political fortunes of the English went into a downward spiral, Joan’s official “rehabilitation” by a papally sanctioned ecclesiastical tribunal (1449-1456) was never in question. The original sentence of Cauchon and his associates was nullified in Paris in 1456. However, the nullification trial made no explicit theological judgment on Joan’s voices, visions or clothing. It simply vacated the original verdict on mostly procedural grounds. By this point, the long and bloody saga of the Hundred Years War had already come to an end with the English capitulation of Bordeaux (1453). Had Joan been alive at the official conclusion of the war, she would have been about forty-one years old. More than five centuries later, the Roman Catholic Church solemnly declared her a saint (a holy virgin, but not martyr) on May 9, 1920.\(^{36}\)

**Interpreting Joan**

After reading through the transcript of Joan’s trial, as well as some of the surviving letters that she dictated, many of my students are skeptical about the Vatican’s declaration of her “sanctity;” instead, many question her sanity.\(^{37}\) While rightly shocked by her treatment in captivity and the manner of her death, many of them think that Joan was on some level delusional, especially when she claimed that she could somehow know the will of God.\(^{38}\) Others wonder if she became a victim of her own fantasy and celebrity, which propelled

---

36 For an excellent synopsis of the political and cultural forces that led to Joan’s eventual canonization, see Warner, *Joan of Arc*, 237-275. For a meticulous analysis of the documents related to Joan’s canonization and the forceful negative arguments made by its opponents, see Kelly, “Joan of Arc’s Last Trial: The Attack of the Devil’s Advocates,” in *Fresh Verdicts on Joan*, 235-236.

37 Meltzer shows how fruitless the attempts to provide a medical diagnosis of Joan have been in academic literature. Some have been tempted to ascribe her voices to the auditory and visual hallucinations of schizophrenia, but aside from her description of voices and visions at her trial, there is nothing in her biography or the testimony of those who knew her that offers any convincing evidence to support such a claim. Meltzer, *For Fear of the Fire*, 158, n. 61.

38 Article 33 of the Ordinary Trial states: “Joan presumptuously and rashly boasted and boasts that she knows the future, and that she foretold past events, and present events that are secret or hidden. Thus she attributes to herself—a simple and untaught creature—what belongs only to divinity.” Hobbins, *The Trial of Joan of Arc*, 138.
her from the obscure margins of medieval society (as an illiterate, adolescent female peasant) to the horses, weapons, battlefields and splendid dining halls of the aristocratic male elite. Perhaps the “fifteen minutes of fame” of the virgin liberator of France had gotten out of hand. Did Joan become a prisoner of her own fable (both figuratively and then literally); did she evolve into a vain narcissist or religiously inspired megalomaniac? Conclusive answers to such questions continue to elude the modern scholar.

As we close out the second decade of the twenty-first century, it is hard to imagine that there is really anything “new” to be said about the historical documentary record of Joan’s brief appearance on the stage of French history. And yet as an icon or artifact that has been manipulated and refabricated by pop culture and the mass media, Joan continues to command our attention. The traumatic circumstances of her trial and death have naturally inspired modern proponents of various noble causes to appropriate Joan as an icon of sanctity and heroic struggle for their own righteous agendas. She has therefore been deployed for almost every conceivable marketing campaign in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century: the crusader for temperance; the poster girl for recruiting Americans for the First World War; the patriotic symbol of French nationalism in WWI and WWII; the proto-feminist icon who paved the way for women’s rights; the virgin Catholic saint who suffered a martyr’s

39 In her lifetime Joan certainly had her detractors, but also she was ardently supported by such intellectual luminaries as Jean Gerson (1363-1429) and Christine de Pisan (1364-1430), who wrote impassioned defenses of the validity of her mission. For an excellent analysis of the contemporary literature of that sort, see Fraioli, Joan of Arc: The Early Debate.

40 Wood says as much in a capacious collection of essays that he helped edit. Wood and Wheeler, Fresh Verdicts on Joan of Arc, ix. Recent biographies of Joan offer new analytical insights but no new documentary materials.

41 The most broad-ranging analysis is by Robin Blaetz, Visions of the Maid (2001). See also, Meltzer, For Fear of the Fire (2001). Meltzer offers perceptive analysis of what she identifies as post-modern nostalgia for the sacred as being one of the main drivers of the modern interest in Joan. It is, however, important to note that both of these titles were published in the very year of the spectacular terrorist attacks by Al-Qaeda on U.S. soil. If the authors followed the normal route of academic publishing, these books are reflective of the scholarship and insights of the respective authors that predate publication by two to five years.
death. Recently, even the medical community has adopted Joan as a model for comforting cancer patients.

Joan’s “feminism” has undoubtedly had the most durable presence in the cultural discourse of modern western society. Her short yet dramatic military career, her defiant physical appearance (the haircut and clothing of a male) and her courageous and spirited testimony before a panel of learned male inquisitors have been taken as a protofeminist challenge to the patriarchal power structures of the Church and the State. This simple “reading” of Joan’s life and trial is unquestionably problematic, but not without some merit. The records of her heresy trial reveal the fanatical preoccupation of her inquisitors with Joan’s refusal to dress and behave like a woman, according to the tenets of medieval Christian society. As Susan Schibanoff notes: “Joan’s transvestment was relentlessly scrutinized” by her inquisitors, being mentioned more than thirty times in the trial’s transcript.

In summarizing the opinions of the theologians who grilled her at her trial, and who obsessed over her attire and physical appearance, the transcript states:

>[S]he has insisted on wearing men’s clothes in the fashion of men-at-arms, and she continually wears them for no good reason, against the honor of her sex. This is scandalous and against good and decent manners. She has also cut her hair round. All these things are against the commandments of God in Deuteronomy 22: ‘A woman shall not be clothed with man’s apparel.’ They are against the teaching of the Apostle, when he says that a woman should cover her head.

42 It is important to note that the Vatican did not declare Joan a “martyr” but instead, a “virgin” saint. As the Devil’s advocates pointed out in their case against her canonization, she did not die a martyr. She had signed an abjuration and then changed her mind after hearing her “voices” again. Kelly, “Joan of Arc’s Last Trial: The Attack of the Devil’s Advocates,” in Fresh Verdicts on Joan of Arc, 235-236.

43 Roseman, If Joan of Arc Had Cancer. While Roseman’s work is therapeutic and devotional, she has done considerable historical research into the life and trial of Joan.

44 Schibanoff, “True Lies: Transvestism and Idolatry in the Trial of Joan of Arc,” in Fresh Verdicts on Joan, 33. She cites the important work of Hotchkiss, Clothes Make the Man: Female Cross Dressing.

45 Hobbins, The Trial of Joan of Arc, 173.
This fury over Joan’s attire is all the more remarkable when we consider, as Henry Ansgar Kelly notes, that before her trial, there is no known case of a woman being prosecuted and condemned for cross-dressing in any medieval ecclesiastical court.46

An illiterate teenaged peasant girl who could barely sign her name had created a King of France, had courageously fought with his armies and now stared down over one hundred theologians and canon lawyers who had the power of life and death over her. To the misogynistic culture of medieval Christendom, that was a shock and a subversion of the divinely established natural order.47 It was also the antithesis of the quaint image of the “pious female” who should be engaged in spinning or weaving, mirroring in sacrificial form, the Virgin Mary who silently and obediently tended to the domestic tasks of the good wife and mother.

In the early twentieth century Joan drew the attention of feminist authors precisely because of her defiant gender-bending clothing and behavior.48 As Ann Astell notes, for nineteenth-century writers who were enamored with Joan’s legend—all of whom were male—Joan’s clothing was of little interest, “For they saw her as a definitively feminine heroine, whose beauty and virginity were protectively and temporarily sheathed in steel. For twentieth-century authors, by contrast, Joan’s transvestism is a key issue, even as it was for her judges in Rouen in 1431.”49 That she dressed in male


47   For an analysis of clerical misogyny and its sources, see Brundage, Law, Sex and Christian Society in Medieval Europe; Blamires, Woman Defamed and Woman Defended.

48   This topic is well summarized by Astell, Joan of Arc and Sacrificial Authorship, 147-184. Given the constraints of my article, I have not included references to the use of Joan as a populist, political icon. There is, however, important work being done on that subject. For example, see Orr, American University Studies: The ‘People’s Joan of Arc’.

49   Astell, Joan of Arc, 147. Joan’s squire, Jean d’Aulon, testified at her nullification trial that he had seen her naked body parts, including her breasts and legs, when helping her dress or treating her wounds. He spoke of her physical beauty, while noting that he was never moved by carnal desires. His testimony survives in his original French dialect. See Warner, Joan of Arc, 17. This type of “immodesty” led the Devil’s Advocates in her canonization case to argue against her sainthood. See Kelly, “Joan of Arc’s Last Trial: The Attack of the Devil’s Advocates,” in Fresh Verdicts on Joan, 235-236.
clothing and wore armor on the battlefield is logical; she naturally wore the uniform required of a soldier engaged in combat.

However, Joan’s insistence on wearing male garments and keeping her hair cut short, even when she was not deployed as a soldier, created a conundrum for her inquisitors, as it does for modern scholars. When discussing how her inquisitors confronted Joan about her male attire, Marina Warner observes that “[her clothing] ranked of equal significance for her with the truth of her voices.”

In modernity, Joan’s clothing and appearance have been expressly linked to questions surrounding her sexual identity, a contested topic since Victoria Sackville-West wrote her *Saint Joan of Arc* (1936). Sackville-West suggests that behind Joan’s androgyny is “a potential homosexuality or bisexuality.”

In the most recent academic literature, this debate continues with conflicting exegetical models that have yet to achieve a clear resolution. In my judgment, it is difficult to make declarative statements about Joan’s sexuality. It is, however, quite obvious that she never intended to disguise her gender. She called herself “la Pucelle,” or “the Maid,” who was given a divine message to leave her home and to become a holy warrior for the liberation of “France.” Echoing the conclusions drawn by Susan Schibanoff, I can say with certainty that Joan identified herself as a female virgin who was divinely instructed to dress as a male soldier. This led her accusers to condemn her for idolatry, since as Schibanoff notes, Joan had made herself into a spectacle for false veneration and worship. It remains a pos-

---


51 Sackville-West, *Saint Joan of Arc*.

52 Astell, *Joan of Arc*, 151. As Astell notes, Sackville-West was the first female author to treat the subject of Joan of Arc since the death of Christine de Pisan (c. 1364-1431).

53 “[U]nlike the holy transvestites, who totally disguised their sex, Joan had not concealed her anatomy or other ‘marks’ of her biological femininity. Intentionally or not, she had cross-dressed.” Schibanoff, “True Lies: Transvestism and Idolatry in the Trial of Joan of Arc,” in *Fresh Verdicts on Joan*, 43.

54 Schibanoff, 47.
sibility that there were complex psychological or sexual issues associated with her clothing, physical appearance, or gender identity. But as a historian working from the extant documentary evidence, I think that such precise conclusions about Joan’s sexual identity or sexual preference are beyond our grasp.\textsuperscript{55}

It is easy to see why a medieval female saint with a male haircut, male clothes, brandishing a sword, and who led armies to glorious victories could have an exotic appeal to a Victorian era crusader for temperance,\textsuperscript{56} a suffragette, or a first or second wave feminist. But in the twenty-first century, where gender identity has been reconfigured and redefined to include gay, bisexual and transgendered individuals who are given legal protection in modern democratic societies, can such a “Joan” continue to capture the imagination of a modern audience?\textsuperscript{57}

In the last half century we have also seen prominent females rise to power in ways that were unimaginable when the suffragette movement made its first forays into politics (e.g., the first and second female British Prime Minister, the first female German Chancellor and the official nomination of the first female U.S. presi-

\textsuperscript{55} Hill’s collection of interviews with the actresses who have played Joan (from the 1920’s to the 1980’s) in George Bernard Shaw’s famous play, \textit{Saint Joan} (1923), offers another interesting model for understanding this dilemma. A term that is frequently used by some of these actresses is “tomboy,” to denote a female who wants to associate with the activities of “the boys” of her time. Laurie Kennedy (who played Joan in performances of the play in 1973 and 1976) states: “I was a tomboy when I was a kid. There was something freeing about being one of the guys. I had an older brother and I always wanted to be part of what he was doing rather than what my peers were doing….I would always try and outdo my brothers’ friends, whether we were climbing poles or climbing mountains, and I sometimes did.” Hill, \textit{Playing Joan}, 173.

\textsuperscript{56} In her discussion of Mark Twain’s Joan of Arc novel (1896), Astell quotes the work of Skandera-Trombley, who sees an explicit link between “Twain’s Joan” and the goals of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union: “[Twain’s] Joan of Arc espouses all the ‘pet’ causes of the WCTU: she is an adamant defender of children’s rights, animal rights, dress reform, and temperance. Joan stops the troops from engaging in whoring, drinking, and swearing.” Skandera-Trombley, \textit{Mark Twain in the Company of Women}, 160-161; cited by Astell, \textit{Joan of Arc and Sacrificial Authorship}, 98.

\textsuperscript{57} More than twenty years ago, a transgender activist invoked Joan as an icon for the movement. Feinberg declares, “Joan of Arc suffered the excruciating pain of being burned alive rather than renounce her identity. I know the kind of seething hatred that resulted in her murder—I’ve faced it. But I wish I’d been taught the truth about her life and courage when I was a frightened, confused trans youth. What an inspirational role model—a brilliant transgender peasant teenager leading an army of laborers into battle.” Feinberg, \textit{Transgender Warriors}, 36.
dential candidate). It is hard to imagine that the Romantic idealistic figure of Joan can sustain its exotic counterculturalism or “otherness” in the face such historic changes.

Joan’s improbable military career has also been the focus of considerable popular and scholarly attention, but in the end, what was Joan really fighting for? Can her casus belli serve as a continued source of inspiration for other, “holy causes”? When properly viewed within the context of the Hundred Years War in its entirety, and stripped of Romantic notions of a messianic mission by a virgin saint, Joan’s war becomes a medieval war that had the goal of undoing a century of political and military history in what is now France. While she rehabilitated and crowned a disinherited king in spectacular fashion, in her short career, dissolving the patchwork of fiefdoms and conflicting loyalties of Armagnacs, Englishmen and Burgundians was beyond her grasp. Joan’s crusade also represented a reality that she might not have fully appreciated: the medieval ideal of European Christendom was collapsing and the modern nation-state was being born.

Joan’s self-proclaimed holy war for the King of Heaven was a fight for the creation of a “France” that was devoid of Englishmen, even

58 Of course, there are also numerous examples of women assuming leadership roles in the United States government and military, including deployment in combat.

59 Joan’s military prowess continues to be debated. Seward dismisses the modern claims that Joan turned the tide of the war through her military command. She appears to have been some sort of talisman for French forces, but she played a marginal role on the battlefield. See Seward, The Hundred Years War, 213-231. On the other hand, DeVries devotes an entire monograph to the study of her capabilities as a military commander. See DeVries, Joan of Arc: A Military Leader. Another important work on Joan’s success on the battlefield is by Richey, Joan of Arc: The Warrior Saint. It is abundantly clear that Joan did, in fact, lead large armies at a startlingly young age; that she revitalized the Valois war effort when it was on the verge of collapse, boosting the morale of the troops who fought the English. She also did great damage to the morale of the English and Burgundian armies, who to that point seemed invincible.

60 Blaetz notes that the modern appropriation of Joan for various causes began in earnest at the turn of the twentieth century: “In the earliest years of the twentieth century, the widespread tendency to find advantage by associating one’s agenda with Joan of Arc coincided with both the First World War and the birth of the mass-produced image.” The cultural crisis of the Great War and its aftermath also provided a fertile environment for neo-medievalism and nostalgia for some lost chivalric order. Blaetz, Visions of the Maid, 13.
if they were fellow Catholics. In a letter that she dictated and sent to the English commanders at Orléans and the English King himself, before she lifted the siege, Joan used some of her most violent rhetoric. Speaking audaciously to the King she says:

I am commander of the armies [je sui chief de guerre], and in whatever place I shall meet your French allies, I shall make them leave it, whether they wish to or not; and if they will not obey, I shall have them all killed [Et si ne veullent obeir, je jes feray tous occire]. I am sent from God, the King of Heaven, to chase you out of all of France, body for body….If you do not wish to believe this message from God through the Maid, then wherever we find you we will strike you there, and make a great uproar greater than any made in France for a thousand years, if you do not come to terms.\(^{61}\)

Philippe Buc characterizes this aspect of Joan’s political ideology as being “dangerously relentless.”\(^ {62}\) He argues that her repeated use of bellicose language, and her threats of violence and death to cities that would not immediately surrender to her reveal an inability to engage in rational, diplomatic negotiations that could end the bloody war peacefully. Buc even goes so far as to argue that Joan’s capture and execution were, in the long run, beneficial to the French kingdom: “For Charles VII, then, it may have been a good thing that the Maid was burnt before turning against him, like a mad shepherd.”\(^ {63}\)

**Conclusion**

From the Neo-Catholic revival and nostalgic medievalism of the nineteenth century to the late twentieth century, Joan of Arc has stood alone among legendary figures of the Middle Ages in her capacity to be appropriated and employed for a host of modern noble

---

61 Pernoud, *Joan of Arc*, 34. A transcription of the original French text is provided by Pernoud, 249-250. I have inserted some of Joan’s original words (in their original spelling) into the English translation I have cited.


63 Buc, *Holy War*, 195. It is hard to agree with this assertion, given that Charles owed his very crown and kingdom to this Maid. Perhaps Buc is engaging in a bit of hyperbolic sarcasm. But his view of Joan must be understood in the context of his lengthy study, which stretches from antiquity to modernity, and whose purpose is to critique Christian ideologies for armed conflict (and her career is often linked to the medieval crusades and the early modern European wars of religion).
causes. Her personal courage, tenacity and intellectual acumen during the grueling legal proceedings to which she was subjected are no doubt remarkable. The abuse she endured while imprisoned and her tragic death are also no doubt appalling. But the religiously fueled, ferocious language of Joan’s holy war and the bona fide violence and bloodshed which she advocated and in which she personally participated were often minimized by her modern devotees when she was sublimated into other, more palatable “causes.”

Yet a close examination of Joan’s words and deeds reveals that her aims and objectives were not the universal “greater goods” of modern activists who have used her story as a palimpsest onto which they write their own narratives. As I noted, the tragic circumstances of her trial and brutal death have overwhelmed the precise details of Joan’s message, mission and its outcome. In reality, Joan’s apocalypticism was very narrowly defined by the politics of fifteenth-century France. As Marina Warner observes, “[Joan’s] career lies outside the main current of medieval mysticism because her consistent tendency was to prefer secular channels of power to religious ones.”

Larissa Juliet Taylor goes even further in her description of Joan’s piety: “Her religious activities, while notable, were not extreme. By contrast, her military, political and legal adventures were characterized by boldness, pride, and impetuosity.”

As “God’s Messenger,” Joan was more of a political mystic and activist than a transtemporal spiritual teacher. She generally eschewed the patronage of the clergy, had no spiritual director, and was biblically illiterate. She did not preach an eschatological message of universal repentance, personal conversion or devotion, reconcilia-

64 Warner, Joan of Arc, 93; see also Wood, Joan of Arc and Richard III, 146.

65 Taylor, The Virgin Warrior, 37.

66 Taylor notes that in both the Old and New Testament, prophecy was “open to women as well as men;” she therefore sees parallels between the prophetic political activism of Old Testament women (e.g., Deborah) and Joan. Although Joan expressed no real interest in paradigmatic female prophets or warriors in Jewish scripture, some of her earliest supporters made that linkage. Taylor, The Virgin Warrior, 18-19; Fraioli, Joan of Arc: The Early Debate, 36-37.
tion with God or harmony within the tumultuous Church of the era of the Great Schism. Her voices and prophecies were consigned to French dynastic politics and the reconfiguration of the feudal order of France, England and Burgundy. Unlike the typical female mystics of the Middle Ages, Joan did not become a pious recluse who withdrew from the cares of the world. She did quite the opposite by adopting a very public career as a professional soldier, crossing gender boundaries and breaking into the ranks of the cultural and political elite.67 As Deborah A. Fraioli observes, Joan’s first appearance before the Valois court at Chinon revealed the essence of her political mysticism and its sharp contrast with the medieval tradition of female prophecy: “So it goes without saying that for Joan to arrive accompanied only by men-at-arms, with no confessor, envisioning for herself a military mission, based on the authority of her own word, we are witnessing a categorical deviation from the norm.”68

Combining an earthly political cause with a heavenly mandate, Joan believed she was a holy warrior in a cosmic battle waged on behalf of Jesus, the King of Heaven. She said as much in a letter dictated to the Duke of Burgundy on the day of Charles VII’s coronation, imploring him to reconcile with the new king of France:

And I must make known to you from the King of Heaven, my rightful and sovereign Lord, for your good and for your honor and upon your life, that you will win no more battles against loyal Frenchmen and that all those who wage war against the aforesaid holy kingdom of France are warring against King Jesus, King of Heaven and of all the earth, my rightful and sovereign Lord.69

We should remember, too, that Joan flapped a large white battle standard, inscribed with Christian icons and sacred names when she

67 As Warner, so aptly puts it, “She showed that one did not have to be a nobleman to be a nobleman.” Warner, Joan of Arc, 159.

68 Fraioli, Joan of Arc: The Early Debate, 50.

69 Pernoud and Clin, Joan of Arc. Her Story, 67-68. Charles must have been shocked by this communication, since Joan neither consulted him nor told him about it until after it had been sent.
rallied her troops and led them into the blood and carnage of the battlefield. She also claimed that she loved her banner more than her swords, and that she carried the banner to avoid personally killing anyone. “Asked which she preferred, her banner or her sword, she said she was much fonder, indeed forty times fonder, of the banner than the sword…she carried the banner when she attacked the enemies, to avoid killing anyone; she says she never did kill anyone.” Hobbins, *The Trial of Joan of Arc*, 69.

Painted to her precise specifications, the banner depicted Christ seated in majesty, with the holy names “Jhesus Maria” prominently displayed. The blood that flowed under that banner was justified by Joan’s visions and voices; there could be no doubt, in her mind, that her political cause and her methods of achieving it were holy and just.

The narrowly configured political Manichaeism of Joan, and the certitude with which she rushed into armed conflict should give modern audiences pause. Joan’s idiosyncratic, black and white understanding of dynastic politics allowed for no negotiation or compromise; the forces of the good and gentle King Charles VII were locked in mortal combat with the blasphemers, *les Goddons*. In his analysis of the propaganda of the Hundred Years War, John Aberth sees new forms of demonization of one’s enemies that apply directly to Joan: “This was the essence of the new nationalism: to suffer and deal out death in the name of a country or a sovereign who can do no wrong, against a dehumanized enemy who is never in the right.” Aberth, *From the Brink of the Apocalypse*, 53.

And as Larissa Juliet Taylor notes, even though she claimed not to have personally killed anyone, “Joan’s strategic decisions and actions resulted in numerous casualties on both sides,” and as her military career progressed, “she was not particularly bothered by bloodshed.”

70 She also claimed that she loved her banner more than her swords, and that she carried the banner to avoid personally killing anyone. “Asked which she preferred, her banner or her sword, she said she was much fonder, indeed forty times fonder, of the banner than the sword…she carried the banner when she attacked the enemies, to avoid killing anyone; she says she never did kill anyone.” Hobbins, *The Trial of Joan of Arc*, 69.

71 Interestingly, in reviewing David Byrne’s rock opera, “Joan of Arc: Into the Fire,” Ben Brantley describes the Joan of this musical as being a fanatic: “I’m not sure the Joan embodied here by the gifted but ill-used Jo Lampert should be taken as a paradigm for today’s wearers of pink pussy hats. This is someone who proceeds without reflection or internal debate, and who knows she’s right no matter what anyone else says. She is, in other words, a fanatic, which is a scary thing to be these days.” “Review: ‘Joan of Arc’ and the Monotony of Sainthood,” *New York Times*, March 15, 2017.

72 This nickname was applied to the English on account of their reputation for blaspheming when they took the name of God in vain (“God damn” was truncated into the French neologisms of *les Goddems, Goddons, or Godons*).

73 Aberth, *From the Brink of the Apocalypse*, 53.

74 Taylor, *The Virgin Warrior*, 11; 68.
Reflect again, for a moment, on the horror of recent religiously inspired terror attacks and their ghastly images of bloodshed that have been disseminated around the world. Now think of Joan’s apocalyptic, supposedly divinely inspired crusade against the English, with its sanctimonious and belligerent rhetoric, that took the lives of hundreds of combatants, including her own. Might not Joan now begin to lose her appeal as some sort of Rorshachian ink blot, with which any aggrieved constituency can craft its own narrative? Does modern western society really want to construct its political, religious and cultural identity by embracing a fanatical medieval warrior like Joan of Arc?

Timothy M. Thibodeau is Professor of History at Nazareth College of Rochester. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Notre Dame and has written extensively on the history of medieval Christianity and the medieval liturgy. He co-edited the modern Latin critical edition of William Durand of Mende’s (c. 1230-1296) Rationale divinorum officiorum, and has published English translations of the first five books of Durand’s lengthy liturgical exposition. He has also been a contributor to the History Channel and has done extensive national and international media work on the history of the papacy, Roman Catholicism and religion and politics in modern America.
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75 Astell has, in effect, devoted an entire monograph to the modern literary process of “reading into Joan” what the poet, playwright or novelist wants to see. Astell, Joan of Arc and Sacrificial Authorship.
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Labouring for the Lost Love
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Lee University

Shakespeare’s Love’s Labour’s Lost often is considered a “problem play” because of its emphasis on word-play and its extreme “topicality” to a 16th-century, London audience. Yet imaginative staging reveals that the play actually provides excellent opportunities for connecting with our current millennial students and audience members.

The theatre program at Lee University, like many other college theatre programs, rotates certain types of plays throughout the years in order to provide students with a variety of theatre experiences. Shakespeare is one of those types, and in the 2016-2017 school year it was time to produce a Shakespeare. When Love’s Labour’s Lost was announced as part of our university theatre season I heard many people remark they were surprised I would choose to direct that play because of its inherent difficulties. Many others remarked they had never heard of this Shakespearean work.

The Shakespeare Theatre of New Jersey describes the play as “probably best known for being ignored.” However, data collected by Shakespeare researcher Eric Minton, who has collected information on productions of Shakespeare since 2011, show that Love’s Labour’s Lost is the 18th most produced Shakespeare play, which out of 39 plays documented for production is right in the middle of popularity. I will admit it was a quirky choice, however, our production touched on some aspects that connected well with our college student audience and helped fulfill some needs in our program.

As is the case in many theatre programs across the nation, our program features a large number of women; around 75% of our students are female. The options in dramatic literature are not particu-

1 Shakespeare Theatre of New Jersey “Love’s Labour’s Lost.”

2 Kopf, “What is Shakespeare’s Most Popular Play?”
larly helpful in that gender dynamic, but the classics are especially difficult to produce, which often leads to substantial gender-bending changes to older scripts in order to offer students with the opportunity to perform in a classic piece. While I certainly might have chosen a more well-known Shakespearean play, I hesitated to do so. First, because I prefer to introduce our audiences to plays they find less familiar, and second, because I worry audiences come with preconceived notions and expectations about plays like *Romeo and Juliet* that make it difficult to meet those expectations. *Love’s Labour’s Lost* also provided a play with more prominent female roles than is usual in Shakespeare’s other scripts. By updating the time period for the world of this play there were even more avenues for including actresses in the production, while also amplifying some of the themes in this play.

Admittedly this is not an easy play to produce today. As pointed out by many scholars it is challenging to produce because of the specificity of many of the references to Shakespeare’s 16th-century audiences. However, many audiences find that most of Shakespeare’s plays contain topical and timely references, though perhaps in smaller doses. The two most often produced Shakespearean plays in the US, according to Eric Milton’s research, are *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet*. These two plays usually are familiar to my incoming freshman, and audiences going to see these plays today, whether they have read the play or not, are quite familiar with the basic stories. The challenge of a play such as *Love’s Labour’s Lost* is that audiences are coming in already feeling behind with their lack of knowledge of the story, in addition to feelings of inadequacy in understanding Shakespeare’s language.

As our team approached the play, we were aware of these challenges and worked on several concepts to help create a more welcoming environment for our audiences. Our production team was made up of two faculty members as director and light designer, and two student designers for set and costumes. In addition to directing, I also served as the sound designer and, later projection designer.

3 Kopf, “What is Shakespeare’s Most Popular Play?”
Our school is a small, liberal arts university and our program offers students opportunities such as design in our production process. The set design for this particular show was actually initially begun as a class project in the Fall semester in the Scene and Set Design course. All students in the course were required to create a design for the show with the possibility, but not the promise, that the design would actually be utilized for the production. The design had to be one that was appropriate to our more intimate black-box theatre, a space that is 50x50 feet with a seating structure for this show that allowed for 119 seats.

I met with the Design class to discuss the play, emphasizing the themes of gender, wordplay, and relationships. I made it clear that I was open to all ideas they had, including updating the time period; I had been hovering around setting the world of the play in the early to mid-20th century. I also mentioned that I had been considering ways to utilize projection walls in our theatre behind our curtains, which can easily open, in order to help the audience navigate this play. The variety of designs was quite interesting, including a traditional French garden from the 16th century, a prohibition-era speakeasy, and a street scene.

Ultimately, I chose a design by a senior theatre student, Megan Kinney. She had gravitated towards the 1960’s when considering the gender dynamics of the story and had found insight in the play: “My inspiration for the set comes from the text itself. *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, one of Shakespeare’s wittiest plays, is all about word play and intellectual banter. I wanted to take this in the literal sense by creating a world of thought bubbles and shapes. Artist Roy Lichtenstein used these comic-book-like shapes in his work. His work gained much recognition during the 1960s, a new frontier for women, presenting a feminist platform and ideas of equality. In his work he painted women as shrewd and whiney but, I wanted to give them a new identity, placing Shakespearean characters in his pop art world.”

---

4 Kinney, Interview on the set design for *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. 
Her vibrant design was an abstract sculpture garden that created interesting visual dynamics. The stage featured 3 platforms: a square thought bubble, a circular thought bubble, and a starburst thought bubble. A swing hung from the overhead grid was utilized by several characters during the play. Boxes for seats were covered in boxwood topiary material, corresponding with the topiaries around the set trimmed in the shape of thought bubbles. Vibrant reds, yellows, blues, and greens filled the stage. Her set gave me inspiration in my directing choices for the show and was an avenue I never would have thought to pursue on my own.

Set for Lee University Theatre production of Love’s Labour’s Lost.
Set Design by Megan Kinney.

Now armed with this inspiration we set about further developing the world of this play. Our costume designer, junior theatre major Anthony Sandefer, utilized ideas from high fashion in the early 1960s to create his costumes. He also took advantage of the strong color palate and embraced the vibrant look of the show. One of the most striking elements of this play is the less than comedic ending without a marriage, but instead a promise for the future. For those yearning for a more straightforward classic comedic ending with a marriage this ending can feel unresolved; however, the costume design in this
production helped to contextualize that discrepancy by emphasizing the youth and impetuousness of the King and his friends. Those characters wore academic jackets and sweaters, while the Princess and her group were quite well-dressed in a more mature fashion. It was a minor detail, but it did emphasize that the women were more thoughtful and reluctant to just sail off with the men at the end. (See illustrations at end of article).

With this design we were able to utilize the projection walls in our black-box theatre. The audience was arranged in a thrust seating arrangement and the back wall was used to project animated slides throughout the show. There had been an early idea to project quick definitions and explanations for words and jokes that would come up as the play went on. That idea was discarded due to lack of time and resources to actually accomplish this. Instead, we made use of a program called Powtoons to create animated slide shows that provided quick synopses of what had come before and what was to come. The projections appeared at the very beginning of the play and in-between scenes. The available bank of slide designs in Powtoons had several that were complimentary to the overall design of the show. When scenes were in process blank screen options with color and slight designs were implemented.

Projection for Act I Scene I:
Lee University Theatre production of Love’s Labour’s Lost.
Audience members commented on how helpful these projections were. In fact, they were quite minimal with only a few sentences before most scenes that simply helped briefly describe the progress of the play. However, the audience perceived them as critical to enjoying the performance. The slides simply offered quick overviews, rather than any sort of deep analysis, so I suspect audiences were most likely reacting to feeling some pride in that they were understanding the gist of what was going on. Audiences tend to approach Shakespeare with some trepidation, worried they will not understand anything, but this technique allowed them to feel some confidence in their own interpretation skills and to fill in any holes in the story they might have. The projections tied into the word bubble designs of Kinney’s set.

The sound design was playful and entertaining. Working as my own sound designer I sought out music that, while indicative of the time, did not include the most well-known songs of the period; the music
reflected the period but was less likely to feel like a best-of playlist for the early 1960s. The music further amplified the playful, fun aspects of the production and provided some fun staging moments.

As for casting, because of the updated time period I was able to cast Mote with a woman, adding another strong role for a female performer. One audience member, a faculty member, noted, “I didn’t recall if Mote was meant to be a male character in Shakespeare’s script—and it doesn’t matter, of course—but she really owned this part and was convincing in every regard.” Our particular production also featured actors of a variety of ethnicities. While not necessarily true to either period, this script lends itself well to providing a variety of casting opportunities. The final product resulted in 7 women and 10 men making up the company, which is an excellent gender breakdown for a Shakespearean play.

We embraced the sense of games and play in our production which is borne out in the script itself, as C.L. Barber notes in the essay “The Folly of Wit and Masquerade in Love’s Labour’s Lost” that “... what is striking about [the play] is how little Shakespeare used existing action, story, or conflict, how far he went in the direction of making the piece a set of exhibition of pastimes and games.” We encouraged the sense of play in the garden by providing the swing and various games like lawn darts and badminton.

The first introduction to Don Armado and Moth featured the two playing Twister while the 1963 song Malagueña by Los Sonor played. Another playful moment with music occurred when the King and his men brought in their gifts for the women during a scene break prior to Act V, each dancing along with Al Hirt’s 1963 song Java from varying directions. As one of our actors stated, that sense of play and fun was one of the highlights for the audience and performers: “I really enjoyed having it set in the 60s, as it is a time period that we could relate to more; we weren’t as “stiff” as we
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might have been in original costume. Even though we stuck to the script, we did things like play badminton, do pushups . . . . It was exciting every time we got out on stage because we got to show our university and community that classics like Shakespeare can be not only funny, but enjoyable to watch.”

These staged games became a physical representation of the games played amongst the characters in the script. C. L. Barber notes that the play is really no more than a collection of “wooing games” rather than a well-developed story. However, as Barber points out, “the most important games . . . are the games with words.” These word games are perhaps the most challenging aspect of this particular play. As mentioned earlier, it is a play that is oftentimes dismissed or ignored because of the 16th-century inside jokes. There were a few jokes in the script that were far too specific to the original context to successfully play for a contemporary audience. Therefore, a few cuts were made to the text. Yet, the vast majority of the play was kept intact. While I would not go so far as to say that our audience fully understood all of the jokes, they did understand the essence of the play and it was enough. We played to sold-out crowds, with over 50% of our regular show audiences comprised of university students. Over 200 high school students also saw the play, and were responsive and engaged with it. While it is usual for students on our campus to be assigned from a class to see a show, the most telling sign of a successful show is one that keeps the crowd after intermission. It was rare to see anyone leave after intermission and there were even some students that came back to see the show a second time.

Dumisa Moyo, a senior, who played Berowne remarked: “what made [the production] so easy to connect with as an actor and also a millennial student was its themes on reinvention. It seems like we are always trying reinvent or improve ourselves . . . and both the men (through studies and rules) and the women (through deteriorat-
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ing the male ego) take part in this reinvention.”

Over the course of the play most of the characters are forced to reevaluate themselves or considerably change in some way. Moyo points out an important connection for modern audiences that is not as clear in many classic plays. Oftentimes, if considerable growth or change occurs, it occurs in just a few characters whereas in this play many characters undergo reevaluation or growth. Another actor, Abbigail Barrett, mentioned that the setting and direction helped make the play “easy for everyone to understand” and “more enjoyable.”

Ultimately, while *Love’s Labour’s Lost* may seem an insurmountable challenge for production in the 21st century it actually provides excellent opportunities for connecting with our current millennial students and community audience members. Research shows that millennials are not as likely to engage in committed relationships: significant drops in the percentage of millennials living with a partner and committing to marriage have been recorded. This is a generation that does not necessarily enjoy the happily-ever-after narrative that is more common in most of Shakespeare’s comedies. These Shakespearean characters actually press a pause button on their relationships, noting that it is too soon to have made a decision regarding marriageability but that they must wait and see if there is a true commitment and bond involved. As Barber points out, “the final joke is that in the end ‘Love’ does not arrive, despite the lords’ preparations for a triumphal welcome.”

While the wordplay may seem like a deterrent to modern audiences, I believe they are actually particularly well-suited for the type of back and forth dueling with language in this play. The majority of our audience, and the entirety of our company, were made up of the generation that created the internet meme as a new form of com-
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munication. The verbal sparring in the script feels very similar to the virtual sparring that occurs amidst the back and forth comments on Facebook and Twitter feeds with memes. While seemingly silly, “the exponential rise of social media has spurred the creation and transmission of countless internet memes, to the point where it can be said that internet memes constitute a unique form of communication, with nearly as much subtlety and diversity as a proper language.”

The actors enjoyed the lively, spirited dialogue in the play and were in some ways particularly suited to it.

We spent a substantial amount of time helping them understand the references and it was always great fun to see them begin to understand the nuances of the language and the skill of Shakespeare’s work. One of our English faculty members wrote me a note after the production mentioning several of the actors and their work. He noted of the actor playing Berowne, “many of my students and colleagues who watched this play were amazed at the sheer volume of his lines, and the alacrity with which he delivered them all with a confident flourish. He seemed like a peacock strutting among his pride out there, moving seemingly effortlessly from comical scenes to outrage to contemplation to irony.”

Chicago Tribune reviewer Chris Jones posed the question at the beginning of his February 2017 review of a local production of Love’s Labour’s Lost, “what is the hardest of all the plays by William Shakespeare to produce today?” He theorizes most would respond with the thought provoking tragedies or “problematic dramas like ‘Othello,’ ‘The Merchant of Venice’ and ‘The Taming of the Shrew’” but argues it is in fact Love’s Labour’s Lost. Jones points out the play is “ . . . the most florid and verbose of Shakespeare’s comedies and a theatrical indulgence of the Elizabethan obsession with rhetorical prowess, especially when it came to speaking nice of love.” However, as is often the case with classic pieces, despite the pitfalls that have marred the reception of Love’s Labour’s Lost perhaps this play simply needed to find the right time for production.
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And perhaps that time is now. We set out to produce this play mainly as an educational exercise for our theatre students. It is important that they have at least an experience with a Shakespeare production before they graduate. We never dreamed this show would end up being a well-loved production from our program. I knew that there were landmines associated with it, but I enjoy challenges and enjoy having the opportunity to potentially introduce audiences to something new. The production design, the excitement of our cast and the audience connections made this a particularly successful production. A university audience enjoying a play that celebrates and ridicules wordsmiths found this admittedly challenging text to be an unappreciated gem. Perhaps this oft-ignored Shakespeare will find its own renaissance in the 21st century.

Christine Williams is an Associate Professor of Theatre and Coordinator of the Theatre program at Lee University in Cleveland, TN. She teaches a variety of courses in theatre and her research interests center on Tudor theatre history and theatre pedagogy.

Illustrations

*Berowne (Dumisa Moyo) prepares the King and his friends to woo the ladies at the end of Act IV Scene 3.*

*Lee University Theatre production of Love’s Labour’s Lost.*
Armado (Jordan Hope) and Moth (Anna Barge) have just finished playing twister as Don Armado contemplates his feelings in Act I Scene 2. Lee University Theatre production of Love’s Labour’s Lost.

The Princess (Audrey Wagon) and her ladies confront the King (Corey Knight) Act II Scene 1. Lee University Theatre production of Love’s Labour’s Lost.
The King (Corey Knight) and his men visit the ladies dressed as Russians in Act V. Lee University Theatre production of Love’s Labour’s Lost.

The King (Corey Knight) discovers his men writing love letters. Act IV Scene 3. Lee University Theatre production of Love’s Labour’s Lost.
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