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Conclusion
This doctoral thesis focuses upon the translation of patristic works into English in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Considering the pragmatic usage of texts in humanist culture, this research project explores the mobilisation of vernacular versions of the Church Fathers in response to historical crises. Regarding Renaissance humanism as a gendered intellectual methodology, I have investigated the way in which these texts particularly aim to address the needs of men, offering them exemplars to 'cope' with their social circumstances.

The first chapter involves the analysis of Thomas Drant's rendition of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Epigrams* (1568) as part of the struggles of the early Elizabethan era. I suggest that this verse translation may possibly have played a supportive role for Protestant clerics facing a loss of humanist confidence due to educational deficiencies and the conflict of learning with the Catholic 'Louvainist' scholars.

The second chapter examines John Healey's version of Augustine's *City of God* (1610) in the context of the colonisation of Virginia. I propose that the Augustinian text - and the included commentary by Vives - may have represented a 'handbook' for the predominantly male community of planters confronted by (among other problems) the severe difficulty of establishing a household and fathering the next generation.

The third chapter looks at Tobie Matthew's translation of Augustine's *Confessions* (1620) as an aid for Catholic Englishmen in an age of religious persecution. I contend that this text advertises and advances a passive / feminine form of manhood - which had been intially propagated by late sixteenth-century recusant ideology - in order to offer succour to its socially debilitated male readers.
By undertaking an examination of these previously neglected texts, this thesis has attempted to expand the understanding of Renaissance humanist translation, as well as to offer a unique insight into the history of gender.
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and to the memory of
my wonderful teacher and friend
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INTRODUCTION

The prestige accorded to patristic texts by the Renaissance humanists has been addressed by a range of eminent scholars of this intellectual movement. Eugene F. Rice, for instance, has affirmed that: ‘The discovery, rediscovery, and reevaluation of Christian antiquity was an integral part of the more general humanist discovery and reevaluation of ancient art and letters’.¹ In fact, the element of ‘discovery’ only truly entered into the humanists’ academic endeavours in relation to the works of the Greek Fathers which, as Paul Oskar Kristeller has stated, were translated into Latin for the first time in this period.² However, although the ‘Christian classics’ of the Western Church had been widely available throughout the medieval era, the humanists regarded themselves as ‘rediscovering’ the patristic literary legacy which had been, in their view, tragically obscured by textual corruptions and the fantastic biographical mythologisation of these saints.³ These intellectuals, then, viewed such ‘familiar texts with new eyes’,⁴ reading the Fathers with a new linguistic and historical sensitivity which led to their ‘re-evaluative’ re-editing of the patristic canon.⁵

One of the most significant emended versions of the Fathers’ compositions was Erasmus’ edition of St. Jerome’s letters, published in 1516. In this we may witness the high esteem which the ‘architect’ of Northern European humanism had for this patristic thinker.

He wrote in his dedication to William Warham that 'Jerome alone possesses, united in one package, ... and to a remarkable degree, all the gifts that we admire separately in others'.  

But what precisely were the 'gifts' which Erasmus so admired?

Examining both this dedicatory epistle and his 'life' of Jerome which stands before the saint's epistles, we can perceive that the humanist had a profound respect for the Father's learning. Erasmus honoured the saint's enegetic enthusiasm for erudition, asking: 'Who expended so much effort in every branch of learning?', and marvelled at his eloquence which he deemed to excel that of the orator who was conventionally most lauded by the humanists, asserting that: '... in my opinion Cicero himself ... is surpassed by him in some of the qualities of a good style, ...'. More particularly, the humanist made manifest his appreciation for Jerome's classical training in grammar and rhetoric, as well as his willingness to study Hebrew in order to 'properly' perform Biblical exegesis.

Many critics have commented upon what Lisa Jardine has referred to as 'the Escher-like flicker-effect ... from biography to autobiography, and from portrait to self-portrait' in Erasmus' account of Jerome's personal history, and, indeed, those aspects of the Father which he valued do seem to remarkably reflect his own scholarly preoccupations. Erasmus thus appears to have venerated Jerome as both a model for humanist study and a legitimation of its praxis, the classically trained Fathers generally being helpful to humanism in its morally difficult attempt to intellectually ally pagan and sacred literary interests.

---

7 Erasmus, dedication, CWE, Ixi, 7.
8 Erasmus, dedication, CWE, Ixi, 7.
10 Erasmus, 'Life of Jerome', CWE, Ixi, 34.
saint's broad education actually served in Erasmus' patristic profile to comparatively undermine the credentials of humanism's contemporary cerebral rivals, the scholastics, commenting that:

Today, ... some men totally ignorant of all the arts and lacking refinement rely on a few paltry sophisms and on a smattering of Aristotelian philosophy, and they rush into the profession of theology with unwashed feet and hands.13

Thus we may observe the absolute centrality of Early Christian thought to the establishment and advancement of Northern European humanism, the Fathers, arguably, offering those involved in this enterprise the method and justification for their lettered revolution.14

However, quite startlingly, the English renditions of the Greek and Latin patristic texts produced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have received - as far as I can ascertain - no critical attention. Erasmus himself emphasised the worth of such vernacular versions in the Jerome edition, his epistle to Warham actually opening with an attempt to remind his patron of the status given to this venture in classical times:

... the most powerful and prosperous monarchs thought no concern more becoming to them than to arrange for the translation of works of outstanding authors to be translated into various tongues, that more men might enjoy them.15

Yet whilst Renaissance humanist scholars evidently recognised the beneficial nature of making such sacred texts available to a more extensive readership, it seems that such works have lost their meaning for modern academics and have thus been assigned to the 'dustbin' of literary and intellectual history. Like the Renaissance humanists who claimed to have

13 Erasmus, 'Life of Jerome', CWE, lxi, 42.
14 Eugene F. Rice has commented that this elevation of patristic thought functioned, partially at least, to displace the scholastics: 'A principal aim of their enthusiasm was to undermine the authority of the one by magnifying the authority of the other' - 'The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity: Lefèvre d'Étaples and his circle', Studies in the Renaissance, 9 (1962), 126-141 (p.129).
15 Erasmus, dedication, CWE, lxi, 3.
found the Fathers’ works "abandoned to roaches and worms". I might, then, suggest that in preparing this dissertation I have ‘rediscovered’ these long-neglected ‘englished’ Elizabethan and Stuart editions of the Fathers sitting lonely and unloved in the stacks of the British Library!

Indeed, despite the fact that translation played a prominent role in humanist pedagogy - with the pupil moving back and forth between creating versions of set texts in the ‘native’ and the classical language - the analysis of the vernacular versions of ancient and ‘foreign’ texts which mature humanists produced after they had left the classroom has been largely disregarded during the past fifty years by those engaged in Renaissance studies, as Warren Boutcher has pointed out. He has diagnosed the lack of scholarly interest in these literary productions as being due to a kind of ‘misreading’ on the part of modern academics - we go to these texts expecting fluency and fidelity to the source and are inevitably disappointed.

To this interpretative quandary Boutcher offers a radical cure, proposing that we read Renaissance translations as ‘original and unique performances of texts’. This involves setting aside our contemporary desire for linguistic accuracy in the vernacular version and concentrating instead upon retrieving the ‘strategic purposes’ for which the translation was created. Thus in order for these texts to ‘speak’ to us we have to ‘translate’ our critical selves, to attempt to appreciate the ‘rhetorical’ attitude to literature which Renaissance humanism had appropriated from classical learning. As Rita Copeland has affirmed, in Roman theory

---

the Latin version of a Greek text 'actually displaces the originary force of its model',\textsuperscript{22}

further emphasising that this epistemological system was predicated upon the notion that 'the highest wisdom is that which has its end in result, in social and political action'.\textsuperscript{23}

In fact, almost a century ago, Flora Ross Amos drew attention to the Renaissance translators' belief that their work was 'of peculiar service to the state';\textsuperscript{24} citing Nicholas Udall's declaration that: '... a translator travaileth not to his own private commodity, but to the benefit and public use of his country'.\textsuperscript{25} Such public-spirited statements have since been construed by critics as verbalisations of patriotic sentiment.\textsuperscript{26} However, I would argue, with Boutcher, that these words actually represent the translators' absorption of the current pragmatic humanist conceptualisation of textual activity,\textsuperscript{27} which followed in the civic-oriented philosophical footsteps of the ancients, as disclosed by Copeland. Hence, as Boutcher has proposed, if we wish to revive the 'meaning' of 'englished' Renaissance texts we have to engage with this very \textit{practical} notion of translation, to seek out the particular 'point' the 'author' intended to make with this new rendition.\textsuperscript{28}

Nevertheless, if we take into consideration the work of Anthony Grafton, Lisa Jardine and William Sherman,\textsuperscript{29} to which Boutcher's insight into the Renaissance culture of translation is indebted, we may become aware of another aspect of the signification of


\textsuperscript{23} Copeland, \textit{Rhetoric}, p.17.


\textsuperscript{25} Quoted by Amos, \textit{Theories of Translation}, p.88.


\textsuperscript{28} Boutcher, 'The Renaissance', p.47.

\textsuperscript{29} GJ (see list of abbreviations). See also Lisa Jardine and William Sherman, 'Pragmatic readers: knowledge transactions and scholarly services in late Elizabethan England' in \textit{Religion, culture and society in early modern
sixteenth and seventeenth century translations which present-day scholars should keep in mind - that the readers of these renditions had also been ‘infected’ by the methodology of pragmatic humanism through their education and may thus have turned to these texts for guidance much in the way that the modern citizen might profit from ‘self-help’ books. I am aware that reading practices were varied in the Renaissance and that humanist textual engagement might also be a ‘casual’ experience in this era. However, there appears to have been a particularly powerful utilitarian ethos encasing translations in this period which would, I believe, have ‘conditioned’ the audience’s response to such material. For as Boutcher states, the (educated) members of the Tudor and early Stuart society ‘had a ‘living’ relationship to these ... texts, a sense that they were ... ready to hand ... for immediate application to actual problems and experience’.

Indeed, if, as Kristeller has stated, the humanists’ eschewed the theological examination of patristic texts, it seems plausible that spiritual works might have been read in the Renaissance with the same interpretative attention - aiming towards active application - which was directed at pagan literature. Rice has stated that ‘Patristic works could be put to ... practical ... purposes ...’ and, in fact, Erasmus divulged his pragmatic appreciation of such sacred literary matter when he closed his ‘memoir’ of Jerome with an exhortation for those using his edition to employ this Father’s work as a ‘prop’, asserting that: ‘There is ...
no way of life which may not be formed by his precepts ...'.\textsuperscript{35} As Lisa Jardine has commented, Erasmus handles Jerome's works 'as if they were Cicero's'\textsuperscript{36} and I would contend that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries patristic translations were themselves judged to be a rich resource, full of exemplars which the audience might exercise in various areas of their existence. Indeed, I will suggest that such 'englished' texts might have been 'written' and studied for an 'action' which did not always have the public sphere - in any conventional sense - as its 'goal', as has been previously proposed by scholars of pragmatic humanism.\textsuperscript{37}

Hence in this thesis I will present three 'case studies' of English Renaissance renditions of patristic texts considered from the perspective of the pragmatic humanist model. In each chapter I will attempt to recover the historical context which may have prompted the translation and then offer a reading of its possible use by its contemporary audience, proposing potentially 'salient' points in the main body of the work and also in its paratextual elements, such as dedications, prefaces and printed annotations. However, by thus endeavouring to reconstruct the 'intention' of the new 'adaptation' and its contemporary interpretation through this process of literary 'archaeology', I do not pretend to present certainties. Without concrete evidence (marginalia, for example), I move across centuries, across gender and, indeed, across class to gather insights with only history as my guide: these studies are merely 'meditations' upon the meaning of patristic translations in Renaissance culture.

\textsuperscript{35} Erasmus, 'Life of Jerome', \textit{CWE}, lix, 62.
\textsuperscript{36} Jardine, \textit{Erasmus}, p.67.
\textsuperscript{37} GJ, p.30 - I will refer to this article more closely in Chapter Two.
This dissertation will, moreover, explore the way in which the production of these vernacular versions may be seen to have had a more far-reaching function than the one referred to by Boutcher, who has indicated that such works potentially furthered the career of the 'author' who presented a newly 'englished' text which 'usually pointed towards an urgent issue in the household of the dedicatee'.\(^{38}\) Indeed, I will argue that in each of the examples I have examined, a major work of Early Christian literature is rendered into the vernacular for more than individual gain or the 'good' of a particular family. There is, though, in every instance, as the Boutcher quote intimates, an 'urgent issue' which the new version may be seen to pragmatically address: these patristic translations, I will contend, were composed and construed as a form of 'crisis management'. The crises in question in all three 'occasions' were, I argue, connected to specific intellectual, social and religious circumstances which threatened the gender identity of a particular group of Englishmen. Patristic translation was, I suggest, for men, this element of pragmatic humanist praxis being a 'masculine' intellectual activity which precisely aimed to sustain Renaissance males by furnishing them with texts which would support their manliness in traumatic contexts.

Much interesting and worthwhile work has been produced on the subject of the difficulties faced by female humanists in the Renaissance. Grafton and Jardine have examined the way in which the socially elite 'ladies' who had access to humanist learning were deprived of a formal oratorical training, citing Leonardo Bruni's notorious query: '... why exhaust a woman with ... the thousand difficulties of rhetorical art, when she will never see the forum?'.\(^{39}\) They have also disclosed how women were only encouraged in their humanist studies as a 'distraction', concluding that: 'Cultivation' is in order for a

\(^{38}\) Boutcher, 'The Renaissance', p.50.

\(^{39}\) Quoted in HH (see list of abbreviations), p.32.
noblewoman; formal competence is positively unbecoming'. Indeed, such 'competent' feminine learning was deemed to be so threatening to propriety that Isotta Nogarola - a woman who strived to publicly engage with her male scholarly peers - was ultimately accused of incest. Yet what is most intriguing for me is the fact that such female humanists frequently mobilised their learning, as Margaret L. King states, 'to achieve the political or social ends sought by male relatives', King further describing the way in which Battista Montefeltro's oration to Emperor Sigismund was designed to gain that monarch's assistance in restoring her husband and son-in-law's ancestral lands. Hence it seems that humanism 'worked' for Renaissance women as long as they accepted that it was a form of intellectuality which ultimately served men.

However, putting your erudition at the disposal of the male community could not 'protect' a woman from opprobrium, as Lady Anne Bacon, the translator of John Jewel's An Apologie or answere in defence of the Churche of England - a text I will analyse in detail in the first chapter - was to find out in the 1560s. Her text's preface was, perhaps tellingly, not penned by herself - it is, according to Alan Stewart, by Matthew Parker, the Archbishop of Canterbury and seemed to attempt to 'excuse' her inappropriate literary enterprise by emphasising that this vernacular version had the 'approval' of the 'original' male writer, Parker stating that he and 'the chiefe author of the Latin worke ... perusinge and conferringe

40 HH, p.33.
41 HH, p.40.
43 King, 'Book-Lined Cells', p.70.
44 Alan Stewart, 'The Voices of Anne Cooke, Lady Anne and Lady Bacon' in 'This Double Voice': Gendered Writing in Early Modern England, ed. by Danielle Clarke and Elizabeth Clarke (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), pp. 88-102 (p.93).
youre whole translation, haue without alteration allowed of it ...'. 45 Thus, although critics such as Margaret Hannay have suggested that women were culturally 'permitted' to translate pious works, 46 I would contend that this precautious male-authored preface suggests that women humanists could not, in truth, pragmatically utilise translation techniques without the facing the risk of 'dishonour', even if they were, as Lady Bacon arguably was, striving to enhance the cause of Protestant humanist masculinity. Indeed, this plight was, arguably, made manifest by the Catholic exiles' outrage at her literary intervention, Thomas Harding deeming Lady Bacon's work to be a flagrant transgression of intellectual gender boundaries, declaring that: '...she passeth the bondes of womanly state in presuming to meddle so fare [sic] in these perilous matters ...'. 47 Hence Anne Bacon used her linguistic talents to ostensibly support the men of the nascent Church of England, but Parker's 'doubling' of the lady's identity with his own and Jewel's authoritative male personae - which might be seen to strive to make the translation their own safely masculine work 48 - finally did nothing to keep her feminine reputation intact. Translation was for men in every sense. 49

45 [Matthew Parker], dedication, [John Jewel], An Apologie or answere in defence of the Churche of Englande, with a briefe and plaine declaration of the true Religion professed and used in the same, trans. by A[nee] B[acon] (London: 1564), first unsigned leaf (after title page), verso. All further references to this edition will be cited as Apologie.


47 Thomas Harding, Confutation of a Booke intitvled an Apologie of the Church of England (Antwerp: 1565), fol.41'. All further references to this edition will be cited as Confutation.

48 Stewart has suggested that Jewel and Parker evoke Lady Bacon's feminine piety to disguise the political intention of this religious text - 'The Voices of Anne Cooke', p.94. However, I would argue that their prefatory 'authorisation' of this officially commissioned vernacular version might additionally be seen to express extreme unease about a woman's employment of pragmatic humanist translation techniques which, I would suggest, is shared by Harding, his response representing more than religious strife.

49 Mary Ellen Lamb among others, has asserted that women were 'allowed' to translate because this was a 'degraded' activity which was designated 'female' in Renaissance culture - discussed by Hannay, Silent But For the Word, p.9. However, as Stewart reminds us, the number of male translators actually far exceeded the number of female ones in this period, thus suggesting that it was more probably understood to be a 'masculine' form of literary endeavour - 'The Voices of Anne Cooke', p.90.
Yet I would contend that it is not enough for feminist academics to draw attention to the limitations set upon the Renaissance’s learned women. Although Stephanie Jed’s work has attempted to probe more deeply into the gendering of humanist textual praxis - delving into the sexual politics of philology in relation to the Italian republican commentary on the rape of Lucretia - she still sounds disappointed that: ‘This tradition ... does not readily furnish data about questions of ... female experience, and subjectivity’.  

I would alternatively propose that it would perhaps now be more profitable for feminists to acknowledge the limits set upon the erudite women of the Renaissance, to understand that humanism was not about femininity, and to analyse what it was ‘really’ about: men. By working from this reality we can perhaps begin to more clearly comprehend the cause of the female humanists’ difficulties and even become more sensitive to the sense of academic alienation sometimes experienced by women presently studying and working in the humanities - the son and heir of the humanist movement.

For indeed, as far as I am aware, no scholarship has been undertaken to investigate humanism as a male gendered intellectual methodology or as a particular construction of male identity. Yet if we look again at Erasmus’ comments on Jerome, we may, I suggest, witness the propagation of a particular form of manliness. I would argue that what the humanist revered in and promoted through the patristic figure was not only a special form of studious practice, but, in reality, also a specific model of intellectual masculinity. Indeed, in Erasmus’ dedication to Warham we may, arguably, witness the way in which Renaissance humanism posited erudition as the new ‘heroic’ expression of manhood, the editor asserting that: ‘... like a modern Hercules I set out on my most laborious but most glorious campaign,'  

taking the field almost unaided against all the monsters of error'.

It is this ideal - based upon the classical paradigm of the *vir civilis* - of the learned, eloquent, public-spirited man which, I would propose, became pervasive in English Renaissance culture, being propagated primarily through Erasmian influenced educational institutions and literature.

I will suggest that it is this model of manhood - which, arguably, came into being initially to meet the burgeoning bureaucratic demands of the Italian city-state - that the vernacular translations of patristic texts analysed in this thesis all tacitly negotiate with. It may be vigorously embraced or radically remoulded depending on the circumstances which the rendition is addressing, but in each case, I will argue, the 'masculine' process of translation has as its *telos* the pragmatic metamorphosis of a male gender identity which is predicated upon the humanist paragon.

How then could female translators such as Lady Bacon hope to be a humanistic 'success'? Being ideologically constrained to remain within the domestic sphere, erudite women were, I would suggest, automatically 'cornered' by the manly civic ethos of translation whose public orientation inevitably implied a spatial and even sexual violation of

---

51 Erasmus, dedication, CWE, lxi, 10. It is interesting to note the 'homosociality' of Jerome's scholarship in Erasmus' *vita* which states that the saint travelled extensively and 'met men who were distinguished either for their learning or for their moral integrity ...' - *CWE*, lxi, 28. This masculine 'economy' of humanist study is also reflected in Erasmus' own praise of the Amerbach brothers who assisted him in the preparation of the edition - *CWE*, lxi, 11.


53 One might argue that even those Englishmen who had never received a humanist education might have been conscious of this masculine ideal - this gender ideology might be seen to have been broadly disseminated in society, 'trickling' down from the 'higher' social ranks, by being transmitted through various cultural forms. Indeed, this paradigm of manhood might be witnessed to be present in the 'popular' plays of the possibly grammar school educated William Shakespeare - in *The Tempest*, for instance, Prospero's usurpation might be regarded as a dramatic reflection upon the 'problem' of unyoking humanist learned manhood from its civic purpose - the Bard's work is, I would suggest, replete with examples of 'intellectual masculinity' which would plausibly have 'reached' the illiterate members of his theatrical audience.

54 See, for example, the examination of Guarino's 'civic' training in the humanities - *HH*, Chapter One, pp.1-28.
boundaries for them.\textsuperscript{55} Indeed, it seems possible that women - like Lady Bacon - recognised that beyond their own private, meditative 'englished' works, they might only create vernacular versions of texts which would 'sustain' the male audience: humanist translation does not, I would contend, aim towards the articulation or assistance of female experience.

This thesis is, then, necessarily about men who translated patristic texts and, more importantly, the way in which their manly readers might have been potentially 'translated' by these works in times of crisis, their gender identities plausibly being altered to meet the force of circumstance by textual engagement, but broadly remaining within the rubric of the humanistic 'bookish' model of masculinity. In fact, it is intriguing to consider Grafton's comments upon the type of scholarly exchange which occurred in the Renaissance between a privileged and a 'paid' individual interpreter which he depicts as 'a game rather like cricket, carried out by collaboration between a gentleman and a player'.\textsuperscript{56} This description, I would suggest, beautifully captures the masculine nature of pragmatic humanist reading techniques, whether performed alone or in a group: it helpfully highlights the male-orientation of the literary search for exemplars.

I will contend that this process of personal transformation might have partially occurred through the male reader's interpretative 'translation' of the classical concepts of manhood present in these vernacular versions of the Fathers' texts into the 'language' of humanist manliness, whose 'tropes', arguably, so closely echoed the archetype of ancient manhood. There were, of course, many significant differences between classical thought and Renaissance humanism. Both cultures were not 'monolithic' - they were subject to internal variations and intense academic contentions which I do not wish to elide. However, I am

\textsuperscript{55} See Wendy Wall, \textit{The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance} (Ithaca and London: Cornell U.P., 1993) on how published women writers were frequently construed as 'harlots' - p.282.
working from the principle here that the parallels between the two were strong enough to have been readily recognisable to humanistically educated Renaissance readers: it may even have represented a form of hermeneutic osmosis. Indeed, these analogies between classical and humanist patterns of male gendering may have been apparent to the translators themselves who might be seen to ingeniously 'rewrite' these patristic texts in order to 'access' a particular Father's attitude to ancient masculinity which was deemed appropriate for the context in question.57

Hence in Chapter One I will argue that Thomas Drant's 1568 translation of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Epigrams and Sentences Spirituall* might be considered to deliberately make the saint's 'hard-hittting' poems, which offer direct advice on a range of aspects of classical manhood (counselling, for example, the importance of wisdom, eloquence and action), available to the literate clergy of the nascent Protestant Church whose humanist manliness desperately needed bolstering after it had been fundamentally undermined by educational deficiencies, poverty and the controversial onslaught of the Louvainist exiles. I will contend that humanist intellectual masculinity was regarded as a crucial force for the attainment and authorisation of religio-political power in this period and that Drant thus 'composes' this patristic text as a means of maintaining the Anglican male's precarious, but hegemonic position.

Following this, in Chapter Two, I will propose that John Healey's 1610 vernacular version of St. Augustine's *Citte of God* was translated as a 'guidebook' to support the men involved in the colonisation of Virginia, the patristic text presenting male readers with

---

56 Grafton, 'The Humanist as Reader', p.199.
57 Grafton has discussed the way in which Renaissance authors assumed that their similarly schooled audience would be able to pick up on certain (classical) allusions, asserting that: 'All humanist writers expected their
'precedents' not only for the political establishment of an 'earthly city', but, more significantly perhaps, for the performance of a modified masculinity more pertinent to the exigent circumstances of settlement. For, as I will explore, the humanist model of manhood - based upon the foundation of the household and public activity - was no longer practicable in the American environment. Hence I will suggest that the Augustinian work, with its inherent resistance to the classical notion of 'worldly' manhood and its emphasis on affective interiority might have provided literate male planters with a gender paradigm which was apposite for their current situation. Furthermore, I will suggest that the saint’s exegetical emphasis upon the Old Testament patriarchs might also have succoured them in their struggle to become fathers in a land where wives were rare - and relatively powerful - and there was a strong social imperative to produce the next generation. It is this aspect of reproduction which, I will propose, prompted Healey to translate the entirety of Vives’ 1522 commentary upon this work, the humanist’s philological interventions usefully - even obsessively - concentrating upon sexual issues in the patristic text, as well as also possibly helping to maintain the male colonising readers’ humanist intellectual identity in its insistence upon the value of this type of masculinity.

Yet if Healey’s rendition of Vives’ commentary might be seen to have ‘diluted’ the anti-classical / humanist Augustinian worldview in The Citie of God, I will assert, in Chapter Three, that Tobie Matthew’s 1620 ‘englightening’ of this Father’s Confessions actively focussed upon this facet of the saint’s work in order to supply Catholic men with a version of manhood suitable to the their oppressed situation. I will argue that this patristic autobiographical masterpiece becomes in this exile’s rendition a means by which to advance readers to be masters of this art of decoding’ - 'The Humanist as Reader', p.198. I believe that translators as 'authors' made this assumption.
a particular passive / feminine recusant mode of masculinity which had been in ideological
circulation since the 1580s. It is this ‘domesticated’ vision of manly identity, of Catholic men
being ‘cut off’ from the civic sphere, which, I will suggest, Matthew’s translation and its
paratextual apparatus responded to, possibly bestowing upon its male recusant readers a
refashioned kind of ‘studious’ gendering which diminished the significance of secular
achievement - which was beyond their reach due to religious persecution - and offering them
female exemplars as imitative inspiration for their new acquiescent manliness.

From the above summaries, it is perhaps obvious that this study of Renaissance
patristic translations represents a journey into the comparatively unchartered territory of the
history of gender. This hinges on the theoretical assumption that masculinity is not an
essential, unchanging and body-bound element, but a cultural construction whose ‘ideal’
manifestation is dependent upon material circumstances. Such an analysis also requires us to
break historical ‘habit’ ‘by examining men’s experiences as specifically male rather than
generically human’. I am not asserting that Renaissance humanists were conscious of the
male goals of humanist intellectual praxis: they would probably have regarded the masculine
objectives of their learning as normative - it was simply what they did. However, a lack of
ideological self-reflection does not mean that this system of study did not have a very manly
agenda which demands our deliberation.

It is probably also already apparent that this thesis will, additionally, generate some
insight into the role of patristic thought in the intense inter-confessional competition for
socio-religious dominance in Renaissance England and in this sense I hope that my work will
prove at least tangentially of interest to contemporary scholars of the Reformation and
Counter-Reformation. The discussion of such issues has demanded that I utilise a particular vocabulary to define the spiritual affiliations of individual and groups. Hence whilst concurring with Alexandra Walsham’s observation that the title of ‘Catholic’ was one which was highly-contested in Renaissance England, being fiercely fought for by both religious camps, I have chosen to employ the term as it is commonly used in modern parlance - connoting those believers who maintain a loyalty to Rome and the Pope - for ease of readerly comprehension, sometimes also alluding to the Catholics of late Elizabethan and Stuart England as ‘recusants’ - a Renaissance term of abuse which I evoke, without judgement, simply to describe the non-church-going Catholics of this period. Similarly, I have opted not to engage with the multiplicity of theological differences within the Church of England - Lutheran, Calvinist and Zwinglian - in this era and the views of its Puritan dissenters, merely addressing those within this establishment as ‘Protestants’, ‘Anglicans’ or ‘Reformers’, as I felt such fine definitions to be beyond the scope of this thesis.

Finally, I would like to make the reader aware that because of this study’s accentuation of the ‘originality’ of Renaissance translations, each of my chapter titles have been composed as if the translator were the author and, indeed, these Renaissance figures have been at the centre of my historicised attention. However, in my discussion of these works I have sometimes used the ‘original’ writer’s name or connected the author and translator’s names for clarity’s sake (i.e. ‘Healey / Augustine’), so that the reader may be able to distinguish between the ‘englisher’’s direct marginal comments and sentiments which might be seen to be vicariously voiced through the translated part of the text.

Furthermore, because of the contextual approach I have adopted, seeing the translation as if it were a 'new' literary production, I will not discuss the linguistic shifts between the 'master' text and the English rendition. I am not, as the humanist men I scrutinise, gifted in the classical 'tongues', hence I leave this detailed work to those with different skills and different objectives. Possessing 'small Latin and lesse Greeke', I have thus been unable to provide passages of Gregory of Nazianzus to correspond with those cited in the main text. However, as I hope to assist those who wish to compare these renditions with the 'master' texts, in Chapters Two and Three I have presented the equivalent Latin quotations from both Augustine and Vives in the footnotes. My task as I have understood it in the years of my doctoral research has not been to replicate humanist philological methodology in this way, but to interrogate such intellectual manoeuvres. However, like a true daughter of Erasmus, I hope that Translating Men will 'translate' my readers, helping them to perceive more clearly the positions they occupy within the gendered structures of scholarship.

CHAPTER ONE -

Skirmishes of learning: Thomas Drant's *Epigrams* (1568) and the Protestant struggle for humanist manliness in the early Elizabethan era

Thomas Drant is a relatively unknown figure of Elizabethan letters, being recognised by literary history merely as a minor rhymer - a kind of 'footnote' to the more esteemed talents of Gabriel Harvey, Philip Sidney and Edmund Spenser.\(^1\) In this chapter I intend to focus upon Drant as a *translator*, examining his 'englishing' of Gregory Nazianzus' *Epigrams and Sentences Spirituall* in the historical context of the 1560s. Although this is itself a poetic work, I will set the question of Drant's versifying abilities aside, exploring instead the ways in which this vernacular version of a patristic text may have represented a crucial - possibly even semi-official - attempt to strengthen Protestant humanist masculinity in the face of both the internal difficulties of the nascent Church of England and external textual assaults from the Catholic exiles in Louvain.

Much of Drant's life remains obscure, although it has been noted that he was born in Leicestershire and attended St. John's College, Cambridge, where he gained his B.A. in 1560-62, M.A. in 1564 and proceeded B.D. in 1569. His humanist prowess was evidenced in 1564 when Drant presented verses in English, Latin and Greek to Queen Elizabeth when she visited the university. He also displayed his eloquence a year later when he performed a public exercise on the subject 'Corpus Christi non est ubique'. It was perhaps this burgeoning

---

humanist expertise which led Edmund Grindal - the new Protestant Bishop of London - to select Drant as his domestic chaplain and to offer him the post of reader in divinity at St. Paul's, a position which was followed by a string of clerical appointments in the Sussex area.  

Despite the absence of a detailed biography for Drant, it is obvious from the above basic summary that his career path took him close to the zenith of Elizabethan Protestantism. Indeed, Drant's translation of Gregory is actually dedicated to Grindal, Drant stating: 'That these fewe sayinges of Gregorie Nazanzen should be to your L[ordship] addressed (as the doinges of a learned father to a learned father) that is of congruitie: that from me to your L[ordship] that is of my dutie.' Thus Drant emphasises not only Grindal's erudition (he equates him with a patristic 'giant'), but also his own patronage bond with the high-ranking ecclesiastical figure.

Although Drant's accentuation of Grindal's scholarliness will seem more salient later on, let us now concentrate upon the problems which men like Drant - a figure clearly deeply immersed within the Protestant Church - would have experienced during the early Elizabethan era. First of all, it must be stressed that the Protestant establishment was not very 'established' in this period. Patrick McGrath has described the Church following Elizabeth's accession as 'a sickly baby which might easily have succumbed to the many dangers which threatened a sixteenth-century childhood ...'. In fact, as Patrick Collinson has pointed out,

---

2 All the information in this paragraph is taken from the DNB (see list of abbreviations), vi, 1-2. Drant was made prebend of Firle, rector of Slindfold and Archdeacon of Lewes - all between January and April 1569/70. It is suggested that Drant died in April 1578.  
3 Drant, dedication, Epigrams and sentences spirituall in vers, of Gregori Nazanzen an auncient & famous Bishop in the Greke churche..., trans. by Thomas Drant (London: 1568), sig. Aii'. All further references to this edition will be cited as Epigrams, the original author's name will be omitted for brevity.  
bishops like Grindal were themselves not very securely placed, suffering the 'nagging anxiety' of poverty which possibly persisted for years.\(^5\)

Yet there was one particular issue must have impacted heavily upon clerics such as Drant – that is, staff shortages. In a decade which Norman Jones has depicted as being a period of 'sheer angst',\(^6\) which witnessed a general economic crisis involving inflation, hunger and disease; in a country which had, arguably, not reverted to Protestantism by popular demand,\(^7\) there was a chronic lack of ministers to propagate the new official religion. Christopher Haigh suggests that the influenza epidemic of 1559, along with a series of governmental deprivations and the resignation of other disenchanted clergymen left many benefices standing empty in this period;\(^8\) Rosemary O'Day further declaring that ten percent of livings were vacant in 1561.\(^9\)

As a consequence, the Protestant Church could not afford to 'flush out' those temporising Roman Catholics who chose to remain in their sees.\(^10\) Furthermore, in order to meet this deficit, Elizabethan bishops had to resort to the dubious practice of pluralism, whereby ministers (such as Drant) held various appointments simultaneously, this inevitably

---


\(^7\) McGrath has discussed how Protestants possibly formed only a minority group in the early years of Elizabeth - *Papists and Puritans*, p.12. Patrick Collinson also suggests that a predominantly Protestant England did not come into being until the 1570s, the Catholics forming the majority of English believers before that - see *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* - The Third Anstey Memorial Lectures in the University of Kent at Canterbury 12-15 May 1986 (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), p.ix.


\(^10\) In O'Day's view, the deprivations which followed Elizabeth's accession were necessarily limited because of the clerical deficit: this meant that not it was not possible for the Protestant hierarchy to discharge many inappropriate ministers - *English Clergy*, p.44. Presumably this included a percentage of 'closet' Catholic sympathisers.
leading to absenteeism and insufficient pastoral care. These religious leaders also, more significantly, attempted to find a solution to the clerical shortfall by performing mass ordinations: Grindal, for example, consecrated two-hundred and twenty one clerics in his first year of office and then seventy three more in the following year. As Collinson wryly phrases it: ‘... the bottom of the barrel may soon have been reached’.

Indeed, most historians of the period agree that many Protestant divines were intellectually inadequate far into the Jacobean era, but especially at the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign. O’Day writes of ‘the mass of ignorant, vocationally unsuitable men who formed the clerical group in the late 1550s and early 1560s ...’ and Collinson affirms that graduate ministers were a rare commodity in the years following Elizabeth’s accession. In fact, as Christopher Hill and others assert, livings were so poorly provided for in this period that they could not be reasonably expected to attract or sustain pastors with strong educational backgrounds – they could easily find more lucrative employment in the secular sphere. Thus many of the men invested in the exigent circumstances of the early Elizabethan era were, in scholarly terms, the ‘detritus’ of the nation’s masculinity - and once entrenched in their sees, I would suggest, they became a painful thorn in the side of English Protestantism.

11 O’Day, English Clergy, p.31.
12 Collinson, Grindal, p.112.
13 Collinson, Grindal, p.112.
14 O’Day, English Clergy, p.126. She refers to the level of clerical learning from Elizabeth to James I as ‘... this generally dismal state of affairs ...’ - English Clergy, p.3.
Yet I would argue that the Protestant clergy's scholarly deficiencies represented more than the poignant failure of the Reformed Church to fulfil its evangelical promise. Indeed, I would contend that this community of 'cerebrally challenged' clerical men actually embodied the Protestant inability to retain a firm hold on the contemporary model of humanist manliness, a form of gender identity predicated upon erudition: to be a 'real' man in this era you had to be clever.

Although this paradigm of humanist intellectual masculinity was, I believe, pervasive throughout the Renaissance period, it may be specifically seen to be present in this early Elizabethan Protestant context in the correspondence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker. It is this model of maleness which I would suggest to be lurking behind the words of his apprehensive letter to Grindal requesting him to curb his ordination frenzy:

... we and you both, for tolerable supply thereof, have heretofore admitted unto the ministry sundry artificers and others, not traded and brought up in learning ... [...] [We ask you] hereafter to be very circumspect in admitting any to the ministry, and only to allow such as ... have been traded and exercised in learning, or at least have spent their time with teaching of children ...  

Here, I would contend, in the prioritisation of intellectual labour over manual labour and the almost mantra-like insistence upon 'learning', we view the official desire for a humanisically adept Protestant clergy. But – as the very existence of this epistle exhibits - the Protestant Church is predominantly falling drastically short of this ideal. After all, Parker is willing to be pleased by a ministerial candidate who has had the slightest contact with the (presumably) Erasmian pedagogical system!

Thus I would suggest that those who were, like Drant, in the upper echelons of Protestant society - and, indeed, even those lesser clerics with a basic grammar school

---

17 O'Day proposes that Protestantism placed an augmented emphasis on preaching and congregational contact which it was consequently unable to provide due to the incompetence of its ministers - *English Clergy*, p.126.
education - would have perceived the new generation of clergy of which they were a part as being, on the whole, explicitly *inadequate* in relation to the current criteria of humanist gender excellence: without studiousness, Anglican men were nothing.

Although this may have had an impact upon the Protestants' sense of manliness both as individuals and as a group, to 'lose' at the game of humanist masculinity might also have been seen by these men to have potentially wider, more devastating, political consequences as the Protestants' controversial battle with the Louvainists throughout the 1560s made menacingly clear.

Writing from their exile in the Low Countries, these former Oxbridge Catholic intellectuals feasted upon the Protestant clergy's academic imperfections like a school of bookish piranhas. Protestant controversialists might well deride Catholic 'ignorance', as we shall see, yet when a Catholic such as Thomas Dorman responded to Alexander Nowell's disparagement of *his* educational qualifications, the repercussions were perhaps more serious for his Protestant adversary - too much of what he and his co-religionists said had the ring of truth (see Figure 1). Hence Dorman sardonically marvels how Nowell had been transformed from a humble schoolmaster into a minister, wondering that: '... perhappes / the same spirite that hathe created of late diuines ( ... in their shoppes / or disputing upon the alebenche for their degree) so many tinckers / coblers / cowheardes / broome men / fidlers / and suche like / haue also made him a preacher emongest the rest.'19 Hence here the Protestant clergy are

---

18 Quoted by O'Day, *English Clergy*, p.130 - square brackets indicate O'Day's editorial ellipsis.
19 Thomas Dorman, 'The Preface to the Readers, conteining [sic] the Answere to M. Nowelles preface', *A Disprovfe of M. Nowelles Reprovfe* (Antwerp: 1565), sig.*. All further references to this edition will be cited as *Disprovfe*. Dorman (d.1577?) had caught the eye of Thomas Harding who arranged for his transfer to Winchester School in 1547, an establishment which was to ultimately be the scholarly origin of the majority of the Catholic academic exiles. Dorman played a major fianancial and educational role in the establishment of the English College at Douai - see *DNB*, v, 1149-1150. Nowell (1507?-1602) had been in exile in Frankfurt in Mary I's reign. However, even on his return to England his fortunes remained rather mixed - his relationship with Elizabeth I was decidedly tempestuous in the 1560s, Elizabeth publicly rebuking Nowell on several occasions.
portrayed as foundering before the (ineluctably elitist) paradigm of humanist intellectual manliness: these men are good with their hands, but not with their heads.

Moreover, from Thomas Harding’s perspective, the Protestants’ scholarly ineptitude produced a more radical result - they could not render a credible rationale for their theological stance. In the dedicatory preface to his Confutation, Harding expressed confidence that Elizabeth, as a humanistically trained monarch, would observe the paucity of the Protestant case, proclaiming:

... how little true reason, substantial learning, or effectual argument there is to prove the particulars of it, the body and substance of these doctrines being found to be but a lump of untruths in deed, as your Maiesties great judgement attending it can not but perceive: ...  

I would contend that in Harding’s critical comment we may begin to conceive precisely why the Protestant clergy’s inferior mastery of humanist learned masculinity was such a momentous issue in the 1560s and why the Church of England strived so hard to not only improve its educational status, but also to suppress those texts published by the Louvainists. More than being a question of bruised male gender identities, the Catholics’

As a married clergyman, Nowell managed to fairly successfully juggle his domestic life with his other clerical responsibilities, which included, at one time, being chaplain to Grindal - a post which might suggest that he had some familiarity with Drant - see DNB, xiv, 688-695.

20 Thomas Harding, ‘To the Right Mighty and Excellent Princesse Elizabeth by the Grace of God Quene of England, Fraunce, and Irland [sic], Defender of the Faith’, Confutation, sigs.*5’ - [*6’]. Harding (1516-1572) had been a virulant Protestant prior to the Catholic queen’s reign, he had been chaplain to Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset and tutor to his daughter, Lady Jane, who was greatly aggrieved by Harding’s apostasy under Mary I. He went to Louvain following Elizabeth’s accession, after he had lost his position as Bishop Gardiner’s chaplain and been deprived of his role as treasurer at Salisbury where Jewel - gallingly - was soon to reach prominence - see DNB, viii, 1223.

21 O’Day has described the ‘examinations’ which were established in 1561 for the scrutinisation of clerical candidates - these included literacy and a (humanistic) knowledge of Latin - English Clergy, p.50. Whether these criteria were always met is another matter.

22 There was a Royal Proclamation prohibiting the importation, distribution, ownership and even reading of these of books, however, no copy of this has survived. It is apparently mentioned in the state papers of April 1564. There was also an Act proposed against Louvainist literature in 1566 which is still extant. The contemporary Catholic scholar, Nicholas Sanders, estimated that 20,000 texts were sold in England despite this ban - see John Hungerford Pollen, The English Catholics in the reign of Queen Elizabeth: A Study of their
intellectual challenge to the Protestants - their possibly superlative command of the model of humanist manhood - meant, I would suggest, the effective control of a particular form of 'cultural capital' which was deemed in the Renaissance to be a commodity which might be readily traded for access to religio-political power.\(^2\) Hence I would argue that within this economy, the man possessing the most potent 'proofs', the finest textual skills, the greatest eloquence and proficiency in the classical 'tongues', was considered to more easily achieve entry into the ranks of authority (be it as a bishop or a counsellor). Indeed, I would contend that it matters little that the notion of humanist socio-political mobility may have been, for the large part, a fantasy,\(^2\) as a fantasy might still have an enthralling ideological influence. Therefore if the erudite 'prince' could, in the nightmares of the Anglican imagination, be possibly persuaded by a more humanistically masculine Catholic, then the Protestant status quo might have been seen to stand in jeopardy in this period.

In fact, this sense of Catholic humanists 'waiting in the wings', as it were, was highlighted by Dorman when he alluded to the exiles as:

\[\ldots / suche a nombre no worse learned, / nor of lesse discretion ... \ldots Who maye when it shall please his [God's] wisdome ... to moue the harte of oure prince to call us home / [shall] shewe our selues worckemen in buylding up that / which heretikes haue destroyed and pulled downe.\(^2\)\]

---


\(^2\) In HH, Grafton and Jardine dispute the success of humanist education as the basis for a bureaucratic career, describing the pedagogical work of Guarino as 'evidence of the problematic nature of any attempt to show a regular and causal link between routine competence and creative achievement, let alone civic qualities of leadership and integrity' - p.28.

\(^2\) Dorman, Disprove, sig.+3°.
Hence with Elizabeth’s reconversion still a plausible prospect,\textsuperscript{26} it was, I argue, absolutely vital that Protestants in the 1560s attempt to acquire exclusive dominance of humanist intellectual masculinity in order to justify and maintain their ascendancy.

It was this struggle for the cultural force of humanist manhood which, I would propose, made what Dorman defined as the 'skirmishes of learning'\textsuperscript{27} between Protestant and Catholic scholars in the 1560s so significant.\textsuperscript{28} Indeed, I will argue that it was this so-called 'Great Controversy' with the Louvainists, in conjunction with the experience of the 'lowbrow' condition of the greater number of the penurious Protestant clergy, which was the motivating context for Drant's vernacular version of Gregory Nazianzus' \textit{Epigrams}.

In this chapter I aim to disclose how this translation of a Greek patristic work might be seen to have had an agenda in keeping with the gendered pragmatism of Renaissance humanist scholarship, Drant's work making manifest the way in which humanist translation represented a 'knowledge transaction'\textsuperscript{29} for male goals. Indeed, I will suggest that this text endeavoured to assist an intellectually, financially and even morally weak Protestant clergy to cultivate a more solid sense of humanist manliness after it had been further undermined by the academic conflict with the Catholic exiles - a topic which I will examine in detail in the next section.

Although Drant does not explicitly mention the Louvainists or the clerical crisis in his rendition of the \textit{Epigrams}, the third section of this chapter will analyse a selection of other

\textsuperscript{26} See Jones, \textit{Birth of the Elizabethan Age}, p.19.
\textsuperscript{27} Dorman, \textit{Disprofe}, sig. +2'.
\textsuperscript{28} John E. Booty stresses the importance of this literary dispute - see \textit{John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England} (London: S.P.C.K.), 1963, pp.ix-x.
\textsuperscript{29} My use of this term develops the idea expounded by Lisa Jardine and William Sherman in 'Pragmatic readers', pp.102-124. The skills of humanist reading are shown by Jardine and Sherman to have been 'hired' by prominent figures seeking political prominence - I am primarily interested in how the intellectual methodologies of Renaissance humanism might be seen to be very expeditiously 'exchanged' for a broader reaching male security.
works in his *ouevre* in order to reveal our translator's very obvious awareness of the precarious state of early Elizabethan Protestantism. I will attempt to display not only Drant's sensitivity to the intrinsic problems of the Anglican clergy, but, more importantly perhaps, his intense appreciation of the implications of the current inter-confessional contest for humanist masculinity, a consciousness which caused him to carry out bold literary attacks specifically against the Louvainist camp.

With this broadly historical and more 'local' context for Drant's translation in place, I will offer a close reading of the verse translation in the fourth section. There I will contend that as well as functioning as a 'showcase' for Protestant humanist skill, Drant's rendition of the *Epigrams* also possibly acted as an 'instruction book' for contemporary Protestant male readers. I will put forward the notion that Drant's 'rewriting' of Gregory actually transformed the classically-educated Father's precepts into ideas which would imitatively bolster his audience's fragile humanist manhood, as well as offering support on issues such as poverty.

It is conceivable that Drant's work was endorsed by the Elizabethan hierarchy, being commissioned by Grindal in response to the predicament of Protestant men in this period, much in the way that the Cromwellian administration authorised translations of Erasmus, arguably, in order to 'shore up' the credentials of male Reformers in the 1530s.30 Yet whatever the exact origins of Drant's translation, I will propose that it was, perhaps, this brief but practical work - rather than the 'dranting of verses' 31 - which may have been his greatest gift to his contemporaries.

---


31 Gabriel Harvey, 'Pierces Supererogation', quoted by the *DNB*, vi, 2.
In March 1565 the Bishop of Salisbury, John Jewel, wrote to Henry Bullinger in Switzerland complaining that: ‘The popish exiles are disturbing us and giving us all the trouble in their power; ...’.\(^{32}\) The exiles in question were, of course, the Louvainists, Jewel restating this sense of being besieged in the February of the following year when he sent a letter to Bullinger and Lewis Lavater acquainting them with his predicament:

... in addition to my other incessant troubles, my own and other people’s, domestic and public, civil and ecclesiastical ... I am compelled, almost alone, to engage with external enemies. ... They are indeed our own countrymen, but enemies in heart and enemies in the land they dwell in. For our fugitives at Louvaine [sic] began during the last year to be in violent commotion, and to write with the greatest asperity against us all.\(^{33}\)

Hence pan-European Protestant epistolary communication (itself an important element of humanist culture) very directly discloses the fact that all was far from well in the Church of England of the 1560s. More particularly, it also makes manifest the way in which Jewel - quite literally the intellectual ‘gem’ of English Protestantism - experienced the Catholic exiles as formidable adversaries in this period.

Yet despite the existence of such first-hand accounts of the perturbation which Protestant men endured due to their encounter with the Louvainists, there has been a tendency among some historians to downplay the threat posed by these Catholic refugee

\(^{32}\) Letter LXIII, March 1\(^{st}\) 1565, *The Zurich Letters, comprising The Correspondences of several English Bishops and Others, with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the early part of The Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. and trans. by Hastings Robinson, 2 vols (Cambridge: U.P.,1842 -1845), i (1842), p.138. Jewel (1522-1571) was at the end of his life when he engaged in this controversy - he had met Martyr when he assumed the position of Professor of Divinity there. He spent time with this friend in Stassburg and Zurich after fleeing to Frankfurt during Mary I’s reign – that is, after publicly subscribing to Catholicism - see *DNB*, x, 815-819.

\(^{33}\) Letter LXVII, February 8\(^{th}\) 1565/6, *The Zurich Letters*, p.147.
scholars in the early Elizabethan era. Mark Nicholls has declared that: '... English Catholicism was not given fresh sustenance or direction until the arrival of the missionary priests from the continent during the 1570s'\textsuperscript{34} and Norman Jones has depicted contemporary Catholics as being 'remarkably quiescent until the late 1560s'.\textsuperscript{35}

Such writers, I would suggest, underestimate the Catholic menace in this decade because they overlook the fact that polemical wars can also have their casualties – or rather, to use another metaphor, they forget that a 'paper tiger'\textsuperscript{36} can bite. I would argue that political action is not always as obvious as the armed rebellion of the Northern Earls in 1569 – resistance can take place at a textual level and still be profoundly influential. That is to say, sometimes - such as, arguably, at this point in the 1560s - the pen may be mightier than the sword: the Louvainists may not have invaded English soil, but they were not, therefore, necessarily inactive in the way that later Elizabethan and Jacobean male recusants were judicially and ideologically induced to be.\textsuperscript{37} Indeed, academics studying the period perhaps lose sight of the significance of this literary controversy because they neglect the intellectual-historical framework for such texts. They fail to recognise the fact that the Catholic émigrés and their Protestant rivals shared the Renaissance humanist model of textual work which deemed writing and reading as effectively engaging in civic life\textsuperscript{38} – to those involved in the Great Controversy books were like bombs.

In fact, I would also argue that the Louvainist menace is often discounted due to a critical indifference to the very political nature of theological works. For instance, Peter

\textsuperscript{35} Jones, \textit{Birth of the Elizabethan Age}, p.66.
\textsuperscript{36} This phrase is used with different meaning by Peter Clark - quoted by Collinson in \textit{Birthpangs}, p.x.
\textsuperscript{37} See Chapter Three of this thesis on Tobie Matthew's \textit{Confessions} where I argue that the gender identity of Catholic Englishmen was pragmatically altered into passivity by recusant thought in response to the pressure of religious persecution.
Holmes – one recent scholar who dedicates two chapters to the discussion of the exiles' texts – sees the polemical literature composed by the Catholics in the Low Countries to have deliberately avoided temporal issues, asserting that: ‘... on the whole the Louvainists preferred not to be drawn into the discussion of political questions and stuck to safer, more theological ground’.\(^{39}\) Hence whilst acknowledging the political implications of Sanders' support for the papal supremacy,\(^ {40}\) it might be suggested that Holmes' work does not recognise the full importance of the Louvainists' work because he disregards the very serious socio-political impact of such doctrinal debate.

In an increasingly secularised era, it is possibly easy for postmodern Western academics to become inattentive to the wide-ranging cultural reverberations caused by religious thought, which, in the Renaissance, reached from governmental policy to the practice of daily worship. Moreover, I would contest that for the apologists associated with this literary fight in the 1560s there would not have been such a strong disciplinary distinction between theology and politics – in the humanist intellectual methodology both of these types of texts might have been merely viewed as material to support a specific position or facilitate an action.\(^ {41}\) Thus, as we saw in the case of Jewel's distressed remarks to his European friends, the Louvainists' wrangling over sacred concerns would – and undoubtedly did - seem perilous to the men of the contemporary English Protestant commonwealth, if not to twentieth-century scholars.

\(^{38}\) See GJ, p.30.


\(^{40}\) Holmes, *Resistance and Compromise*, p.27.

\(^{41}\) See Chapter Two of this thesis where I discuss John Healey's translation of St. Augustine's *Cittie of God* as a sacred text which might have been read in a 'secular' sense, this shift being facilitated, in my view, by the immutability of the humanist desire to discover exemplars for male activity.
In fact, I would contend that this omission of the humanistic factor from contemporary discussions of the Great Controversy leads to a more momentous oversight: historians fail to comprehend the Louvainists as alarmingly serious contenders for religio-political power in England in the 1560s. For if, as I pointed out in the introduction to this chapter, manly humanist dexterity might be believed to procure religio-political status in Renaissance European culture, then the Catholic expatriate scholars’ mutual – if not possibly prevailing - claim to humanist masculinity might be seen to have represented a very real challenge to the newly-founded Protestant order. Indeed, I intend to show that their shared ability to mobilise humanist discourse – which included a common utilisation of linguistic expertise, translation skills and religious textual learning – was witnessed as being extremely ominous for the status of English Protestantism in this era. This situation, I would suggest, explains what we will see to be the fervent endeavour of Jewel and other Anglican apologists to reassert their intellectual manhood and to make humanism their ‘own’: their controversial works - and even Drant’s Epigrams - might be deemed to be a drastic attempt to ‘shore up’, even legitimise, the Protestant position of social dominance.

Although McGrath has emphasised the Elizabethan Protestants’ scholarly vulnerability in relation to their Catholic opponents, underlining the fact that: ‘... those who occupied the high positions in the Church were markedly inferior intellectually ...’ and Ruth Charvasse has, more recently, commented that Jewel was subordinate to Harding in terms of humanist historiographical competence, little critical attention has been paid to the intense struggle for preeminence in learning which so strongly characterises the works of the Great Controversy. None of the studies of this polemical debate appear to notice this fight for the

42 McGrath, Papists and Puritans, p.17.
erudite humanist mode of manliness or, in particular, the fundamental precariousness of the Protestant possession of this gender ideal in this period.

I would propose that this is due to more than a critical 'blindness' to issues of masculinity. I would suggest that the intimidating nature of the Louvainists as rivals for humanist manliness — and, accordingly, for religio-political influence in England - has been largely ignored on account of a tendency amongst historians perfunctorily to equate humanism with Protestantism, stating the one movement, rather simply, as the cause of the other. Hence A.G.Dickens depicts the way in which: 'Christian humanism could easily pass beyond Erasmian criticism and ... become an important component of the Protestant Reformation', a sentiment which is echoed by Claire Cross who asserts that: 'It proved to be a relatively small step to move from reading and expounding the Bible from the liberal, philological standpoint, ... , to examining the new inspiration of Luther'. Indeed, Lewis W. Spitz has affirmed that: 'Without the humanists and without humanism there would not have been a Reformation ...'. From such a critical perspective, it would seem difficult to appreciate either the sense that English Protestants did not have a steady hold on humanist masculinity in the 1560s or the notion that their Catholic opponents possibly did.

Although there were some points of agreement between humanism and Protestantism, it might be contested that their connection is much more complex than the above quotations would suggest. It is the very turbulence of this humanist-Protestant marriage which, I would argue, helps elucidate Protestant anxieties concerning the 'ownership' of humanist male

identity in the 1560s at a deeper, intellectual historical level, exposing an intrinsic unease which clerical educational inadequacies and the Louvainist confrontation further exacerbated. For even if, as Erika Rummel has illustrated, humanism and Protestantism did, arguably, have some interchangeable objectives, such as the rejection of scholasticism and the focus on scriptural reading,\textsuperscript{47} with Steven Ozment also describing their common interest in the principles of education, eloquence and action,\textsuperscript{48} both of these writers have additionally queried the straightforward paralleling of these two intellectual trends. Thus Rummel states that: '... any conclusions about the relationship between humanism and the Reformation must be heavily qualified',\textsuperscript{49} while Ozment reminds us that: 'The positive association of humanism and Protestantism, ... is only one side of the story ...',\textsuperscript{50} recalling that: 'Erasmus ... came to view the Lutherans as a threat to the liberal arts and good learning'.\textsuperscript{51}

Hence the Protestant 'entitlement' to humanist manhood could perhaps be perceived as being rather dubious from the outset. In fact, looking at John Yost's work on what he refers to as the 'Protestantization of English humanism' in the 1530s, a process which involved the production of government-advocated translations of Erasmian texts which aimed to mould the celebrated scholar into 'a supporter of Henrician reform as well as humanist Protestantism',\textsuperscript{52} one might argue that there was not a 'natural' affinity between the two ideologies since a bond had to be so very deliberately forged. Furthermore, John

\textsuperscript{49} Rummel, Humanist-Scholastic Debate, pp.130-131.
\textsuperscript{50} Ozment, Age of Reform, pp.302-303.
\textsuperscript{51} Ozment, Age of Reform, p.304.
\textsuperscript{52} John K. Yost, 'Taverner's Use of Erasmus and the Protestantization of English Humanism', Renaissance Quarterly, 23 (1970), 266-276 (p.271).
McDiarmid, analysing the vernacular scripture debate in the same period, proposes that the fusion of humanism and Protestantism could only have a limited 'lifespan' due to major differences of opinion concerning concepts such as men's agency and divine grace. This incompatibility, according to McDiarmid, may have rendered the permanent synthesis of this pair of world-views (as posited by Yost) an impossibility, McDiarmid alternatively couching their association in terms of an 'ad hoc alliance'.

Yet the problem with alliances is that they may be made with someone else. If Protestantism's affiliation with humanism was fragile in the 1530s, their union might be seen to be even more uncertain thirty years later when it might have appeared that humanism had made a pact with Catholicism in the personages of the learned Louvainists. However, this intellectual combination has yet to be explored thoroughly by historians. Concerning the broader European context, Rummel has merely alluded to Erasmus' position as a Catholic humanist as a 'painful compromise', with only John Olin and John O'Malley daring to examine the Jesuits as an extension of the humanist movement. Indeed, although there are studies of early sixteenth-century English Catholic thinkers such as John Fisher, there appears to have been hardly any academic enquiry into the survival of Catholic humanism, albeit at the margins of Elizabethan and Jacobean culture. It as almost as if modern scholars have taken at face value Taverner's propaganda respecting Protestant humanism, or have unthinkingly accepted the Renaissance Reformers' polemical positioning of Catholics as

---

54 McDiarmid, 'Humanism, Protestantism, and English Scripture', p.136.
55 Rummel, Humanist-Scholastic Debate, p.134.
scholastics, which Rummel has described\(^{58}\) and which we will witness shortly in our examination of the controversial texts of the 1560s.

Thus English Catholic humanism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is, arguably, an area which has been largely discounted by contemporary intellectual history, but one that is central to our understanding of the humanist 'panic' which the literary strife with the Louvainists engendered in the imagination of Protestant men. This encounter highlighted the frightening prospect that Catholic males might be potent masters of humanist masculinity, a notion that I would suggest we need to absorb in order not only to comprehend this particular cultural moment, but, more importantly, to discern the process of Protestant humanist masculine aggrandisement in which it may be argued Drant's *Epigrams* participates. I would contend that the knowledge of this background, of the intellectual and political potential of Anglicanism's male Catholic enemies and the inherently unsound condition of Protestant humanism, makes Drant's translation appear much more meaningful.

Turning now to the texts of the Great Controversy, it is a little surprising to observe the intellectual self-assurance which Protestants seemed to enjoy at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign when Jewel presented his 'Challenge' to the Catholics in a sermon which was read first in November 1559 and then again in March 1560.\(^{59}\) However, we must remember that at this stage English Protestants might have cause for optimism, to hope that the quandaries their clergy faced were only 'teething troubles'. Additionally, this audacity might be interpreted as a Protestant attempt to 'cover up' its own humanist weaknesses with a show of erudite machismo.

---


\(^{58}\) Rummel, *Humanist-Scholastic Debate*, p.8.
Whatever the reason, the fact remains that Jewel goaded Catholic male scholars to prove their doctrinal viewpoint with remarkable bravado, saying that he would ‘subscribe’ to their faith:

If any learned man of all our adversaries, of all the learned men that be alyue be hable to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old catholike Doctour or father, out of any olde generall councell, out of the holy scriptures of God, or any example of the primitiue church ...  

Indeed, he was so bold as to express his belief in their ultimate failure to meet this provocation, stating that: ‘... when they shall be called to tryall, to shew their proufes: they shall open their handes, and fynde nothing’. Thus in this ‘smug crow of victory’ Jewel confidently assailed his Catholic humanist counterparts (the ‘learned men’), disparaging their allegedly mediocre ability to handle original sources and arrange an argument.

However, Jewel must later have regretted this vaunt when it became apparent that it had provoked the Louvainist ‘backlash’ which, as we saw at the opening of this section, so distressed the bishop and his associates. Although the Catholic reaction was somewhat ‘delayed’, Jewel receiving only one ‘immediate’ response from Henry Cole (the deprived Dean of St.Pauls), within a few years the activity of refuting the Challenge and Jewel’s other major work, Apologie for the Church of England - a Latin work commissioned by Cecil and

60 John Jewel quoted in Thomas Harding, ‘To the Reader’, An Answere to Maister Iuelles Chalenge (Louvain: 1564), sig. [*iii*]. All further references to Harding’s citation of this work will be labelled the Challenge; all other parts of Harding’s text will be described as the Answere.
62 Jones, Birth of the Elizabethan Age, p.70.
63 It was first published in Latin in 1562, after, apparently, being commissioned by Cecil in May 1561 following the English government’s refusal to permit the papal nuncio to enter England - see Jones, Birth of the Elizabethan Age, p.71 and Southgate who quotes Cecil’s correspondence with Throckmorton in Paris on this subject, John Jewel, pp.56-57.
translated by Lady Bacon in 1564 - had become an ‘industry’, as Norman Jones has labelled it. 64

Before I proceed to investigating this Catholic response, let us look at precisely what was contained in Jewel’s Apologie, a text which was central to Protestant life in this period due to the 1563 Convocation’s stipulation that a copy must be placed in every cathedral and collegiate church. 65 Intriguingly enough, although this work still exudes polemical energy, the argument of the piece is launched from a position of supposed Protestant persecution, Jewel using this sense of victimisation to corroborate the fact that his Church exemplifies the ‘truth’. Hence Jewel creates a justificative genealogy for Protestant men predicated upon a gory patriarchal past in which the righteous were oppressed by vicious opponents, asking:

... who knoweth not after what sorte our Fathers were railed upon in times past, which first began to acknowledge and professe the name of Christe, howe they made priuat conspiracies, deuised secrete councels against the common welth, & to that end made earelie and priuie meetinges in the darke, kylled yonge babes, fedd themselves w[i][h] mens fleashe, and lyke sauage and brute beastes, didde drinke their bloude? 66

Even if this establishes for their Catholic foes an antithetically outrageous history of political machination, infanticide and cannibalism, this early sense of being on the defensive might be seen to be perpetuated throughout the text, even in ways which appear to relate directly to the basic crises in the Church which I discussed in the introduction to this chapter, problems which are now apparently conspicuous to the Protestant hierarchy. Jewel, for example, tries to displace the problems of the Protestant clergy onto the Catholic clergy, to make the educational deficiencies of contemporary clerics and the issue of pluralism matters which specifically affect their religious adversaries: ‘For these men ye se giue to one man not

---

64 Jones, Birth of the Elizabethan Age, p.76.
65 Booty, John Jewel as Apologist, p.6.
two benefices only, but sundry Abbaies many times, sometime also two Bishoprykes, sometime three, sometime four, and that not only to an unlearned man, but often times even to a man of warre'. Thus Catholic priests are implied to have no access to humanist masculinity, being not only ignorant, but also associated with a physical, martial masculinity debased within an arguably pacifistic humanist culture which possibly preferred to enforce subjection by rhetorical means.

Indeed, Jewel's Apologie made various other attempts to deny the Catholic exiles' humanist proficiency, thus, I would suggest, tacitly acknowledging the threat which these adversaries presented. In a textual manoeuvre which might be described as being characteristic of Jewel's disputative style, he initially seems to give the Louvainists their 'due' in terms of offering recognition for their humanist masculine prowess, delineating them as an erudite workforce which has professedly been 'hired' by the pope:

... there haue ben besides wysely procured by the Bysshop of Rome, certaine parsons [sic] of eloquence yenough [sic], and not unlearned neyther, which shoulde put theyre helpe to thys cause now almost despaierd of, & should polyshe and set furthe the same ... to the end, that when the matter was trymlye and eloquently handled, ignorant and unskilfull persons might suspecte there was some greate thing in it.

Nevertheless, in this intriguing 'nod' to Catholic learning, there is a simultaneous drive to diminish the risk their alternative spiritual ideology poses (Jewel derogatively cites it as 'thys cause now almost despaierd of') and, perhaps more importantly, an endeavour to
undermine Catholic intellectual masculinity by intimating that their oratorical capabilities - a key element of humanist manhood - are unsophisticated: they can only charm the foolish.

Indeed, this assault on the Louvainists' rhetoric is extended when Jewel figures the linguistic command of the Catholic émigrés as vicious slander, a language which is, purportedly, different from 'decent' Protestant persuasion, affirming that:

We willingly leave this kind of eloquence to our adversaries, who whatsoever they say against us, be it never so shrewdly or spitefully [sic] said, yet think it said moderately and comely enough, and care nothing whether it be true or false. We need none of these shifts which do maintain the truth.\(^70\)

More significant though is the *Apologie*’s artful effort to fashion the Louvainists into scholastics. At one point, Jewel asks his reader to remember the wrangling which took place between medieval intellectual factions: ‘... why doth Thomas dissent from Lombardus, Scotus from Thomas, Occamus from Scotus, ...: And why do the Nominalis disagree from the Realles?’.\(^71\) In this way the text shrewdly transfers the critical ‘spotlight’ away from Protestant disunity, back in time onto a scholasticism which is, in turn, subtly identified with Catholicism.

We will witness how these strategies were also marshalled in other controversial works - intriguingly, on both sides of the debate - in a moment. However, let us concentrate for now upon the *Apologie*’s most blatant attempt to promote Protestant humanist masculinity - the text’s appendix on the state of clerical education in England ('Touchinge the uniuersities'). In this section, one which in its very existence quietly confesses the difficulties the Church was enduring in this period, Jewel strives to display Elizabethan Protestantism as the learned inheritor of Erasmian erudition. He advertises its university

\(^{70}\)[Jewel], *Apologie*, trans. by A[nne] B[acon], Bii'.

\(^{71}\)[Jewel], *Apologie*, trans. by A[nne] B[acon], Ev'.
system as being far in advance - both morally and educationally - of monastic (Catholic) culture, alerting his readers to the exceptionally sober training of contemporary students, stating that: ‘...they liue in colledges [sic] under moste graue and seuere discipline, euene suche as the famous learned man Erasmus of Roterdame ... was bolde to preferre before ye very rules of the Monkes’. Indeed, the collegiate churches of Eton and Winchester are exhibited here as paragons of humanist pedagogical excellence, where the audience is reassured that they will ‘fynde a greate number of yong Scholers [sic], the whiche after they be once parfect in the rules of Grammer and of versifieng [sic], and well entred in the principles of the Greeke tong and of Rhetorike, are sent from thence unto the uniuersities: ...’. Once at these institutions, Jewel declares that young Protestant men find this level of humanistic distinction is maintained: ‘Euery one of the Colleges haue their Professours of the tonges and of the liberal Sciences ...’. Indeed, to complete this narration of Protestant humanist scholarly achievement, Jewel creates an ending which is, as might be expected, absolutely in keeping with humanist education’s own (arguably, self-justificatory) teleology, the bishop stating that this scholarly production line will manfacture civic-oriented intellectual men: ‘... there may ... arise up out of the Uniuersities learned & good ministers & others mette to serue ye com[m]on welth: ...’. Hence Jewel’s text puts forward an idyllic image of Protestant humanism, showing it to be supported by impressive bastions of learning which supply a stream of brilliant ministers and bureaucrats: Protestant intellectual masculinity is, according to this appendix, safe and sound in England. However, this additional part of Jewel’s text appears, in reality, to

have been a public relations exercise which involved not only putting a fresh ‘spin’ on the chaos of clerical recruitment, but also aimed to deflect the Louvainists’ criticism of the Protestants’ ‘management’ of English humanist culture, a stimulus which might be seen to surface when Jewel writes that: ‘Wee thought good to annexe these thinges, to thende [sic] wee might confute & confounde those that spread abroad rumours, how yᵗ with us nothinge is don [sic] in order & as ought to be don [sic]: ...’.⁷⁶

I would also suggest that Jewel here additionally intended to smooth over the very large cracks in Protestant scholarly life which were privately acknowledged in his correspondence with his former tutor, Peter Martyr. There he lamented that: ‘Our universities are so depressed and ruined, that at Oxford there are scarcely two individuals who think with us; and even they are so dejected and broken in spirit, that they can do nothing’. Indeed, Jewel concluded despondently that: ‘... I cannot at this time recommend you send your young men to us, either for a learned or religious education, unless you would have them sent back to you wicked and barbarous’.⁷⁷ Hence the Protestant intellectual infrastructure was, in reality, in dire straits in the early Elizabethan era, with the universities, the highest echelons of English academia, apparently still under Catholic control. Thus at the time when this essential pedagogical resource for replenishing Protestant humanist manliness, for building a literate Reformed clergy, was most needed, it was, in truth, unavailable.

Yet if there were dilemmas for Protestant men within the nation’s borders, there were also terrifying intellectual enemies without - the Louvainists were not prepared to accept either the Jewel’s characterisation of Catholics as intellectually inept or his version of Elizabethan England as a Protestant humanist utopia. The bishop’s main controversial

combatant was Thomas Harding whose work we briefly encountered in the introduction to this chapter. He was previously a Protestant associate of Jewel's, a past which Harding alludes to in his response to the Challenge where he asserts that: ‘... my hart served me not to deale with M. Iuell myne old acquainted, felow and countrey man other wise, then swetly, gentilly and courteouslye. And in dede here I protest, that I loue M. Iuell, and detest his heresies’. Harding and Jewel had much in common: both had a Devonshire upbringing and an Oxford education under the guidance of Martyr; both subscribed to Catholicism under Mary (although Jewel later fled abroad to Protestant Switzerland) and both served in the diocese of Salisbury, a fact about which Harding - the disenfranchised cleric - quite naturally perhaps, felt some bitterness.

The correlation of the careers of these two men did, indeed, make the Great Controversy ‘personal’, as Booty stresses. But I would contend that the fact that Harding and Jewel were ‘Brothers and Enemies’ represented something more profound than a ‘man to man’ clash of former friends. I would argue that this contest between these two scholars - who possessed the same intellectual training but differing doctrinal destinies - was actually so explosive because it graphically revealed that humanism could easily serve divergent spiritual ideologies. Harding, as a humanistically learned man, perhaps more than any other Louvainist, luridly personified the Protestant fear, mentioned earlier in this section, that Catholics could be more intellectually masculine and might, therefore, acquire religio-political dominance. This is the reason, I would suggest, why Jewel and his Protestant allies

77 Both quotes are drawn from Letter XIV, May 22nd, 1559, The Zurich Letters, ed. and trans. by Robinson, p.33.
78 Harding, Answeare, fol.6'.
79 See Harding, Confutation, fol.56 for a mention of their mutual link to the Salisbury diocese.
80 Booty, John Jewel as Apologist, p.61.
81 Booty, John Jewel as Apologist, p.62.
fought so vigorously against Harding: they needed to disavow his ostensibly successful ‘usurpation’ of humanist methodology.

However, Harding was not only willing, but also very able to engage the Protestants in this struggle for humanist manhood. His intellectual credentials were impeccable, having once been selected by Henry VIII to be Professor of Hebrew at Oxford due to ‘being esteemed a knowing person in the tongues’. Hence despite the rather partisan comment of W. M. Southgate - a writer on Jewel - that the Protestant bishop was ‘the better scholar as well as the abler controversialist’, I would contend that this linguistically gifted individual was more than a match for his ex-colleague, as his texts - the literary ‘tanks’ of the 1560s - may be seen to demonstrate.

Like Jewel, Harding worked strenuously to loosen the religious opposition’s hold on humanist manliness. He aimed to accomplish this through a general degradation of Protestant intellectuality. Hence one of his prefaces proclaims that it is not actually a great feat of erudite manhood to discredit Jewel’s work since this rival is so weak, Harding evoking classical male gender exemplars to establish this point:

As it had benne smal glorie for valiant Achilles to haue beaten Thersites, whom Homere describeth ready of his tongue, and a coward of his handes: so among the skilful Diuines, he may not looke to winne great commendation of learning, who confuteth M. Iewelles writinges.

Indeed, in another work, Harding goes so far as satirically to suggest that Jewel’s ‘masterpiece’ is so substandard in its scholarship that his co-religionists believe it to have
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82 Quoted by the DNB, viii, 1223.
83 Southgate, John Jewel, p.89.
84 Thomas Harding, ‘The preface to the Reader’, A Detection of Sundrie Fovle Errovs,Lies, Sclavnders, Corruptions, and other false dealings, touchinge Doctrine, and other matters, uttered and practized by M. Iewel, in a booke lately by him set forth entituled, A Defence of the Apologie.&c (Louvain: 1568), sig.*ii'. All further references to this edition will be cited as Detection.
been written by a member of their own group in order to deliberately sabotage the Protestant cause: ‘There is no small number of men, which are moued to suspect, that the Apologie was devised by some catholike man intending to mocke this newe clergie of England, and to put them quite out of estimation and credite’. Yet Harding’s assault on the cerebral inadequacy of Protestant men extends beyond his feud with the Bishop of Salisbury, the Confutation taking a broad swipe at the lack of humanist talent in the Elizabethan clergy by addressing Protestants as those that: ‘... content your selues with Little lerning [sic], esteme in your ministers the reading of English more then logike, philosophie, knowledge of tonges and good artes ...’.

One of the ‘good artes’ which Harding deemed Protestants to ‘fail’ at was rhetoric. In a similar move to the one performed by his Protestant counterpart, Harding expressed distaste at the scurrilous talk which is, supposedly, Protestant oratory. He invoked the Reformers’ discussion of purgatory as an example of a situation in which this state of affairs came clearly to light, stating that there: ‘... you and your ignorant fellow [sic] ministers gladly shewe your vile railing and scoffing eloquence’. Moreover, in Harding’s view, Jewel’s use of persuasive language exceeded the limits of male humanist propriety, this rendering him a ‘lesser’ (definitely not intellectual) class of man, as he intimated in his ‘atomisation’ of Jewel’s argument, remarking that:

After this ye fetch a florish [sic] of Rhetorike, where your diuinitie faileth. ... I am loth [sic] to lose time in rehersing your silly follies, and very vaine, yet wicked toyes. Which as they be not very fitte for any hicke scorner (no though he haue his
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85 Harding, Confutation, fol.245'.
86 Harding, Confutation, fol.291'. It is interesting to consider how the Protestant emphasis on vernacular scripture meant that in some sense they had distanced themselves from the study of classical languages and that this, therefore, left them open to accusations of inferior erudition: this was possibly an additional way in which their humanist masculinity had been compromised.
87 Harding, Confutation, fol.250'.

diserdes cote on and his bable in his hand), so do they very much discommend your persons.\textsuperscript{88}

In this quote we may also witness the way in which an overabundance of eloquence is equated by Harding with an inability to shape a solid theological argument - Jewel is depicted as resorting to verbosity when his 'diuinitie faileth'. Indeed, in the preface to the \textit{Detection} Harding takes his Protestant rival to task for what he sees as a conspiracy of empty words covering up a paucity of proofs:

\begin{quote}
Thou shalt finde, that he perfourmeth more in shewe, then in acte: that commonly he maketh vp in Tale, where he lacketh in Weight: that with multitude of wordes, he couereth the penurie of Reasons: ... he setteth foorth the barrenesse of substantial Proufes, as many do their thinne Hippes with stufte Hosen, and their sclender Armes with bombast Sleeues.\textsuperscript{89}
\end{quote}

Hence Jewel’s supposed proclivity to provide ‘puffed up’ rhetorical fictions due to an integral argumentative incompetence is unequivocally correlated by Harding with a physically inferior male body: he seems to insinuate that the Protestant man who abuses rhetoric in order to hide his meagre reasoning fundamentally fails to fit the ideal of humanist intellectual masculinity.

In fact, this alleged lack of cogent ratiocination in Jewel’s texts is itself an issue which Harding highlights in order further to belittle Protestant humanist manliness. Rather than being ‘sidelined’ in the Renaissance, logic or ‘dialectic’ - as a hybrid of scholastic deduction and the humanist emphasis on language - remained, as Lisa Jardine’s work reveals, an important constituent of humanist intellectual culture.\textsuperscript{90} It is not surprising then to find Harding deriding Jewel’s skills in this area of erudite masculinity, criticising the opening of

\textsuperscript{88} Harding, \textit{Confutation}, fol.145'.
\textsuperscript{89} Harding, ‘The Preface to the Reader’, \textit{Detection}, sig.*ii'v'.
\textsuperscript{90} It is not surprising then to find Harding deriding Jewel’s skills in this area of erudite masculinity, criticising the opening of
the Apology in the following terms: ‘... I finde two fowle faultes, the one in your rhetorike, the other in your logike’. Indeed, he goes on to mockingly suggest that his opponent must make his rationality more concrete, asking Jewel: ‘Know ye not that your similitudes and comparisons make weake argumentes? We like them in your Rhetorike, but now we require of you good logike’. Furthermore, the Catholic scholar derides Jewel’s, supposedly much-paraded, cognitive powers when he remarks:

You crake much of your great skil in Logique, in comparison of other mennes ignorance: searche out I praie you, emong your rules of Logique, whether ... the Distinction of a worde, that hath diuers significations, placed in a controuersie, ought not to goe before the disputation of the controuersie.

Thus he sets Jewel’s humanist intellectual manhood at a small price, enlarging this attack to envelop Protestant pedagogy per se when he snidely adds: ‘Wel maie this Logique be allowed in your new schoole at Geneua, in any learned Vniuersite of Christendome, certainly it wil not be allowed’.

Moreover, having launched an offensive on humanist masculinty in the field of argumentation, Harding continues this onslaught by casting doubt upon Jewel’s ability to analyse and deploy textual material - an essential part of the humanist’s role in Renaissance culture. The Catholic émigré accuses his adversary of actually corrupting the works he elicits to support his cause, an intellectual debasement which is openly linked by Harding to an immature form of humanist masculinity:

---

91 Harding, Conputation, fol.5'.
92 Harding, Conputation, fol.191".
93 Harding, Detection, fol.130'.
94 Harding, Detection, fol.155'.
95 See Jardine and Sherman, ‘Pragmatic readers’.
You plaie like a shrewde boye of the Grammar schoole, who hauing a Theme appointed him by his Maister to dilate, and write vpon, purleth, and gathereth out of euery booke, as manie sentences, as he findeth to haue one worde of his Theme, or sounding towarde his Theme.\(^{96}\)

However, as well as sending Jewel back to the classroom as an example of intellectual puerilility, Harding further depreciates the Protestant’s humanist manhood by closing his *Detection* with the mocking statement: ‘Verely M. Jewel it appeareth, that you haue readde more, then you vnderstand, ...’.\(^{97}\) Hence the Bishop of Salisbury does not, ultimately, even have enough literary aptitude to tamper with texts – his errors are created, according to Harding, by his being just too ‘dumb’ to do the job properly!

Such scholarly shortcomings lead, in Harding’s diagnosis, to another humanist ‘disaster’ in Jewel’s work: the Protestant does not have command of patristic writings, this being, arguably, an intensely significant element of humanist masculine identity, as the introduction to this thesis has already discussed. Harding chides his old Oxford associate, telling him to: ‘Reade the olde Fathers in suche sorte, that you may vnderstande them without mistaking their right, and purposed meaning: then may you cite them both to your owne honestie, and to the commoditie of others’.\(^{98}\) Thus, in the Catholic’s eyes, the Protestant lacks the interpretative understanding which might metamorphose these ancient texts into something useful to the wider community: he is unable to fulfil the function of a ‘proper’ humanist man, in other words.

Part of the problem, in Harding’s judgement, is that Jewel is over-reliant upon, as well as rather clumsy in, his utilisation of the humanist commonplace method.\(^{99}\) Hence

---

96 Harding, *Detection*, fol.396v.
97 Harding, *Detection*, fol.410v.
Harding apparently discovers another area in which Protestant learned masculinity might be seen to have gone astray, dismissing Jewel's *Defence of the Apologie* as merely 'a copying out of common places laid vp in Notebooke, ...'. Indeed, he emphasises his opponent's extreme ineptitude in performing this 'everyday' enterprise of humanist manhood, stressing that:

... he writeth out other mennes sayinges without order, or discreto[n], skippeth from one matter to an other, and emptieth, as it were, the stoare of his Notebooke into this Defence, and when he hath shuffled in al, he proueth nothing directly, but onely bringeth the Reader to a Confusion ...

Jewel, then, in Harding's view, cannot mobilise his literary knowledge to positive effect and thus, once more, fails the 'test' of humanist masculinity.

In addition, Harding's vilification of Jewel's misuse of the humanist commonplace technique, brings us closer to perhaps an even more intriguing imputation: that the Protestant is a *scholastic*. Having, arguably, displayed a powerful perception of orthodox humanist praxis throughout his corpus and presented a generally persuasive case *against* the Protestant possession of intellectual masculinity, Harding further endeavours to rhetorically annihilate his opposition by ridiculing Jewel as an outmoded thinker dependent upon medieval authorities, who is, therefore, clearly *outside* the realm of humanist manliness:

... the Truth needeth not so many sayinges piked [sic] out of Schoolemenne, of Summistes, of Gloses vpon Gratian, and other partes of the Canon Lawe, and out of so many Canonistes of al sortes. For trial of a mater [sic] to be prooued true, in questions touching our beleefe, one saying of the Scripture is sufficient: if the expresse Scripture faile vs, twoo or three testimonies of the Ancient Fathers not being contrarie to the reste, maie suffice.

---

100 Harding, *Detection*, sig. **** v.
101 Harding, *Detection*, sig. ***iii v.
102 Harding, *Detection*, sig. [**iii' ].
Here, in a manoeuvre which astonishingly reverses what we saw earlier in this section to be the ‘sterotypical’ intellectual historical perception of this period, Harding, the Catholic exile, attempts to establish himself as the ‘true’ guardian of humanist values. He dramatises himself as the defender of the principle of purely turning to Biblical and patristic texts in the pursuit of spiritual ‘truth’, against a Protestant who misguidedly looks beyond the sacred texts to the ‘lesser’ works of scholars habitually disdained by the humanist movement. Thus the Louvainist might be seen to sagaciously steal the ‘crown’ of humanist manliness from his former ally and to leave Jewel sitting deep in the desert of scholasticism.

Indeed, Harding makes an even more heroically direct attempt to assimilate humanism to his religious cause - he (perhaps with strong justification) emphasises the Catholic nature of Erasmus' beliefs, thus adroitly capitalising on a possible ‘weak spot’ in the Protestant humanist defence. In the Detection Harding denounces the Protestants’ frequent polemical recourse to the words of the humanist icon as deluded:

... howe happeth it, that ye condemne those articles of religion, which he confesseth true? ... If Erasmus be not such a one, as you say, why do you allege his autoritie [sic], whose iudgeme[n]t in sundry articles ye contenme? But what hath Erasmus to helpe you in this matter? Truely when al is searched, nothing at al.

In fact, the exile had also attempted to appropriate Erasmian thought in his answer to Jewel’s Challenge, where he alluded to the arch-humanist in order to exonerate a particular point of Catholic religious ritual: ‘Thus Erasmus gathered proufe of priuate or as M.Iuell gesteth, Single Communion, out of the scriptures, and he was as wel learned in them as M.

---

103 Rummel has described how humanists stereotyped their schoalstic rivals as ‘oscurantists who had never read classical authors, wrote atrocious Latin, and were interested only in esoteric quibbles, ... ‐ Humanist-Scholastic Debate, p.11.
104 McConica has discussed how Erasmus was, until the end of his life, faithful to the Catholic Church and its doctrines - English Humanists, p.26.
105 Harding, Detection, fol.163'.
Iuell is. Yet here I leaue Erasmus to his own defense'. 106 Hence Harding makes Erasmus a part of the Catholic spiritual family, retrospectively turning his intellectual talents to their purpose: humanist masculinity prospers, it seems, exclusively in Louvain.

However, looking again at the last line of the previous quotation, we may begin to perceive in the language a reluctance in Harding's intellectual relationship with Erasmus - he leaves the humanist super-scholar to his 'own defense', as if there was some misdemeanour afoot which the Catholic wishes to separate himself from. Indeed, in some sense this is true: Erasmus' books were, in principle, dubious - if not forbidden - reading material for Catholics after being put on the Index in 1559. They were regarded by the papacy in this period, somewhat hysterically and even erroneously perhaps, as part of the cause of the Reformation crisis. 107 Even at this great moment of humanist masculine glory, therefore, when Harding had apparently argumentatively acquired the ideological backing of the most celebrated humanist of them all, he has - as a Catholic - to relinquish his intellectual treasure due to official prohibition. Indeed, this might be seen to be the reason that Harding also expresses antagonism towards Rotterdam's cerebral 'star' in his work, here disputing his authority on the highly contentious issue of clerical marriage: 'Erasmus, and Cornelius Agrippa be menne of smal credite God wote in this cause ... . It is co[m]monly reported (you know) for a vaine shifte of a theefe, to say, Aske my fellow, whether I be a theefe, or no'. 108

Harding may, furthermore, also be seen to concurrently display an antipathy towards Renaissance humanism which may be considered to be symptomatic of his position within

---

106 Harding, *Answere*, fol.20″.
107 Pope Paul IV condemned the humanist's texts, this being part of a rising Catholic mistrust of Erasmian thought and its connection to the Reformation. Erasmus' works were made available to Catholics after the Council of Trent of 1562, but only in censored editions - see Ozment, *Age of Reform*, p.299.
108 Harding, *Detection*, fol.307″.
the Catholic Church of the 1560s. For example, the *Confutation* assails the illustrious Italian humanist, Lorenzo Valla, declaring that:

... he was not in every point very sounde, as it appereth [sic] in his booke of free will, and in his annotations vpon the newe testament. In all thinges he handled, he shewed him selfe newe fangled, rather then groundedly lerned [sic], as well in grammer [sic] and logike, as in diuinitie.\(^{109}\)

In fact, somewhat startlingly, Harding suggests that it is a superfluity of this 'newe fangled' humanist erudition, as well as an insiduous scholasticism, which renders Jewel’s scholarship so insufficient. Once more chastising his adversary for his misapplication of the commonplace method, he writes:

Sir you do now but gather peeces together, which you haue gathered out of your note booke[s] ... , some out of the Canonistes, some out of the scooleme[n] [sic], and them not of the greatest estimatio[n], most of al out [of] humanitie bookes, wherein you be pretely sene. And that seemeth to be your chief profession. As for diuinitie, there appereth no great knowledge in you.\(^{110}\)

Thus, I would suggest, we witness quite plainly the inner conflict of a Catholic intellectual in this period. As an evidently accomplished humanist, whose gifts we have already seen, it is almost instinctively Harding’s strategy to render his enemy a hopeless scholastic – and not a very skilful one at that (Jewel is said to pathetically allude to the less esteemed members of the medieval philosophical spectrum). However, as a thinker bound by his loyalty to the Catholic Church, Harding had to simultaneously enunciate his detestation of Jewel as a humanist. Hence the Protestant who is primarily represented in Harding’s ouevre, as we have seen, as a humanistic ‘loser’, becomes, under the pressure of papal paranoia, far *too good* at this kind of learning, a scholarliness which is ideologically undesirable even in it

\(^{109}\) Harding, *Confutation*, fol.208\(^{v}\).

\(^{110}\) Harding, *Confutation*, fol.259\(^{v}\).
is (allegedly, in Jewel’s case) in its most debilitated form: humanism becomes another stick to beat the Protestants with.

Harding’s contest for humanist manliness in this era might thus be seen to have been confused and even inhibited by his fidelity to church authority. This, indeed, might also explain the reason why contemporary academics are so hesitant about examining the history of Catholic humanism – they are perhaps averse to the idea of external limitations being set upon intellectual activity, even if, as Rummel has argued in relation to the Erasmian notion of *pia curiositas*, it might not have appeared to be a curtailment of freedom to those involved.\textsuperscript{111}

Indeed, a similarly convoluted textual dynamic – entailing the execution of humanistically brilliant attacks upon Protestant intellectual skill *alongside* the confirmation of a papally proscribed denunciation of humanist praxis – may be seen to be present within the work of the Louvainist group as a whole. Harding had many learned champions in the Low Countries, including the senior humanist academic, Thomas Stapleton and two younger scholars, Thomas Dorman and John Rastell, the first of whom we have already encountered\textsuperscript{112}. Each of these three stood by Harding’s side against Jewel, with Dorman – as we have already seen in the introduction – also participating in a ‘satellite’ controversy with Nowell.

\textsuperscript{111} Rummel, *Humanist-Scholastic Debate*, p.10 and p.139.

\textsuperscript{112} Rastell (1532-1577) was educated at New College, Oxford and travelled to the Continent following Elizabeth’s accession, being resident at Louvain, Antwerp and also Rome, where he entered his noviceship for the Society of Jesus. He died whilst acting as vice-rector of the Jesuit college at Ingolstadt - see *DNB*, xvi, 747-748. Stapleton (1535-1598) was also trained at New College, Oxford, this formidable intellectual undertaking theological studies at Louvain in the 1560s. He then became - like Dorman - involved with the foundation of the English College at Douai. In 1590 he obtained the Chair of Holy Scripture at the University of Louvain. There were rumours that he was being considered for promotion to cardinal at the end of his life, his work being well-favoured by Pope Clement VIII - see *DNB*, xviii, 988-991.
These erudite émigrés might be readily seen not only to share Harding's agenda of refuting the Protestant claim to humanist manliness, probably for religio-political reasons, but also to employ similar polemical strategies in order to reach this goal. Stapleton, for instance, focussed on the now familiar idea of the English Protestant divines as generally educationally second-rate men, referring to the Reformer's 'clergy of Laie Craftesmen, and Younge Scholers ...',\textsuperscript{113} while Dorman compared Jewel's intellectually inadequate work to the labour of an 'inferior' working-class male who was, by implication, necessarily outside the exclusive sphere of humanist excellence:

... he patcheth and cobbles with his rotten lingells a nombre of clouted ifs, and is like the false tinner that mendeth one hole and maketh two newe, or crafie [sic] Couper that to fasten one whoope looseth three: he tumbleth hedlong into a greete heape of absurdities ... \textsuperscript{114}

In addition, these Louvainists make an analogous endeavour to disrupt the connection between humanism and Protestantism by degrading their opponents' rhetorical skills. Like Harding in his intellectual assasination of Jewel, Dorman depicts the preface of Nowell's response to his Proufe as excessively eloquent, Nowell being shown to misuse this humanist skill to the detriment of the principles of logic: '...to [sic] muche Rhetorike made him playe the foole / and while he folowed to [sic] neare the preceptes of his arte / he straied to [sic]

\textsuperscript{113} Thomas Stapleton, \textit{A Returne of the Vntrvthes vpon M.Jewelles Replie. Partly of such, as he hath Slaunderously charged D.Harding withal: Partly of such other, as he hath committed about the triall thereof, in the Text of the first foure Articles of the Replie. With a Reioyndre upon the Principal Matters of the Replie, treated in the Thirde and Fourthe Articles} (Antwerp: 1566), facsimile ed. by D.M.Rogers, English Recusant Literature 1558-1640, 308 (Ilkley, Yorkshire: Scolar Press, 1976), fol.36\textsuperscript{v}. All further references to this edition will be cited as \textit{Returne}. A new series of foliation commences at the start of the discussion of the 'Fourth Article'.

\textsuperscript{114} Thomas Dorman, \textit{A Provfe of Certeyne Articles in Religion denied by M.Ivell, sett furth in defence of the Catholyke beleef therein}... (Antwerp: 1564), fol.73\textsuperscript{v}. All further references to this edition will be cited as \textit{Proufe}. 
far from the rules of all good reason'. Indeed, in Stapleton's view, Jewel's garrulosity may be seen to sweep him beyond the acceptable limit of humanist oratory, describing how:

... as a stream blowen vp with winde and weather, carieth with it muche frothe and filthe by the very rage and drift of the water: so M. Iewel in this place, fulowing [sic] and wandering ouer the bankes with Copia Verborum, by the Violence and force of his talke, carying [sic] a great deale off [sic] errour, and Vntruthe alonge before him ...

Hence here we witness Stapleton exercising his own linguistic abilities in order to paint a vivid verbal picture of his Protestant opponent's failure to perfectly realise the humanist ideal of persuasive masculinity: the bishop is represented as, quite literally, taking the key textbook of Erasmian rhetorical techniques too far, over the 'bankes' into an area of misapprehension.

Yet if, like Harding, these Catholic scholars posit Protestant Englishmen as being defective with regard to the contemporary humanist paradigm of eloquent manhood, these Louvainists also make a similar point concerning their adversaries' disputative ineptitude. More than being the consequence of rhetorical exorbitance, as Dorman depicted it in the quote given in the paragraph above, the muddled thinking of Protestants reveals a radical inability to ratiocinate. Thus Stapleton informs Jewel: 'Your manner of Reasoning, is so beside al Reason, and so Square from the Purpose, that thereof arise a huge and manye Number of Lewde and Fonde Argumentes ...' and Dorman correlates Nowell's apparently poor justifications with madness, asking: '... who sence [sic] reason was first poured in to mannes heade, harde [sic] euer of one that occupieth the place of a wise man, a more folishe

---

115 Dorman, 'Preface to the Readers ...', Disproufe, sig.+ 3'.
116 Stapleton, Returne, ff.157'-158'.
117 Desiderius Erasmus, De duplici copia verborum et rerum. Such attacks on Protestant rhetoric may, indeed, have been multivalent – they may also have represented the anti-humanist anxiety created by the intellectual 'boycott' of Rome.
[sic] or brainsicke kinde of reasoning then is this ...¹¹⁹ In fact, as in Harding’s work, the
English Protestants’ deficient exposition of their ‘case’ is linked to their disproportionate
dependence upon the *loci communes*, Rastell ‘enlightening’ Jewel in this matter by stating
that: ‘... the force of your leming, co[n]sisteth in rifeling of other men[n]s argume[n]ts ... not
in co[n]firming any of your owne ...’.¹²⁰ Hence these Catholics aim to disclose Protestant
men as not only failing in their pursuit of logic, but, in addition, as being inexpert in their
handling of commonplaces. Thus the Protestants are, once more, portrayed as being unable
to attain important elements of humanist intellectual masculinity.

Indeed, these Catholic émigrés further echo Harding in performing the canny
tricks of both representatively moulding their Protestant enemies into scholastics and also
rendering Catholicism the rightful heir of humanist thought. Hence Stapleton derisively
compares Jewel’s assault on Harding to the inanity of juvenile males and, more tellingly, to
the ‘quibbling’ of medieval-type thinkers: ‘Suche lewde shifting becometh Boyes and
Children, or rather Co[n]tentious Sophistes in scholes’.¹²¹ Jewel, then, as a puerile scholastic
pedant, is, therefore, portrayed as being absolutely inadequate to the contemporary archetype
of male intellectual gender excellence: the tie between humanism and Protestantism is,
apparently, severed. Moreover, Dorman, makes Erasmus ‘speak’ for the Catholic cause,
drawing upon the acclaimed humanist’s authority to support the concept of papal supremacy,
referring the reader to: ‘... the judgement of *Erasmus*: where he shall finde in expresse
wordes, that S. Hieromes opinion was, that all churches should be subject to the churche of

¹¹⁸ Stapleton, *Returne*, sig.[**4*].
¹¹⁹ Dorman, *Disprooufe*, fol.64**r**.
¹²⁰ John Rastell, *A Treatise intituled, Beware Of M .Jewel* (Antwerp: 1566), fol.40**r**. All further references to
this edition will be cited as *Beware*.
¹²¹ Stapleton, *Returne*, fol.103'. This reference is from the first batch of foliation which runs up to Stapleton’s
discussion of the Fourth Article of Jewel’s work when the numbering recommences.
Rome'. Thus, I would suggest, the patristic work of this distinguished scholar subtly becomes figured as evidence for the Catholic 'origin' of Northern European humanism.

Nevertheless, as in Harding's writings, there comes a point in these Louvainists' texts when the pressure exerted by the papal 'embargo' against humanism has to be acknowledged. Hence Dorman disparagingly delineates Protestants as being *inordinately* humanistic, despite concurrently making, as we have witnessed, a formidable assault on his religious opponent's intellectual manliness. The Catholic scholar alludes to Walter Haddon and thus emphasises how the attachment to classical texts might be seen to be the root of Protestantism's pernicious theology. He scorns this Anglican's reading of pagan works which, supposedly, led him to his fallacious doctrinal conclusions, these being reached: '... after so much turning and tossing, troubling and vexing, of Cicero his maister and chieuest author of his diuinitie: ...'.

Hence Dorman's work, in common with that of Harding, exhibits a profound ideological tension within the Louvainists' conceptualisation of humanist masculinity. It is, on one hand, an intellectual ideal which they, manifestly, value highly; one which they display a definite flair for. They clearly wish to deny humanist learning to their English Protestant foes, ridiculing, as we have seen, their lack of erudite manliness perhaps due to a desire to have unique access to the religio-political power such a knowledgeable gender identity was, arguably, seen to secure within Renaissance culture. However, humanist masculinity is, coincidentally, due to the Church's condemnation, anathema for Catholic men and must, therefore, be censured by these exiles.

122 Dorman, Proufe, fol.60'.
123 Haddon had written a Latin work which attempted to refute the Catholic humanist, Osorius,' work which I will examine in the next section.
124 Dorman, Proufe, fol.116'.
Even so, I would argue that the very nature of the Louvainists’ discourse, their palpable interest in, for example, the intellectual issues of rhetoric, logic, commonplaces and patristic scholarship, together with their distaste for scholasticism and appreciation (albeit sporadic) for Erasmus, all added up to create an overall impression of decidedly humanist achievement. I would contend that no matter what was the ideological ‘undertow’ in these texts, the main current of thought contained within them concerned the intellectual virility of Catholic humanist men in contrast with contemporary English Protestants’ scholarly impotence. Indeed, I have carried out this somewhat lengthy survey of Louvainist literature in order to emphasise how this question of the confessional ‘ownership’ of humanist gender identity utterly obsessed these Catholic exiles in a manner which not only expressed their sensitivity to its significance as a possible pre-requisite for spiritual and secular domination, but also functioned to deeply disturb the educated male English Protestant community. I would propose that it was this ‘reading’, rather than one concerning their texts’ delicate traces of anti-humanism, which would have been absorbed by scholars in early Elizabethan England.

Before I go on to analyse the Protestant polemical ‘reception’ of these works, I want to look at one more aspect of the Louvainist onslaught – that is, the aspect of Protestantism’s supposed iniquity. Although not immediately recognisable as an aspect of intellectual masculinity, ‘virtue’ was regarded as being utterly fundamental to male humanist identity in this period. Therefore, I would suggest that when Catholics such as Harding vilified the Reformed religion as predicated upon depravity, his words would have resonated as more than a criticism of contemporary conduct. He refers to Protestantism in the *Confutation* as:
... a grosse gospell, a carnall gospell, a belly gospell: wonder it is not, if those peoples be not wholly withdrawen from assenting to the same who be not of the finest wittes, and be much geuen to the seruice of the belly and of the thinges beneath the belly.\(^{126}\)

Protestant thought is, then, characterised as the preferred religious stance of the glutton and the lecher, individuals who are also inevitably excluded from the realm of intellectual manhood (they are ‘not of the finest wittes’). Protestant men are hinted, therefore, to be disqualified from humanist masculinity on the grounds of debauchery: sin gets in the way of scholarly attainment. It will be extremely useful to retain a sense of this cultural correlation between male morality and humanist erudition when we examine Drant’s *Epigrams* in the fourth section of this chapter.

But how did the English Protestant intellectuals of the 1560s react to what we have seen as the intense Louvainist aggression against their humanist gender identity? Jewel, as the supposed ‘mainstay’ of Protestant learning in this period, tried to put on a ‘brave face’, publicly proclaiming that the Catholic émigrés’ intellectual insults were irrelevant. Responding to Harding in his *Defence*, Jewel intially appeared to be nonchalant about the controversy and its implications for Protestant humanist masculinity:

Ye saie, wee reade neither the Olde Writers, nor the Newe, but are utterly ignorante, and voide of al learninge: and in respecte of the Beames of your knowledge, knowe nothinge. It were a very ambitious, and a childishe vanitie, to make vauntes of Learninge. For as mutche as ye seeme desirous of the fame of great Readinge, ye shal haue the whole praise, and glorie of it, M. Hardinge, without contention. Wee wil rather saie with S. Paule, *Wee knowe nothinge, but onely Iesus Christe Crucified upon his Crosse*.\(^{127}\)

\(^{125}\) See Skinner, *Reason*, for a discussion of how the ‘proper’ masculinity of the *vir civilis* was dependent upon the cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance, a point which was further perpetuated by Renaissance humanist texts such as Thomas Elyot’s *The Book named the Governor* - Chapter Two, pp.74 -87. \(^{126}\) Harding, *Confutation*, fol.14'.

\(^{127}\) John Jewel, *A Defence of the Apologie of the Churche of Englane, Conteyninge an Answeare to a certaine Booke lately set forth by M.Hardinge, and Entituled, A Confutation of &.c* (London: 1567), p.472. All further references to this edition will be cited as *Defence*. 
However, despite this apparent aspiration to 'higher' spiritual things which, supposedly, makes the current inter-faith intellectual competition inconsequential, the writer could not finally resist revealing the extent to which Harding had got underneath his humanist skin, adding that: 'Yet notwithstandinge wee are neither so ignorant, nor so idle, but that wee are hable, and haue leasure to reade, as wel the Olde Doctours, & the Fathers of the Churche, as also your lighte unciuile Pamflettes, and blotted Papers: ...'.

Hence Jewel's text, may, in reality, be seen to very overtly comprehend the threat the Louvainists posed in the early Elizabethan era, the bishop endeavouring to reassert the erudition of contemporary Protestants in the face of such Catholic attacks on their humanist manliness. At a length of eight hundred pages, Jewel's Defence is perhaps the most obvious piece of textual testimony that the Louvainists' claim to be the 'masters' of the Northern European humanism was not, ultimately, debilitated by the papal vetoing of Erasmian thought. I would suggest that Drant, along with his fellow Protestants, was starkly aware of this menacing fact.

Before I go on, in the next section, to examine closely the response of our translator to this gender crisis and all its religio-political repercussions, let us examine the work of his reformist associates in order to not only appreciate the full impact of the Louvainists' polemics, but to also become familiar with the Protestants' weapons of literary retaliation. These may, quite astoundingly perhaps, be seen to resemble those of their Catholic adversaries. There is, for instance, the customary generic rejection of the adversaries' humanist erudition, Jewel sardonically saying to Harding that:

... touchinge any kinde of the Liberal and Learned sciences, there was no great cause why ye shoulde, either so highly rowse your selfe in your owne opinion, or so

---

128 Jewel, Defence, p.472.
greately disdeigne [sic] others. Ye maie remember, that your Prouincial Constitutions beginne with these words, Ignorantia Sacerdotum.\textsuperscript{129}

Moreover, years after the Challenge, Jewel may be witnessed to be still performing his typical 'two-faced' gesture of first saluting Harding's rhetorical talents - stating in the preface that 'utterance, and Eloquence, and sounde of woordes, and boldnesse of speache he wanteth none'\textsuperscript{130} - before swooping in for the kill on this same point of humanist masculinity. As he condescendingly asserts later in the text: 'Ye maie soone be Pardoned, M. Hardinge, for speaking il: for as mutche as, for ought, that maie appeare by your speache, ye haue not yet learned to speake wel'.\textsuperscript{131} Indeed, he even goes so far as to ironically suggest that Harding's - ostensibly outrageous - language use is 'above' him: 'Concerning the satanical Sprites, & stinkinge breathes, & vile Woordes, & sutche other like flowers of your Eloquence, M. Hardinge, I confesse me [sic] selfe to be far inferiour ...'.\textsuperscript{132} Furthermore, he perpetuates the controversy's purported 'tradition' of feminising the figure of the inordinate orator, which he claims Harding initiated in the Confutation, Jewel somewhat saucily asking his opponent why he did not 'refraine better from sutche wilde speaches, as might seeme to proue your selfe a scolde?'.\textsuperscript{133}

But more than allegedly possessing a feminine form of disorderly utterance which 'naturally' precluded him from humanist competence, Edward Dering implied that, rather than representing a commanding consummation of rhetorical valiance, Harding's extravagant oratory against Jewel actually revealed his defective masculinity. This idea materialised in his juxtaposition of Harding with a minor soldier from classical history, where he narrated

\begin{footnotes}
\item \footnote{Jewel, Defence, p.571.}
\item \footnote{Jewel, Defence, 'To the Christian Reader', sig.[Bv'].}
\item \footnote{Jewel, Defence, p.477.}
\item \footnote{Jewel, Defence, p.292.}
\end{footnotes}
that: 'When King *Alexander [sic]* had proclaimed war against *Darius*, a certaine boasting *Persian* in steede of more manhood, used mucche unreuerent talke agaynst them of *Macedonia*: and especially against *Alexander hymselfe*: ...

Thus the Protestants challenge Harding's entitlement to humanist manhood at the level of eloquence, but they also dispute his intellectual gender identity by employing what we have witnessed as the 'conventional' controversial strategy of questioning the opponent's reasoning skills. Jewel tells his old Oxford acquaintance that he lacks the cognitive skill requisite for male humanist success, asserting that: 'M. Hardinge pretendeth Logique, and endeth in Sophistrie'. Indeed, the Catholic exile's mode of thinking is, in Jewel's perception, deeply flawed, this leading the Protestant to acerbically speculate upon its origins and process: 'I merveile, M. Hardinge, where yee learned so mutche Logique. Howe frame yee this Argumente? ... With what cement can yee make these seely loose partes to cleaue togetheather? It pitieth me to see your case'. Dering, meanwhile, also berates Harding for his supposed lack of rational skill, writing how: 'He hath forgotten his Logicke, and therefore

---

134 Edward Dering, *A Sparing Restraint, of many lauishe Vntruthes, which M. Doctor. Harding dothe chalenge, in the first Article of my Lorde of Sarishburies Replие* (London: 1568), sig.Bi. All further references to this edition will be cited as *Sparing Restraint*. The italic emphasis on gender here is my own. Dering (c.1540-1576) was involved in this period with own spiritual revolution at Christ's College, Cambridge, taking the Elizabethan Church to task for its pastoral inadequacies. He gained the prestigious positions of chaplain to the (albeit doomed) Duke of Norfolk and to the Tower of London, yet by the close of the 1560s, Dering distinctly refused to tow the Protestant 'party' line. After consequently falling into disfavour with the Elizabethan establishment, Dering married Anne Locke - a widow who had previously taken her children to Geneva to be near John Knox - and he spent the last of his years offering spiritual comfort to a collection of high-ranking women which included Lady Bacon - see Patrick Collinson, "A Mirror of Elizabethan Puritanism: The Life and Letters of 'Godly Master Dering'" in his *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*, History Series, 23 (London: Hambledon Press, 1983), pp.289-324. Although he was a Puritan, I will not treat his response to the Louvainist threat distinctly, since despite the internal strife with the hierarchy of the Church of England, there was a definite 'closing of ranks' in the face of Catholic enemies in this period, as McGrath has stated: 'They were like members of a family who quarrelled savagely with each other but who quickly formed a united front when outsiders like the Papists tried to take advantage of their division' - *Papist and Puritans*, p.33.

135 Jewel, 'To the Christian Reader', *Defence*, p.10.
geseth [sic] out blind distinctions at adventures'.\textsuperscript{137} Indeed, Nowell attacks Dorman on the same front, even more fascinatingly insinuating that his Catholic adversary's ratiocination is so unsatisfactory that he does not even deserve the right to be considered an animate object, declaring that:

\ldots I doubt not, but M. Dorman so reasoninge shall plainely appere [sic] \ldots to reaso[n] more like a trunke than a man: who, though he haue a head upon his shoulders, yet dooth he by such monstrous, and unrea[sona]ble reasonynge, showe him selfe to haue but small witte and lesse learninge in his heade.\textsuperscript{138}

By identifying these logical shortcomings, the Protestants thus aim to deny the Louvainists 'custody' of the contemporary humanist form of erudite male gender identity. Indeed, in Nowell's remark, it seems more evident then ever that intellectuality really did make the man in English Renaissance culture.

Besides this, the Protestant scholars castigate the Catholics for their purportedly insubstantial linguistic and textual skills. Thus Jewel reproaches the 'papists' for their illiterate clergy, attesting that they are of the: '... Schoole \ldots that, for the moste parte, can neither \textit{Speake Latine}, nor \textit{Reade Englishe}, nor \textit{vnderstande the Articles of their Faithe}, nor \textit{any portion of the Scriptures} \ldots ', metaphorically summarising them as: '\textit{Clowdes without Raine: Lanternes without Lighte: Salte without sauoure: \ldots}'.\textsuperscript{139} Indeed, the Protestant bishop also censures Harding for his maladroit handling of patristic works, avowing that: '... wee haue good cause many waies, to doubte your dealings: but in nothinge more, then in the handlinge of the Fathers',\textsuperscript{140} also affirming that: '... sommetimes [sic] ye allege Authorities

\begin{footnotes}
\item[137] Dering, \textit{Sparing Restraint}, sig.Ri'.
\item[138] Alexander Nowell, \textit{A Reproufe... of A Booke entituled, A Proufe of Certayne Articles in Religion denied by M.Iuell, set furth by Thomas Dorman ...} (London: 1565), fol.113'. All further references to this edition will be cited as Reproufe.
\item[139] Jewel, \textit{Defence}, p.601.
\end{footnotes}
of the Fathers, not considering, neither to what ende they spake, nor what they meante'.

The 'godfather' of the Louvainist academic 'mafia' is, therefore, displayed as being defeated in the fight for humanist manliness due to his alleged intellectual amateurism: he cannot, as a true humanist 'player' should, deal 'properly' with the writings of the early patriarchs by analysing them with philological precision.

More intriguing than the attacks on the Catholics, though, are the efforts of these controversialists to evoke a direct connection between Protestantism and humanism, ostensibly in order to bolster their intellectual prestige in a period in which it was, undeniably, insecure. Hence Nowell enterprisingly evokes Erasmian thought as support for the Reformers' beliefs, simultaneously striving to 'take back' patristic thought from the exiles. Thus he advises the audience to examine the preeminent humanist's edition of St. Cyprian in order to ascertain the 'fact' that the Father was against the papal supremacy and for a more democratic vision of the equality of all bishops:

... if the readers will but caste their eye upon the shorte argument of the epistle writte[n] by Erasmus, who was no unskilfull or neglige[n]t vewer [sic] of the writinges of olde fathers (and whose authoritie M. Dorman useth in this booke, agaynste us) they shall easily understand the same. 142

Hence early sixteenth-century Northern European humanism is, Nowell insists, the precursor of Protestantism, Erasmus being understatedly staged as the scholar-genius whose textual work legitimises the Reformers' actions, rather than those of their Louvainist rivals.

Jewel, however, makes an even more persistent and, indeed, compelling endeavour to make humanism the 'handmaiden' of Protestant ideology. Not only does he attempt to reconstruct the Italian philosopher, Pico della Mirandola, as a budding religious

141 Jewel, Defence, p. 439.
142 Nowell, Reproufe, fol. 35'.
revolutionary, instructing Harding how he ‘besoughte Pope Leo.10. to abate the vaine Multitude of your ceremonies: to refourme youre Praiers: and to cut of [sic] youre Fables: …’¹⁴³ but he also, like Nowell, brings forward the writings of Erasmus as corroborating evidence for Protestant doctrine. Thus, in the following quote, he calls upon the humanist’s testimony concerning the matter of Purgatory, concurrently stating that the ‘junior’ Catholic academics of the 1560s could not possibly live up to the, supposedly pro-Protestant, hero’s level of patristic erudition or, indeed, or hope to emulate this exemplary model of intellectual masculinity. He styles Erasmus:

... a man of famous memorie: whose name for learninge, & iudgement, hath at al times among the Learned, benne mutche esteemed, with whom your yonge Louanian Clergie [sic] may not wel compare, in the profounde knowledge of ye Doctours, without great blushinge.¹⁴⁴

Furthermore, in Jewel’s text, the renowned Spanish humanist, Juan Luis Vives, whose commentary on St. Augustine’s City of God will be analysed in the next chapter, is forcibly ‘converted’ to Protestantism, being cited as a witness to the spuriousness of a significant Catholic work:

... writinge of your Lege[n]da Aurea, which was the Mother of al your deuoute Ecclesiastical stories, or Fables, [he] saithe thus, ... : I see no cause, why it should be called the Goulden Legende, seeing it was written by a man of an iron face, and a ledden harte, and is freight ful of most shamelesse lies.¹⁴⁵

Therefore, the Bishop of Salisbury, rather astutely, contrives to transmute the ubiquitous humanist anxiety concerning textual authenticity into a desire for Protestant reform. Jewel implicitly urges his male readers to embrace these prominent scholars as their

¹⁴³ Jewel, Defence, p.627.
¹⁴⁵ Jewel, Defence, p.520.
intellectual forefathers, thus, I would suggest, more broadly boosting the humanist masculine morale of the Elizabethan clergy.

Yet more than deftly obscuring the ostensibly Catholic beliefs of these humanists - Erasmus died in that faith and Vives had to leave England in the due to his loyalty to his patron, Catherine of Aragon\textsuperscript{146} - Jewel's \textit{Defence} also, incredibly inventively, modified the early sixteenth-century humanists' condemnation of scholasticism into an attack on the Catholic intellectuals of his own period. This subtle equation of the two movements occurs as part of an explicit refutation of Harding's, potentially dangerous, protestation that Catholics possess the paramount claim to humanist masculinity, Jewel maintaining that:

\begin{quote}
It were no greate Maisterie, to charge the Chiefe Doctours of your side with somme want of Learning. Ludouicus Viues saith ... : \textit{For the space of certaine hundred yeeres paste, the lesse any Booke came into (your Learned ([sic] studentes handes, the purer, and better it came to vs. Meaninge thereby, y' eueruy thinge was the woorse for your Learned handelinge. ... . Erasmus saithe, ... : The monstrous folies, y' we commonly reade in y\textsuperscript{e} Commentaries of the late Interpreters, (whereby he meaneth the very croppe, and the woorthieste of al your Scholastical Learned Doctours) are so far without shame, and so peeuishe, as if they had benne written for swine, and not for menne.}\textsuperscript{147}
\end{quote}

Thus Jewel, 'up against it' in both a gender and thus religio-political sense, attempts to assuage the intellectual threat of the Louvainists by not only dramatising their erudition as being censured by two paragons of humanist excellence, but by also concomitantly indicating that textual corruption and an inefficient, even punctilious, exegesis are contemporary Catholic problems. The exiles, cannot, in this 'soothing' Protestant version of events, actually acquire learned masculine power because they are scholastics, whose methodologies are represented as being absolutely antithetical to the aims of Renaissance humanism.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{146} See McConica, \textit{English Humanists}, p.54.
\textsuperscript{147} Jewel, \textit{Defence}, p.571.
\textsuperscript{148} Ozment has argued that, in reality, the boundary between humanism and scholasticism was more fluid -- \textit{Age of Reform}, pp.305-306.
Hence they are posited as being infected by the intellectual 'plague' of their pedantic ancestors – they are, as Jewel tells his opponents ‘youre Schole Doctoures …’.\footnote{Jewel, *Defence*, p.548.} Thus the early sixteenth century humanists’ means of ‘slaying’ their educational rivals, becomes for Jewel, the ultimate tool for humiliating the Louvainists in the 1560s.

In this way we may come to appreciate the sense in which the English Protestant intelligentsia put up an impressive struggle for humanist manliness in the first decade of the Elizabethan era, one which seems to be, unlike that of the Catholics’, free of externally-imposed intellectual contradictions. Nevertheless, while their opponents tussled with the implications of papal anti-humanist feeling, these Reformists did themselves have to face the fearful ghost of scholasticism which might be seen to haunt their works. For as Harding and his associates pointed out at the time, the Protestants made frequent recourse to the authority of these thinkers, Dering, for instance, stating that ‘it is plaine, yt \textit{Scotus} & M. Harding do not agree’\footnote{Dering, *Sparing Restraint*, sig.2Fiivii'.}, as well as evoking Aquinas to uphold the Reformers’ position on daily communion: ‘Loe heere are maister Hardings owne Doctors, which doe sufficiently answere his untruth’.\footnote{Dering, *Sparing Restraint*, sig.2Li'.} In this last quotation we may begin to perceive exactly how treacherous the mobilisation of anti-scholasticism against the Catholics was for Protestants in the Great Controversy. No sooner had they derogatively labelled their opponents as users of this ‘degenerate’ intellectual discourse, then they were caught utilising it themselves! The Protestants could not slur their spiritual opponents without sullying themselves and thus, I would suggest placing themselves uncomfortably beyond the humanist ‘pale’. Indeed, John
O’Malley has drawn attention to the way in which Protestantism might be seen to retain a scholastic residue despite the open antagonism of Luther to this thought-system.152

Hence both sides of this early Elizabethan literary conflict were, arguably, riven by ideological paradox, a complexity which, perhaps, hampered each confessional camp’s attempt to obtain the ‘option’ on erudite masculinity. However, I would suggest that the very close polemical proximity of these Catholic and Protestant controversial works was a more significant problem. As we have seen in some detail in this section, the Protestants and the Louvainists availed themselves of virtually the same disputation strategies concerning the ‘tropes’ of humanist manliness: therefore, the more each group strove to distinguish itself humanistically, the more it, necessarily, found itself sounding like its enemies.153

Indeed, this circular confusion might particularly have been seen to hold potentially appalling consequences for the Protestants with their relatively recent, and almost certainly anxious, hold on religio-political power in England: what if Elizabeth could not tell them apart from their Louvainist rivals? Might they, then, lose their hegemonic position? This possibly terrifying prospect of blurred intellectual identities, of the inability of Protestants to find their own cultural individuality in a decade when they desperately needed it, was emphasised, perhaps with great effect, by Harding when he wrote in the Detection: ‘... we sprang not out of you, but ye out of vs’.154 As the prodigal sons of Catholic spiritual scholars, the Protestants had a lot to prove: the impossibility of achieving this separateness within the perimeters of a mutually employed humanist discourse arguably perpetuated this painfully

153 This situation may have come about due to the fact that these spiritual groups shared humanist culture, but it was, arguably, exacerbated because of the controversial convention of replying to each of the individual parts of the opponents’ work, this, perhaps, inevitably leading to a textual ‘mirroring’.
154 Harding, Detection, fol.203".
recursive literary conflict, one which possibly only ended due the publication problems of the exiles and the deaths of the chief protagonists in the early 1570s.  

Unlike us, looking back from the beginning of the twenty-first century, Jewel and his fellow Protestants could not be confident that they would ultimately triumph – they could not make a ‘window’ into the soul of the queen who, like a Catholic, kept candles in her chapel and know that she would not ever abandon them for political expediency’s sake. They could not know that their uneducated clergy would endure and their fragile university system would stand the test of time. Thus for men such as Drant, the early Elizabethan era was, I would argue, a period of intense struggle and trepidation, one in which the Louvainist challenge to Protestant humanist masculine supremacy was taken very seriously, being regarded as a severe source of religio-political peril.

In fact, I would contend that contemporary Protestants, quite literally, considered the Great Controversy as a desperate fight for survival, one which was, indeed, documented in a distinctly martial lexicon. For although Catholics such as Dorman alluded to this literary quarrel as the ‘skirmishes of learning’, as we saw in the introduction to this chapter, it was, arguably, the Protestants - the group who had more to lose in terms of socio-spiritual power – who more intensely experienced, and hence expressed, this textual contention as mortal combat. The Louvainist, Rastell, did, in fact, mobilise military metaphorical language to (interestingly, for our purposes) divulge the wide impact of the debate on the masculine community, writing that: ‘... now the battle beginning afreshe, there is slurred vp a closer

155 Pollen has described how the Louvainists’ publications dwindled due to extrinsic factors, such as the spread of the Reformation to the Netherlands - English Catholics, p.109.

156 Jewel criticised this monarchical concession to ‘papistry’ in a letter to Peter Martyr written on November 16th, 1559 - see Letter XXIV in The Zurich Letters, ed. and trans. by Robinson, p.55.
attention in every mannes minde, to marke how truly it is fought’, concluding that: ‘... somewhat is wrought, I think, in every man, one way or other about these matters’.\textsuperscript{157}

However, it is, arguably, Protestant literature which is more fully stuffed with warlike words. Hence Dering, for example, reflects on the afflicted life of Job, using this as the pretext to argue that life is a battle, thus betraying a deeper Protestant ‘siege’ mentality. He asks his audience to ponder:

... what maner of fight we haue, what enimies to encounter with us, howe great of force, how cankred of will, how subtile in devise, how continuall in assault, & on the other side how weak we be of our selues ... .\textsuperscript{158}

Yet if we fleetingly glimpse here the poignant vulnerability of early Elizabethan Protestants, Dering soon attempts to, propagandistically perhaps, promote the pretence that the ‘victory’ over the Catholic exiles has already been gained. He boasts to Harding: ‘... your tentes are spoyled, your defences are weakned [sic], your holdes are ouerturned, and your Captaines slaine’.\textsuperscript{159}

Indeed, a similar textual operation, involving the honest declaration of Protestant difficulties, followed by an endeavour to put a more positive ‘spin’ on events, is also present in the work of Nowell. There we intially witness an acknowledgement of the Protestants’ fear of their daunting Louvainist adversaries, which is rapidly replaced by the familiar disparagement of their opponents intellectual skill. Nowell admits that the Catholics: ‘... may seeme, of greater force and violence, than that it can be possibly resisted, seing [sic] these yonge soldiours haue geuen such a fresh onset’, but he then consoles the reader by saying: ‘... I dare assure you that either these matters shal thus stil be handled by scholers or yonge

\textsuperscript{157} Rastell, ‘To the Indifferent Reader’, Beware, sig.[Aviii"].

\textsuperscript{158} Dering, dedication, Sparing Restraint, sig.\textsuperscript{ii}.

\textsuperscript{159} Dering, Sparing Restraint, sig.Ciii'.
studientes ... or if the olde doctors dare adue[n]ture ... they shal handle the saide matters but scholerike ...'. Moreover, Nowell augments this confident image of Protestantism when he describes Dorman as 'skirmishing with his owne shadow', further asserting that: '... he plaieth the man in that unblouddy battaile, ... without duste raising, or bloud sheadinge, without enemie slaine, hurte, or put to flight, ...'. The Louvainist is, therefore, comfortingly represented as not having any impact upon his Protestant foes, this attempting to reassuringly dissolve the earlier disclosure of apprehensiveness.

Thus, I would argue, this bellicose discourse both betrays the Protestant community's disquiet in the early Elizabethan era and shows how contemporary writers aimed to alleviate this: we may be scared to engage our religious rivals, these texts say, but we will win, even if you (or I) do not believe it. Hence we may, perhaps, safely say that the English clergy were evidently terrified by the Catholic émigrés' attacks and possibly understood that their gender identity was at stake, this causing them to figure the scramble for humanist intellectuality as a hostile contest of heroic masculinity.

However, this martial language may, in addition, be seen to symbolise yet another part of the acute Protestant effort to 'annex' Northern Renaissance humanism in this period: these intellectuals may be, I suggest, articulating an aspiration to become one of Erasmus' Christian soldiers, as originally laid out in the Enchiridion. By employing a military vocabulary, the Protestants might be seen to be subtly aligning themselves with this part of the humanist literary heritage which had famously employed an idiom of conflict to explicate the purpose of (an arguably male) spiritual life, stating that the godly warrior: '... wyll put on iustyce for his brest plate / and take for his helmet, sure and true iudgement / he wyl take a

160 Nowell, 'The Preface to the Reader', Reproufe, sig.A3'.
161 Nowell, Reproufe, fol.123'.
shelde of equite impenetrable, or that can not be persed / yes and he wyll sharpe or fascion cruel wrath into a spere'\textsuperscript{162}

Whatever the reasons for this military terminology, the 1560s was a decade in which the Protestant ministry had to battle to retain its humanist intellectuality, arguably because such a manliness served to substantiate the entitlement to religio-political power in European Renaissance culture. Protestant men had to justify their hegemonic status in the face of the fact that their poverty-stricken clerics were lacking in erudition and their universities were in a shambles. They were constantly confronted by the disturbing fact that the Catholic exiles were excellent humanist scholars who worked consistently to undermine their enemies' sense of erudite masculinity. They urgently needed to show that their learned Catholic opponents could not, in reality, do any better than themselves: they had to, in turn, disputatively dismiss the Louvainists' manly humanist prowess so that the English government might not call upon them for 'counsel' in this uncertain period. In this situation, early Elizabethan Protestantism had never required Christian soldiers more and, as we shall see in the next section, Thomas Drant was incredibly eager to be at the front line.

Around Easter 1570, Drant gave a sermon in which he proclaimed: 'It is ours, it is ours, it is all of it ours'. The 'it' in question was humanist scholarship. Hence not long after he had rendered Gregory Naziansus' *Epigrams* into English, Drant the preacher may be clearly seen to be participating in the Elizabethan Protestant struggle for the possession of intellectual masculinity as explored in the last section. In fact, other parts of Drant's *oeuvre* disclose him to have been very directly involved in the controversial conflict with the Louvainists: his vitriolic textual response to Richard Shacklock's work reveals the cleric to have had a powerful awareness of the importance of refuting the contemporary Catholic scholars' pretensions to humanist manliness. Furthermore, Drant's work discloses a definite desire to use humanist translation for advancement of the Protestant cause, his rewriting of Horace's *Satires* becoming the site of a radical outburst against 'papist' temporisers in the Church of England. I will examine this part of Drant's printed corpus here in an attempt to establish a 'local' context for my reading of the *Epigrams* in the fourth section.

Just as Jewel and his associates utilised the space of doctrinal debate to promote the cause of Protestant learned manhood, Drant, in a way similar to his fellow intellectual clergymen, may be seen to have transformed the theological rhetoric of the sermon into a means by which to reinforce the humanist identity of male Anglicans. His approach in these public exhortations reiterated the strategies of the Protestant controversialists examined in the previous section: he strove to persuasively subvert the Catholic claim to humanist erudition.

---

163 Thomas Drant, *Two Sermons preached, the one at S. Maries Spittle on Tuesday in Easter weeke. 1570. and the other at the Court of Windsor the Sonday after twelfth day, being the viij. of January, before in theyeare. 1569* (London: [1570]), sig.Dii'. All quotations are drawn from the sermon presented at S. Maries Spittle unless stated otherwise - all further references to this edition will be cited as *Two Sermons*.
Proposing that 'these troublous barkers Louanians'\textsuperscript{164} were generally obstuse in theological matters, Drant evoked a scriptural analogy which functioned to feminise these émigrés, affirming that: 'He that is ignoraunt in papistrie, is like the woman of Samaria, which standeth at the fountaine, and is a thyrst, and yet feeleth her selfe not to be a thirst'.\textsuperscript{165} The Catholic scholars' were, then, clearly debarred from humanist masculinity, their 'womanly' imbecility being, in Drant's view, partly due to their dependence upon an inaccurate version of the Bible, which was the fallacious basis for the Catholic spiritual viewpoint:

Touching the vulgar translation, that is the matrix and conceptorie place of very errour, and ignoraunce. Hence Dunce, hence Dorbell, hence Houlcotte, Bricot, Tapper, Capper, Ecchius, Pighius, Coelaeus, and Hofmeister, haue founded, and finde out many a fonde argume[n]t. Hence wrangle the Iesuites, hence wrastle the Sorbonistes, hence the horne of Rome is most loftilie exalted.\textsuperscript{166}

Thus in this mockery of the figures of European Catholic learning (such as Pighius), Drant depicts Protestantism's religious opponents as being both frustrated in their endeavours to offer a plausible 'case' for their beliefs and also unable to provide a an exegetically pure spiritual text. Hence through these interconnected issues, it is insinuated that Catholic men fail at humanist logic, as well as being inadequate in terms of humanist philology.

Indeed, Drant negates the Louvainist, Nicholas Sanders,' supposed humanist capabilities for a parallel reason - his ratiocination lacks credibility, as our translator apparently noted in the Louvainists’ discussion of need for services to be implemented in the classical language of Rome:

Doctour Sanders in an Oration that he made in the face of Louane, hath much wrested his wit to proue that those thinges which are done in the Church ought to be done in the latin toung - The argumentes that this Doctour bringeth are but few, and

\textsuperscript{164} Drant, \textit{Two Sermons}, sig.[Cvii].
\textsuperscript{165} Drant, \textit{Two Sermons}, sig.[Cviii].
\textsuperscript{166} Drant, \textit{Two Sermons}, sig.Ciii.
those but fond, and except a couple, and scarce too that couple, are worthy ye recitall.\textsuperscript{167}

Yet if contemporary Catholic humanists may be seen to be lacking in reasoning skills, Drant may be seen to perform an even more shrewd manœuvre when he audaciously declares that the ‘papists’ of the past were, in reality, only specious scholars:

Sir Tho\[mas\] More is always wrangling and iangling, harping and carping, about No, and Nay, yea, and yes the word, and that word \ldots\ . And as Rachell mourned for her children, because she had them not: so Sir Thomas More might mourne for his duinitie [sic], because he had it not. D. Fisher hath alleged many thinges most unproperly, \ldots: It is easie to be shewed, his doctrine is not learned, and therefore ought not to carry credit with me[\textit{n}] of learning.\textsuperscript{168}

In this way, I would argue, Drant aims to ‘neutralise’ the tradition of English Catholic humanism. Here More is traduced as an almost scholastical pedant, whose ineptitude is shown to representatively cost him his male gendering - he is compared to a weeping, barren woman - and John Fisher’s knowledge is utterly disgraced. Yet more than, once again, revealing that the humanist model of masculinity had made ‘cleverness’ prerequisite for men in European Renaissance culture - More cannot be said to be a man without it - I would suggest that Drant’s lambasting of the two luminaries of English Erasmian learning effectively robs the Louvainist exiles of a pair of major exemplars for their erudite manhood. In a period where imitation was crucial for self-formation,\textsuperscript{169} Drant’s sermon might be seen to thus attempt a violent blow against the mimetic foundations of male Catholic intellectual identity.

\textsuperscript{167} Drant, \textit{Two Sermons}, sig.[Cvi'].
\textsuperscript{168} Drant, \textit{Two Sermons}, sig.Dv\textsuperscript{v}'.'
\textsuperscript{169} This emulative culture was central to the scholarly praxis of Renaissance humanism - thus the emphasis on exemplars in reading in this period - see, for instance, GJ. See Chapter Three of this thesis for a discussion of the recusant male’s possible imitation of female role models.
Indeed, this endeavour to reproduce the history of Catholic scholarship as being replete with figures whose studies do not meet the standards of humanist learning may be seen to be also present when Drant reacts to the émigrés’ protestations of superior knowledge:

Without all peraduentures, there hath bene of Master Hardinges side so long a cataloge [sic] of so unlearned, and insensible writers, as I thinke by arte memoratiue, they connot [sic] be comprehended. That which Aloes is to the lippes, which galles is to the young, which a carcasse smell is to the nose, which a cockatrise [is] to the eyes, which a naked dagger is to the hart, that it is, and euen that comfort it is, to be conuersaunt in the base barabrismes, & balde solisismes, and bad sillogismes, and whole dungeons of the Duncerie of Hardinges companions. Let them not be so shrill in crying out, and craking of their learning ....  

Hence, in a way which echoes the approach of other Protestant ‘soldiers’, our translator quietly shifts the linguistic and logical ‘problems’ of scholasticism onto his religious opponents, a move which evidently aims to obstruct the Louvainists’ entry into the realm of humanist masculinity.

Indeed, Drant mirrors Jewel in his discerning attempt to invoke the early sixteenth-century humanist antagonism to the ‘futility’ of medieval erudition as a critique of contemporary Catholic intellectuality. In the following quote he sarcastically depicts the exiles’ supposed reverence for scholastic thinkers, before setting the humanist hierarchy against them, Drant impersonating the Louvainists’ allegedly lavish praise:

All haile Learned doctors, Doctorall doctors, Docterly doctors, Irrefragable doctors, Impregnable doctors, Seraphicall doctors, Angelicall doctors, Magistrall doctors, Illuminate doctors, Autenticall [sic] doctors .... . But see the learning of these doctors in the epistles of obscure men, and in a dialogue betwene Reuclin and Erasmus.  

---

170 Drant, Two Sermons, sig.Di⁺⁻⁻.  
171 ‘Duncerie’ here alludes disparagingly to the thought of the medieval philospher Duns Scotus whose work became anecdotally aligned with ignorance in this period - I am grateful to Julian Bain for this insight.
In this passage, the work of the most celebrated Northern European humanist is summoned to signify the émigrés' inability to attain humanist intellectual manhood, but I would also propose that we witness here a subtle attempt to construct a connection between humanism and Protestantism. This endeavour is, indeed, effected - quite aggressively - elsewhere in the sermon, Drant very brazenly appropriating the humanist pantheon in response to the Catholic intellectual challenge:

I tell them [the Louvainists] the great Beuclarkes [sic] and chaptaigne scholars of all christendome are ours, and on our side, Picus Mirandula of a miraculous witte, and abundaunt learning, was ours. Erasmus the worship of the worlde, and Melancton [sic] the Phenix [sic] of Germanie, Iohn Reucllin the Hebrue father, and William Budaeus the Greeke father, were ours. Ye groundselles of learning, ye kindlers of light, indeede ye be ours. 173

In fact, this quite courageous Protestant annexation of humanist manhood takes another turn when Drant asserts that even if the Catholic exiles might be seen to be blessed with some erudition, they must acknowledge that they enjoy this privilege purely because of their 'debt' to Protestant humanist scholarship:

These Papistes haue lighted their candles at your candles, and whetted theyr weapons at your stones, and sucked up their learning at your feete: Eve[n] so Thomas Harding sucked up his learning at Peter Martyrs feete ... and Fredericus Staphilus at Melanctons [sic] feete, Saunders, and the Iesuites haue their Grecismes and Hebraismes by immitation [sic] of Musculus. ... Papistes, from us ye haue had it, or by our examples ye haue spyed it [humanist learning]. ... Crowes leaue your cackling, or geue you home agayne your borowed fethers. 174

Thus our translator locates the Louvainists as being in a dependent, even pedagogically infantilised position, sitting subordinately before their great Protestant humanist masters: the Catholics, it is implied, are intellectual boys, rather than men, unable to make an original contribution to knowledge since their erudition is merely derivative.

172 Drant, Two Sermons, sigs.[Dviý].
173 Drant, Two Sermons, sig.Dii". 
However, I would contend that there is something else here which works to undercut Drant’s endeavour to disputatively deprive his opponents of humanist masculinity: that is, in order to spread the notion that Catholic learning is ‘second hand’, the cleric has to first acknowledge its existence. This not only, I would suggest, contradicts what we have seen to be the sermon’s broader desire to repudiate the possibility of Catholic humanist skill, but also raises the spectre of a humanist training that is used ‘otherwise’. I would argue that this passage accidentally announces that men like Harding and Sanders could take this intellectual methodology in another ideological direction and hence exposes the fact that the humanist-Protestant ‘love affair’ - which Drant had worked so hard to advance - was, actually, a lie. Hence our translator’s impassioned attempt to defeat the Louvainist threat (which is, conspicuously, still present at the beginning of the 1570s) might be seen to, ultimately, leave the exiled Catholic intellectuals’ humanist manhood and religio-political potency disconcertingly undiminished.

Hence in the pulpit, Drant exhibited his keen appreciation of the urgent need to fight for Protestant humanist manliness against the Catholic expatriate scholars who presented an alternative source of ‘counsel’ for the Elizabethan commonwealth. His engagement with the Louvainists was decidedly dexterous (even if it is a little argumentatively inconsistent), yet what is so striking is the determined persistence of this assault, an attack which occurs within the framework of an exposition on the ‘Song of Songs’. The fact that a polemic concerning intellectual masculinity effectively replaced evangelism in this sermon symbolises the extent to which the Great Controversy impacted upon the early Elizabethan Protestant clergy. Indeed, I would propose that Drant’s defiant professions of Protestant humanist supremacy in this sermon - rather than representing the Anglican scholars’ unequivocal achievements in

174 Drant, Two Sermons, sig.Diiv.
the area of 'liberal' learning - actually lay bare the extent of the crisis of Protestant gender confidence in this period. The fact that our translator apparently feels forced to address this issue over and over again surely implies that he decidedly did not have faith in the - generally uneducated - Protestant ministry's humanist intellectual manliness, or, furthermore, truly believe the Louvainists to be such unlettered enemies. Thus at a short chronological distance ahead of the vernacular version of the *Epigrams*, one may see Drant the parson to be profoundly anxious about the 'outcome' of the conflict described in the previous part of this chapter, a concept which we will do well to preserve in our minds as we analyse the translation of Gregory Nazianzus' work in the next section.

However, looking back a few years prior to the publication of this 'englished' patristic work, to the time when Drant might have been contemplating this literary venture, we may, once more, witness this cleric as being on 'active service' against the Catholic humanist foe. Richard Shacklock was a Louvainist whose fields of scholarly expertise - versification and translation - disquietingly corresponded to those of Drant. As such a close rival, Shacklock, I would suggest, typified to our translator the menace of the Catholic humanist waiting to usurp his place, this partly explaining why Drant reacted so vehemently against his work. When Shacklock produced a verse eulogy in Latin on the eminent exiled Catholic academic, Cuthbert Scot, Drant responded by composing an entire text dedicated to derogating the intellectual émigrés. In this work there is a prefatory epistle addressed 'To

---

175 Not much is known about Shacklock apart from the fact that he was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge where he gained his B.A. and M.A. and became a fellow. Following Elizabeth's accession this divine travelled to Louvain where he studied civil law - see DNB, xvii, 1275.

176 Thomas Drant, *Impii Civvisdam Epigrammatis qvod editid Richard Shaklockus in mortem Cuthberti Scoti quondam praesulis Cestrensis Apomaxis... Also certayne of the speciall Articles of the Epigramme, refuted in Englyshe...* (London: 1565). All further references to this edition will be cited as *Impii...*.
the English Louvainistes, the Pope his suppliantes' in which Drant writes of the popular praise given to Shacklock's creation, now translated into the vernacular, stating that:

Many were the vauntes, and passing were the wordes, that were euerie where bruted in commen[n]dation and maintenaunce of this so litell, but learned Englysshe Poesye: It doth argue (I right willingly confesse) the inditer therof to be a prety [sic] ordinary smatterer: not so lettered a workman ... .

Thus here we may observe Drant diagnosing the warm welcome which the (presumably Catholic) public has apparently given this text as being indicative of its lack of intellectual sophistication: the 'spin' surrounding the text is necessary because of its inherent weakness, or, to present another interpretation, readers, allegedly, only love an 'ordinary smatterer'. In this passage, I would propose, our translator attempts to dismiss Shacklock from the humanist elite who, it is intimated, simply indite refined rhymes which speak for themselves.

Moreover, Drant aims to destroy the eulogy's depiction of Scot as a high-achieving humanist. His own poetic reply refers to: 'Cutbert [sic] that coulde enough of craft more then of learned skill ... ', thus positing the dead scholar as having possessed more cunning than knowledge. Indeed, in a familiar manœuvre, Drant casts aspersions upon Scot's lauded eloquence, twisting Shacklock's evocation of the common Renaissance image of oratorical power concerning the Herculean enchainment of the audience into one of duping the ignorant which consequently debilitates the deceased Catholic's claim to 'own' this manly

---

177 Drant, Impii..., sig.[c4̊].
178 Drant, Impii..., sig.[diii̊].
179 See Skinner, Reason, p.92. Shacklock's had depicted Scot's powerful eloquence, declaring that: 'If englysh talke or Latine speche to us thou forth dyd bryng, / Me thought the hearers on thy lyppes, dyd hang as by a styng' - see Drant, Impii..., sig. dii̊.
humanist ability: ‘... / In latin or in english tong such processe dyd he ryng, / That he wold leade the noosled foole, as it were with a string, / ...’. 180

Furthermore, Drant uses his verse response to build an impression of the Protestant clergy as an intellectually powerful group in an attempt to cancel out Catholic criticism of the uneducated English ministry. Retorting to Shacklock’s remark that: ‘Ah me promotions of great pryse do chaunce to tryfying boyes, / ...’, 181 our translator mythologises the men of the contemporary Church of England, presenting them as paragons of humanist eloquence and knowledge: ‘... / O happy days, promotions now fall not to tryfling boyes, / ... / Both old & yong of fyled tongue, and of surpassyng lore: / ...’. 182

Indeed, the alleged erudite masculinity of the Protestant hierarchy is paraded at the close of the text where Drant inserts a Latin poem entitled ‘Ad Dominvm Ivellvm et Moribundos Louanienses’. Here we may witness our translator as being conversant with the controversial literature surveyed in the second section of this chapter, the first stanza opening with a summary of the key ‘warriors’ of the Catholic camp: ‘Hardingus trux fronte pugil, spes altera Rome, / Dira fremens, magnum, contra ciet arma Iuellum. / Dormannus, Rastell, Stapleton, socia agmina iungent, / Tela vibrant: ...’. 183 However, the piece, predictably perhaps, concludes by portraying Jewel as the undoubted conqueror in this cerebral confrontation, one who is comparable to the greatest classical archetype of martial masculinity: ‘Catholicae fidei Iuellus magnus Achilles, / Hardingum straut: sis felix magne Iuelle’. 184

---

180 Drant, Impii..., sig.[diǐii”].
181 Shacklock quoted by Drant, Impii..., sig.diif.
182 Drant, Impii..., sig.[diǐii””].
183 Drant, Impii..., sig.[eiif’].
184 Drant, Impii..., sig.[eiif’].
Yet if Drant was so confident about the Protestant's ability to 'rout' the Catholic scholars on the field of intellectual manliness, why was our translator so unmistakably perturbed by the Louvainists' polemics? In fact, why did he depict the Great Controversy as a fight at all if it was such a simple triumph? I suggest that here our translator, like other Protestant writers in the early Elizabethan period, reveals himself as being involved in 'hyping' the humanist gender identity of Anglican clerical men for religio-political reasons. I would suggest that behind this supposedly strong barricade of Protestant 'liberal' learning, shuddered a legion of divines expecting it to crumble and let in the troop of Catholic 'counsellors'.

It is because of being in this hazardous position that, I would argue, Drant wrote so virulently against the anonymous Catholic 'englisher' of Shacklock's poetic work, his anxiety, arguably, emerging in the violent metaphor of medical intervention he employs to describe his critical handling of the unknown 'papist's vernacular version of this piece. He dubs himself 'a rude Chirurgian' who operates upon a 'wound', declaring that: 'I rubbe so rough, I ransacke depe, I cut unto the core: / More healthfull for to haue my helpe, more easefull to the sore'. Hence Drant may be seen to resort to performing mutilating surgery upon this, supposedly, diseased literary body in order to keep this religious scholarly opponent from invading his territory of textual excellence. Catholics could not be permitted to be seen as capable translators because such skill might pose a manly humanist threat to the Protestant hegemony. Such scholars not only produced texts which might potentially influence the course of spiritual and secular life, but also, perhaps more importantly, they

185 Drant,'To the unknowen Translater of Shaklockes verses', Impii..., sig.e'.
186 Drant,'To the unknowen Translater of Shaklockes verses', Impii..., sig.e'.
187 Drant,'To the unknowen Translater of Shaklockes verses', Impii..., sig.e'.
represented a linguistically-gifted workforce which might alternatively serve the Elizabethan administration.

This concern is indisputably present in Drant's poetic 'counterblast' to Shacklock's English rendition of the epistolary text which the Portugese humanist, Osorius, had addressed to the current queen. Our translator rancorously repudiates this text which was entitled 'A Pearle for a Prince', brusquely affirming that: 'We haue so much of better thyngs, we cast these perles away. / And sely Shaklock, sely ma[n], may praise his pearles els wheare, /...'. 188 Indeed, I would argue that this rejection is so abrupt precisely because Shacklock had brought into the domain of English understanding a text which in its masterly utilisation of the 'advice for princes' genre very explicitly exhibited the Catholic hold upon civic humanism. The Louvainist's translation had brought a broader swath of the English public face-to-face with the Protestant hierarchy's intellectual nemesis. 189

In fact, even more than his vernacular rendition of the work of Hosius (see Figure 2) 190 - the Polish Catholic scholar much-maligned by the English Protestant intellectual community - Shacklock's rewriting of Osorius would, I suggest, have been a terrifying text for the contemporary Anglican hierarchy. It set before Protestant eyes a 'nightmare' scenario: a Catholic humanist offering guidance to their monarch. Indeed, Shacklock / Osorius is disclosed to have a clear conception of the role of the public-spirited male humanist, the work announcing early on its appreciation of the significance of 'counsel', asserting that:

188 Drant, 'To Shaklocks Portugale', *Impii...*, sig.e".
189 I would like to draw the reader's attention to the existence of an extraordinary image from this controversy which appears in the Catholic text, *Chorus Alternatim Canentium* [Antwerp?: 1563?], a satire on the Protestant responses to Osorius from figures such as Haddon and Bucer. This contains a startling image of Osorius engrossed in (humanist) study - with a desk and lectern - on a chariot being pulled in triumph while the Reformist 'dogs' pull him on!
190 Stanislaus Hosius, *A Most Excellent Treatise of the begynnyng of heresyes in oure tyme, compiled by the ... Byshop of Wormes in Prussia. To the most renowned Prynce Lorde Sigismund mygthe Kyng of Poole, greate...
... no Prince is able by any meanes, either in warr to get the victory, or in peace to mayntaine his honoure, either in his affaires to behaue hymself politikely, or in his leasure continewe quietlye, which is not as it were walled with the company of good men. 191

Yet if Elizabeth, as a woman, was, perhaps, deemed to especially require the protection of this 'wall' of masculine humanist intellectuals, 192 then Shacklock's introduction to the text makes it manifest that these academic aides should be selected from the ranks of the Catholic intelligentsia based in continental Europe. Thus studious foreign men such as Osorius and, in particular, I suggest, the Louvainist exiles, are promoted by the translator as possessing a better vantage-point from which to consider English affairs:

... it hath pleased hym [God], to make greate learned men, which dwell on the hygh hylles of the Catholyke fayth, a farre of [sic] to discrye the flames which dayly consume England, and not onlye to discrye them, but also to send holy water of a moste godly councell to quenche them. 193

It was this vision concerning the religio-political potential of Catholic humanists which Shacklock wanted to propagate amongst the 'papist' community in England, expressing his wish: '... to styrr vp all deuoute Catholykes not learned in the latten tongue, to pray to God for the Quenes Maiestie, that as she hath good councelloures abroade in farr countryes, so she may haue good councelloures at home in her courte ...'. 194 That is,

---

191 Hieronymus Osorius, An Epistle of the Reuerend Father in God ... Bishop of Arcoburge in Portugale, to the most excellent Princesse Elizabeth by the grace of God Quene of England, Fraunce, and Ireland &c., trans. by Richard Shacklock (Antwerp: 1565), fol.12". The main text sits under the rubric 'A Pearle for a Prince', therefore all further references to this edition will be cited as Pearle.

192 Osorius makes his condescending attitude to the female queen quite apparent in his supposed tribute to her gifts, asking: '... what is more to be wondred at, then to beholden in a woman a manly constancie, in a virgin an horeheded prudence, in greate abou[n]dance of richesse, greate praise of temperaunce and modesty? What can soner [sic] astonish a man, then to see the tendre and deintie nature of a woman to be trimmed and decked with so many vertues, ... ' - Pearle, trans. by Shacklock, fol.8'.

193 Shacklock, 'To the Reader', Pearle, fol.3'.

194 Shacklock, 'To the Reader', Pearle, fol.3'.
Shacklock asks his co-religionists in the ‘homeland’ to hope for - and even work towards - the day when Elizabeth will ask for advice from erudite Catholic men.

It is hardly surprising, then, that Drant so resolutely renounced ‘Shacklock’s Portugale’. Indeed, his translation of the *Epigrams* may perhaps be seen to participate in the battle against this Louvainist’s dream of a commonwealth supervised by Catholic scholars, the dedication to Grindal stating that: ‘... the booke is small: and, a pearle is smal likewise, ...’, this analogy possibly subtly suggesting that this ‘precious’ text is intended to offer a Protestant humanist alternative to Shacklock’s literary treasure.

But before I analyse Drant’s vernacular version of Gregory Nazianzus’ poetic pieces, let us consider the way in which our translator’s works register a willingness to encounter not only the external enemies of Protestant England, such as the Louvainists, but also those ‘chameleonic’ Catholics who contrived to sabotage the nascent Church from within. For instance, Drant’s rendition of Horace’s *Satires* (1566) becomes the ‘occasion’ to revile those religious temporisers who remained in their ministerial places, thus infiltrating England’s spiritual infrastructure.

Removing the entire ‘Fifth Satire’, Drant addresses the ancient poet in order to establish his own intellectual independence:

Frende Horace thoughe you may me use as to translate your verse,
Yet your exployte I do refues [sic],
at this time to reherse.
Not euery tricke, nor euery toye,
that floweth from your braine,
Are incident to my pen,
nor worthie of my paine.196

195 Drant, dedication, *Epigrams*, sig.Aii".
196 Horace, *A Medicinable Morall, that is, the two Bookes of Horace his Satyres, Englyshed accordyng to the prescription of saint Hierome...The Wailyngs of the Prophet Hieremiah, done into Englyshe verse. Also*
Hence although he regards himself as being in the service of the 'first' composer of this work, Drant evidently considers the condition of the humanist translator to be one of creative freedom. He clearly privileges his own purposive 'rewriting' above the demands of textual fidelity, this further substantiating Warren Boutcher's conceptualisation of the 'originality' of translations in this period.\textsuperscript{197}

Even though Drant might be seen to expurgate this part of the text because of its inappropriate sexual content,\textsuperscript{198} it is exceptionally intriguing to witness that he replaces it with an elaborate satire of his own concerning the insidious presence of Catholic priests within the Church of England in the 1560s. This religio-political parody takes the form of a poetic dialogue between Pertinax, a Catholic who absconded to Louvain, and Commodus, who pragmatically weighed up his options and concluded that persevering within the 'reformed' church was preferable to facing penury in exile, imparting how this strategem offers him the opportunity to surreptitiously strike at the heart of Protestantism:

\begin{verbatim}
To sanctuarie of papistes
    to Louaine shoulde I flye?
That were a way to begger me
    to bringe me unto nceede:
And in so doinge, I shoulde woorke,
    the mother churche smalle meede. ...
He can not hurte his foe the moste
    that kepes the furste away:
I was resolude [sic] to keepe me close
    and see a furder stay.\textsuperscript{199}
\end{verbatim}

\textit{Epigrammes}, trans. by Thomas Drant (London: 1566), sig.Ciii'. All further references to this edition will be cited as \textit{Satires}.

\textsuperscript{197} See the introduction to this thesis.
\textsuperscript{198} This satire includes a reference to Horace having a 'wet dream' following a frustrating evening with a young woman: 'hic ego mendacem stultissimus usque puellam / ad medium noctem exspecto: somnus tamen aufert / intentum Veneri, tum immundo somnia visu / nocturnam vestem maculant ventremque supinum' - \textit{Horace: Satires I}, trans. by P. Michael Brown (Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips, 1993), ll.82-85.
Drant's poem also relates how the conniving Commodus has managed to attain a plethora of positions in the new church, which result in him being not only financially comfortable, but also able to further his religious cause by recruiting Catholic sympathisers, Commodus bragging that: 'Liuinges are myne, geuynges are myne, / the countenance is myne: / Promotions come to me alone, / or where I will assynge'.\(^{200}\) This point of unease is presumably present here because of the chronic shortage of clerics in this decade, which meant, as I discussed in the introduction to this chapter, that the Protestant hierarchy could not afford to either exclude such Catholic candidates, or even prevent these spiritually suspicious figures from gaining more power because of the exigent need for pluralism in this period.

In fact, Drant's satire stresses that this Catholic 'conspiracy' will not only destroy the burgeoning Protestant Church, but also lead to the downfall of English academia. Commodus gloats that: '... if there be not speedie healpe, / against me and my fooles. [sic] / Ile driue their Gospell from the churche, / and learnyng from the Schooles'.\(^{201}\) Thus, I would suggest, the poem obliquely encapsulates the profound insecurity of English Protestants in the early Elizabethan era: not only is the fabric of their religious life torn by confessional confusion, but their humanist education system is, as Jewel conceded to Martyr, still under the influence of Catholicism. Although Drant might attempt to transpose the blame for these current difficulties onto the religious opposition, these issues remain, finally, Protestant problems.

Hence, once more, the onus falls upon our translator to palliate the contemporary Protestant intellectuals' sense of failure by depicting such men as successful humanists. Indeed, our translator may be seen here to make an energetic effort to establish his own

\(^{199}\) Horace, *Satires*, trans. by Drant, sig.[Cvii'].

\(^{200}\) Horace, *Satires*, trans. by Drant, sig.D'.
manly intellectual identity by defending humanism against its scholastic rivals, stating that: ‘Those cacklinge pyes, that use to prate, / so much againste humanytye, / Are commonly the lewdest dawes, / and skillesse in diunitie’. 202 In fact, I would suggest that, like other Protestants involved in the Great Controversy, he perhaps makes an implicit parallel between these, supposedly, obsolete thinkers and the ‘Popishe dawes’ 203 of his own day, this occurring through the maintenance of the ornithic metaphor. Furthermore, Drant testifies that: ‘The true precise, none doo despise, / but all men knowe it well, / That they in learnynge and good lyfe, / moste commonly excell’. 204 Hence ‘authentic’ Protestants are said to be distinguishable from Catholic deceivers through their ‘trademarks’ of humanist knowledge and virtue, the issue of intellectual masculinity emerging, once more, to underscore its importance in this period. Nevertheless, these ‘signs’ of ethical humanist manhood do not guarantee that one will not be tricked by Catholic clerics, Drant complaining that: ‘... Commodus hath fonded some,...’. 205

Thus, as in the Great Controversy, the ultimate awkwardness, if not impossibility, of discriminating between erudite men of divergent faiths comes to light. As much as Drant’s satire strives to make Protestants conscious of the ‘treacherous’ Catholics in their midst, it finally provides them with a faulty system for ‘spotting’ these stealthy fathers: he tells his co-religionists to look out for the traces of a humanist manliness which might be argued to be ubiquitous amongst the cultural elite and certainly not specific to Anglican men. By overzealously absorbing the notion of male Protestant humanist ascendancy, Drant, arguably, loses the trail on the ‘hunt’ for hidden Catholics within the English clergy.

201 Horace, Satires, trans. by Drant, sig.D
203 Horace, Satires, trans. by Drant, sig.[Cv]
204 Horace, Satires, trans. by Drant, sig.Dii
In this section we have witnessed Thomas Drant to be absolutely at the centre of the struggle for Protestant humanist manliness in the early Elizabethan era. We observed our translator fiercely fighting the Louvainists’ attestations of intellectual dominance through both his sermons and poetic productions. In fact, we witnessed him as being specifically resistant to Shacklock’s use of translation, where he seemed to show an awareness of the religio-political implications of a convincing Catholic humanist manhood. Indeed, we perceived Drant the clergyman to be painfully cognisant of the current crisis in both the Protestant clergy and education system, a concern which seeped into his humanist scholarship on Horace.

It is these literary works which, I believe, present us with grounds for considering Drant’s *Epigrams* as a work orientated at ameliorating the condition of contemporary Protestant men. With their learned humanist masculinity pointedly under threat due to the dearth of educated Reformist divines and the impact of the Great Controversy, the intellectual gender identity of male Anglicans had to be reinforced in this period order to help secure the Protestant body politic. If Drant drew attention to the Protestant claim to humanist manliness in his pulpit, it seems credible that he might have ‘rewritten’ a patristic text in the late 1560s because of a similar motivation. If he utilised the methodology of humanist translation to highlight the matter of Catholic temporisers within his Church, it seem feasible that he would shortly after ‘english’ a sacred text in order to help those men working within this troubled institution. Bearing this context in mind, I will now turn to Drant’s vernacular version of Gregory of Nazianzus’ work.

Having established the historical conditions in which Drant's work was produced, I will now present a reading of the *Epigrams* in the light of this context. I will propose that an understanding of the 'trying' times which were the 1560s permits us to perform our own critical trick of necromancy, enabling us to revive the dormant meanings of this translation, a text which has for too long appeared dead to the 'doctors' of literary history.\textsuperscript{206}

I will suggest that this small patristic work may - like some of Drant's other works - have been intended to make a significant contribution to the propagation of Protestant humanist manliness in this era. Indeed, I will put forward the notion that Drant translated the Greek Father's poetic pieces - which contain classical concepts concerning manhood (involving the importance of learning, linguistic ability and so on) - specifically so that Anglican men in the exigent environment of early Elizabethan England might have imitative 'nourishment' for their enervated humanist masculinity. Jewel wrote in this decade that 'men are become effeminate'\textsuperscript{207} - I will explore here how the *Epigrams* may have aimed to counteract the cultural decay of intellectual manhood.

I would contend that Drant, as an evidently skilful Protestant humanist, would have had a clear perception of the practical teleology of the process of translation and its role in causing action. That is, within the, arguably, male-oriented methodology of Renaissance humanism, the 'englishing' of texts would have been implicitly recognised by Drant (and others) to lead to the consolidation of masculine selfhood. In fact, I would suggest that our translator may have expected his work to have been comprehended in these terms by its

\textsuperscript{206} As far as I am aware, there are no studies of this work.


IV
contemporary audience - that is, by humanistically trained male Protestants, familiar with the pragmatic ethos of exemplary reading and seeking manly paradigms to support them during this period of religio-political crisis.

Indeed, Drant's own very distinct appreciation of the humanist model of utilitarian textual use is possibly made explicit in his vernacular rendition of Horace's *Art of Poetry* which might perhaps be deemed to articulate Drant's sentiments concerning the consultative role of the versifier. There he affirms that: 'The Poets seeke to profitt the, / Or please thy fansie well, / Or at one time things of profitt / and pleasaunce both to tell', further reiterating this notion of the perfect poet as a source of delightful admonitions when he professes that: 'He beares the bell in all respects / ... / Who can in delectable style / good counsaile with him bring'.

I would argue, then, that Drant would have almost certainly viewed his poetic translation of the *Epigrams* as being an aesthetically gratifying means by which promulgate beneficial 'counsel' to his fellow male Protestants - indeed, it is just possible that his patron, Grindal, judged Gregory's work to be serviceable in this sense and thus commissioned this English version.

In fact, I would propose that the gender of both Drant / Gregory's intended interpreters is made manifest by the text's presupposition of its readers' masculinity which materialises, for instance, in the epigram on the 'Temptation by the other Senses' which directly admonishes perfume-wearing men:

To odours wommanishe, and fragrant smell,
Thy selfe to tender touchinges do not yealde,
If these doe maister thee, what wilt thou well
Deserue with hande in battayle champion fielde?\textsuperscript{210}

Thus we witness a overt piece of textual advice which was, perhaps, applicable to the men engaged in the 'skirmisshes of learning': Protestant males must abandon their 'feminine' foppery if they wish to vanquish their Louvainist foes.

In fact, I want tentatively to propose that Drant's rendition of the \textit{Epigrams} was 'designed' to be utilised by a particular social group of men: the Anglican clergy. Being a work of literature, Drant's text was, obviously, beyond the reach of uneducated Protestant ministers. This patristic work would, though, have been accessible for those English divines who had received a rudimentary grammar school tuition, as well as the more illustrious graduate members of the religious hierarchy. These men, I would speculatively suggest, were Drant's 'target' audience: the fact that the text was dedicated to Grindal might be seen to intimate that the translator envisaged his spiritual work circulating within the enclosed economy of ecclesiastical experience. Indeed, the \textit{Epigrams} openly addresses the more elite part of this masculine community in a poem entitled 'Let Bishops and Prelates geue light' which reminds this 'clique' of their exemplary role within society:

\begin{verbatim}
O you that Lordlike rule so sterne, and stoute,
Whose wealth, and worship stretcheth farre, and wyde:
Take hede your lyncks, and lanterns go not out,
Least wycked Prelates you at last be tryde,
If light be darke, that was so bright, and trimme,
What wylbe darkenes of it selfe so dimme? \textsuperscript{211}
\end{verbatim}

Although even these male religious figures were, in reality, relatively impoverished, as Collinson has pointed out (see the introduction to this chapter), I would argue that this

\textsuperscript{210} \textit{Epigrams}, trans. by Drant, sig.[Avii].
\textsuperscript{211} \textit{Epigrams}, trans. by Drant, sig. [Av\textsuperscript{v}].
poem reveals the way in which Drant's text transforms St. Gregory's concern for the priests of his own time into a means of maintaining the morale of Elizabethan ministers. These spiritual figures were, after all, especially effected by the loss of humanist masculine prestige, being confronted by the shortage of learned clerical personnel, as well as the scholarly Catholic exiles’ simultaneous assault on their intellectual identity. The English clergy were, then, blatantly in need of textual assistance to heal their male humanist pride and, I would contend, Drant’s *Epigrams* was created for this purpose: it might, among other things, be seen to be a patristic ‘band aid’ for Protestantism’s academic ego.

Gregory Nazianzus’ work may have initially appealed to Drant’s sensibilities as a versifier, the saint being renowned for his poetic excellence. Nevertheless, Drant’s appropriation of this Father’s work may be additionally judged to be part of an inter-confessional competition for the ideological possession of patristic thought which may be seen to continue into the seventeenth century. Indeed, the work of Gregory Nazianzus may be viewed to have held special significance for the Protestants connected with the Great Controversy. The Catholic exiles did, in fact, cite this Father in their polemics: Harding quoted Gregory’s statement that not everyone was qualified to contemplate the divine in order to demolish the more ‘democratic’ spiritual philosophy of Protestantism, while Shacklock referred to the saint’s anecdote about the ‘heretic’, Valens, when dealing with Haddon’s refutation of Osorius. However, it was the English Protestants who may be seen to have worked most vigorously to enlist Gregory into their ‘army’ in the 1560s. Thus Jewel

---

212 It is uncertain which text(s) of Gregory’s work Drant based his version upon, although an edition containing both the sentences and epigrams - in the original Greek with a parallel Latin translation and notes - was published the year before Drant’s vernacular version appeared - *Divi Gregorii Nazenzeni Episcopi, Theologi, Graeca quaedam & sancta Carmina: Cum Latina Ioannis Langi Siles! interpretatione ...* (Basel: 1567).

213 See Chapter Three of this thesis.


in the *Apology* defended clerical matrimony by alluding to this patristic figure: ‘... as Nazianzen saith of his owne father, that a good and diligent Bysshopp doth serue in the ministerie neuer the worse for that he is maried [sic], but rather the better, and with more ablenes to do good’.216 Furthermore, Jewel evoked this saint in order to dismiss the seriousness of Protestant disunity by mentioning that the Father’s own church was full of internal religious strife: ‘When as saith Nazianzene, the partes of the body wer [sic] consumed and wasted one of an other ...’.217

Indeed, Drant made frequent recourse to this Father in his sermons. He moulded the saint’s outrage against the enemies of his own time (presumably the Arians) into a statement against the rebelliousness of contemporary Catholics: ‘Fitly sayth Gregorie Nazianzene: their glosing is of peace, but their glory is in bloud’.218 Moreover, he offered his congregation this patristic personage as an archetype of rhetorical masculinity, calling attention to ‘that noble eloquence’ which the Father (supposedly) had.219 Hence Drant may be perceived to have valued Gregory’s work not only as an advantageous weapon for combating the Protestant nation’s religious enemies, but also as a fruitful exemplary resource for the development of humanist manliness.

Thus the 1568 vernacular rendition of Gregory clearly stemmed from a more popular Protestant intellectual fascination with the saint in this period which our translator patently participated in. Indeed, by presenting an ‘englished’ version of the *Epigrams*, Drant might be seen to have made a forcible endeavour to not only conclusively claim the Father’s work for Anglicanism, but to, in addition, demonstrate the Protestant possession of patristic

---

218 Drant, *Two Sermons*, sig.[Evi'].
219 Drant, *Two Sermons*, sig.[Li” - preached at Windsor.*
knowledge: a vital ‘muscle’ of erudite humanist masculinity which needed to be ‘flexed’ in the context of the polemical war with the Louvainists. In fact, from its trilingual prefatory material - revealing Drant’s command of English, Latin and Greek - the Epigrams advertises itself as a ‘showcase’ of linguistic brilliance, the text arguably answering the Louvainists’ literary assaults upon the Protestant clergy’s supposed lack of humanist learning. Indeed, the preface’s paralleling of Grindal and Gregory (which we examined in the introduction to this chapter) might be interpreted as a piece of publicity for Anglican scholarly ‘might’.

Gregory Nazianzus is presented within Drant’s preamble to the main text as the epitome of humanist ‘sweet-talking guys’, his poem ‘Ad Gregorium’ beginning with the phrase: ‘Dulces docta modos loqui / Dum Christum celebrat Calliopae tua: / Dum tristis temporis, & loci / Destes carmine crimina’. Hence, I would suggest, the Father is established as a model of persuasive humanist virtue suitable for contemporary Protestant men, a figure who, aptly enough, persisted in the face of tribulation. Drant thus clearly presents the beleaguered clergy with a patristic paragon whose experience may prove a profitable precedent. In fact, this was how Jewel had also utilised the Gregory’s work, exploiting the Father’s blighted career - in which he experienced extreme opposition from the Arians both at Constantinople and at the Council of Nicea - to make a point about the current plight of English Protestants:

---

220 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig. Aiii'.
221 St. Gregory of Nazianzus (329-389) was the son of the Bishop of Nazianzus. He was educated at Athens, where he was taught alongside St. Basil, who was to become his close friend. However, Gregory ultimately rejected these rhetorical and philosophical studies, turning, with Basil, to the world of spiritual contemplation, spending two years in retreat at Pontus. After that, Gregory returned home to assist his aged father in his ecclesiastical affairs, being reluctantly ordained as a priest. Basil had become Archbishop of Caesarea and, facing a rival at Tyana, caused Gregory to be made Bishop of Sasima in order to maintain his power in that area. Gregory refused to go there and this resulted in a rift between the friends which was never properly healed. Gregory was called out of solitude to Constantinople which desperately required religious reconstruction following the persecutions by Emperor Valens. Hesitantly, he headed there and founded a church in a house where he delivered his celebrated sermons for which he gained a large following. However,
... Gregory Nazianzene speaketh this of the pitifull state of his owne time: We saith he, are in hatred amo[n]g ye Heathen .... . In this case was the Churche of Godd [sic] when the Gospell firste beganne to shyne, and when the fury of the Tyraunt[es] was not as yet cooled, nor the sword taken of [sic] from the Christians neckes. 222

Indeed, Drant's translation of the Epigrams may be seen similarly to furnish Protestant divines with a text which is 'sympathetic' to their currently burdensome circumstances. This work is suffused with a sense of affliction, the poem 'A Spiritual Dompe' pleading for heavenly aid in coping with oppression, imploring: 'O godhead beare with me / Whom they with weapons beate, / And of their rampinge rage / Delaye the risinge heate'. 223 Thus Drant’s 'englished' patristic text might be seen to assist Anglican ministers to endure the encounter with the Louvainists who, as we saw earlier, had bruised the Protestants' scholarly sensibilities. Moreover, in 'A praier against Iulianus', Drant’s rewriting of the Father's own ecclesiastical difficulties might be seen to be expeditiously reflect the helpless disorientation which might have been potentially generated by the internal problems of the Protestant Church in the 1560s, the poem forlornly declaring that: 'No wyt, no reason, no good gift / Of spirit nowe is left, / No manner armoure against the deuill / That thus inuads by theft, / And wynnes by craft, and treachery'. 224

In fact, Gregory's contemporary enemies might have been seen to be metamorphosed into Catholics in this Elizabethan version of the Epigrams. The poem 'Against the Arians, Hipocrates, and discueurs [sic]' refers to the first of these foes in terms that might be
considered to mirror Drant’s sermonising remarks upon the treacherous ‘papists’, stating that:
‘They speake not as they thinke, / Ther sayinges, and ther mynde / Or selde, or neuer in one’. Moreover, this lengthy piece might be even deemed to reflect a fear of Protestant apostasy, of believers being seduced by the Catholic cause in this arduous era, the poem nervously attesting that the opposition leads the ‘flock’ into doctrinal temptation: ‘They couer for the fyshe / A mortall hidden hoke, / Both those which haue no guides, / and those whiche haue suche guides. / Without, or with such guids [sic] / All into mischeefe slids’. Indeed, Drant / Gregory might be seen to encapsulate the strain which Protestant clerics lived under in this period when the text bemoans: ‘... What planctiue Pooet can / These dayes enoughe lament’. Yet more than offering an empathic echo of the difficulties of Elizabethan Protestant experience, I would suggest that Drant’s *Epigrams* provided practical advice for contending with these problems. For instance, the text enjoins those intellectual men facing adversity to:

```
Truste not to [sic] muche, ne yet to [sic] muche dispayre,
The one doth make us dissolutely to bolde,
That other leades to euerlasting care,
Correcte the last, and firme the former holde,
Arighte: and freely fare upon thy waye
Not enuie pale, nor malice neade thee staie.228
```

Thus by adhering emotionally to the humanist *via media* - or prudent affective mean of Aristotelian thought Protestant men will, the text asserts, neither become foolishly complacent in their state (which might leave them prey to their religious opponents) or

---

225 *Epigrams*, trans. by Drant, sig.[Cviii"].
226 *Epigrams*, trans. by Drant, sigs.[Cviii"]-Df.
228 ‘Nor presume, nor dispaire’, *Epigrams*, trans. by Drant, sig.[Avi"].
despondently succumb to Catholicism. Hence a classical notion is ‘translated’ into the modern context ostensibly in order to help the Anglican clergy. Indeed, the importance of persevering is also emphasised by Drant’s work in the poem ‘Keep on thy course in vertue’ which, apparently, urges Elizabethan men to:

Proceade in thinges with good aduise begonne,
To moue at first makes not a good mans state,
But still to moue vntill the thing be done,
For we doe counte him curste, and worthy hate,
Not who a litil [sic] downwarde slippes awry,
But he that falles exalted once on hie.230

In this way, then, the Epigrams may, arguably, be seen as cautioning Protestant divines to stand morally firm in the face of the predicaments they faced within and without the Church in this period.

In fact, if the most dreadful crisis which confronted the Protestant hierarchy of the early Elizabethan era was, as I have argued, the profound degradation of their manly humanist prestige, with all its religio-political implications, I would argue that this translation’s primary purpose was to supply exemplary material which worked to enhance Protestant humanist manliness in a way which supplemented the process of intellectual aggrandisement involved in the Great Controversy. I would suggest that Drant - being obviously sensitive to the diminution of Anglican scholarly esteem due to the deficiencies of the Church’s ministers and the onslaught of the Louvainists - saw this patristic text as presenting him with the opportunity to reproduce the precepts of classical masculinity incorporated within Gregory’s text in order to create a ‘new’ work which would be meaningful for Protestant clergymen in need of humanist revivalisation. In fact, I would propose that our translator may have rendered the Epigrams into the vernacular not only to
make it accessible to a broader audience - some of the Protestant elite may, after all, have had a knowledge of Greek - but also to renew interest in the work by demonstrating its validity as a ‘restorative’ for contemporary Protestant erudite manhood.

Gregory / Drant’s poetic work is brimming with ideas which might have imitatively sustained the humanistically insecure Anglican clergymen of the 1560s. Although Gregory ultimately abandoned the active spiritual life, retiring to meditate upon divine matters and create literature, the *Epigrams* hold no resentment against ancient thought - as do St.Augustine’s works - and thus may have embodied a straightforward source of textual support for Protestant men whose educational background would, arguably, have facilitated the intellectual conversion of classical concepts into patterns for Renaissance humanist manliness.

For instance, this work, produced by the rhetorically-trained Father, sets the ‘true’ Christian / Protestant man at odds with the model of physical masculinity in a way that might have be seen to reflect the prioritisation of ‘bookishness’ within the manly gender ideal of Renaissance humanism. In the poem given the binary title, ‘A vanitie of this lyef / A passage to God’, the narrator describes a different sort of man: ‘... / He hunteth, and he haukes, / And he in cheualry delights, / ...’, piously concluding: ‘But Christ is my rewarde, ...’. Indeed, this translation might have been understood to positively promote the cause of studious manliness, possibly stirring its male Protestant humanist readers to further cultivate their erudition with poems such as ‘Learning and wisedome’ which suggested that:

\[ \text{Wisedome is safer thing then prosprous lucke,} \]
\[ \text{Fortune doth faune, and sclender stroke doth yealde,} \]

\[ \text{---} \]

\(^{230}\) *Epigrams*, trans. by Drant, sig.[Avi’].

\(^{231}\) See the next two chapters for discussion of the different ways Renaissance translations might be seen to negotiate with this ambiguity about rhetoric and other issues within Augustine’s texts.

\(^{232}\) *Epigrams*, trans. by Drant, sig.[Evi’’].
But witte, and wysedome giue the stronger plucke,  
And only they do rule in towne and fielde.  
Learning doth passe the brightest gift of mynde,  
A surer treasure shal we neuer finde. 233

Thus intellectual masculinity is represented as a ‘mainstay’ which Protestant men must hold on to in the unfortunate ‘storms’ of the early Elizabethan era. In fact, a similar point is impressed in other parts of the text, such as in the epigram ‘Wisdome vanquisheth’ which informs the reader that: ‘The practisd Pilote can eschue / Both wracke of waue and winde / Gainst haples happe the happie wise / Best present helpe can finde’. 234 Hence the Protestant’s grip on erudition is correlated here with the ability to survive: if the Anglican establishment are ‘clever’ they will be able to navigate around the rocky patches of religious life. Indeed, this notion of the ‘staying power’ that is provided by classical / humanist manliness is further advanced in the poem ‘Wisedome is stronge’ where the resilience of the intellect is illustrated: ‘Not heauie thumpes, or hamers harde / Do moue at all a stithe, / To beare all bruntes a steadfast mynde / hath puisance strong, and pithe’. 235

In this way, then, the Epigrams reinforces the importance of humanist scholarly manhood, apparently stressing that Protestant clerics must energetically pursue this gender ideal in order to endure under the current conditions. This was a ‘message’, I would suggest, which would have had been readily received by the translation’s educated clerical audience, which would have had, as we have seen, an awareness that the ministry in general needed to ‘wise up’ in order to both accomplish its evangelical aims and to defeat its Catholic rivals. Indeed, these rivals may have been ‘recognised’ by Elizabethan readers in the poem ‘Vse and Abuse’ which states that: ‘The greatest ornament to lyfe / Is knowledge used right. / Abused

---
233 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.[Bii'].
234 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig. Fii'.
235 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig. Fiii'.
knowledge is againe / Most yrcksome unto sight'. The Louvainists' 'abuse' of humanist learning was most certainly 'yrcksome' to the Protestant hierarchy!

But more than privileging this classical / humanist notion of intellectual masculinity, the translation offers more detailed 'advice' on aspects of the 'performance' of this gender identity. The text begins, for instance, with a rumination upon 'The Two Kindes of life, Actiue, and Contemplatiue' which, rather vaguely, concludes that a man must follow the type of existence which is most congenial to him. However, throughout the rest of the text, there is a pervasive accentuation of the virtues of 'doing' which was, ostensibly, intelligible in the Renaissance period in terms of the 'outgoing' impulse of civic humanist manhood. Thus there is a poem called 'Wel doing is better then wel saying' which might have incited Protestant divines to exert themselves for their cause- and even their career - in its declaration that: 'A speachles deede doth passe a deedeles worde. / Without good deeds fewe haue ben caught up hie, / ...'. Furthermore, another piece highlights the same issue, affirming that: 'Good deedes are better mucho then fee, or golde, / The one decaye, the other stande, and holde'. Hence the Epigrams might be interpreted as aspiring to motivate dejected Protestant divines who, as Jewel informed Peter Martyr early in Elizabeth's reign, were in need of inspiration, the bishop disappointedly avowing that: '... there is not the same alacrity among our friends, as there lately was among the papists'.

236 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.Fi'
237 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.[Av'']
238 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.[Av']. The issue of the importance of 'deeds' might have been an issue of ideological confusion for Protestant men who believed that faith was superior to 'good works' and yet were also informed by a civic humanism that accentuated the value of social action. Indeed, a humanist reading of this part of the text might have been the only way to 'iron out' the, perhaps, 'Catholic' implications of these epigrams.
239 'Knowe thy selfe. Good deedes better than golde', Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.[Avi].
Drant’s work also gives textual space to other constituent parts of Renaissance humanist masculinity, such as, for example, linguistic ability. By replicating the classically educated Father’s predilection for oratorical manhood, the 1568 Epigrams offered the clerical men of this period emulative ‘food’ with which to nurture their own rhetorical manliness. Hence poems such as ‘The tounge’ might have been perceived as by the Elizabethan audience as promoting eloquence as an estimable male skill: ‘A Tounge well spoken uttereth out / Of hooney wordes a fludde, / The foolyshe mouth doth utter mucho, / But uttereth little good’, a point which was further advanced in the poem ‘Language’ which states: ‘Forth out the wise mans wittie mouth, / Procedeth language swete, / ...’. Thus Drant’s readers perhaps found themselves textually persuaded to develop their stylistic skills, an essential aspect of humanist manliness which was profitable both for proseltyising in the pulpit and in the polemical maintenance of the religio-political Protestant hegemony.

Similarly, the Epigrams highlights the significance of male friendship, or amicitia, an issue which has been recently been recovered as a significant facet of Renaissance humanist culture. Hence Drant’s translation apparently ‘imports’ a classical preoccupation into the contemporary Elizabethan environment where it had assumed fresh relevance, the text accentuating this concern in poems such as ‘A deare frende is a deare treasure’ which informs men that they should: ‘Thinke nothing dearer then a faithfull frende, / ...’ and, moreover, concentrate upon working through their differences, commanding men to:

---

241 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig. Fii'.
242 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig. Fii'.
243 Indeed, Drant later expressed a desire to produce a treatise on this topic, stating that: ‘... I looke to haue better occasion here afer to write some full treatise of the eloqe[n]ce of preachers ...’ - see A Fruitfull and necessary Sermon, specially concernyng Almes geuing, preached the Twisday in Easter Weeke. The yeere of our Lord. 1572. at S. Maries Spittle (London: 1572), sig.[Evii']. All further references to this edition will be cited as Fruitfull and necessary Sermon.
'Abridge thyne ire, and sone it ouer sende. / Of frendly loue not to make an ende'. Indeed, there is another poem entitled 'Frendeshyp' which also encourages this male 'bonding', but make its readers additionally aware of the discernment which must be practised in these relationships, affirming that: 'A trustie frinde is treasure best / In honoure, and distrese, / No person lewde for any cause / In frendshippe do possesse'. In this way, Drant's translation offers shrewd guidance to the Protestant men involved in the tumultuous years of the early Elizabethan era, charging them to vigilantly strive towards humanistically preserving the concord of their masculine religious community in the face of hardship - there had been, after all, various difficulties caused by internal dissent in this decade, including the Vestarian Controversy which was caused by more the fervent reformers' desire to abandon the 'papist' surplice. The nascent Anglican clergy needed to present a united front and it is possible that the Epigrams' advancement of humanist amicitia appeared a plausible means by which to achieve this.

Indeed, the matter of male association might be seen to be correlated to the classical concern with 'counsel' which is present in the patristic text, a topic which, as we have seen, had acquired intense importance in the humanistic religio-political milieu of the 1560s. Hence Drant's translation includes the poem 'Counsaillers are necessary' which attests that:

The eye that all thinges spies, it selfe not spies,  
If it be blynde, then spies it not in deede  
It selfe, nor ought, but blynde, and bluntshe lies.  
Of counsaylers we then doe stande in neade,  
For so the hande doth (pardie) neade the hande,  
And of the foote, the foote in neede doth stande.'

---

245 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig. [Bi'].  
246 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig. [Fv'].  
247 See McGrath, Papists and Puritans, pp.86-87.  
248 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sigs. Bi'-[Bii'] - missigned 'Eii'.
Thus the *Epigrams*, albeit gauchely, may be regarded as having made its Elizabethan Protestant humanist male readers even more conscious of their social significance as it was constructed within the classical/humanist model of civic-oriented manhood, ostensibly increasing their appreciation of the historically acute need to refine their intellectual manliness in order to retain their ascendancy within the English commonwealth.

Drant's translation was, then, very much a humanist text. It, arguably, both boosted the prestige of English Protestantism as an example of the exercise of Anglican erudition and presented concepts by which Elizabethan clergymen might emulatively benefit, becoming more humanistically manly and, therefore, less permeable to the literary incursions of the Louvainists. Yet before the Protestant clergy could authentically attain this gender ideal, it was, apparently, compulsory that they jettison the debauchery which was presumed by Drant to impede the assumption of humanist manhood. Rebuking the clergy and then the nobility in a sermon, he pondered:

... whether that officers and masters of belly cheare and instrumentes of worldly pleasures doth grow up to a great principallitie, And rather by those meanes then by wisedome [,] gouernement, temperauncy [sic], councell, actiuitie ... 249

Protestant England's troubles were, then, diagnosed by Drant as emanating from the social elevation of dissolute masculinity: the nation would improve if the men adopted the listed virtues of humanist manliness. Put another way, Elizabethan Anglican men must give up their licentious lifestyle and read books instead! The clergy were perhaps not, then, paragons of righteousness, a point which perhaps also left them exposed to the Catholic opposition's opprobrium. 250

249 Drant, *Fruittull and necessary Sermon*, sigs.[Cvii'] – Df'.
250 Whatever their ethical state was, it might be contended that the identity of Protestant ministerial men perhaps automatically involved an acceptance of their inherently 'sinful' nature, this being predicated upon a
It is this sense of reforming the Protestant clergy’s ‘disruptive masculinity’ in order to prepare for the acquisition of humanist manhood which clarifies the function of the 1568 text’s inclusion of a variety of epigrams concerning the control of the masculine body. In a way which would certainly excite the imagination of Foucauldian scholars, the poem ‘The chastning of thy body is a medicine for vice’ alludes to the advantages of self-punishment:

Wyne, lust, enuie, and Satan are all one,  
Whom they possesse, the same they doe oppresse,  
Teares, hunger, prayers, are deemed fit alone,  
And meadsons [sic] meete the same to redresse.  
So I those griefes doe use for to asswage,  
So staye I them, and rule them in their rage.252

In addition, there are many poems dedicated to the subjugation of the individual senses, such as the piece ‘Temptation by the eares’ which counsels the closure of these orifices against salacious banter, advising men to heed instead ‘proper’ conversation: ‘Gainst wanton talke thyne eares with waxe doth shitte / ... / But what so for an honest man is fitte, / That thou respectiuly [sic] must very ofte / Both marke with diligient and hedie care, ...’.253

Furthermore, the Epigrams also suggests that the mouth - another bodily entrance - must be ‘guarded’ so that gluttony does not gain admittance. Hence the poem ‘Be not liberal

---

postlapsarian reformist theology which might be seen to ‘always already’ have positioned these men in the mire of moral failure. This issue of human potential is what might be seen to have ultimately divided Erasmus and Luther (see Ozment, Age of Reform, p.290), but is a concern which might also have had extensive implications for the Protestant utilisation of humanist textual methodologies: Drant’s translation, for instance, could, arguably, only have had an emulative impact upon its male readers if this was their individual predestination. Thus the Epigrams’ possible success as a male ‘self-help’ book might be seen to have rested upon its audience’s ability to make a ‘leap of faith’, to believe that they were ‘chosen’ and, therefore, were meant to make changes in God’s ‘masterplan’. However, these problematic issues are beyond the scope of this present thesis.

252 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.Bi”.
253 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.[Avii]".
to thy belly' represents the evanescence of culinary pleasure by, rather luridly, depicting the process of digestion:

Still geue me, geue me, critic the geedy [sic] paunche,  
And haue thou shalt, if well thou canst it saue,  
But in dunge it passeth by the haunche  
Eftsones, what bootes it thee so much to haue?\textsuperscript{254}

In a similar vein, the \textit{Epigrams} includes a poem entitled 'Thriftye Dyet' which affirms that: 'A dyet thinne doth profit more / Then that thou doth devise / ...'\textsuperscript{255} Indeed, there is a piece which very explicitly acknowledges the notion that voracity is absolutely antagonistic to the text's cherished ideal of Protestant humanist masculinity. The title of the poem 'A fat belly, a leane witt', arguably, implies that the act of gorging oneself sets a man outside intellectuallity, the piece further informing us that:

\begin{quote}
A gorrell paunche, and godly mynde  
In one maye hardly lye,  
Things contrary we playnly se [sic]  
Dryue out the contrary.\textsuperscript{256}
\end{quote}

In fact, such words may also have represented sound advice in this decade since it was - as I described in the introduction to this chapter - an era of general economic deprivation and one which also saw severe financial 'cutbacks' in the spiritual sector.\textsuperscript{257} Hence as well as ostensibly 'counselling' his readers to leave behind the moral degeneracy which had, in Drant's view, hindered Protestant men's procurement of the humanist erudite masculinity they so desperately needed in the 1560s, this translation, ostensibly, also offered its male clerical audience some 'comfort' in their monetarily uncertain condition. Thus we

\textsuperscript{254} \textit{Epigrams}, trans. by Drant, sig. [Avii].  
\textsuperscript{255} \textit{Epigrams}, trans. by Drant, sig. Fii'i.  
\textsuperscript{256} \textit{Epigrams}, trans. by Drant, sig. Fii'-Fii'i.  
\textsuperscript{257}
witness the text, quite conveniently, praising the positive side of destitution in poems such as 'Pouertie is better then ill gotten riches' which reminds the reader that: 'With hunger no man sodenly doth die: : [sic] / Sinne kylleth, and condemneth by and by'. 258 Indeed, there is a similar sentiment present in another poem which censures wealth as a merely ephemeral element of life, stating that: '... / All worldly treasure in the ende / Shall suffer wracke, and wast', 259 whilst the piece called 'Riches' suggests that affluence is a fount of inequity:

The servuant swift of vice is welthe,
All powers with headye swaye,
To mischiues [sic] auckward do decline,
And leades to losse awaye.260

Moreover, as well as, perhaps, having an anodyne effect upon the indigent Protestant clergy, this translation might be seen to have had an additional purpose: to advocate the redistribution of wealth across society, but perhaps especially within the ministerial ranks. Hence we see poems such as 'Godly pouertie is to be relieued' which encourage mutual support in the community, providing the exemplar of compassion between non-human creatures: 'That Egle in her neast (we reade it oft) / A litle straunger byrde wyll harboure softe'. 261 In fact, the text aims to incite the readers to donate to those in need, impressing that this is an act of Christian love: '... all thy who / Doe cladde the poore, doe cladde our sauior (lo)'. 262

Thus, what might initially seem to our twenty-first century insight to be a somewhat unwieldy collection of poetic pieces on disparate subjects, becomes more meaningful under

257 Hill has described these changes, stating that: '... commutation [the presentation of cash instead of goods as tithe payment], improprition [the sale or leasing of the right to tithes], 'decay' of fees and offerings, inequitable taxation - contributed to impoverish a large section of the clergy' - Economic Problems of the Church, p.200.
258 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.[Aviii].
259 'Treasure', Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.Fiii'-[Fv].
260 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.Fv'.
261 Epigrams, trans. by Drant, sig.[Aviii].
the pressure of an historicist reading. Considering the early Elizabethan era as a period of Protestant struggle for the religio-politically important paradigm of humanist manliness, we may, I would propose, come to a clearer comprehension of the motivation and intended function of the *Epigrams*.

As a work 'born' from Gregory Nazianzus' own experience of persecution, we saw that the *Epigrams* was a text which may have presented Protestant men in the 1560s with an emotive echo of their own difficult experience. Yet looking again at the patristic text's fixation with the concepts of classical masculinity, we can, perhaps, begin to grasp the way in which Drant's translation would have concomitantly offered those members of the Protestant clergy who were educated at least to Erasmian grammar school level the opportunity to imitatively seize a selection of precisely put notions to succour them in their 'scramble' for humanist intellectual manhood. However, more than presenting practical advice on the attainment of wisdom, rhetoric, the active life and so forth - guidance which was so urgently needed for both the evangelical role of Protestants and, indeed, their very survival against the polemically potent Louvainists - we also witnessed how the poems work to improve the reader in a moral sense. The patristic text's ascetic castigation, I argued, came to represent in Drant's rewriting the desire to ethically dispose Protestant men to Renaissance humanism, to make them abandon the nefarious practices which our translator apparently believed to 'block' the realisation of a humanist gender identity which might amend the early Elizabethan nation. Indeed, we additionally considered the *Epigrams* repulsion towards wealth to be more than a moral statement, contending that this promotion of the virtue of poverty might have, quite appositely, worked to console the Elizabethan Protestant clergy in their generally impecunious condition.

262 'Almesse dealing', *Epigrams*, trans. by Drant, sig.[Aviif].
Drant's work, is, then, a text which might be deemed to reveal itself as a pocket-sized humanist 'handbook' for the intellectually, morally and financially beleaguered Protestant clergy of early Elizabethan England. Indeed, I would contend that it not only discloses the significance of Gregory Nazianzus' thought to Protestants in this period, but also intriguingly exposes the technique of Renaissance humanist translation to have been a practical tool for aiding and abetting men in crisis. Without being aware of the complex difficulties which Protestant men endured in the early Elizabethan era, we cannot, I would propose, begin to grasp the poignant connotations of this little patristic text with an ostensibly big mission to save Protestant clergymen.
Taking the critical concept of the pragmatic nature of Renaissance humanist textual production and reception as a basis, I have presented an account of how Thomas Drant's vernacular version of Gregory Nazianzus' Epigrams might be seen to have participated in the Protestant struggle for humanist manliness in the early Elizabethan era. Indeed, I have argued that this work *purposively* provided a source of support for literate Protestant clergymen whose intellectual manhood had been compromised in the 1560s.

In the first and second parts of this chapter, I examined the broader historical context for this work in order to exhibit the immense pressure which Protestant ministers were under in this period. Being generally poverty-stricken and educationally inadequate, I discussed the way in which these men were further confronted by a formidable external threat to their humanist masculine prestige in the form of the Louvainist exiles. These Catholic scholars, I suggested, embodied the menacing presence of an alternative type of humanism, an academic group with differing religious affiliations which, in this decade of uncertainty, were considered by the Protestants to be serious contenders for religio-political power in England. It was, I argued, only by appreciating the way in which humanist masculinity was envisaged as being 'exchangeable' for access to the mechanisms of secular and spiritual government in Renaissance Europe that we could come to understand the 'hysteria' which the Louvainists caused in the Protestant camp in the 1560s. The 'Great Controversy' ultimately represented both sides' desperate attempt to obtain an 'exclusive' hold on this erudite form of male gender identity, with the intellectual complications ostensibly caused by the papal denunciation of Erasmus apparently not debilitating the Catholic scholars' impact upon the
Protestants whose own historical attachment to humanism which was, I argued, intrinsically insecure. However, I also proposed that while the English Protestants’ hegemonic status meant that they had effectively more to ‘lose’ - this possibly becoming manifest in their use of martial language to describe the dispute - the very fact that both factions mutually embraced the contemporary criteria of studious humanist masculinity (involving eloquence, logic and sacred textual knowledge and so forth) actually meant that the Protestants could not discursively discover a discrete masculine identity, a fact which, perhaps, engendered more religio-political panic and thus perpetuated this polemical strife.

Following this, in the third section, I honed in on Drant’s ouevre in order to reveal his heavy involvement with this Protestant project to attain ‘ownership’ of intellectual manliness, discussing how his sermons fought ferociously to assimilate humanism for the Anglican cause and to debilitate the Louvainist opposition’s claim to such learning. Indeed, I also showed how Drant even engaged directly in the Great Controversy, singling out the work of Richard Shacklock - a translator and versifier - ostensibly in order to deny Catholics these humanist skills which might, in the Renaissance view, possibly gain them admission to the centre of civic authority. In fact, this was, I argued, the intellectual ‘bête noire’ which Shacklock’s version of Osorius brought to the attention of literate Englishmen: a Catholic humanist could, it claimed, give superior advice to the ‘prince’, a point which Drant strenuously tried to refute.

It is this historical background into which I have placed the Epigrams in order to attempt to bring the text’s latent meaning to light, to appreciate the significance of this forgotten text. Although this work does not specifically mention the Louvainists or the other problems which the Anglican clergy faced in this decade, I have suggested that the agenda
concerning the propagation of Protestant humanist manliness present in Drant's other compositions is also tacitly present within this translation. Indeed, I proposed that the afflicted Protestant ministry - who, I contended, were the text's designated audience - would have been consoled by Drant's 'englishing' of Gregory Nazianzus' experience of oppression. More importantly, though, I argued that the Epigrams might have functioned as an 'instruction book' for the development of intellectual manhood, Drant's rewriting of the Father's classical concepts concerning masculinity - wisdom, rhetoric, friendship and so on - being readily modified into models for humanist manliness by the text's Protestant male readers who had presumably had Erasmian educations (albeit only at a grammar school). In fact, I also put forward the possibility that the text's concurrent emphasis on masculine moral and physical self-control might have been part of this same textual strategy, the accent on asceticism working in Drant's translation as a preliminary step which must be taken before a virtuous humanist masculinity may be assumed.

In this way, I contested that Drant's translation aimed to render Anglican clerics more humanistically 'macho' in order to advance the Church's aims in the parishes and, more importantly perhaps, secure Protestantism's religio-political position in the face of the Louvainist textual assault. Indeed, this possibly semi-official 'showcase' of humanist linguistic achievement - conceivably being commissioned by Grindal - perhaps not only aimed to silence the Catholic enemies' taunts concerning the lack of erudition in the English clergy, but was maybe also designed to offer Protestant ministers palliative precedents for coping with their current material privation.

Thus while the Epigrams might appear to our aesthetically attuned perception to be a bundle of somewhat blundering poems, I would suggest that male Renaissance readers -
arguably more alive than us to the practical value of a text - might have discovered in this translation a treasury of exemplars to embolden them in the 'skirmishes of learning' which, with other factors, precipitated the crisis of Protestant humanist masculine confidence in the 1560s. Sadly, we will never know for certain either Drant's intentions - or possibly those of his patron, Grindal - in creating the Epigrams, nor even how the work was received by contemporary Anglican ministers, since we have no extant marginalia or textual responses to enlighten us. With the help of history, however, we can still have a compelling 'conversation' with the intellectuals of the past, even if it is one that happens in twilight.
CHAPTER TWO –

Favouring the secular: John Healey’s *The Cite of God* (1610) and masculinity in the colonisation of Virginia

In 1990 Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine published a seminal paper on the pragmatic nature of scholarly reading in Renaissance England. In their view reading was always ‘goal-orientated’ - an active rather than a passive pursuit, asserting that textual engagement was always ‘intended to give rise to something else’.¹ This ‘something else,’ in their account, was a particularly public form of action. This is illustrated through the analysis of Gabriel Harvey’s study of Livy in the latter part of the sixteenth century, his marginalia exposing how such classical works were ‘plundered’ for justificative paradigms for contemporary military and political interventions.² They also point out how Harvey’s markings reveal reading as potentially ‘careerist’ - texts serving as models and even means for the advancement of the aspiring humanist who was employed to mobilise his book-learning to ‘facilitate’ (in Grafton and Jardine’s terms) the undertakings of a great house or individual.³ In this chapter I hope to extend the scope of Grafton and Jardine’s utilitarian theory of erudition by applying it to the first edition of John Healey’s 1610 translation of St. Augustine’s *The Cite of God*, the particular religious text which remains at the periphery of their article.

For, in fact, it is Harvey’s recourse to Augustine’s *De Civitate Dei* in the 1590s which is a cause of perplexity for Grafton and Jardine. They can readily accept its usefulness for reference purposes, as a ‘museum’ of ‘lost’ classical details,⁴ a humanistic

---

¹ GJ.
² GJ, pp.51-52.
³ GJ, p.35.
⁴ GJ, p.58.
attitude to the text which is made manifest by Vives' dedicatory preface to Henry VIII in
the 1522 edition ('englished' by Healey) in which he refers to Augustine's work as a
'treasury' which 'hath preserued the reliques of some of the best things'. However,
Grafton and Jardine remain uncertain about Harvey's apparent assertion of the superiority
of Augustinian thought and Christian culture, the Renaissance scholar stating that: '... I
confess that the ideal state of philosophers and heroes is a shadow by comparison to the
City of God.' Grafton and Jardine admit finding it difficult to decide 'how Harvey
reconciled it [this Augustinian attitude] with his other readings' - readings which
evidently respected the exemplary 'counsel' of classical texts.

One way in which they attempt to assimilate Harvey's 'Augustinian' readings is to
propose that they are part of a shift in Harvey's personal perspective following the demise
of his 'worldly' ambitions with the deaths of Sidney and Leicester, or his move as a
lawyer to the ecclesiastical court of Arches. Yet, as their work shows, what remains
resilient in Harvey's readings of Augustine is a belief in paragons of male virtue, Grafton
and Jardine stating that Harvey's engagement with the text provokes thoughts of a range
of heroic 'duellers' from Homer, Hesiod, Virgil and the Old Testament 'offering David

5 Juan Luis Vives, dedication, St. Augustine, Of The Citie of God: with the learned comments of Io[annes]
will be cited as The Citie of God, the original author's name will be omitted for brevity. The Latin in the
1522 Basel edition of De Civitate Dei, ed. by Desiderius Erasmus, reads: 'Præter haec omnia congruit siue
ingenio, siue studiis tuis hoc opus, in quod Augustinus optinæm eorum partem, quæ apud veteres legerat
autores, tanq[ue] in thesauros coniecit: nernpe cum hominibus acutissimus summa praeditis & eloqu[e]ntia
& doctrina disputaturus. Quo factum est, ut aliud agens multas optimaru[m] rerum seruarit religicias
domiciliris earum & quasisedibus, unde prius peti solebant, euersis' - sig. 2a. All fin-ther Latin references
will be drawn from the 1522 edition. St. Augustine of Hippo (354 -430) was educated at the University of
Carthage, abandoning his plan to become a lawyer in order to become a scholar, being primarily interested
in Platonic philosophy. He moved to Rome and then to Milan to teach rhetoric, where, being influenced by
St.Ambrose, he left Manichaeism and - after a long internal struggle, documented in the Confessions - he
was baptised (in 386) as a Christian, thus fulfilling his mother's long-held wish (St.Monica). Returning to
Africa in 388 he adopted a quasi-monastic life and was ordained as a priest, becoming Bishop of Hippo in
396, a position he held until his death - see Farmer, Oxford Dictionary of Saints, pp.25-26.

6 Quoted in GJ, p.45.
7 GJ, p.54.
8 GJ, p.70.
9 GJ, p.44.
and Goliath ... as an example of a vivid heroism that even Augustine could not condemn. 10

Thus, I would suggest, Grafton and Jardine implicitly indicate how the reading of ‘religious’ and ‘secular’ texts (I will contest this discrete categorisation in a moment) could be reconciled in this and perhaps other contexts in the period. For what does seem apparent from their discussion of Harvey is that he seemed able to (unproblematically?) appreciate both divine and classical precedents, even if at a later point he leaned temperamentally towards the former. Although Grafton and Jardine present the potentiality for a plurality of readings of a given text, depending on the original brief, 11 I would tender the possibility that what made Harvey’s intellectual leap between Augustine and Livy feasible was the stability of humanist reading praxis, in particular, the very immutability of its goal. The teleology of this process was, as I have already argued, the reinforcement of masculine identity.

Indeed, with humanism’s status as a male-dominated movement standing as almost axiomatic, 12 I have already proposed in this thesis that these scholars would read to support their own interests and those of their ‘patrons’ - their interests as men. Whether examining Livy or Augustine, it appears from my cursory ‘gleanings’ from Grafton and Jardine’s piece, that Harvey sought heroes - models to imitate - to inspire his manhood. It is this consistent and very gendered intellectual approach which, I would argue, effaces the difference between ‘spiritual’ and ‘secular’ writings under humanist eyes. As we shall observe in Vives’ commentary upon The City of God, this theological text was regarded less as a source of moral or spiritual edification than as a splendid collection of male exemplars which nourish - and offer the occasion to promote - the

10 GJ, p.70.
12 See the introduction to this thesis.
relatively new (in the context of early sixteenth-century Northern Europe) humanist gender ideal involving what I have described as ‘intellectual masculinity’, an ideal which I will suggest assumed a fresh paradigmatic significance in Healey’s seventeenth-century rewriting.

In some sense, then, this male-oriented mode of pragmatic reading could be seen to not just break down the bordering walls between secular and religious texts, but to actually attempt to transform the sacred into the ‘profane’. Thus in Thomas Thorpe’s preface to the first edition of *The Citie of God*, posthumously dedicated to the Earl of Pembroke by the publisher, we read of Healey’s relationship as a translator to Augustine and Vives: ‘Though these be Church-men, and this a Church-matter, he vnapt, or vnworthy to holde trafique with either; yet heere Saint Augustine, and his Commenter Vives, most fauour of the secular: ...’¹³ Hence Thorpe may be seen to legitimate his author’s access to this divine work by bringing it down to a ‘mundane’ level. Yet more than this I would suggest this remark reveals how he intended - and expected - this book to be read. He advertises the secularity of the holy text because he knows this is what the audience desire from it - they want *The Citie of God* as a ‘worldly’ guide.

In fact, I would argue that what we are witnessing here is more than the easy expansion of earthly exemplary reading practices to the realm of religious writings. Grafton and Jardine’s theorisation of the political application of texts will, indeed, be seen to be corroborated in the case of *The Citie of God*, part of this study stressing the use of this work in the very secular process of the plantation of Virginia, the text offering vindicatory models just as Harvey’s Livy had supported Thomas Smith’s endeavours in Ireland.¹⁴

---

¹⁴ GJ, p.42.
Nevertheless, I would suggest that the definition of the secular sphere to which Thorpe aligns Healey’s work needs to be stretched to encompass more than such obviously civic male interests. Mary Beth Norton has produced some interesting work on the predominance of what she refers to as the ‘Filmerian’ patriarchal social model - parallelling the family and state - in early America and the difficulties experienced by male settlers in clarifying their appropriate public and private roles. Following this, I would propose that in the colonial environment for and in which The Citie of God was written and read (I shall discuss this point in more detail later) the ‘secular’ was a larger territory than modern minds might conceive it - at least for men.

For although it can be convincingly argued that the Renaissance more firmly demarcated women’s domain as the ‘domestic’, I would put forward the possibility that for male members of early American society - and possibly other men - there existed no such distinctly defined concept of a ‘private’ space. If the economic, moral and sexual management of the household was seen to reflect and impact upon the commonwealth in this period, then the ideas of an independent home life or individual eroticism for men appear anachronistic and impracticable. For even if you were a bachelor (as many Virginians were in the early years), you could not escape your responsibilities to the community - the onus remained to forge such familial and ‘fruitful’ ties. What men did indoors and in bed were, therefore, secular matters.

In this way, then, the public action which, as Grafton and Jardine affirm, was the designated result of pragmatic reading could be seen to be about more than male agency in the clearly political sphere. It could be that, at least in the case of spiritual works, the

16 See Hutson, The Usurer's Daughter, p.20, where she reproduces Kathleen Davies' table of the binary activites of the male and female spouses as set out by Dod and Cleaver.
17 Norton has discussed how single men were pressurised into moving into established households, being socially and legally prohibited from living alone, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.41.
secular end aimed at by exemplary study - the 'something else' I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter - might seem to include what would, in our contemporary terminology, be regarded as 'intimate' aspects of masculine subjectivity. We have already seen how Protestant clergymen in the 1560s polemically fought for the religio-political power which they believed to be potentially realised by the successful execution of the role of the manly humanist scholar. However, it also seems plausible that humanistically trained male readers in the Renaissance sought out heroes to advise them in their more secretly 'secular' roles - as household heads and husbandly lovers - as well in their more obviously civic duties.

Indeed, this chapter will propose that Healey's *The Citie of God*, as well as participating in the 'propaganda' for the Virginia Company of 1609-10, additionally functioned as a 'source book' for archetypes and behaviours appropriate to men in the colonial environment, entirely encompassing what we - with our polarised conceptualisation of social activity - might be tempted to define as their 'public' and 'private' lives. Thus, in this light, Thorpe's comment that Augustine and Vives 'most favour of the secular' could, perhaps, intimate his sense of the way in which the everyday 'earthly' life of men - as gendered not generic figures - is addressed by this book. The publisher may be seen to be alluding to the way in which in Healey's male readers could seek out guidance on their role as 'patriarchal' governors - of communities, households and especially wives - as well as discovering narratives and theological expositions within its pages which might assuage the sharp sexual anxieties which, I will argue, were aggravated by social conditions in Virginia.
Richard Beale Davis has discussed the intellectual quality of male settlers at Jamestown in the early years of the colony\(^{18}\) and William S. Powell has produced evidence of a request for *The Cittie of God* by a settler in 1621,\(^ {19}\) thus indicating the text's inclusion in what Louis B. Wright has described as the necessarily 'utilitarian' reading of the colonists.\(^ {20}\) Hence Healey's text may, I believe, have presented such literate early American men with paradigms for a new masculinity - even a more 'internal' manhood - in a situation where traditional gender criteria were no longer tenable.

Since I have been only able to closely examine the two copies of *The Cittie of God* available at the British Library (one copy each of 1610 and 1620 editions), focussing my textual analysis on the former, I am as yet unable to present direct evidence of readers' responses to the work (such as in the form of marginalia). Hence the claims I will make in this chapter concerning the 'raison d'être' of Healey's work rest - as did my notions concerning Drant's *Epigrams* - upon a 'rock bed' of research into the context of the translation's production. This will involve the analysis of primary and secondary historical sources, the additional works of Healey's oeuvre - including translations of Joseph Hall's *Mundus Alter et Idem* (1608), a consolatory letter *Philip Mornay, Lord of Plesis, his Teares For the Death of his Sonne* (1609) and *Epictetus Manuall* (1610) - plus a selection of promotional literature for Virginia, primarily sermons. The latter are especially significant, for as John Parker states: "The propagandists of these years will tell


\(^ {19}\) William S. Powell, 'Books in the Virginia Colony Before 1624', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3\(^ \text{rd} \) series, 5 (1948), 177-184 (p.180).

us above all else what they believed was in the minds of their readers, what would be convincing to them.  

Yet the ‘rhetoric’ of these pieces may be considered to disclose more than the ideological mind-set of The Cite of God’s readership - in William Crashawe’s pulpit oratory, for instance, we may see something of the reasons why Healey’s work was ‘written.’ For Crashawe insists in his preface to the 1620 edition that he was the ‘trigger’ for the translation, declaring: ‘... I set one about it, who if he had time enough (for he is now with God) wanted not I am sure, neither will nor skill to doe it well’.

Indeed, I shall say more about Crashawe’s involvement with the Virginia enterprise and his connection with Healey in a moment, yet first it is necessary to confess the difficulty I have experienced in attempting to accurately identify John Healey and construct a definite biography for him, a task which is yet incomplete. Richard E. Byrd’s foreword to Huntingdon Brown’s 1937 edition of Healey’s translation of Hall’s Mundus alter et idem states that Healey was born around 1585 and educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, before touring the continent in 1603-1606 and departing for the New World in 1609. However, Byrd - following E. A. Petherick - declared this Healey to have been a recusant, a fact which clearly does not correspond either with the 1610 edition’s marginal outbursts against the Augustinian scholarship of the Catholics based in Louvain or,

---

22 Saint Augustine of the City of God: with the learned comments of L. Vives. Englished ... now ... compared with the Latin originall... and amended, ed. by [William Crashawe], trans. by [John] Healey, 2nd edn (London: 1620), sig.43v.
23 Richard E. Byrd, foreword to Joseph Hall, The Discovery of a New World... Englished by John Healey ca.1609, ed. by Huntington Brown (Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard U.P., 1937), footnote 8, pp.xxix-xxx. All further references to this edition will be cited as Discovery.
24 See, for instance, Book XVII, Chapter v, where the translator berates his ‘papist’ predecessors for excluding part of Vives’ commentary on the rapaciousness of priests, stating: ‘If Louuaynist vnlesse you had felt your selues toucht with this, you would never have razed it out’ - The Cite of God, trans. by Healey, p.630. The theologians at Louvain had produced Augustinian texts which were published in Antwerp in 1576-1577 - see Paul Oskar Kristeller, ‘Augustine and the Early Renaissance’, footnote, p.367.
indeed, the fact that a Puritan such as Crashawe, apparently, appointed Healey to produce this translation.

Yet having thus dismissed Byrd's theory, I must admit that the only concrete 'clues' we have to Healey's 'true' history are the dedicatory epistles to the two editions of *The Citie of God* (his other self-penned prefaces give little away). Thorpe's introduction to the 1610 edition, which I have already cited, bombastically refers to Healey as 'your late imaginary, now actuall Trauailer, then to most-conceited Viraginia, now to almost-concealed Virginia, ...'. 'Viraginia' probably alludes here to the virago-like women of 'Sheelandt' represented in Healey's earlier translation of Hall's satirical work, *The Discovery of a New World*, to which I will return later. Nevertheless, the 'almost concealed' nature of Healey's Virginia venture is absolutely correct - no record of his passage to America exists.

Even so, Thorpe's dedicatory epistle (and, indeed, the 'corrected' version by Crashawe in 1620) affirms that the work was 'in progress' when the author died in Virginia (a fact broadly accepted but uncorroborated by historians), stating that Healey 'bequeathed at hence parting (thereby scarce perfecting) this his translation at the imprinting to your Lordship's protecting'. In this way, then, *The Citie of God* may be seen to participate in the early colonial context - to be early American literature.

But in another sense, the involvement of Healey's text with Virginia may be seen to be 'about' England - about the invocation of religious exemplars for the aggrandisement of the nascent and trouble-stricken Virginia enterprise in 1609-10 (an

26 See *Passenger and Immigration Lists Index*, ed. by William Filby and Mary K. Meyer, 4 vols (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, 1982-1985), ii (1985). However, in John Camden Hotten's edited list, 'John Hely' appears in the muster of the inhabitants at 'Jordan's Jorney' in 1623 and 1624, this 24 year old man confirming that he had travelled to the plantation in the Charles in November 1621. Considering what we shall see to be the 'close knit' character of the 'Hely house', this may indeed be evidence of keeping colonisation in the family - *The Original Lists of Persons of Quality ... who went from Great Britain to the American Plantations 1600-1700* (New York: G A Baker & Co., 1931), p.22.
issue which has been ably discussed by several contemporary historians and to which I will return in the subsequent section). Healey's proximity to this endeavour may be easily established through his association with Crashawe, who, according to Louis B. Wright - as well as possessing a working knowledge of the Fathers - acted as a 'promoter' for the Virginia Company. With Crashawe's assertion (in 1620) that he prompted Healey to produce *The Citie of God*, the text can be confidently regarded as an instrument of this 'propaganda' movement.

In fact, Healey himself could be seen to be a very active, even aggressive, contributor for the Virginia 'spin' if he is accepted as the 'I.H.' who wrote the preface to Captain John Smith's *A True Relation* (1608), the first account of life in the colony endorsed by the Virginia Company to appear in England. John Parker believes that this 'introduction' was produced by our translator, quoting 'I.H.'s expression of the zealous objective of the Virginia project as the 'erecting of true religion among Infidells ...'. Yet if this is Healey, we cannot assume any direct relationship with Smith, 'I.H.' stating that he 'happened' upon the manuscript 'by chance (as I take it, at the second or third hand)'. Nevertheless, it would act as further evidence of his status as a 'sympathiser' for the Virginia settlement, 'I.H.' revealing the reasons for the text's imprinting when he states: '... induced thereunto by diuers well willers of the action, and none wishing better towards it then my selfe ... [ I ] thought good to publish it: ...' 

---

29 Quoted by Parker in *The Westward Enterprise*, p.250.
30 I[ohn?] H[ealey?], 'To the Courteous Reader', [John Smith], *A Trve Relation of such occurrences and accidents of noateas [sic] hath happe in Virginia since the first planting of that Collony, which is now resident in the South part thereof, till the last returne from thence. Written by Th[omas] Watson. Gent. One of the said Collony, to a worshipfull friend of his in England* (London: 1608), sig. ¶. This statement may, however, be a 'ruse', like the text's false authorship. All further references to this edition will be cited as *A Trve Relation*.
31 H[ealey?], 'To the Courteous Reader', [Smith], *A Trve Relation*, sig. ¶.
This connection with Crashawe has led me to research the possible presence of this particular 'well-willer' at the Inner Temple in London, where Crashawe held the position of preacher.\textsuperscript{32} Joseph Foster's \textit{Alumni Oxonienses} suggests three potential candidates called 'John Hele' (spelling was not, after all, standardised in this period) who were also admitted to the Inner Temple.\textsuperscript{33} For which reasons the following discussion will make clear, it has been as yet impossible to discern the precise identity of our translator amongst the convoluted histories of what appear to be same-named members of one extended Devonshire family. Hence, I would ask readers to patiently bear with me as I wander through the options my preliminary investigations have presented.

One conceivable contender is the John Hele who was admitted to the Inner Temple on 14 October, 1604.\textsuperscript{34} However, he also matriculated at Broadgates Hall (later Pembroke), Oxford on 28th June, 1605,\textsuperscript{35} where he was more likely to be in residence, since, as Prest has discussed, members of the Inner Temple were often there only transiently, some even being admitted merely honorifically or with the intention to turn to law at a later date.\textsuperscript{36} Thus although the youthful age of this figure (matriculation usually took place at seventeen or eighteen years old) might not be a barrier to colonial adventures (most Anglo-Virginians were, after all, young men), one could express doubts concerning the feasibility of his contact with Crashawe and even his ability to embark on a sophisticated translation like \textit{The Citie of God} at such an age - although, arguably, translation was the 'meat and drink' of any humanistically trained student. Indeed,

\begin{itemize}
  \item[32] William Crashawe (1572-1626) was the father of the poet, Richard Crashaw - see \textit{DNB}, v, 36-38.
  \item[33] \textit{Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714}, ed. by Joseph Foster, 2 vols (Nendeln, Lichtenstein: Kraus Reprint Limited, 1968), i, 689.
  \item[34] \textit{ITR} (see list of abbreviations), 2: i, 5.
\end{itemize}
Healey’s publishing career did commence in 1608 - around the time this Hele may have graduated (although no record of the conferral of a degree exists).37

Another alternative is the second son of the eminent Inner Temple ‘bencher’ John Hele, who became the queen’s serjeant and was knighted on James I’s ascension to the throne. Named after his father, he matriculated at Balliol College, Oxford on 6th February 1588-1589 and was admitted to the Inner Temple on 25th January 1589/90.38 Although students of the law frequently ‘lived out’ when they were in London, the Inner Temple’s records seem to suggest John Hele Jr. did not properly undertake legal training until after his degree was completed (for which there is no record),39 his more regular residence being perhaps evidenced by a request to the Temple’s ‘parliament’ (or ruling council) to permit John and his brother Francis to be admitted to their father’s chambers over the Crown Office (21st April, 1594).40 This John Hele became MP for Plympton in 1601 and 1604.41 However, the fact that he is not mentioned in his father’s will of 1608 (whereas the sixth and seventh sons are)42 would seem to confirm that he was deceased by this time. Indeed, the History of Parliament alleges he died in 1605, although admitting that the details of his life remain vague.43

Finally, there is the John Hele who studied at Exeter College, Oxford, matriculating on 3rd December, 1575. One printed transcript of the Inner Temple registers the admission of a John Hele in November 1578,44 around the possible time of

37 Register of the University of Oxford 1571-1622, 2: iii.
38 ITR, 1: ii, 362.
39 Register of the University of Oxford, 2: iii.
40 ITR, 1: ii, 392.
44 Students admitted to the Inner Temple 1547-1600, ed. by W. H. Cooke (London: [W.Clowes & Sons],1878), p.84.
his graduation (although this record is 'unreliable' according to Prest). This figure I take to be the son of Hugh Hele, Sir John Hele's brother who was aged 16 at the death of his grandmother, Margery Warwick, in 1572.

In fact, a mysterious John Hele appears in the ITR from 1587 who, having apparently been previously disciplined for 'defaults in learning', was told, on 15th June 1589, that the Inn's parliament would take further time for consideration of this matter. In this and other instances prior to the admittance of John Hele Jr., the ITR refers to this John Hele and Sir John Hele as the 'younger' and 'elder' respectively, thus insinuating that these terms are being utilised merely as distinguishing markers, rather than as signifiers of a paternal relationship. Thus it becomes problematic to keep track of the career paths of this John Hele and John Hele Jr., the index of the printed transcript of the ITR making matters worse by conflating references to this pair under one heading!

Hence despite the fact the ITR declares this last John Hele to have been made a 'bencher' on 25th May 1601, it is hard to decipher precisely which figure this and other promotions refer to. Indeed, a John Hele did hold various prestigious positions, including that of Reader in the summers of 1603 and 1604, presenting a high-profile series of August lectures. Yet what is even more exciting is the documentation we have revealing a John Hele in conference with William Crashawe on 28th January 1609-10 when the Puritan divine petitioned Hele and other members of the inn's 'parliament' for maintenance. Mention of John Hele in this high-level capacity continues until 20th May, 1610 (when he hears, with others, a petition for 'stopping up' the Temple gate), after

45 Prest, Inns of Court, p.6.
46 Visitations, ii, 464.
47 ITR, 1: ii, 358.
48 ITR, 1: ii, 441.
49 ITR, 2: i, 1 and 4.
50 ITR, 2: i, 46.
which point he suddenly disappears from the records.\textsuperscript{51} One could suggest that this betrays the timing of his departure for Virginia, although I have been as yet unable to locate a sailing to America which would ‘shore up’ this theory (Lord de la Warr left England on April 1, 1610).\textsuperscript{52}

As we consider the credibility of this eminent figure as our ‘author’, his obvious intellectual credentials press for him as much as his possible age at the time of emigration may weigh against him. Since we have evidence that John Hele Jr. may have been dead at this point, it seems likely that this personage is the last John Hele (son of Hugh), who having been born around 1556 would have been a fairly venerable (for those times!) ‘fifty-something’ by 1610. However, it seems improbable that this John would take it upon himself to embark to America, even if his greater years might easily explain his greater physical vulnerability and even death in the colonial environment! It is, however, more credible that our translator was the very youngest Hele - beginning to publish at around the age of twenty. If this does not seem viable, we should consider that his works preceding \textit{The Citie of God} were much less ambitious in scale. (He may even have been son or grandson of Walter - therefore, cousin to Sir John Hele and Hugh Hele.) Nevertheless, my judgement remains, ultimately, poised on this issue, pending further research.

Having laid out the methodological concerns which frame this paper and gestured towards a biographical context for Healey’s work, the next section will attempt to depict a more ‘macrocosmic’ vision of the historical environment of \textit{The Citie of God}. Focussing upon the religious ennoblement of the Virginian cause in 1609-10, I will analyse some of the archetypes and anxieties present in the ‘promotional’ literature of this time and ask how Healey’s text may have participated in this exaltation of territorial expansionism.

\textsuperscript{51} ITR, 2: i, 50.
The English aspiration to found a settlement in America began to shift towards becoming a reality in June 1578, when Elizabeth I granted letters patent to Sir Humphrey Gilbert to establish a colony there. After two failed expeditions (one due to Spanish incursions, the other due to poor weather), the charter passed to his half-brother, Walter Raleigh. He set out in April 1585 and discovered a suitable area for plantation which was dubbed - quite obviously in honour of his unmarried queen - ‘Virginia.’ At this point, 107 men were left ‘on site’ for a set period of a year, after which Drake deposited 15 others. Yet it was not until two years later, in 1587, that the first major attempt at colonisation was made, Lieutenant Governor John White taking 117 people (including the first few women and children) to America. However, when White was finally able to return to Roanoke Island, in 1591, this entire frontier community had vanished. The only hint of their whereabouts was the place-name ‘Croatoan’ carved into a post. With this word the tragic enigma of the ‘Lost Colony’ came into existence. David Beers Quinn has proposed the probability of several search missions for these first settlers in the years prior to the second wave of settlement in 1607 and their possible survival until right up until this point in time when they may have been massacred by Powhatan’s tribe. However, four centuries on, their fate still remains uncertain.

Whether or not Amerindian aggression did play a part in the disappearance of these early pioneers (the brutal conditions in Virginia may have been enough in themselves), the colony could not be publicly avowed to be absolutely ‘lost’ in the years before Jamestown was securely planted since this immigrant group represented a significant part of England’s ‘right’ to possess territory in America. Flying in the face of
of the donation of Pope Constantine - which gave Spain the exclusive authority to settle the Americas following Columbus' 'discovery' - plus the continuing belligerence of the Spanish in protecting this part of their domain, the supporters of the Virginia enterprise in 1609-10 repeatedly attempted to undermine the Spanish claim. The donation is a frequent focus of attack. Only William Symonds strives to (literally) incorporate it into English royal heritage, writing of: 'Our most sacred Soueraigne, in whom is the spirit of his great Ancestor, Constantin ...'. Otherwise the usual approach is outright derision. Robert Johnson's *Nova Britannia* (1609) belittles the papal declaration as 'a new toye most idle and ridiculous', intriguingly proceeding to compare the Spanish reliance upon this article to the legal sophistry of the counsellors to a 'depraved' (Eastern) monarch:

> When the flatterers of Cambrises King of Persia, could finde no lawe to warrant his immoderate lust and incestuous marriage with his owne daughter, yet they tolde of another lawe which they had found, whereby the Kings of Persia might doe what they listed, if in these cases likewise there be a law that the Pope may doe what he list, let them that list obey him, for we beleeeue not in him.57

Here we may begin to observe how territorial, and indeed Protestant, 'unease' may be expressed in erotic terms. However, as we shall see later in this paper, the social and material climate of Virginia actually created a great deal of sexual disquiet, disturbing the traditional definitions of gender roles. In a very real sense, many colonial anxieties were carnal anxieties.

For now, though, let us direct our attention to the emergence of the Virginia Company on April 10th, 1606, when the programme for colonisation and trade assumed a

---

55 William Symonds, *Virginia A Sermon Preached at Whitechappel in the presence of... the Adventurers and Planters for Virginia, 25. April 1609. Published for the benefit and use of the colony ...* (London: 1609), sig.A3v. All further references to this edition will be cited as *Virginia*.
56 Robert Johnson, *Nova Britannia: Offring [sic] moste Excellent fruites by Planting in Virginia. Exciting all such as be well affected to further the same* (London: 1609), sig.[A4v]. All further references to this edition will cited as *Nova Britannia*.
57 [Johnson], *Nova Britannia*, sig.Bv.
fresh coherence. The Company was headed by a royal council, including Healey's - allegedly preferred - dedicatee, William, Earl of Pembroke, which instigated a series of voyages from 1607 on. Yet on 23rd May, 1609 a second charter inaugurated another phase in the Virginia Company's development. For as John Parker has emphasised, this new directive document made evangelism (at least ostensibly) the chief aim of the American venture: 'The principall effect which we can deliver or expect of the action is the conversion and reduction of the people of those parts unto the true worship of God and Christian religion'.

In Parker's view, this proclaimed proselytising purpose was not merely a cover for a more 'mundane' drive to rally men and raise money. For him, the religious impetus for colonisation in 1609-10 was sincere, commenting upon the large (but not accurately quantifiable) number of printed sermons supporting the project but not commissioned by the Virginia Company. Indeed, Parker suggests the godly passion for empire superseded political and economic interests: '... to a degree never again equalled in the history of British overseas expansion the appeal was most forcefully made by preachers with a message essentially religious. And the pronouncements of the Virginia Company itself were in much the same tone'. As he firmly states: '... by no means was it a mere facade for the merchants' ambitions'. In this opinion he echoes the earlier work of Perry Miller, who regarded the Virginia endeavour as being based on similar principles to 'a medieval pilgrimage'. According to Miller: 'Religion, ... was the really energizing power in this settlement ...'. Yet for Quinn the spiritual transformation of the 'heathen' was purely 'a much publicized and half-believed in objective, ... in the early stages it was a propaganda

58 Quoted by Parker in The Westward Enterprise, p.251.
60 Parker in The Westward Enterprise, p.245.
61 Parker in The Westward Enterprise, p.269.
point only...’. Indeed, it is Louis B. Wright’s belief that Sir Thomas Smith deliberately marshalled the crusading power of preachers in order to gather public backing for Virginia during the particularly difficult year of 1609.

Whether we consider this loudly declared holy impulse for the colonisation of Virginia to be authentic or cynical Jacobean ‘hype’, the enlistment of religious exemplars for the glorification of this undertaking cannot be denied. Whether we regard ecclesiastical or fiscal ends as the primary here, the desired outcome of the reading of these texts is, to reiterate Grafton and Jardine, public action. Thus sermonizers overtly evoke paradigmatic biblical ‘sentences’, pulling them out of their reading in order to encourage others to take up their place in the colony. Hence, according to William Symonds, Virginia is more like ‘Eden’ than anywhere else. To Robert Gray, in *A Good Speed to Virginia* (1609), Virginia is like Canaan, Crashawe making a similar parallel: ‘The Israelites had a commandement from God to dwell in Canaan, we have leaue to dwell in Virginea ...’.

Indeed, Perry Miller has stressed the special significance of Babel for the settlers, the scattering of peoples and the consequent ‘confusion of tongues’ being a positive model for colonisation by which, in his words, ‘... God artfully turned the greatest curse into the greatest blessing’: In fact, Symonds does present Babel as a ‘prototype’ for Virginia, affirming that:

... as all the commandements of God do finde rebellion against them: so hath this most specially; insomuch that the whole earth conspired to make open

---

64 Quinn, *North America*, p.445
65 Wright, *Religion and Empire*, pp.89 - 90
67 Robert Gray, *A Good Speed to Virginia* (London:1609), sig. D2'. All further references to this edition will be cited as Good Speed.
68 William Crashawe, *A Sermon Preached in London before the right honorable the Lord Lawarre ... and the rest of the Adventurers in that Plantation. At the said Lord Generall his leaue taking of England ... and departure for Virginiae, Feb.21. 1609* (London: 1610), sig.F3". All further references to this edition will be cited as Sermon.
insurrection against it, by building of a Citie, and Towne, the better to continue together. For the subduing of which rebellion, The Lord came downe, and confounded their language, and scattered them abroad. 70

Yet here we may begin to appreciate the ambivalence of the exemplary religious discourse of this period. For the very illustration which Symonds offers to endorse the establishment of Jamestown simultaneously betrays the construction of the colonial settlement as potentially in flagrant contradiction to God’s ‘anti-civic’ decree.

This possible conflict within the selected archetypes of 1609-10, is also visible in Symonds’ depiction of Abraham’s departure for ‘new lands’. In one sense, he carries out his journey in ‘God’s image’, mirroring the Lord’s plantation of the earth. 71 Yet in another way, Symonds’ representation of Abraham emphasises the way in which the biblical figure’s exodus enacted a rejection of family life and patrimony. In Symonds’ reading, Abraham’s action illustrates the treacherousness of blood relations:

... in many places a man is in no such perell to be cheated and cosoned, if not murthered & poisoned, as among his own kindred ... Some few, and those very few, are not willing to leaue their fathers house, where any thing may bee hoped for after the death of their parents: but for the most part, the world perceiueth that excepte it be to ioyne in a deadly feude, or some peece of excellent villanie, the English Prouerbe is true, The farther from kinne, the neerer to friends. 72

Thus Abraham’s example might have convinced the prospective male ‘Virginian’ of the abnormality of remaining at home, but it also afforded little hope for a felicitous domestic existence in the settlement, for a household in which, as a potent patriarch, one might enforce a peaceful order. Hence here, as in his reference to Babel, we might suggest that we can discern signs of an ambiguous attitude to colonisation in Symonds’ ‘promotional’ texts. Indeed, I would argue that these pieces as a whole expose an almost premonitory consciousness that - as we shall see in the next part of this chapter -

70 Symonds, Virginia, sig.B*.
71 Symonds, Virginia, sig.C*.
72 Symonds, Virginia, sig.D2*.
traditional civic and familial structures, as well as established forms of gendered
behaviour, would have to be eschewed in the Virginian environment.

Although only Robert Gray directly invokes Augustinian doctrine to piously
legitimise violence against the Amerindians, affirming that: ‘... by the judgement of
Augustine himselfe, we might lawfully make warre vpon the sauages of Virginia ...’, 73 I
believe that Crashawe, as a patristic scholar himself, was well aware of the way in which
The Citie of God could ‘facilitate’ the colonial cause. The text he (allegedly) incited
Healey to ‘write’ is a veritable feast of vindicatory exemplars. Not only does Healey’s
work highlight the Christian obligation to correct (or convert) the ‘wicked’, complaining
that men all too often ‘keepe aloofe, and forbeare to give them due instruction,
admonitions or reprehensions, or else wee hold their reformation too great a labour: ...’, 74
but the text is also replete with the kind of epitomes which, as we have witnessed,
contemporary propagandists evidently found useful. Even though I might offer a myriad
of illustrations of The Citie of God’s potential points of pragmatic reference for the
Virginia expansionist campaign my main interest in this chapter is the text’s more
‘secluded’ secular service – that is, the guidance of the ‘subjective’ lives of colonial men
– I will refer only to a few instances in which Healey’s work deals with the scriptural
narratives we have already seen to have attracted the interest of the sermonisers.

Thus even if the entire Citie of God might be read as a highly illustrative history
of the founding of the ‘earthly city’ - Augustine’s exegetical emphasis upon the Old
Testament patriarchs elucidating the formation of nations from Adam on - here I will
focus upon the text’s representation of Abraham and Babel. Intriguingly, in both
examples, the Father’s own rhetorical training appears to accentuate the linguistic aspects

73 Gray, Good Speed, sig.[C4”].
74 The Citie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book I, Chapter viii, p.14. ’Plerumque enim ab eis docendis,
admonendis, aliquando etiam obiurgandis, & corripendis male dissimulatur: uel cum laboris piget ...’ - p.10.
of these narratives in a way that the humanistically trained reader might appreciate. Hence if Symonds, among others, encouraged the Virginian planters to identify themselves with Abraham, Healey’s work may have suggested to the colonisers their status as a ‘chosen’ group possessing an exclusive (English?) verbal understanding of the world and Christ’s redemption:

Nor was it for nothing that Abraham could not communicate this his language unto all his generation, but onely to those that were propagate by Iacob, and arising into an euident people of God, were to receiue his Testament, and the Saviour in the flesh.

Yet when Healey’s work addresses the story of Babel, the question of the dissemination and diversification of (vernacular?) languages is depicted as being negative, a form of godly retribution: ‘... the confusion of tongues was a punishment, which Gods people were not to cast off ...’, a punitive measure which is revealed to undermine the foundations of an oratorically-based political power:

But how was it punished? Because that all soueraignty lieth in commauund [sic] and all commauand in the tongue, thus pride was plagued, that the commaunder of men should not be vnderstood, because he would not vnderstand the Lord, his commander. Thus was this conspiracy dissolued, each one departing from him whom he vnderstood not ...

Thus The Citie of God discloses Babel (or, indeed, Virginia) as the site of the destruction of the classical Ciceronian masculine ideal of ‘eloquent’ control, the humanist Vives concurring that such a loss of effective eloquence is a governmental ‘nightmare’:

75 The Citie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVI, Chapter xi. p.586. ‘Nec frustra linguam istam, hoc est, quam tenuit Abraham, nec in omnes filios suos trasmit tere potuit, sed in eos tantum, qui propagati per Iacob, & insigius atque emine[n]ius in dei populum coalescentes, dei testame[n]a & stripe[m] Christi habere potuerunt’ – p.491.


77 The Citie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVI, Chapter iv, p.578. ‘Genus uero ipsum poenae quale fuit? Quonia[m] enim dominatio impera[n]tis in lingua est, ibi da[m]nata est sup[er]bia, ut non intelligeretur iubens homini, qui noluit intelligere, ut obedinet deo iubenti. Sic illa co[n]spiratione distorta est, cu[m] quiss[ue] ab eo, que[m] no[n] intelligebat abscede ret: ne se nisi ei, cu[m] quo loqui poterat, aggregarat: &
The Princes words are great attractuies of the subiects hearts: which if they bee not vnderstood, make all his people avoide him'.

Hence Healey's book suggests that, as 'Babylonians', Anglo-Virginian men may be seen to be haunted by the possible failure of their 'executive' or even evangelical abilities. Although the physical circumstances in which the 'frontiersmen' found themselves arguably did impinge upon these public areas of their experience, it seems clear from the sermons of 1609-10 that part of the crisis of masculine authority in the colony (which I will turn to in the next section) had its origins in England, in the 'shambolic' nature of recruitment.

Indeed, in 1610 the Virginia Council publicly expressed its regret with regard to having permitted the American settlement to be a 'dumping ground' for 'rogue' males, lamenting the hurt caused by suffering 'parents to disburden themselves of lascivious sonnes, masters of bad servants, and wives of ill husbands ...'. Yet it is precisely this 'low' reputation of the Anglo-Virginian manhood which Crashawe attempts to modify in his homily presented to Lord de la Warr. His refutation, typically, appeals to David's 'tribe' as an paradigm of the reformation of abject masculinity affected by strong leadership in foreign 'climes':

... : for when those men had been trained vp vnder his discipline, they were so altered and refined, that many of them (all being some foure hundred [sic] (no more then a Virginean fleete) became worthie to bee of the honourable of Dauids Worthies, or Mightie Men ...

Nevertheless, as we have witnessed in previous extracts, this religious exemplary discourse cannot unproblematically ameliorate the 'esteem' of the colonial male, since the

---

78 Vives, commentary, The Citie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVI, Chapter xiv, p.578. 'Mult[u]m valet ad conciliandos subditorum animos oratio principis, quae si no[n] intelligatur, auertit omnes ab ipso'- p.484.

79 Quoted in Morton, Colonial Virginia, i, p.31.

80 Crashawe, Sermon, sig.F.
very promise of their transformation under the rule of an American 'David' (itself not particularly plausible since martial law had to be imposed in Virginia in 1609) confirmed the contemptible nature of these pioneers. In fact, Crashawe comments how 'the most disordered men that can bee raked vp out of the superfluitie, or if you will, the very excrements, of a full and swelling State, ... doe often become new men ...' 81

Hence although the colonisation of Virginia inevitably involved the advancement of political mercantile and religious interests (although the order of their prioritization remains debatable), I believe that the promotional literature of 1609-10 indicates the presence of more 'private' aim: the regeneration of English masculinity in the American dominion. Thus while maintaining that The Cifie of God played an active part in the theological elevation of territorial expansion - this being evidenced by Crashawe’s initial encouragement, as well as the details of the text itself - I would suggest that Healey’s work was also, perhaps even primarily, engaged in this subsidiary project of 'manly' renewal to which his patron Crashawe refers.

I would propose that the Virginia endeavour was regarded as affording men the opportunity for ‘redemption’ on a gendered, as well as spiritual level. Yet despite offering the occasion for the honing of a debilitated masculinity, I would also add the proviso that there is, simultaneously, an antithetical sense of the colony as jeopardising traditional manliness, as we shall see in the case of Healey’s translation of Joseph Hall’s Mundus Alter et Idem.

It is into this ideological ‘fissure’ that, I believe, The Citie of God may be inserted. Acting as an exemplary inspiration for those men - maybe in England, but especially America - who aspired to ameliorate their manhood, it supplies ample instructions on male civic and domestic roles, as well as almost obsessively engaging

81 Crashawe, Sermon, sig.[E4*]–F7.
with the subjects of sexuality and reproduction which, I will argue, would have keenly concerned the Anglo-Virginians. More radically though, I would suggest that in the midst of the stark social and material conditions which rendered the customary English criteria of masculinity untenable, Healey’s work may have presented Anglo-Virginian men with a new, more practicable, gender ideal.

In the next section I shall attempt to make manifest how The Citie of God’s advocated renunciation of worldly goods in favour of a pious, emotive (although only in the commentary) interiority and intellectuality may have appeared exemplary advice to male readers in the colony. Readers who, as Louis B. Wright has discussed, even at a later point in time, turned frequently to male conduct books such as Henry Peacham’s Compleat Gentleman (1622) and Richard Braithwaite’s English Gentlemen (1630). Indeed, the utilitarian attitude of Virginian readers would plausibly have made them regard Healey’s book in a similar way to more patently ‘secular’ works, Wright describing their emphasis upon the ‘practical application of Christian doctrine ...’, as revealed by the popularity of the works of William Perkins and Lewis Bayly’s Practice of Piety. As I intimated at the beginning of this chapter, the literature of the ‘heavenly city’ becomes that of the ‘earthly city’ in the perspective of the pragmatic reader: the male reader searching for models.

83 Wright, ‘Prestige of Learning’, p.22.
It is impossible to exaggerate the 'maleness' of Virginia in its early years. The sex ratio of the community continued to be imbalanced throughout the seventeenth century, but the disparity between the numbers of men and women was most severe at the onset of plantation, the period which is the focus of this chapter. Roger Thompson's demographic analysis of the colony at this time emphasises the extreme absence of females, causing the Virginia Company to send 140 'maids' as wives for Virginian men in 1620-21. Yet due to the constant insurges of male migrants until the 1630s (they were considered to be more economically productive), women remained a rarity. In 1624-5 the recorded 'white' population - following the Indian attacks and 'plagues' of disease in the early 1620s - comprised of 873 men, 222 women and 120 children, thus displaying a bias of around four men to one female. Such disproportion inevitably affected relations between the sexes and between men themselves, Thompson's study suggesting that difficulties such as the 'battle' for brides would have (as in other predominately homosocial situations) resulted in a 'reduction of male arrogance'. In the pages which follow, I will discuss some of the material factors which worked with this skewed socio-sexual dynamic to disrupt conventional masculinity in the colony. However, I would also propose that outside opinion on Virginia may have also weakened the colonisers' sense of masculine selfhood, creating a loss of gender confidence.

I return here to Crashawe's oratorical outpouring on the American voyagers to make manifest the 'double bind' these men were put in by contemporary representation.

---

86 Thompson, *Women*, p.35.
In the case of emigration as a male course of action, men were almost damned if they did go and damned if they didn’t. In this sermoniser’s view, the reluctance or refusal to become a planter evinced a shamefully ‘effete’ nature: ‘... it discouers the pusillanimitie, the basenesse, the tendernesse and effeminatenesse of our English people ...’, further exposing the ‘unmanliness’ of the nation in his scornful comment that:

... when other people can indure winter and summer, winde and weather, sunne and showers, frost and snow, hunger and thirst, in campe or garrison, by land or sea, and march on foote through snowe or waters, then our men for the most part are consumed and dead, or else got home againe to the fireside in England.

Thus, as we have seen before, Crashawe designates the Virginian enterprise as providing the means for English masculinity to (im)prove itself. Yet I would argue that such a ‘goading’ - emphasising the cowardice and physical frailty of English men - may have had an adverse effect on those who did rise to the ‘bait,’ the very rhetoric of masculine inspiration ultimately undermining male self-reliance in the colonial environment. With the cultural message confirming that they were ‘low’ and emasculate, I would suggest there would have been many proverbial ‘chips’ on male Anglo-Virginian shoulders.

Indeed, Healey’s translation of Hall’s Mundus Alter et Idem (1605), published three years later as The Discovery of a New World, similarly resorts to a ‘rant’ on the masculine virtues of venturing to foreign lands. Beroaldus provokes the male group of auditors to his travellers tales to demonstrate their manhood by journeying abroad: ‘If yee bee men take that will unto yee, arme you selves against weake opinatiuenesse .... If not, lusk at home without vigour, without honor ....’ This grandiloquent address evidently succeeds in ‘moving’ the narrator, who inconclusively considers his reasons for departure

---

87 Crashawe, Sermon, sig. [F8’].
88 Crashawe, Sermon, sig. sig. [F8’]-G’.
89 ‘The occasion of this trauell, and the pre-instruction of it’, Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.16.
in terms of his own intellectual passion and the exemplarity of such male predecessors: '... were it that mine unquenched thirst and desire of knowledge, together with the applausive carriage I found in these men, were the motiues of these effects, I knowe not.' In this way, the narrator shows himself to have shed 'this more then female feare, ... that wittingly and willingly robbes us of another world.'

But even if the narrator's masculinity is, in some sense 'secured' by these (albeit fantastical) international 'meanderings', his recourse to an imitative ethic of manhood and the manoeuvre which attempts to 'internalise' territorial exploration - to, arguably, make it part of the quest of (humanist) intellectual masculinity - cannot, finally, keep the ghost of feminisation at bay. The Discovery of a New World seems to insinuate that the reconnaissance of strange regions, which it ostensibly endorses as a process of masculine 'renewal,' will also precipitate the decline of male dominance.

It is this fear of men losing their 'natural place' in the colonial location, of not being able to keep a hold on their authority or even their identity (a fear that was, to an extent, to come true in America), which Healey's version of Hall's work 'displaces' onto Virginia. Here the province becomes slyly paralleled with 'Sheelandt', a country which is a male 'dystopia' where women rule: 'The new discovered Womandecoia (which some mistaking both name and national call Wingandecoia, and make it part of Virginia), otherwise called Shee-landt ...' (see Figure 3).

Indeed, in 'Sheelandt' the usual social and economic order is inverted, men performing 'female' chores much to the narrator's horror: 'O how many noble captaines did I see here wearing out their liues on spinning, carding woll [sic] and knitting?'

---

90 'The occasion of this trauell, and the pre-instruction of it', Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.9.
91 'The occasion of this trauell, and the pre-instruction of it', Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.12.
92 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.64.
93 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.66.
further lamenting: 'Ah what a beastly sight was it to see a distaffe and a spindle in a mans hand ...';94 a situation which, intriguingly, meshes with racial discourse when the narrator refers to it as being worse than Turkish slavery.95 Moreover, despite having charge of such domestic tasks, the men of ‘Sheelandt’ do not hold sway in the ‘home’: ‘... no man may bee the ruler of his owne house, in this country ...’;96 let alone in the world, public power being wielded by women at the parliament in the capital ‘Shrewesbourg’ in which, the narrator contemptuously informs us, ‘each one yells is if shee were horne mad’, asking: ‘Is not this able to abash a good mans spirit?’97

With ‘feminine’ politics caricatured as cacophonous lunacy - the text also trades upon the Renaissance stereotype of the garrulous woman in the place-names of ‘Lypswagg,’ ‘Gossipingoa,’ ‘Pratlingen’ and ‘Tales-borne’, among others - the narrator moves on to express indignation at the enforced sexual ‘exploitation’ of the men of the neighbouring nation of ‘Letcheritania’ purely for procreative purposes, explaining how: ‘... just as you see stallion horses kept for breede, so are they stowed into custody ...’.98

Indeed, the narrator expresses disdain for the fastidious care the husbands of ‘Sheelandt’ must take prior to ‘lying’ with their wives – and that being when only the wives desire it (‘when prouander prickes them’), affirming that the male spouse: ‘... arise not out of his cabbin in the entry before the wife bee warme in her bedde, and comming vppe staires bare-foote, knock thrise gentlie at her Chamber dore and offer her his seruice in a soft voice ...’.99

Yet this text, I would suggest, for all its sardonic ‘swipes’ at female hegemony is not a typical depiction of the early modern misogynistic ‘nightmare’ concerning ‘women

94 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.73.
95 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.73.
96 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.74.
97 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.67.
98 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.70.
99 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.74.
on top.’ In fact, I even found the book to be mildly amusing, since its satirical scope may also be seen to ‘derange’ the realms of masculinity, making men epicene. ‘Sheelandt’/ Virginia is said by the text to contain the ‘Ile Hermaphrodite’ or ‘Double-sex’, 100 where a ‘mixed’ transvestism reflects a mixed sex anatomy (both varying in proportion). 101 This ‘gender trouble,’ I would contend, bespeaks something concerning the anxiety that men will not be able to maintain a strong, or even discrete, sexual identity in the colonial setting. This is startlingly illustrated by the ‘portmanteau’ naming of those who live on the ‘Ile’, such as: ‘Mary-philip, Peter-alice, Jane-andrew, and George-audry ...’. 102 In fact, the narrator confesses that in ‘Shrewesbourg’ he foolishly could not distinguish the difference between ‘real’ manliness and the ‘pseudo-manhood’ of the city’s women: ‘Here was I truly guld [sic]; for espying persons in the habites of men, masse thought I, this is good, I am now gotten out of Womendecoia ...’. 103 Through this portrayal of the ‘performativity’ of gender, we may also begin to wonder how the narrator escaped the attention of the ‘Sheelandresses’, his explanation alluding to the ‘imperfect’ masculinity of the (American?) adventurer: ‘My habite was manlike, my face womanlike (for I had yet no beard) ...’. 104

The key to understanding this ‘disintegration’ of maleness is - literally - at the borders of ‘Sheelandt.’ Here the text, intriguingly, offers a jocular critique of the familiar ‘tropes’ of masculine self-definition - gluttony and social ambition. In ‘Eat allia’ (a province of ‘Letcheritania’) he states that: ‘... the more that each mans rotundity of corpulence is found to bee enlarged; vnto the higher place is hee presently advancrd ...’. 105 This physical conspicuous consumption is also correlated with the male vice of
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100 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.71.
101 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.71.
102 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.71.
103 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.71.
104 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.71.
105 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.72.
106 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.75.
sexual excess, the following example simultaneously making a mockery of the civic values of men and their dependence upon classical precedents: ‘...Oysternople, and Potato-py-nople are Cities in Letcheritania, that flourish vntill this day: beeing both founded by Hercules, upon his copulation with 50. women vpon one night’.  

Hence The Discovery of a New World, arguably, betrays the sense of foreboding felt about the future sexual ‘dynamics’ of the Virginia colony. Although it is possible to claim that in contexts such as these broader political concerns may be opaquely couched in the terms of sexual discourse, I believe that the early literature relating to Virginia reveals a deep disquiet about gender issues - concerning the plight of English masculinity in America - which must be interpreted at face value. I would contend that the ‘taunting’ of English men by Crashawe and the like represented more than a rhetorical gesture intended to persuade them to Virginia: the visions of feminine ascendancy and the male ‘degeneration’ into greed, lewdness and pompous vainglory in Healey’s vernacular version of Hall’s work were more than witty parodic sketches (after all, no irony is aimed, for instance, at the Catholic Spanish, as might be expected from an an Anglican bishop such as Hall). It is my view that Crashawe’s sermon enunciated a cultural consciousness of the ‘miserable’ state of the men involved in the colonisation process and a concomitant dread that they would not be able to sustain a successful patriarchal community once overseas. Correspondingly, The Discovery of a New World articulates an almost clairvoyant comprehension of the painfulness, and even pointlessness, of attempting to perpetuate traditional modes of masculinity in the plantation. Imaginatively fusing ‘Sheelandt’ and ‘Virginia,’ the text seems to disclose a ‘forward-looking’ sense that the marks of a man must evolve to match the colonial environment, where food, sex and positions of authority (amongst other gender signifiers) were not in abundance.

106 Hall, Discovery, ed. by Brown, trans. by [Healey], p.25.
Not that the acutely unequal ratio of men and women actually made Virginia a "matriarchy," but *The Discovery of a New World* could be perhaps seen to anticipate the moderate amount of freedom (relative to their 'sisters' in England) which their scarcity bestowed upon females. Thompson provocatively asks if this liberty was merely a transitory phase, 'a brief concomitant of a shocked and disordered frontier situation, before new tradition were firmly bedded and old certainties reimposed ...'. Yet whatever the future, the historical *mise en scene* of *The Citie of God* would have involved, for Virginian women, the relative ease of marriage and re-marriage at a younger age and after a shorter period of mourning for the dead husband, plus the opportunity to make marital alliances which propelled them up the social scale.

Even conceding that this power remained limited within a patriarchal framework, one cannot help but marvel at the strategic employment of sexuality by women in the colonies that has been highlighted by the historian Kathleen M. Brown. Her work revives the stories of wives who engaged in extra-marital relationships (some sexual) in order to prepare for a possible widowhood (husbands being temporary figures in the dangerous and disease-ridden colonies) and single girls who foreplanned their fornications so that they might avoid or accurately arrange pregnancy and be able to ascertain the paternity of any illegitimate child. Such sexual behaviour could only be tolerated in a situation where women, of whatever 'character' were wanted. Indeed, with women also working in the tobacco fields and male servants labouring in the house, possibly subordinate to

---

107 See, for instance, my earlier reference to Johnson's transformation of the 'Donation of Constantine' into a legal document justifying incest.
widows and other high-status females,\textsuperscript{113} the narrator of \textit{The Discovery of a New World} might have felt disconcertingly at home in Virginia!

In this cultural ambience - where Anglo-Virginian men of ‘dubious’ quality faced the anxious task of championing the conventional criteria for masculinity in a colonial situation where (the few) women possessed a degree of influence in heterosexual relationships - that Healey’s translation of \textit{The Citi\e of God} may be seen to take on new meaning. I will suggest that the patristic text’s appeal for Anglo-Virginians lay in its utilitarian function, in its practical use as an exemplary guide for men in the roles of governors, husbands and (at least potential) fathers, addressing their sexual and reproductive unease (of which I will say more later) and ultimately offering a template for a ‘modernised’ American manhood.

For instance, confronted by women’s arguably increased leverage in marriage, Anglo-Virginian males could turn to Healey’s work for advice on their appropriate reaction to these circumstances. On one hand, Augustinian doctrine advocates the superiority of celibacy, itself a potentially helpful insight for the many Anglo-Virginian bachelors unable to find wives, possibly even presenting a justification for avoiding a union with a less than usually subservient female partner! However, \textit{The Citi\e of God} also concedes the merit of the ‘faithful’ husband, ‘true,’ that is, to God: ‘...to grant them both good, a married man of great faith and obedience in Jesus Christ is better than a continent man with lesse: ...’.\textsuperscript{114} Hence marriage is portrayed as a ‘necessary evil,’ but, nevertheless, an association which God intended to be harmonious, the text emphasising the sense of ‘unity’ expressed by Eve’s emergence from Adam’s body: ‘... that the woman was made of his ribbe, was a plaine intimation of the concord that should bee

\textsuperscript{113} Norton, \textit{Founding Mothers and Fathers}, p.403.

\textsuperscript{114} The Citi\e of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVI, Chapter xxxvi, p.611.‘Constituamus ergo ambos bonos; etiam sic profecto melior est coniugatus fidelissimus, et obdientissimus deo quam continens minoris fidei minoris[que] obdientiae’ p.511.
between man and wife'. Vives' commentary, 'filtered' through Healey and rendered especially accessible and noteworthy by the alphabetical indexing of references to the main body of the work (not in the 1522 edition), concurs with this. However, he appears to add an intriguingly incestuous 'twist' to the scenario:

Because the woman was not made of any external parts, but of man's selfe, as his daughter, that there might be a fatherly love of his wife in him, and a filial duty towards him in the wife: she was taken out of his side, as his fellow: not out of his head as his Lady, nor out of his feet as his servant.

Here, in this depiction of the 'semblance' of spouses or even their equality, the regular recourse of the colonists to the image of Adam and Eve - as described by Norton - seems to be positive, putting forward a promising paradigm for sexual relations. Yet the narrative of Adam and Eve also has connotations which may be seen to countermand the 'sacred imperative' of marital equivalence. Indeed, The Citie of God attempts to assert that Adam was not deceived by the serpent (thus upholding the quality of the male intellect!), but that he sinned in following his wife. Even so, the text takes pains to stress that this 'lapse' was not due to Adam being a 'hen-pecked' husband (and, therefore, a 'faulty' man), but was the 'fruit' of his isolation (from men?) and his very parity with his female partner, which we have seen to be considered constructive in other contexts:

... so is it to be thought, that the first man did not yield to his wife in this transgression of God's precept, as if he thought she said two; but only being compelled to it by this social love to her, being but one with one, and both of one nature and kind ...

115 The Citie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XII, Chapter xxvi, p.468. 'Quod vero foemina illi ex eius latere facta est, etiam satis significatam est, quam chara mariti & uxoris debeat esse coniunctio' - p.386.
116 Vives, commentary, The Citie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XII, Chapter xxvi, p.468. 'Quomodo foemina non de aliena parte sumpta est, sed de ipso uiro ceu filia, ut uir in uxorim affectu sit paterno. Haec in illu[m] pietate, & de latere sumpta ceu socia: non de capite ut domina, nec de pedibus ut ancilla' - p.386.
117 Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.60.
Thus the 'liberal' model of marriage, accentuating the analogous nature of the couple, is denounced as the cause of the Fall. Anglo-Virginian men could, then, regard this story as a warning of the dangers of permitting women more 'say' in wedlock. Indeed, this narrative may have incited them to resist the rise of the rare women of the colony, female 'bargaining power' in relationships representing the potential destruction of the newly-founded Eden.

Yet if the example of Adam in *The Citie of God* illustrates to men the wide-ranging, even 'secular', significance of retaining their autonomy and sovereignty in matrimony, the text also produces Eve as a valuable justificative precedent for wifely subordination, also promoting women's predominance and pitiful role as child bearer. We hear God's speech in judgement for the 'lapse': '... *I will greatly increase thy sorrowes and thy conceptions* (saith he): *in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children*: and then he addeth, *And thy desire shalbe subject to thine husband and hee shall rule ouer thee: ...* 119

Although I shall return to this negative representation of female reproductive abilities later on, there is first another aspect of feminine treachery which I wish to examine. Indeed, an additional reason for the reassertion of male mastery is presented by Vives' response to Book XVII, Chapter xiii of the text, the philological explication of the minotaur becoming the occasion for the denigration of female infidelity. In the case of Pasiphae, the mother of the mythical creature, adultery is, at first, bizarrely degraded to the level of unnatural use of an animal 'love-aid'(!), the humanist informing us that whilst her husband, Minos, was at war: '... she fell into a beastly desire of copulation with a *Bull*: and *Daedalus* the Carpenter framed a *Cow* of wood, wherein shee beeing enclosed,

---

118 *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XIV, Chapter xi, p.513. '... ita credendum est illum uirum suae fominae uni unum, hominem homini, coniugem coniugi, ad dei legem transgrediendam, non tanquam uerum loquenti credidisse seductum, sed sociali necessitudine paruisse'—p.427.

had her lust satisfied, and brought forth the Minotaure ... . However, the commentary soon supplants this account with that of Servius who stated: ‘... that there was a man either Secretary to Minos, or some gouernour of the Souldiours vnder him called Taurus, and that in Daedalus his house, Pasiphae and he made Minos Cuckold ... .

I would suggest that in these two explications of the mythological birth of the Minotaur, Anglo-Virginian men would recognise their own apprehensions about the possible betrayals of wives in their frequent absences and their consequent doubts concerning lineage, Vives’ attention swiftly shifting from the intimidatingly independent sensuality of female masturbation to the very real carnal menace of male associates. Thus The Citie of God could have communicated something of the circumspection necessary in a society with a surfeit of men, men with no legitimate outlet for their erotic energies. Hence, as well as advising the subjection of women in order to avoid spiritual, social and sexual disaster in Virginia, the text may also be seen to insinuate the exigency of the internal sexual ‘policing’ of the homosocial settlement - urging ‘men beware men,’ as it were.

Yet aside from these illustrations proposing the supervisory control of husbands both over wives and their male friends, Healey’s text may have also offered Anglo-Virginian men (married or single) another escape - albeit through fantasy - from their feelings of uxorial dependency. From, in particular, their reliance upon women’s spousal selection in the feminine ‘buyer’s market’, without which men could not fulfil their requisite patriarchal or reproductive functions. Challenged by a situation in which


121 Vives, commentary, The Citie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVIII, Chapter xiii, p.680. ‘Seruius hunc taurum non bestiam, sed hominemuisse narrat, seu notariu[m], seu magistru[m] militrum Minois, cum quo Pasiphae in domo Daedali concubuit, ... ’ - p.572.
Chesapeake women did the sexual ‘choosing’, even in Norton’s evidence, to the extent of seducing two desired men into a ‘menage à trois’ scenario. I would suggest that Anglo-Virginian males may have sought imaginative solace in the example of Jacob. Here The Citie of God presents the paradigm of a polygamous man, a man with ‘options’, but whose procreative needs are pure:

... forward Jacob went into Mesopotamia to seeke a wife: where he happened to haue foure women giuen him, of whome he begat twelue sonnes and one daughter, without affecting any of them lustfully ... for he came but for one, and being deceived by one for another, he would not turn her away whom he had unwittingly knowne, ... and so because the law at that time did not prohibite plurality of wiuws for increase sake, hee tooke the other also whome hee had promised to marry before: who being barren, gaue him her maid to beget her children vpon, as her sister had done, who was not baren [sic], and yet did so to haue the more children.

In this lengthy quotation, I believe we can observe a tantalising archetype for colonial men craving to re-establish their amatory and husbandly ascendancy, perhaps under the guise - as in the instance of his first wife - of protecting female honour. Indeed, Jacob may have also appeared to illuminate the possible legitimacy of male polygamy, or even plain promiscuity, in the early years of plantation, whilst reproduction remained an imperative matter, Jacob’s chaste sexuality merely instrumentally satisfying the female yearning for offspring. In male dreams, Virginia might be Mesopotamia.

Indeed, the pressing issue of generation as exemplified by Jacob’s story may have been regarded as the most salient feature of The Citie of God for Healey’s readers - both in England and America, albeit for differing reasons. In England the notion of over-
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122 Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.354.  
123 The Citie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVI, Chapter xxxviii, pp.612-613. 'Perrexit ergo lacob in Mesopotamiam, ut inde acciperet uxore[m]. Vnde autem illi acciderit, quator habere foeminas, de quibus duodecim filios & una[m] filiam procreauit, cum earum nullam concupisceret illicile, diuinae scriptura indicat. Ad unam quippe accipiedam uenerat, sed cum illi altera pro altera supposita suisset, nec ipsam dimusit, qua nesciens usus fuerat in nocete, ne ludibrio eam uidetetur habuisse: & ex eo tempore quoniam multiplicandas posteritatis causa plures uxorcs lex nulla prohibebat, accepit etiam illam, cui uni iam futuri coniugu fidem fecerat. Quae esset sterilis, ancillam suam de qua filios ipsa suspiceret, marito dedit, cum essorer eius, quamius peperisset, imitata, quoniam multiplicare prolem cupiebat, effectit' - p.513.
population was prevalent in materials on the colonisation of Virginia, as Parker has discussed. In Robert Gray's *A Good Speed to Virginia* we are reminded that prior to enclosure, land was available to all and preferment was possible, whereas at the present time, the women of England are *inordinately fertile*, producing a 'glut' of people no longer culled by civil or foreign wars:

... nowe God hath prospered us with the blessings of the wombe, & with the blessings of the brestes, the sword deuoureth not abroad, neither is there any feare in our streeetes at home; so that we are now for multitude ... as the ten thousa[n]ds of Ephraim, the Prince of peace hath ioyned the wood of Israel and Judah in one tree. And therefore we may iustly say, as the children of Israel say here to Joshua, we are a great people, and the lande is too narrow for us: ....

For Gray, these cramped conditions nurture sedition and create poverty through unemployment, assuring that: 'There is nothing more daungeorous for the estate of common-wealths... ' Furthermore, these circumstances are seen to corrupt masculinity: ‘... many serviceable men giue themselves to lewd courses ...' Thus an alleged social crisis ultimately translates itself into sexualised discourse, into a preoccupation with contemporary male behaviour. Once again, the 'recovery' of masculinity emerges as intrinsic to the colonial agenda.

In comparison to Gray's biblical exemplars, Johnson's *Nova Britannia* conjures a narrative of European history as an elucidation of the urgency of colonisation, recalling that:

... the Gothes and the Vandalles, with other barbarous Nations, seeing an overflowing of their multitude at home, Did therefore send their Armies out as raging flouds at sundry times, to cover the faces of Spaine, Italy, and other Prouinces, to free their owne from pestering: ...
Interestingly enough, although Healey 'rewrites' Vives' prefatory section on the Goths and the Vandals, it may be said that the 'tone' of the piece, echoing Vives' pacifistic tendencies, does not portray these tribes in a positive light, the text describing how: '... this stout and mutinous people, discontented with the limits of their owne abode, many times hunted after opportunity [sic] to inuade the possessions of other nations'.

Hence once more we witness *The Citie of God* invoking the common paradigms of the Virginia debate, Healey's work - especially his deliberate insertion of this narrative - perhaps exhibiting an awareness of the cultural currency of certain images and stories. However, we may also observe the familiar instability of this exemplary discourse, Gray's 'barbarous Nations' and Healey's 'mutinous people' being hardly very auspicious models for the Anglo-Virginians!

It is this ambivalence towards empire (there arguably being as many negative as positive exemplars for colonisation in the text) which leads me to wonder whether *The Citie of God* may have been less easily read as an apology for territorial expansion due to an exorbitant English population, than for its engagement with the procreative anxieties of a new domain in America. For, as the sermon of William Symonds makes manifest, in the colonial context a 'burgeoning' community is incredibly beneficial:

... to grow into a great nation is a very great blessing of God. ... they are but Atheists, that hold a great family of children to bee a heauie and sore charge: and they blaspheme they know not what, that wish God had their children, for they could spare them well enough.

Hence he proceeds to criticise the continence of 'papist' nuns and monks.

Clearly, as Francis Bacon - another popular author in the colonies - pointed out,
propagation was requisite for the eventual self-sufficiency of the settlement: 'When the plantation grows to strength, then it is time to plant with women as well as with men; that the plantation may spread into generations, and not be ever pieced from without.' 133

Yet I would contend that procreative marriage represented more than the political opportunity to produce Virginian citizens. As Norton has discussed, the siring of progeny was a crucial signifier of masculinity:

... the ability to impregnate a woman was a key indicator of manhood in seventeenth-century Anglo-America. Childless men were the objects of gossip and impotence served as adequate grounds for divorce. A person who could not father a child was by that criteria alone an unsatisfactory male. 134

Indeed, with the widely-held belief that women needed to experience orgasm for conception to occur, the man who lacked babies, was also considered to lack sexual prowess and to therefore be an insufficient husband. 135 Thus, although the public pressure to deliver young Americans inevitably played a major part in creating this gender expectation, the societal demand for successful heterosexual activity undoubtedly impacted upon Anglo-Virginian men at a more intimate, 'subjective' level. This is one clear instance in which, as I stated in my introduction to this chapter, the 'secular' could not be kept separate from the 'personal' masculine self. In this way, then, the civic humanist masculine model's emphasis on impacting upon the world may have actually had a detrimental effect on manliness.

For if later in the century, as Norton has described, sexuality and childbirth became feminine provinces, 136 I would contend that in these early years of colonisation - when women were scarce - that the male public sphere of interest would have included a responsibility for reproduction. I believe that this onus significantly shaped masculine

133 Quoted by Morton, Colonial Virginia, i, p.70.
134 Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.195.
135 Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.76.
136 Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.203.
experience in Virginia, for husbands and bachelors alike. Indeed, for the many single men in the community the compulsion to generate more planters may have been felt to be especially severe, their masculinity suffering since they were denied access to this gender criteria of 'inartificial' insemination. Thus the fantastical visions of men as breeding machines and the meticulous male attention to detail before engaging in sex with their wives as represented in The Discovery of a New World may have had some real resonance in America!

It is in this context that, I would suggest, The Citie of God would have been 'born' into new meaning, its male colonial readers engaging with the text's almost obsessive fascination with issues of sexuality and fertility, issues which may indeed have originally attracted Crashawe, Healey and others involved in the promotion of the Virginia enterprise to this Augustinian book. After all, our 'author' initially existed in an English environment where population was considered to be a momentous matter and then headed for a domain which desperately needed to be 'peopled'. In fact, the fragility of paternity is intriguingly depicted in his translation of Philip Mornay's consolatory piece for his dead son, Healey telling his dedicatee, John Coventry, to 'wear' the book like an 'amulet' because: '... God may lend you sonnes, and take them away againe at his unchangeable pleasure ...'. Hence it is my opinion that Healey's work might have operated in both of these 'sites', but especially across the Atlantic, as a 'handbook' which dealt amply with the particularly poignant subject of procreation, offering those men who studied it a plethora of images and exemplars to restore a sense of masculine potency.

What first brought this possible historical function of The Citie of God to my attention was the text's commentary. I had in the beginning been examining Healey's 'englished' version of Vives' annotations in order to ascertain the relationship of
Renaissance humanism to Augustinian thought. However, as often (happily) occurs in research, the commentary would not harmonise with my hypothesised humanist response to the text. Rather than being (as I had expected) engrossed, for instance, in the linguistic or 'sociable' aspects of Augustine's work, I discovered through Healey's work, that the essential force of humanist exegesis was directed over and over again at the sexual aspects of the main 'body' of the text. The commentary consistently highlights those places where Healey / Augustine discusses doctrines or biblical narratives pertaining to generation, the marginal 'shadow' of the central text in addition offering, as we shall see, the 'occasion' for the magnification of the humanist model of intellectual masculinity.

Later I will analyse how this intensely intellectual and homosocial emulative gender ethic may have been read and revived by Healey's text in colonial Virginia. But first let me present some of the printed annotations which gradually altered the course of my critical attention. To begin with, it appeared that the reproductive emphasis of the commentary was simply part of its practise of philological explication, clarifying and bringing up to date the biology behind The City of God. This is visible in Healey / Vives' remarks upon the cross-breeding of species which, quite typically, refer deferentially to classical sources: '... as creatures begotten betweene Wolues and Dogges, or Beares and Bitches, &c. Pliny saith that such beasts are never like either parent, but of a third kinde, ...'. However, it is when the commentary specifically equates the state of adulthood with sexual growth that we start to see the significance placed upon procreativity and its consideration as the foundation of all gendered identity: 'Maturity in man is the time
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138 For example, Vives does not express any interest in the narrative of the Babylonian diaspora and its implications for language use and social activity.
139 Vives, commentary, The City of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XV, Chapter xxvii, p.570. 'Vt lysisca, lupi & canis, sed Plinius lib. viii. obseuaturn esse dicit e duobus diuersi generis nata tertii generis fieri, & neutri parentum esse similia, eaq[ue] ipsa, quae it nata sunt, non gignere in omni animaliu[m] genere idcirco mulas non parere'- p.477.
when he is fit to beget children when as hair groweth upon the immodest parts of nature in man or woman'. Nevertheless, a most striking example is when Healey / Vives describes the Manichees, a religious sect to which Augustine belonged prior to his conversion to Christianity. Here the historical basis of this movement is, surprisingly perhaps, obscured, with the group’s procreative peculiarities coming to the fore: ‘... if they vsed their wiues, yet must they auoide generation, least the diuine substance which goeth into them by their nourishment should be bound in the fleshly bonds of the child begotten’.141

Thus observations such as these intimated to me something of the allure of progenitive concerns for at least this particular humanist. Although this itself deserves to be the subject of research, what excited me more was the question of the persisting relevance of the commentary and also the main text almost a century later, the purpose of Healey’s deliberate (and complete) rewriting of Vives’ and Augustine’s words and the text’s subsequent reading. I have already begun to suggest possible answers to this query, but now I will attempt to reveal the extent of the exemplary ‘riches’ which The Citie of God would have bestowed upon its male colonial readers, men desperately seeking the ‘salvation’ of their masculinity through the siring of progeny.

142 It is possible that Vives (1492-1540) - as a member of Catherine of Aragon’s circle in the 1520s - was sensitised to the question of generation due to the pressure placed upon his patroness to produce a male heir for Henry VIII, the matter which, arguably, was the eventual cause of the breakdown of their marriage and, indeed, the English Reformation. Although Vives did not enter England until 1523, the DNB states that Vives was visited by the king and queen in Bruges in 1521, the period when he was working on the Augustinian commentary - xx, 377. However, the commentary’s procreative emphasis might well simply reflect Vives own concerns as an as yet unmarried and childless man.
143 The option to select only ideologically apposite sections of the text is evidenced by A Short Relation of Divers Miracles at Shrines (Paris: 1608), a work which translated only Book XXII, Chapter viii, thus ‘reclaiming’ Augustinian doctrine for the Catholic cause.
One way in which the text may have offered reassurance to these men was through its representation of Abraham as an emboldening archetype of lasting virility. In Book XVI, Chapter xxviii, we witness Healey / Augustine’s exegetical ‘sharpening’ of St. Paul’s statement that ‘Abrahams body was dead’, a remark which seems to resemble the cultural sentiments of the Virginia colony that without generative capacity a man did not ‘exist’, at least not in gender terms. Here the text resists such a lethal ‘writing-off’ of the great patriarch for reproductive reasons, placing the blame for barrenness - in what we shall soon see to be a characteristic manoeuvre - upon women, belabouring the point that Abraham’s wife, Sarah, was not of child-bearing age:

> For his bodie was not simply dead, but respectiuely; otherwise it should haue beene a carcasse fit for a graue, not an ancient father vpon earth. Besides the guift of begetting children that GOD gave him, later after Sarahs death, and he begot diuers vpon Keturah, and this cleareth the doubt that his body was not simply dead; I mean vnto generation.\(^{144}\)

Nevertheless, with what we have witnessed as the symptomatic instability of exemplary discourse, whilst helpfully suggesting men relinquish responsibility for propagation (as, of course, they later did in the sense of abandoning the pursuit of midwifery), the passage proceeds to sabotage its male readers invocation of Abraham as an inspiring image of sempiternal sexuality, an exemplar which might have perhaps given especial encouragement to unmarried Anglo-Virginians who feared they might not be fathers for a while. The text presents a potentially crippling contextualisation: ‘ … a man in those daies was not in his weakest age at an hundred yeares, although the men of our

---

\(^{144}\) *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVI, Chapter xxviii, p.604. ‘Ad aliquid enim emortuu[m] corpus eius intelligere debemus, no[n] ad omnia. Nam si ad omnia, no[n] ia[m] senectus uiui, sed cadauer est mortui. Qua[m]uis etia[m] sic solui soleat ista quaestio, quod de Cethura postea genuit Abraha[m]: quia domu[m] gignendi, quod a domino accepit, etiam post obitu[m] ma[n]sit uxoris* - p.505.
times bee so, and cannot beget a child of any woman: they might, for, they liued far longer, and had abler bodies than we haue'.

Thus their masculine predecessors are show to have possessed the gift of longevity, unattainable by early modern man. This physical superiority is, in addition, revealed to have placed their forefathers in the enviable position of being able to survive for a protracted enough period of time to single-handedly 'sire' an entire community: ‘... the Fathers of old liued so long, that one man might see a number of his owne propagation sufficient to build a cittie’. Yet if this ideal may have seemed depressingly beyond the reach of male settlers, the perusal of another part of the text would have raised their spirits, Healey-Vives’ commentary producing a more recent anecdotal example of superlative male fertility:

In my fathers time their was a towne in Spaine, euery dweller where-of was descended from the children of one man who was then a liue [sic]: yet were there an hundred houses in the towne, so that the youngest knew not by what name of kinred [sic] to call the old man, for our language hath names no higher then the great grandfather.

Reading around the text, then, colonial men might still find inspiration even for their wildest generative dreams. Yet if this was not enough, Healey’s work might be also observed to ‘shore up’ the sense of the fruitfulness of Anglo-Virginian masculinity by further denigrating female procreative powers. Although, the pregnancy of Abraham’s ‘geriatric’ wife, Sarah, is hailed by the Augustinian text as a miraculous event, Healey /

---

Vives’ annotations on this chapter actually accentuate the feminine lack of fecundity and even their (reprehensible?) use of contraceptive measures, stating that: ‘The phisitians hold womens barrenesse to proceede of the defects of the matrix, as if it bee too hard, or brawny, or too loose and spungeous, or too fat, or fleshly: ... I ommit [sic] the simples that being taken inwardly procure barrenesse ...’.

Indeed, if in the procreative history of Abraham and Sarah enacts a displacement of sexual deadness from male to female, the text also insinuates that even if women do bear, God - not the mother - is the true begetter of the child. It is intriguing to note that when *The Citi of God* wishes to stress the necessary gratitude of humankind for God’s works, it uses the opportunity to deny feminine reproductive influence: ‘Nor call wee a woman the creatrix of her child, ... although the womans soule being thus or thus affected, may put some quality vpon her burthen ... : yet shee can no more make the nature that is produced, then shee could make her selfe: ...’.

Yet what is particularly startling is that the commentary exploits this sexualisation of a theological issue as an occasion to insert a personal reminiscence which underlines the perverse and even vampiric nature of pregnant females: ‘Child-bearing women do often long for many euill things, as coales, and ashes. I saw one long for a bit of a young mans necke, and had lost her birth but that shee bitte of his neck untill he was almost dead, she tooke such hold’.

---


149 *The Citi of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XII, Chapter xxv, p.466. ‘Ita nec foeminam sui puerperii creatricem appellare debemus, sed potius illum, qui cuidem suo famulo dixit: Prius quam te formarem in utero noui te. Et quamuis anima sic uel sic affecta praegnantis ualeat aliquibus uelut induere qualitatis foetum, sicut de urgis uariatibus fecit Iacob, ut pecora colore uario gigenerentur, naturam tamen illam, quai gignitur, tam ipsa non fecit, quam nec ipsa se fecit’ - p.384.

In fact, it is not only ‘expectant’ women who are considered to be desirously violent by the paratext, feminine sexuality as a whole being depicted by Healey / Vives as a noxious force. For instance, the amatory life of Semiramis (a figure who I shall return to in my discussions of the text’s portrayal of female political power) is represented as a deadly cocktail of whorish homicide and incest, the translation telling us: ‘She was held wonderous lustfull after men, and that she still murdered him whome she medled with: that shee tempted her sonne, who therefore slew her, either for feare to fare as the others had, or else in abomination of so beastly an act.’

By this means, then, Anglo-Virginian male readers might have witnessed the textual mortification of the very female carnality which may have seemed to hold masculinity to ‘ransom’, since the satisfaction of these womanly desires was held to be the key to reproductive increase. But if this vilification of female sensuality and procreativity was not enough - helping to restore a sense of male potency as pure as Abraham’s and suggesting men refuse to accept the ‘guilt’ of childlessness - I would suggest that Healey’s work presented the Anglo-Virginians with the ultimate promise of freedom from their present sexual obligations. In the ‘heavenly city’, the text pledges, there will be no reproduction or even conjugal relationships, the following passage alluding to the plausibility of the total exclusion of the female gender, claiming that there: ‘... they shall not marry, nor take no wife. For regeneration shall exclude generation from thence. Therefore I hold this no idle note, that in the whole generation drawne from Seth there is not one woman named as begotten in this generation.’

---


152 *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XV, Chapter xvii, p.554. ‘Enos autem sic interpretatur homo ut hoc non posse foeminam nuncupari periti linguae illius asseruerent, tanq[ue] filius resurrectionis, ubi non nubent, neq[ue] uxorres ducent. Non enim erit ibi generatio, cum illuc perduxerit regeneratio. Quare & hoc non incassum notandum arbitror, quod in his generationibus quae propagantur ex illo qui est appellatus Seth, cum genuisse filios filiasq[ue] dicatur, nulla ibi genita nominatim foemina expressa est’ – p.463.
men could read of a holy future where their masculinity would no longer revolve so vulnerably around women and those requisite children. The supernal paradise of *The Citie of God* may, indeed, have crystallised the escapist hopes of early American men wishing for independent manhood in an all-male Christian community.

In fact, it might appear from this that the rejuvenation of masculinity, as exhorted by Crashawe, may not - as the redemptive ‘cleansing’ away of original sin, to which the text refers - actually materialise except in an ‘empyrean’ environment. However, *The Citie of God* also makes it manifest that the male body itself is evidence for the possibility of ‘regeneration’ on earth. The sign of this process is the circumcised phallus: ‘... for what doth circumcision signifie but the putting off corruption, and the renouation of nature?’.\(^\text{153}\) In fact, this ‘mark’, commanded by God to Abraham and all his descendants, is shown by the text to be mandatory for incorporation into masculine society. As God stated to the patriarch: ‘... *the uncircumcised man-child, ... shalbe cut off from his people, because he hath broken my covenent*’.\(^\text{154}\) Thus Healey’s text might have heartened its Anglo-Virginian male readers by suggesting that, at least in this biblical scheme, masculinity always possesses the prospect of its own resurgence.

Nevertheless, as well as being a proud symbol of redemption, the phallus is also a source of opprobrium in *The Citie of God*. Here the text highlights the embarrassment of erections, since they always ‘stand for’ (if you pardon my expression!) the presence of sinful appetite: ‘... in the members of generation, lust is so peculiarly enfeoffed, that they cannot moue, if it be away, nor stirre vnlesse it (beeing eyther voluntary, or forcibly excited) doe moue them. This is the cause of shame and auoyance of beholders in this

\(^{153}\) *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVI, Chapter xxvi, p.602. ‘Quid enim aliud circumcisio significat, quam uetustate exuta natura renouatum?’ - p.503

\(^{154}\) *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVI, Chapter xxvi, pp.601-602. ‘Et erit testamentu[m] meum in carne uestra in testamentu[m] aeternum: et qui non fuerit circu[m]cisus masculus, si non circu[m]cidetur carne praeputii sui octauo die interbit anima illa de genere eius, quia testamentu[m] meum dissipuit’ - p.503.
Thus Healey’s work, once more, exposes the equivocation of its exemplary discourse.

Still if these ‘stirrings’ of masculine desire were innately ‘unrighteous’ then what of those ‘homoerotic’ practices which may have been the most ‘attractive’ alternative available to the many ‘unwived’ Anglo-Virginians? (That is not to say that the following acts were exclusively enjoyed by ‘sex-starved’ single men). Although Norton has stated that there was only one prosecution for sodomy in the early to mid-seventeenth century Virginia, she reminds us that this figures does not reflect the sexual ‘reality’ of the colony since during this period the moral approach of governmental bodies was non-interventionist. That is, it relied upon the unofficial structures of public life (say, gossip) and the internal discipline of the patriarchal family to regulate sexuality.

Indeed, Norton has uncovered a great deal of evidence of the existence of households headed by two male ‘mates’ (as they were referred to) running tobacco plantations together. ‘Mates’ were never both husbands (although occasionally one might have a female spouse) and documents pertaining to these partnerships inevitably lay out what would occur in the case of the wedding of one of the men, thus intimating the current bond between the two men as, at least, a makeshift ‘marriage’. As Norton adds: ‘... it would be truly remarkable if all the men-only partnerships lacked a sexual component.’

But what does The Citie of God have to say about this? Anglo-Virginian homoerotic ‘mates’ would have found Healey’s work to be characteristically antagonistic towards their relationships. The text clearly condemns homosexual activity, informing

---


156 Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.354.


158 Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.354.
the reader how Lot was ‘deliuered out of Sodome, and the whole territory of that wicked citty consumed by a shower of fire from heauen: and all those parts where masculine bestiality was as allowable by custome as any other act is by other lawes’. Indeed, this censorious attitude is further evinced in Healey / Vives’ response to the main text’s deprecation of Greek ‘belief-systems’ (excepting Plato), the commentary concurring that: ‘... these Galli were al of them beastly villaines, Sodomites giuen to al filthinesse in the world’.

Yet both the main text and the printed annotations may be seen to retain a respect for the classical concept of ‘amicitia’, a cerebral ideal of male friendship which had been revitalised by Renaissance humanism. Indeed, if as Stewart has stated, in sixteenth-century England this classical paradigm had to strive against an established feudal model of male interaction which depended on the exchange of women in marriage, we might contend that the mostly-male ‘milieu’ of Virginia - where espousal was, arguably, less of a masculine-oriented dynamic - may have been a particularly nourishing environment for such textually-linked manly intimacy.

In this way, then, the aesthetic of ‘amicitia’ - broadly disseminated by humanist schooling and, therefore, as available exemplar at least for educated Anglo-Virginians - may have supported men in their homosocial / sexual dealings, especially those between ‘mates’. For Healey / Augustine, this paragon of emotional bonding between men is presented as the very foundation of sociability, the text cherishing male mourning for a deceased companion, affirming that: ‘... hee that forbiddeth vs that, may as well forbid all

159 *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVI, Chapter xxx, p.606. ‘Post hanc promissionem liberato de Sodomis Loth, & ueniente igneo imbre de coelo, tota illa regio impiae ciuitatis in cirnerem uersa est, ubi stupra in masculos in tantam consuetudinem conualera[n], quanta[m] leges sole[n]t aliorum factoru[m] praebere licentia[m]’-p.506.


conference of friend and friend, all sociaall curtesie, nay euen all humane affect, and thrust them all out of mans conversacion: ...'. In fact, in the humanist commentary, this closeness is illustrated as engendering self-improvement, thus insinuating its role in furthering the more expansive aim of creating a masculine 'renascence' in the American colony. Here readers encounter the remedial relationship of Socrates and Alcibiades, of which we are told that the ancient philosopher:

... taught him, and made showe of loue to him, to keepe him from the vnchast loue of others ... Socrates (saith Tully) having perswaded him that hee had nothing that was man in him, and that high borne Alcibiades diffred [sic] nothing from a common porter, hee grew into great griefe, and beseeched Socrates to teach him vertue, and to abolish this his baseness.'

Virginia, then, could, arguably, not be Sodom, but it might be Athens or Rome.

Still, even if this classical archetype may have exonerated the 'man-to-man' connection which were encouraged by the Virginian socio-sexual environment, *The Citie of God* implying such affinities as a positive part of the colony's attested project of transforming its prodigal sons, I would suggest that the very existence of 'mates' in Virginia - of dual-headed male households - would have subverted the traditional basis of male patriarchal and political control in the province. Since ancient Greek times the possession of a household represented the property qualification necessary for citizenship, for participation in the democratic affairs of the city-state. However, even later, after the onset of the Christian era, as *The Citie of God* makes manifest, the 'oikos' (home) and 'polis' (city) were imagined to be interdependent in a much more intimate way. Healey / Augustine writes that: '... the families peace adhereth vnto the citties, that is the orderly

---


command, and obedience in the familie, hath reall reference to the orderly rule and subjection in the cittie'. Thus the figure of the father is the ‘nexus’ between these ostensibly public and private spheres, his domestic rule being fundamentally related to civic government in what Norton has referred to as the ‘unified theory of power’ which had been rejuvenated by humanists in the Renaissance.

This patriarchal framework which Norton shows to be prevalent in Virginia, thus was patently predicated upon the submission of dependents, once more reminding male settlers of their deeply serious obligation to dominate their wives for the ‘good’ of the colony. Indeed, later in the century, when legal systems were more strongly established, men were punished for their partner’s crimes, the court, therefore, obliquely stating where the true fault lay. If this judicial expression of identity suggests an oddly indistinct conception of masculinity as a result of this homogenous scheme of authority, this structure also re-affirms the idea which I have already proposed, that male ‘subjectivity’ is inescapably involved with secularity in this historical context. Hence all the marital, sexual and procreative issues I have discussed so far would all, arguably, have been regarded under this one heading, all reading of *The Citie of God* ‘favouring the secular’ in this wide-ranging sense.

But, to return to the main thrust of our discussion, it is transparent how this ‘home-based’ notion of male supremacy may have hit upon difficulties in Virginia. To refer once more to *The Citie of God*, we witness there the oblique ‘deification’ of the householder, the commentary describing God’s omniscience in domestic terms:

> The Gouernor of a family (if hee bee wise and diligent) knowes at an instant where to fetch any thinke [sic] in his house, be his roomes neuer so large, and

---

165 *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XIX, Chapter xvi, p.774. ‘... satis apparat esse co[n]sequens, ut ad pacem ciuicam pax domestica referatur, id est, ut ordinata impera[n]di obedienque concordia cohabitantium, referatur ad ordinatum imperandi obedienq[ue] concordiam ciuium’- p.656.

166 Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers*, p.8.

167 Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers*, p.102.
many; and shall we thinke that GOD cannot doe the like in the world, vnto whose wisdome it is but a very casket?\textsuperscript{168}

In addition, we see, through the words of Healey / Augustine the intense significance of the performance of the role of ‘paterfamilias’ in order to be a man, or even a moral being. The text relates the story of Vulcan’s son, ‘Cacus’ (meaning evil), his monstrous character being primarily evidenced by his failures as a husband and father: ‘... though his wife neuer had a good word of him, hee neuer plaied with his children, nor ruled them in their manlier age ...’,\textsuperscript{169} these wrongs ostensibly taking precedence (at least in order of mention) over his delight in theft and murder! I would suggest that such examples, elevating the patriarchal element of manhood may not have offered much succour to the male American settlers.

For as is already apparent, the establishment of a conventional heterosexual household in Virginia was a ‘herculean’ task, since there were few women to master and make a family with. Furthermore, as Norton has emphasised, these hard-won homes were extremely vulnerable in the unhealthy conditions of the colony which frequently brought disease and death to their doors.\textsuperscript{170} But if being ‘mates’ seemed to be a promising solution, we can assume that, aside from the shared physical infinity and similar material sparsity of these all-male households, the gender ideology of patriarchal power may have created increased difficulties. For although Norton does not detail the day-to-day life of these men, one might imagine, in a state of sexual and economic equivalence, where, say, two male partners owned a tobacco plantation together, that the question of the division


\textsuperscript{169} The Cite of God,trans. by H[ealey], Book XIX, Chapter xii, p.767. ‘Quamuis ergo huius regnum dirae spelunae fuerit singularis, ut ex hac ei nomen inuentum, tum sit; nam malus Graece κάκος dicitur: quod ille uocabantur, ut nulla coiunxes es blande ferret refferetq[ue] sermonem: nullis filiis uel alluderet paruulis, uel grandiusculis imperaret, ... ’ - pp.650-651.

\textsuperscript{170} Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, pp.13-14.
of labour (who did the housework?) and the drive for dominance might have caused clashes. With the position as 'head' of the house bestowing men with especial authoritative powers in early Virginia due to the lack of solidified administrative 'infrastructure', the desirability of this sovereignty may have created a crushing masculine competitiveness which craved the 'feminisation' of other men, of the other 'mate'. Many Anglo-Virginian males may have been in this subdued plight. Let alone those married men who had, at last, constructed their independent households and thus gained their criteria for masculinity, only to have their patriarchal confidence undermined by these 'mates' doing things 'otherwise'.

In this environment, then, as Norton has emphasised, the persisting patriarchal ideal offered the men of the Chesapeake few solutions, suggesting a crisis of doubt concerning paternal domestic dominion. Indeed, men had only diminished opportunities for authority in the public arena, there being, as Thompson has asserted, no feudal system, cities or established aristocratic political structure within which preferment could occur. Thus with both sides of the traditional patriarchal sphere of influence in 'trouble', I would suggest The Citie of God’s dismissal and downright defamation of female public power would have both registered and assured the anxieties of Anglo-Virginian male readers concerning their insecure imperium.

This process occurs in the humanist margins of the text, where the commentary displaces the uncertainty concerning masculine civic power - plus the possible colonial fear of female rule (which we have witnessed previously in Healey’s translation of Hall) - onto women, ultimately serving to propose men as the only appropriate proprietors of an overtly temporal command. In this (albeit circuitous) way, I believe Healey’s text may

---

171 Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.39.
172 Norton, Founding Mothers and Fathers, p.124.
174 Thompson, Women, p.8.
have fortified Anglo-Virginian male confidence in their right to govern, thus sustaining their morale until the day when ‘homely’ or ‘worldly’ openings afforded the chance to seamlessly assert control. On several occasions, the commentary focuses in detail upon female figures of leadership. Here ‘Lavinia’ is finally put in her ‘proper place,’ removed from politics to a rural and maternal idyll, the paratext stating that:

Some think that *Lavinia*, after *Aeneas* his death swaied the state till *Syluius* came to yeares, and then resigned to him. Some say *Ascanius* had it though hee had no claime to it from *Lavinia* by whome it came: but because that she had as yet no sonne, and withall, was of too weake a sex to manage that dangerous war against *Mezentius* and his son *Lausus* ... therefore she retired into the country, and built her an house in the woods where she bought vppe her sonne, ...

Furthermore, the ‘depraved’ Semiramis emerges once again to function as a negative exemplar, the text’s philological annotations working to de-legitimise her supremacy. Hence in the first version of her rise to power, the text depicts Semiramis as an excellent military strategist who naturally takes her husband’s monarchial place after his death, relating how she:

... taught him [the King] how to subdue the Bactrians when then he besieged [sic]: so *Ninus* admiring her wit and beauty, maried her, and dying left her Empresse of Asia, vntill her yong sonne *Ninus* came at age, so she vndertooke the gouernment and kept it fourty two [sic] yeares.


However, the success of her rule during this rather lengthy period of minority, is then denigrated through intellectual ‘hearsay’ as the achievement of a duplicitous bloodthirsty maniac: ‘This now some ... affirme that shee begged the sway of power imperiall of her husband for fiue daies onely, which hee granting, she caused him to bee killed, or as others say, to bee perpetually imprisoned’.177

Yet I would argue that Healey’s text enacted a more radical function than the reassertion of the male prerogative through the devaluation of feminine claims to political ascendancy. I would contend that confronted by socio-economic conditions which threw the patriarchal concept of masculine public and private mastery into confusion, the male readers of early Virginia could turn to The Citie of God for a new paradigm of manliness, a paradigm more germane to the colonial situation. In fact, the text may be seen to offer a quite revolutionary solution to the particular issue of the fragility and impracticability of male civic control in the Chesapeake by challenging the true worth of worldly glory and goods as essential components of masculinity.

If as Kathleen Brown has suggested, even in the last quarter of the seventeenth century American men were still suffering from an inability to impose their authority through the signs of conspicuous consumption,178 it seems plausible that in the particularly ‘spartan’ first years of plantation, Anglo-Virginian manhood required an alternative to the material gender ethic. It is the infeasibility of the perpetuation of this notion of masculinity as wealth - and, in addition, the classical / humanist vision of manliness as political action - in the American settlement which, I would suggest, Healey’s translation of The Citie of God addresses. I would propose that the text’s ‘ascetic’ rejection of the transient temporal objects of fame and riches, presented a

spiritual exemplar which was a practical answer to the mundane problem of 'being a man' in such unsympathetic surroundings. At one point early in the text, Healey / Augustine asks: 'Take away vaine-glory and what are men but men?' Here I would suggest, we can intimate the 'end' of the text's repudiation of the Roman notions of ostentatious wealth and civic honour: the reduction of masculine subjectivity to its most 'simple' form. It is this Christian archetype of the man without materiality, without the world, which may have appealed to early Anglo-Virginians.

At this stage it is intriguing to note that Healey, as Salmon has discussed, had previously shown interest in 'neo-stoical' doctrines, his translation of Epictetus advocating the philosophical 'distillation' of the masculine self in order to decrease personal vulnerability: '... if thou prize nothing for thine own but that which is essentially so, and hold all those externall goods, as they are, truly aliens from thy state, thou shalt bee seated aboue the power of all iniury or compulsion: ...' Indeed, here we may also witness the way in which such an 'internalisation' might also involve the repudiation of the original patriarchal relationship, the text advising its readers to eschew authority over their sons to preserve their own serenity: '... thou must stand at vtter defiance with such cogitations as these: ... If I correct not my sonne, hee will neuer be good. ... it is better to see badnesse in ones sonne, then to feele miserie in ones selfe'. By this means, then, we may begin to comprehend how such a retreat into interiority might specifically represent a revision of masculinity.

179 The Cifie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book V, Chapter xvii, p.220. 'Tolle iactantia[m], & o[m]nes homines q[u]d su[n]t nisi homines?' - p.163.
182 Epictetus, Enchiridion, trans by H[ealey], p.20.
Although *The City of God* makes some space for the issue of material belongings, regarding them as 'temptations' to be met by Christians in society, suggesting: ‘... let vs use these things, to do our selues good towards GOD'\textsuperscript{183} and even bestows some exemplary 'credit' upon the builders of the Roman Empire: ‘... the vertues of those illustrious men was giuen, both to stand as a rewarde for their merrites, and to produce examples for our vses',\textsuperscript{184} the general 'tone' of the text is anti-worldly. In fact, the text seems to correct its last comment on Rome, stating that: ‘... ambition would not preuaile but amongst a people wholly corrupted with couetousnes and luxury'.\textsuperscript{185} This derogation of the familiar classical and humanist masculine tropes of civic aspiration, or virtue, is further advanced by the text's attack on Nero, the ruthless hunger for political power being portrayed as degenerating masculinity to the degree that the customary gender definitions can no longer be applied:

... *Nero Cesar* was he that got first of all to the top-turret of all this enormity: whose luxury was such that one would not haue feared any manly act of his: & yet was his cruelty such, as one ignora[n]t of him would not haue thought any effeminat [sic] sparke reside[n]t in him: \textsuperscript{186}

Indeed, Augustine's crusade against goods leads him to severely conclude that poor Christian men were tortured in Roman times (ostensibly to give up their property) due to their hidden affection for opulence, those with loftier intentions escaping this pain:

\textsuperscript{183} *The City of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book V, Chapter xvii, p.220. 'Sed utamur & in his rebus beneficio domini dei nostri' - p.163.

\textsuperscript{184} *The City of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book V, xviii, p.223. 'Proinpe p[er ] illud impiu[m] ta[m] magnu[m] ta[m]q[ue] diuturum[m], uiuoruq[ue] tantoru[m] uirtutibus praeclaru[m] atq[ue] gloriosum, & illor[um] inte[n]tioni merces, qua[m] quaereba[n]t, est reddita, & nobis proposita necessariae co[m]monitionis exe[n]pla: ...' - p.165.

\textsuperscript{185} *The City of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book 1, Chapter xxx, p.46. 'Minime autem praeeualeret ambitio, nisi in populo auaricia luxuriaq[ue] corrupto' - p.30.

\textsuperscript{186} *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book V, Chapter xix, p.225. 'Sed huius uicii sumnitate[m], & quasi arce[m] quandam[m] Nero Cesar primus obtinuit: cuius fuit ta[n]ta luxuries, ut nihil ab eo putaretur urire metue[n]du[m]: tanta crudelitas, ut nihil molle habere crederet, si nesciretut' - p.167.
‘... perhaps they had a desire to them though they had them not, and were poore against their wils ...’.

Thus with Nero’s descent through ambition into a (literal) ‘no mans land’ of gender identity, the commentary is perhaps correct to conclude that ‘wee must resist the desire of glorie, and not yeeld to it’, a fitting axiom for men in a materially and politically insufficient situation such as Virginia. What *The Citie of God* proposes to replace these signifiers of public renown and material affluence with is the invention of masculinity as internalised and untouchable piety. As Healey / Augustine writes of the martyrdom of the early Christian saints: ‘They lost all that they had: what? their faith? their zeale? their goods of the *inward man*; which inritcheth [sic] the soule before God?’.

Hence with the new paragon of the ‘inward man,’ the conscience acquires a special significance, a conceptual manoeuvre which may in itself have pragmatically aided men living without the established structures of church and law as moral guidance. Masculinity must meditate upon itself in Virginia, ‘harkening’ to oneself being represented as the antithesis of the narcissistic dialectic which privileges the opinions of others: ‘Vaine-glory is not a vice proper to humaine praise, but the soules, that peruersely affecteth praises of men, not respecting the consciences testimonie’. Indeed, this capacity for self-reflection is even exalted to the extent that it is equated with the ‘Book of Life’ which God will read on the Day of Judgement. Rather than being a literal object, this text is the individual’s God-given process of moral recollection:

---

... It is ... some divine power infused into the consciences of each peculiar, calling all their works (wonderfully & strangely) unto memory, and so making each man's knowledge accuse or excuse his own conscience: ... This power divine is called a booke, and fitly, for therein is read all the facts that the doer hath committed, by the working of this hee remembreth all: ... 191

This honouring of the inner 'adjudicating' self is further evidenced in *The Citie of God's* reverence for spiritualised emotion, the passions being portrayed as an inherent and positive part of earthly existence: '... so long as we live in this infirmity, we shall live worse if we want those affects'. 192 Instead of a 'stoical' self-control, Healey's work advocates love as a moderating force for Christians on earth: '... as long as they are pilgrims, and in the way of GOD, [they] doe feare, desire, reioice and sorrow. But their love beinge right, streighteth [sic] all those affects'. 193 It is these feelings, rather than public duties or riches which bring men into true relation with their fellows: 'And they doe not feele affects for themselues onely, but for others also, whom they desire should bee freed, ...'. 194

Where models of civic virtue fail, Anglo-Virginian men can thus reach into their hearts to effect the salvation of others. This vision of conversion as an extension of self-regard is echoed by Crashawe in his comment that the Christian man wishes his friend '... were as holy, and patient, and learned, and zealous, and as highly in Gods fauour as

---

190 *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XII, Chapter viii, p.448. 'Nec iactantia uitum est laudis humanae, sed animae p[er]verse amantis laudis ab hominibus, spreto testimonio conscientiæ'-p.357.
192 *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XIV, Chapter ix, p.509. 'Sed dum uitae huius infirmitate[m] gerinus, si eas omnino nullas habeamus, tunc potius non recte utiuismus' - p.423.
194 *The Citie of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XIV, Chapter ix, p.508. 'Non solum autem propter semetipso his mouentur affectibus, uerumentiam propter eos quos liberari cupiunt: & ne percant, metuunt, & dolent, si pereut & gaudent, si liberantur' - p.423.
himselfe'. Thus Crashawe’s sermon, I would suggest, reveals the colonisation of Virginia itself as an expression of this religious ethos of masculinity, disclosing it as a sentimental journey which actually replaces the usual male political teleology: ‘By others [actions] we may shew ourselues good common-wealths men: by this good Christians’.

In this remark we may envisage how this evangelical empathy was part of the redemption of Anglo-Virginian men which was so strongly urged by Crashawe and others, the ideology of civic humanist masculinity, perhaps, being shown to be eschewed from the very start. Indeed, the specific maleness of this ardent godliness is disclosed by the commentary to The Citie of God, where Christian belief is paralleled with ‘authentic’ masculinity: ‘O what a few lawes might serue mans life! how small a thing might it serue to rule (not a true Christian, but) [sic] a true man! (indeed, hee is no true man that knoweth not and worshippeth not Christ.).’ But more intriguingly still, the humanist para-text goes on to propose emotive engagement with the ‘divine’ and fellow mortals as superseding the philosophical achievements of the ancients: ‘Loue thee that which is aboue as well as thou canst, and that which is next thee like thy selfe, ... Thou shalt then bee greater than Plato or Pythagoras with all their trauells and numbers: then Aristotle with all his quirkes and sillogismes, ...’

In fact, it is this holy masculinity which is highlighted in the preface of Healey / Vives to The Citie of God (in the 1522 Basle edition and ‘revived’ in 1610). Here the text’s ‘original’ dedicatee, Henry VIII, assumes paradigmatic status due to his belief:

... when your defense of the Sacraments came forth, the[n] which nothing can be more elegant, more pure, more religious, and in one word more christian, the

---

196 Crashawe, Sermon, sig. I.
reputation of your mindes goodnesse was much more confirmed, if more it might be: ... and admiration thereof arose in all men: yea even in those who think nothing more honourable, more maiestical, then the power of a King; and those that place riches above all things, and that ascribe exceeding much to the gifts of the body, to beauty, brawny strength, and agility; and that are students in the arts of warre: .... 199

In this passage we may observe the way in which manliness is regarded as a fusion of faith and intellectuality, this Christian humanist model being advertised as impressing even those who are said to still celebrate more, arguably, feudal forms of hierarchical and physical masculinity.

It is the humanist endorsement of studiousness, of textual or linguistic skill as part of the preconditions for manhood - the gender ideal which was, ostensibly, at the heart of the inter-confessional contention of the 1560s - which the main text of Healey’s translation of *The City of God* seems to contradict. As Healey / Augustine stresses, the Christian man does not require classical erudition:

Now if a christian for want of reading, cannot use such of their words as fits disputations, because hee neuer heard them: or cannot call that part that treates of nature, either naturall in Latine, or physicall in Greeke: nor that that inquires the truth, rationall or Logicall; nor that which concerns rectifying of manners, and goodnesse of ends Morall; or Ethicall: yet thence it followes not that he knowes not, that from the true God is both Nature, whereby hee made vs like his Image, Reason, whereby we know him, and Grace whereby we are blessed in being united to him. 200

---


Thus men are *innately* ‘scholarly’ in the ways of God and do not need improvement through theoretical education.

Indeed, the disciples emerge as exemplary figures in the sense that their lack of learning and oratorical training is the miracle which proves the Resurrection. The text promotes the fact that these men were outside formal modes of knowledge and yet still succeeded in their proselytising mission, perhaps thus suggesting to Anglo-Virginian men that scholarship was not vital for their evangelical manhood (even if education would be necessary to even read this text!):

That men ignorant in all arts, without Rhetorike, Logike or Grammar, plaine Fishers should be sent by Christ into the sea of this world, onely with the nets of faith, and draw such an inumerable multitude of fishes of al sorts, so much the stranger, in that they tooke many rare Phylosophers. ... It is incredible that Christ should rise again in the flesh, and carry it vp to heauen with him. It is incredible that the world should beleuce this: and it is incredible that this beleefe should bee effected by a small sort of poore, simple, vnlearned men.201

Yet I would argue that the male Anglo-Virginian readers of *The Cite of God* could not simply embrace this loving, fideistic mode of masculinity. Not only would the humanist schooling which many of them may have received in England have prejudiced their perceptions of the talents of a ‘proper’ man, but the commentary to Healey’s work would, I suggest, have helped to perpetuate the archetype of the intellectual male. In this part of the text, we witness the conspicuous conflation of learning and masculinity, the cerebral abilities of Plato disclosing the philosopher as a ‘transcendant’ male: ‘ ... he erreth in my judgement that holdeth not *Plato* to haue bin some-what more then man, at

201 *The Cite of God*, trans. by H[ealey], Book XXII, Chapter v, p.879. ‘Ineruditos liberalibus disciplinis, & omnino quantum ad istorum doctrinas attinet, impolitos, non peritos grammatica, non armatos dialectica, non rhetorica inflatos, piscatores Christus cu[m] retibus fidei ad mare huius seculi paucissimos misit, atq[ue] ita ex omni genere tam multos pisces, & tanto mirabiliares, quanto rariores etiam ipsos philosophos cepit. ... Incredibile est enim Christu[m] resurrexiste in carne, & in coelum ascendisse cum carne. Incredibile est, mundum rem tam incredibile[m] credidisse. Incredibile est, homines ignobiles, infirmos, imperitos re[m] tam incredibilem, tam efficaciter mundo, & in illo etiam doctis persuadere potuisse’ - p.750.
least of that same rare, and singular race and stamp of men'. Indeed, Prometheus becomes here a paradigm for the humanistic pragmatic application of learning, even if this is shown to involve the surrender of political power:

... unto Epimetheus his younger brother they say he did willingly resign the kingdom of Thessaly giving him-selfe wholly unto celestiall contemplation, and for that end ascending the high mount Caucasus to behold the circumvolution of the starres their postures. &c. And then descending downe came & taught the Caldees Astronomy and policy ...

Hence even though the commentary suggests the superlative nature of spiritual exemplars, the emulative ethos of masculinity with which humanism (as we shall see) was so enamoured, ultimately favours urbane wit over sanctity. Thus, in the following extract by Healey-Vives details the mimetic dynamic of society, concluding with Jesus as the supreme model for men:

The examples of those whome we reuerence do moue vs much: for we indeauor to imitate them in al things, be they gods or men: the people affects the fashion of the Prince, the schollers of the maister they honour, and all mortall men their conditions whom they hold immortall. And here-vppon is our Saviour Christ and his Saints set before al of our religion, to be obserued and imitated.

However, the passage then proceeds to eulogise the humanist Thomas More, intimating the exemplarity of 'his sharpnes of wit, his depth of Judgement, his excellence and variety of learning, his eloquence of Phrase, his plausibility and integrity of manners,

---


his judicious fore-sight, his exact execution, his gentle modesty and vprightnes ... 205

Hence, I would suggest that here the sophisticated intelligence of this future Roman Catholic saint finally takes exemplary precedence over the quintessence of religiosity - the Redeemer.

In truth, the commentary persistently 'secularises' the biblical figures presented by the main text. A subtle 'iconoclasm' occurs in these margins, as Healey / Vives invokes historical sources in order to metamorphose the Old Testament patriarchs into humanist paradigms of erudition and social mobility - much in the way that, as Jardine and Rice have shown, St. Jerome was modified into a paragon of humanist learning.206

Thus, Vives, recounting various accounts of Abraham's life, describes how this scriptural male was born in Chaldea and how:

... hee inuentin Astrology there, and was so iust, wise and welbeloued of God, that hee sent him into Phaenicia, and there hee taught Astronomy and other good Arts, and got great fauour with the King: ...

Furthermore, Moses is depicted as having a similarly profitable intellectual career:

'... the daughter of Chenephris King of Egypt, ha-uing no child herselffe, adopted him for her son, and so he came to great honor in Egipro, because of his diuine knowledge & inuentions in matter of learning and gouernment'. 208

---


206 See the introduction to this thesis.


208 Vives, commentary, The Cifie of God, trans. by H[ealey], Book XVIII, Chapter xviii, p. 665. 'Numenus philosophus Musaeu[s] uocat Mosen, ... a Graecis Musaeu[s] noiai tradit, que[m] scribita Meride Chenephris Aegyptioriu[m] regis filia, q[uo]d ipsa parere no[n] posset, adoptatu[m], maximo apud
Thus the printed annotations utilise *The Citie of God* as a 'site' on which to establish intellectual ability and the public-orientated studies of humanism as the exclusive means to attain masculine excellence: 'I deny not but a grosse-brained fellow be an honest man: more such are so, then otherwise, but the excellent perfection of vertue, is proper to the witty alone'. In fact, this specific form of erudite masculinity may have 'originally' been so vigorously emphasised in the Erasmian edition of 1522 in order to establish humanism - which was, arguably, still only at an early stage in its development in Northern Europe - in the face of competition from the scholastic version of academic manliness. In the following quotation, St. Augustine's discussion of the precise moment of death becomes an opportunity for the humanist commentary to belittle the rival movement's mode of scholarship as mere philosophical 'quibbling'. As in the texts of the Great Controversy examined in the last chapter, scholasticism is represented as a pathetic pedantry which reflects a less mature masculinity:

Why thus: It was but now, and now it is not: not yet? then thus - - - - - but you must into the schooles, and learne of the boies: for those bables are fitter for them then for men. But you and I will haue a great deale of good talke of this, in some other place.210

Hence Augustine is ultimately reassimilated into the 'fold' of humanist exemplarity (see Figure 4 for what might be assumed to be a studious image of the saint), his intellectual 'finicality' being forgiven on consideration of a future heavenly 'man-to-man' discussion of such matters. Indeed, it is this homosocial aspect of humanism which the commentary extensively illustrates, the periphery of *The Citie of God* becoming the

---

Aegyptios habitu[m] honore ob igieniu[m] diuiniu[m] & inuenta tu[m] quae ad eruditione facerent, tu[m] quae ad resp. priuatque & mores singularu[m]'- p.560.


space in which these masculine intellectual communities ‘gather’ and share their knowledge. Anthony Grafton has described the way in which the humanist’s commentary upon a text ‘tended to dramatize his own life and the circles he himself had moved in’\footnote{Grafton, ‘The Humanist as Reader’, p.205.} and, indeed, this is apparent when Healey-Vives long-windedly reminisces that:

\ldots when I was little better then a child, I remember I hard [sic] mine vnkle Henry Marke read in his admired lectures vpon Iustinianns Institutions. Francesco Craneueldio and I had much talke hereof, of late, who is a famous and profouud [sic] ciuilian ... . Truly he is a man of rare conceipt, ... . Marke Laurino, Dean of S. Donatians in Bruges was with vs now and then: if learning had may such friends as he, it would beare an higher sayle then it doth. John Fennius also, of the same house, was with vs sometimes, a youth naturally ordayned to learning, and so he applieth him-selfe.\footnote{Vives, commentary, The Cifie of God trans. by H[ealey], Book IX, Chapter xxi, pp.779-780. ‘Id quod puer pene audisse me de Henrico Marco auunculo meo memini, qu[u]m acutissimus ille iuris peritus Iustianiani Caesaris institutiones in patria mihi praelegeret. Et his paucis diebus de hac ipsa re multa plerumq[ue] differumus ego & Franciscus Craneueldius, iuris & iusticiae co[n]sultissimus ... . Aderantq[ue] interdum Marcus Laurinus, decamus sancti Donatiani Brugensis: cui similes amicos si literae haberent plerosq[ue], felicius certe cum illis agerenter, & Ioa[n]nes Fennius ex eodem. D.Donatiani collegio iuuenis pectore, & in primis cordato, & ad musas earumq[ue]: studiosos omnes amandos a natura factus, studio educatus atq[ue] appositus’ - p.660.}

This lengthy excerpt, I believe, exposes the immense significance of such male scholarly connections for humanism, the manly ‘descent’ of scholarship being seen in the following passage to be prioritised over religious matters. Healey / Vives follows the main text’s description of the physical vastness of the men of biblical times with an anecdote of a visit to see sacred relics. In this we may witness the expression of a - literally - patriarchal ethic of emulation which works to substitute the ‘big boys’ of the past with new humanist heroes of ‘monumental’ intellect:

Vpon Saint Christophers day wee went to visite the chiefe Churche of our citty, and there was a tooth shewn vs as bigge as my fist, which they say was Saint Christophers, There was with mee Hierom Burgarino, a man of a most modest and sober carriage, and an indefatigible student: which he hath both from nature and also from the example of his father: who though hee were old, and had a great charge of family, yet gave him-selfe to his booke that his children might see him and imitate him.\footnote{Vives, commentary, The Cifie of God trans. by H[ealey], Book XV, Chapter ix, p.544. ‘Festo diui Christofori, cum salutatum issemus cum ad maximu[m] urbis nostrae templum, ostensus est nobis dens moralis pugno maior, quam diceba[n]t esse illius. Aderat mecum Hieronymus Burgarimus iuuenis ingenio}
In the past few pages, I have attempted to make manifest the intensely intellectual image of masculinity recommended by the exegetical apparatus of *The Citie of God*. Although the sacred element of manliness is acknowledged here, the ‘homosociability’ it promotes has been shown to be primarily founded upon studiousness rather than an emotive spirituality. Hence the men of early Virginia reading Healey’s work may have experienced an exemplary conflict between the two parts of the text, there, perhaps, being an ideological ‘friction’ between the concepts of manhood as learning and manhood as faith. Even if the humanist males actually ‘ganged together’ in these margins in the early part of the sixteenth century to ‘crpwd out’ the contending masculinities of feudalism (essentially martial in nature) and scholasticism (an abstruse and useless erudition, in the humanist view), what meaning might this commentary have had a century later in America? How might the male colonial readers have reconcile these two exemplary visions of manliness offered by Healey’s translated text?

I would suggest that the answer lies, once more, in the social history of the settlement. On one level, both of these ethics of masculine association - whether through scholarship or piety - may have been welcomed by a predominantly male community arguably eager to discover paradigms which produced new understanding of masculine relations. However, I would also contend that these two notions of manliness presented by *The Citie of God* - there are, of course more ‘masculinities’ within the text, as we shall see in the conclusion - harmonised quite precisely with the labour needs of early Virginia. In this environment, men were, on the one hand, required to further the (at least, superficial) religious aims of the colony, possessing the evangelistic interpersonal skills,
in particular, to emotionally reach and convert their 'heathen' brothers. However, the plantation also desperately needed administrators, to establish governmental structures, this form of expertise being the alleged *telos* of humanist education.

David Beers Quinn has stated that there was a surplus of militia men in the colony as a result of the end of the war with Spain in 1604-5,\(^{214}\) thus suggesting the possible resonance of the ideal, of 'unlearned', religious masculinity present in Healey's work. Nevertheless, as Quinn further emphasises, it was the male colonisers' inability to transform themselves into bureaucrats which nearly drove Virginia to disaster, stating that: 'Some few did prove adaptable; the majority were too professionalised to remain anything but soldiers. Their uselessness ... along with disease ... brought the ... colony several times to the verge of collapse'.\(^{215}\) But at least these men might build forts and help in matters of defence and exploration, whereas, according to Richard Beale Davis, the 'cultivated' (humanistic?) element of Virginian society was totally inept, describing how: ' “Gentlemen”, ... were indeed in too great proportion for the effective building of a colony, too great especially in the earliest years'.\(^{216}\)

In the face of these circumstances, then *The Citie of God* may have functioned as a collection of galvanising exemplars, inciting men to assume their 'rightful' roles as Christian missionaries and colonial administrators. Yet, as we have seen, Healey's work may also have offered Anglo-Virginian men guidance in other 'secular' aspects of their lives: in their marital and sexual relations. The text extensively addresses the intensely pertinent question of procreation, as well as reflecting male anxieties concerning the power of the few female settlers. Indeed, I have argued that these last-mentioned apprehensions might in turn have expressed a deeper male fear regarding the possible


\(^{215}\) Quinn, *Discovery of America*, p.486.

\(^{216}\) Davis, 'Literary Climate of Jamestown', p.36.
defeat of their patriarchal domination and public ambitions in the unstable social context of Virginia - this question returning us, once more, to the exigency of the text’s advertisement of a learned, ‘pen-pushing’ masculinity which would, ostensibly, organise the province. In this section I have also suggested that the advocated ascetic, ‘interiorised’ manhood of *The Citie of God* may have supported men in the ‘mean time’, whilst confronted by such political and material deficiencies. Healey’s patristic work delves deep into the heart of masculinity in order to offer paragons of practical ‘redemption’ to early American men.
IV

Following the work of Grafton and Jardine, and influenced by Louis B. Wright's exposition of the necessarily utilitarian character of learning in early America, this chapter has been predicated upon the notion of reading as a pragmatic activity in the Renaissance. Taking Grafton and Jardine's concept of the public teleology of this process as my starting point, I have attempted to extend their theoretical analysis to a religious text, proposing - as I have done earlier in this thesis - that the humanist interpretative praxis which they focus upon in their essay on Harvey is a specifically male intellectual mode. Here I have suggested that the search for masculine role models is at the heart of exemplary reading, enabling the 'seamless' simultaneous analysis of sacred and profane texts and, arguably, effacing any 'uncomfortable' ideological differences between the two types of literary material. Hence Thorpe does not blaspheme when he claims in the preface to The Citie of God that Augustine and Vives 'most fauour of the secular', since pragmatic scholarly practice easily may be seen to (and usually?) assimilate spiritual works into the 'canon' of the world.

Indeed, even as I have intimated that male-oriented exemplary reading might be seen to expand the 'literary realm of the 'secular,' I have also endeavoured to stretch the limits of 'secularity' per se. Hence while agreeing with Grafton and Jardine that Renaissance reading aimed towards producing overtly 'public' action, I have also argued that, especially in early America, where - as Norton has described - the definition of the 'secular' was in 'flux',²¹⁷ that this concept may also have embraced aspects of masculine subjectivity which might otherwise be considered to be 'private.' Sexuality and familial

issues are 'politicised', thus the guidance which The Citie of God offers to its readers in their lives as husbands makes the text 'secular' as much as its advice on earthly government.

Throughout this piece I have asked my readers to collude with me in an 'leap of imagination'. Bearing in mind my lack of direct evidence of reader response to Healey’s work (marginalia, for instance), I have invoked the rest of Healey’s corpus, a selection of Virginian materials and range of secondary sources to suggest ways in which The Citie of God may have been used by intellectuals in colonial America. Despite possessing some strong testimony of John Healey’s involvement (possibly through the Inner Temple) in the religious promotion of Virginia in England in 1609-10, I confess that my intellectual journey across the Atlantic has been, in some sense, methodologically dubious. However, I would hope that the relationship which I have attempted to establish between Healey’s text and history might lend some credibility to my provisional surmises.

Hence the second section of this chapter concentrated upon the genesis of the Virginia Company, suggesting The Citie of God’s participation in the widespread mobilisation of biblical paradigms to justify the process of colonisation. However, I also concluded that an auxilliary aim of the expansionist project was the ‘renewal’ of an allegedly degenerated English masculinity in America, Healey’s work, arguably, engaging in this course of ‘saving’ men, this textual operation taking place, even if - as we witnessed in the third section of this piece - the materials concerning Virginia also insinuate a concomitant anxiety about the coming changes, a fearful sense that traditional political and domestic paradigms would no longer be tenable in the new settlement. Hence in that part I commenced by examining Healey’s translation of Hall’s delirious satire on the new world in order to evidence the advance cultural consciousness of the gender shifts colonisation would bring. Indeed, I suggested that Hall’s text might be seen
to predict the emergence of more maritally powerful women in America, gaining a degree of authority due to their rarity in the mostly male province, as well as the concurrent crisis in masculine identity due to this and other social causes. Thus we witnessed Anglo-Virginian men under pressure to assert their patriarchal dominance of the household and procreate, even though finding a wife was an arduous task. We saw men encountering an environment which was materially and politically bleak, where there was, at least initially, little opportunity for worldly wealth or ambition.

It is in this situation that, I have suggested, The Citie of God received fresh purpose, serving as a 'handbook' for a disturbed colonial masculinity. I would argue that in this 'sex-saturated' encyclopaedic text, male Anglo-Virginian readers might have sought solace and wisdom on maintaining control over their own insubordinate 'Eve' and reducing their responsibility for the generation of more Americans, even as Abraham implied the endurance of male virility. Furthermore, I have contended that Healey's work is replete with archetypes which explain the homosocial (or even sexual) relationships which inevitably existed in the colony, The Cifie of God apparently legitimising masculine connection, whether through narratives of classical 'amicitia', humanist intellectual 'coteries' or affective Christianity. Faced with a raw absence of 'things' and of the customary structures of public life, I believe that the text's (albeit incomplete) ethic of withdrawal from the transitory 'stuff' of the world, of the inward, 'conscientious' man, would have represented an alternative masculinity for Anglo-Virginians. At least, that is, until the social and administrative fabric of the colony became more fixed, The Citie of God, as we have seen, also encouraging colonial men to develop the evangelical and bureaucratic skills which were requisite for the secure establishment of the settlement.
Rewriting the Church Father and the sixteenth-century Spanish humanist for the sake of Virginia, John Healey’s long-neglected translation emerges as a fascinatingly ‘mundane’ work, a book which colonial men could reach for on ‘rainy days’, seeing their gendered concerns reflected there. In the case of the 1610 edition of *The Citie of God*, it is possible to suggest that nothing is absolutely sacred.
CHAPTER THREE –
Addicted to the feminine gender: recusant manhood in Tobie Matthew’s
Confessions (1620)

In the last chapter we witnessed the ways in which a translation of a patristic text
may have supported men during the crisis of colonisation in Virginia. In this part we will
explore how a vernacular version of another Augustinian text may have offered succour to
Catholic men in Renaissance England by presenting them with a version of masculinity
appropriate to the circumstances of religious persecution.

Tobie Matthew’s Confessions - the first version of this text to appear in English -
was ‘written’ and published in 16201 whilst its Catholic convert author was in exile in the
Low Countries. It is mentioned in John Gee’s ‘supergrass’ work, The Foot out of the
Snare (1624),2 where it is attributed to Matthew and said to be being currently ‘sold for
sixteen shillings’.3 However, we are fortunate enough to possess two much more
extensive reader responses which testify to the book’s polemical power: Matthew

---

1 The Confessions of the Incomparable Doctavr S. Avgvstine ... Togeather With a large Preface, which it
will much import to be read over first; that so the Booke it selfe may both profit, and please, the Reader
more, trans. by [Tobie Matthew] ([St.Omer]: 1620). All further references to this edition will be cited as
Confessions, the original author’s name will be omitted for brevity. There are two series of pagination in this
text: one for the prefatory material and one for the main text.
2 John Gee, The Foot out of the Snare: With a Detection of Syndry Late Practices and Impostures of the
Priests and Iesuits in England. Whereunto is added a Catalogue of such bookes as in this Authors
Knowledge have been vented within two yeeres last past in London, by the Priests and their Agents
(London: 1624). All further references to this edition will be cited as Foot out of the Snare. Gee (1596-
1639) produced this work as a desperate attempt to regain the trust of the Protestant community. He had
‘defected’ to Catholicism following his Anglican ordination and become part of London’s underground
Jesuit movement, being present at a secret meeting at Blackfriars when the floor collapsed killing most of
the worshippers. Being persuaded by the Archbishop of Canterbury to rejoin the Church of England after
this event exposed his practices, Gee denounced his former allies, who, according to Gee, threatened to cut
his throat for this betrayal - see DNB, vii , 986-987.
3 Gee, Foot out of the Snare, p.92.
Sutcliffe composed an entire text attacking the translation in 1626⁴ and William Watts produced his own version of the Augustinian masterpiece in 1631 (see Figure 5), ostensibly purely in reaction to the 1620 edition.⁵ Although both of these Protestant works are characterised by anti-Catholic vitriol, I believe that they still present us with vital clues as to the function of the Confessions in its own era, their anxieties and annoyances highlighting points of significance in Matthew's text which might otherwise remain invisible to the modern eye.

On a most general level, Sutcliffe and Watts make us aware of the 1620 edition's immense importance in an ongoing inter-faith battle for ideological control of the Church Fathers, which we also saw to be present in the works of the Great Controversy as analysed in Chapter One. In the late sixteenth century, Edmund Campion - the brilliant Jesuit missionary who was later martyred for his beliefs - had vigorously asserted the very Catholic nature of patristic thought, calling the Fathers 'entirely ours'⁶ and suggesting that

⁴ M[atthew] S[utcliffe], The Vnmasking of a Masse-monger who in the Counterfeit Habit of S. Avgvstine hath cunningly Crept into the Closets of many English Ladies. Or, The Vindication of Saint Augustines Confessions, from the false and malicious Calumniation of a late noted Apostate (London: 1626). All further references to this edition will be cited as Vnmasking. Sutcliffe (1550? - 1629), the Dean of Exeter for over forty years, was a fervent controversialist, writing a plethora of pamphlets and attempting to establish a college at Chelsea (in 1609) whose purpose was to polemically defeat the 'papists'. However, despite the patronage of James I, this scheme fell into disarray and the college was only partially built. He was also interested in the colonisation of the New World, John Smith mentioning that Sutcliffe encouraged his pursuits in his Generall Historie (1624). He was, indeed, a member of the Councils for Virginia and New England, ultimately being one of the commissioners who concluded the affairs of the Virginia Company. He was Royal Chaplain to both Elizabeth and James, but seems to have fallen from favour as a consequence of his resistance to the Spanish Match, for which he, along with others, was apprehently arrested. This, perhaps, explains some of his animosity towards Tobie Matthew, The Vnmasking being his final contribution to the war against Catholicism - see DNB, xix, 175-176.

⁵ St. Augustines Confessions Translated: And With some marginall notes illustrated Wherein Divers Antiquities are explyayed; And the marginall notes of the former Popish Translation, answered, trans. by William Watts (London: 1631). All further references to this edition will be cited as Confessions. Watts (c.1590-1649) was educated at Oxford where he eventually gained his D.D. in 1638. In 1620 he had had a taste of political life, travelling to Germany with Sir Albertus Morton on a mission to see the United Protestant Princes. In his life Watts held a range of significant clerical posts, most intriguingly, acting as army chaplain to Lord Arundel in 1639 and as Prince Rupert's chaplain on his return to England in 1642, remaining with him throughout the conflict of the 1640s. He died in Ireland of a terminal illness whilst Rupert's ships were blockaded in Kinsale Harbour - see DNB, xx, 986.

⁶ Campian Englished. or A Translation of the Ten Reasons, in which Edmvnd Campian ... insisted in his Challenge, to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, trans. by [Lawrence Anderton?] (London: 1632), p.89. All further references to this edition will be cited as Ten Reasons.
any Protestant response to these texts - either rejection or appropriation - was inevitably self-destructive: ' ... what way soeuer the Adversary shall take ... he runneth himself vpon the sands. Yf he allowe of the Fathers; he then looseth the field: Yf he exclude them; he thus escapeth; but by flight'. Indeed, a similar attempt to 'annex' Augustine occurs in Matthew’s preface to the Confessions, where he criticises his Protestant counterparts - including John Healey - for supposedly ‘doctoring’ the Father’s texts:

This Saint hath been particulerly ill vsed by his Traslatours both of the books de Ciuitate Dei, and also of his Meditations; out of which, the seuerall Traslatours, haue boldly, & sacrilegiously, stolne out of those passages, which might declare to any man that were but halfe blind, that the belief and practise of S. Augustine, and the Church of his tyme, were fully agreable [sic] to that of the Catholike Roman Church at this day; as that of our Adversaryes is wholy different. Sutcliffe and Watts, unsurprisingly perhaps, strive to counter Matthew’s process of patristic assimilation by making Augustine an Anglican, Watts proclaiming: ‘I am of the Religion of the Primitive Fathers, which the Church of England professes’, whilst Sutcliffe argues that Augustine is actually antagonistic towards Catholicism: ‘Neyther doth S. Austine onely passe ouer in silence the new-forged Religion of Papists ... but also directly oppugne the same’. Hence here - as in our earlier discussion of Drant’s translation - we may appreciate the way in which vernacular versions of patristic texts played a crucial role as polemical sustenance for the religious struggle in Renaissance England.

Yet Sutcliffe and Watts have still more intriguing points to make concerning the 1620 edition, points on which they, interestingly, seem to concur. For one, both of these readers express the perception that Matthew’s work is not ‘humanist’ enough,
condemning it for failing to meet their criteria of linguistic excellence. Thus Sutcliffe is deeply derisive of the humanist worth of the text, belittling Matthew’s intellectual masculinity by insinuating that his ‘skills’ are immature: ‘As if every Schoole-boy could not translate S. Austines Confessions, as well as hee, or any Discourse could be more easie’.11

Nevertheless, it is Watts who inflicts the most violent scholarly chastisement on his predecessor’s creation. The title of Watts’ rendition of the Confessions, with its statement that ‘Diuers Antiquities are explayned’, makes the humanistic philological methodology of his text manifest. Also, the dedicatory preface’s description of the Augustinian work replicates a humanistic sense of literary practicality, Watts referring to it as ‘the devout[e]st peece of all St.Austen, and the usefulllest: ...’.12

It is this humanist ‘orthodoxy’ which Watts seems to feel Matthew’s translation has deviated from. Watts punishes this ‘irregularity’ with relentless humanistic harshness, sardonically swiping at his predecessor’s supposedly inferior knowledge of Latin and classical culture. In the following example, we catch him in full pedantic flight concerning Matthew’s apparent error regarding the provision of horses and waggons in Rome:

The former Translator, (whom I finde no great Antiquary nor Critike in Grammar) not standing to examine this, turnes Impertita etiam evectione publica; the Election being publike. Wilfully changing evectione into electione. But what shall become of impertita? In a marginall Note upon the end of the last chapter but one, he challenges us to shew where the Papists had corrupted the Fathers: Sure here is Saint Augustine corrupted; if not out of malice, yet upon shrewd suspition of ignorance, and a desire to be rid of his Taske of Translating.13

10 Sutcliffe, Vnmasking, p.6.
11 Sutcliffe, Vnmasking, p.38.
12 Watts, dedication, Confessions, sig.A4 - my emphasis.
13 Watts, printed annotation, Confessions, Book V, Chapter xii, p.258.
Here Watts portrays the 1620 version of the *Confessions* as a failed humanist venture due to its alleged plethora of verbal and historical inaccuracies. Yet more strikingly, Watts depicts his 'inept' literary rival as being *reluctant* to perform the key humanist 'duty' of translation and therefore seems to suggest that his opposite Catholic number (Matthew) stands outside the bounds of 'conventional' intellectual manhood.

Thus while this cavilling does in some sense represent an endeavour to loosen the 'papist' hold on Augustine, I would suggest that the comments of Sutcliffe and Watts, characterising Matthew's text as a humanist 'wreck', provide us with a valuable insight into the dynamics of the 1620 translation. I would contend that these criticisms of the *Confessions* represent more than the continuation of the Protestant 'tradition' of Catholic intellectual 'bashing' which we saw to be present in the 1560s. I would suggest that, rather than attempting to appropriate humanist manliness and its religio-political potential for Anglicanism, both Watts and Sutcliffe are essentially replying to - and thus make us aware of - the earlier work's explicit repudiation of 'traditional' humanist social ideals and scholarly techniques. Indeed, I would propose that these Protestant readers are particularly resisting Matthew's patristic text's rejection of the concept of a civic-oriented masculinity which was, arguably, the mainstay of humanist gender ideology. If the Louvainists were, apparently, too humanistically manly for Protestant comfort in the early Elizabethan era, I would argue that Matthew - a Catholic in the Stuart period - had managed to create a vernacular version of Augustine which moulded manhood into a form which deeply disturbed Protestant humanist onlookers.

For instance, looking closely at the readings of Sutcliffe and Watts, we can see that they are both highly protective of male public roles, being evidently distressed by Matthew's admiration for those men who choose a secluded life. Watts strongly objects to Matthew's anti-worldly marginal interpolation in Book X, Chapter xlv, responding that:
'Here the other Translater takes occasion to extoll the perfection of Eremits that live in the Wildernes. But is this a place fit for that, which shewes that St. Austen was forbidden it by God himselfe?'. Similarly, but less soberly, Sutcliffe equates Matthew's advocation of a reclusive manhood with insanity: 'This Postiller, sayth, The Hermits Life is a holy state; but his braine, when so he wrote, was not in right state: S. Austine, his Leader, said no such thing'.

I would propose we can perceive more here than an endeavour to enlist Augustine's support for an anti-monastic viewpoint. I believe that what is really being so forcefully defended by Watts and Sutcliffe is a specific classical / humanist version of socially-engaged, studious masculinity which Matthew's Confessions, as we will see, radically undermines.

I will say more about the translation's modification of male gender paradigms - its process and probable cultural 'causes' - in a moment. But before that, I want to focus on one more element of Tobie Matthew's text which his Protestant readers draw to our attention. That is, they also usefully identify that there is something too 'feminine' about the 1620 edition. Sutcliffe is especially sensitive to the paratextual apparatus' emphasis upon female sacred figures. He criticises Matthew's dedicatory preface to the Virgin where she is referred to as 'Queene' stating that: '... it is a vaine imagination to turne the Kingdom of Heauen into an earthly Princes Court, and to suppose that God is married to a woman'. Also, aside from this intriguing instance of anti-Mariolatry, insisting that the Deity is most definitely a bachelor, Sutcliffe, more tellingly, vilifies Matthew's reverence

---

14 Watts, printed annotation, Confessions, Book X, Chapter xliv, p.719.
15 Sutcliffe, Vnmasking, p.77.
16 Sutcliffe, Vnamasking, p.31.
17 Maurice Hamington has pointed out that such Protestant assaults on Mary's sacred status in this period only served to make Counter-Reformation theologians more zealous in their defence of her soteriological role. See Hail Mary? The Struggle for Ultimate Womanhood in Catholicism (New York and London: Routledge, 1995), p.97.
for Augustine's mother, Monica. Picking up on Matthew's veneration of her 'manly Soule',¹⁸ he mockingly declares:

...if her soule were manly, why may not the Apostate haue a female soule, being so much addicted to the feminine gender? If her vertues were massie, why may not his vanities be spongeous and light, like Tyffanie?¹⁹

Thus I would suggest that more than making a doctrinal point against the worship of saints, Sutcliffe actually intimates that the 1620 Confessions is a text overly interested in women. It is steeped in exemplary femininity, so much so that the translator as a 'female junkie' is said to have jeopardised his own gender identity, thus echoing the contemporary notion that excessive 'heterosexual sociability'²⁰ rendered men effeminate.

Hence we see how these contemporary readers illuminate for us a dynamic in Matthew's translation in which the civic humanist model of manhood is demoted, whilst an ideal of holy womanhood is promoted. This, as I will show later when analysing the 1620 edition in detail, is an 'accurate' interpretation of the work.

Yet while Sutcliffe and Watts helpfully underline curious meanings in Matthew's text which might otherwise escape our notice, they are both perhaps too quick to blame this operation within the translation upon the personal 'failings' of the translator. Although he is not explicitly named in their works, since - as we shall see in the next section - Tobie Matthew was possibly the most visible Catholic figure of his generation, one can assume with relative confidence that they were well aware of the identity of their 'target'. For instance, when regretfully confessing that he utilised his predecessor's version of Augustine as a guide for his own ('I too much trusted him'), Watts coyly

---

¹⁸ Matthew, 'A Preface to the Piovs and Covrteovs Reader', Confessions, p.98.
¹⁹ Sutcliffe, Vnmasking, p.57.
²¹ Watts, 'To the Deuout Reader', Confessions, sig.A5'.
states that some name his Catholic counterpart as ‘Parsons’ or a ‘knight’. As the arch Jesuit, Robert Persons, had been dead for many years and Matthew had been made a ‘Sir’ in the early 1620s, one can surmise that this is merely a subtle Protestant jibe at Matthew’s affiliations with the Society of Jesus.

Indeed, as we have just seen, Sutcliffe calls him the ‘Apostate’, thus alluding to Matthew’s infamous conversion, apparently seeking to explain the ‘downplaying’ of humanism in the 1620 edition in terms of Matthew’s status as a humanist ‘gone bad’. He dubs him ‘the rinegued Translator’, whom, he tells his dedicatee, is ‘so vnkind to his Parents, so false to his Countrey, so malicions [sic] to Religion ...’. Thus, Sutcliffe seems to circuitously suggest that it is because Matthew employs his scholarly skills for the ‘other team’, against the Protestant family and commonwealth, that his version of the Confessions is a humanistic ‘flop’.

Watts, on the other hand, appears to construe the humanist ‘deficiencies’ in Matthew’s text - and possibly its accent upon femininity - as a product of the translator’s alleged womanising tendencies, concluding his previously cited outburst on Roman horses and waggons with the disparaging remark: ‘The collapsed Ladies he knew had no skill to examine the Latine’. Thus he conflates a humanistic censure with a sexual slur, since although the term ‘collapsed’ signified spiritual defection, it also had a more sordid resonance in this period. As Gee snidely wrote of the underground priests in London: ‘... their Chastity becomes charity, for the relieuing collapsed Ladies wants’. In fact, Sutcliffe, as we have seen, is also keen to cast aspersions upon Matthew’s sexuality, to portray the text’s ‘addiction to the feminine gender’ as the result of Matthew’s personal

22 Watts, ‘To the Deuout Reader, Confessions, sig.A5’.
23 I will discuss Matthew’s connection with Persons in the next section.
24 Sutcliffe, ‘The Preface to the Chriitian Reader’, Vnmasking, sig.[A4'].
25 Sutcliffe, dedication, Vnmasking, sig.A”.
26 Watts, printed annotation, Confessions, Book V, Chapter xiii, p.258.
proclivities, commenting that: ‘... the Translator himselfe ... may write what he did in the Brothels of France, Italy, and Spaine, when he was younger then now’. 28

Watts and Sutcliffe, then, appear to insist that the 1620 Confessions can only be understood in the light of Matthew’s life history. In the next section, I will test their claim, examining Sir Tobie’s ‘adventures’ in order to explore whether the ‘bias’ in the Confessions that Matthew’s contemporaries have highlighted for us - humanist masculinity down, sacred femininity up - is explicable exclusively through a biographical reading. After discussing the few possible tentative links between Matthew and his text, I will argue that this approach is too limited to capture the full cultural meaning of this translation; that while Watts and Sutcliffe open unusual interpretative doors for us, it is our historical distance which allows us to walk through them to view a larger intellectual landscape.

Hence I will ultimately suggest that we cannot begin to grasp the ‘original’ purpose of Matthew’s Confessions without an awareness of the book’s broader cultural context. In the third section, then, I will present a bold outline of the history of Catholic persecution in England - from the time of Henry VIII to around 1640 - in order to reveal the impact of this oppression upon the gender identity of Catholic men. I will contend that this subjection - gaining in intensity in the 1570s - seriously debilitated such males as public figures and thus the civic humanist paradigm of masculinity was no longer tenable for many of them. I will also argue that the Catholic polemical literature of the late sixteenth century aimed to offer men an alternative gender archetype more appropriate for their suffering state, encouraging them to adopt the behaviours of passivity and recusancy (the non-attendance of Protestant church services) as modes of survival. I will propose

27 Gee, Foot out of the Snare, p.10.
28 Sutcliffe, Unmasking, p.59.
that while women prospered because of the enforced 'domestication' of the Catholic religion, acquiring a new dominance, Catholic males found themselves 'feminised' by persecution and the new model of manhood, being pushed back into the private sphere and ideologically induced to cultivate a submissiveness similar to the 'traditional' gender identity of women. Hence I will suggest how, as a consequence of this, female hagiographies assumed an augmented exemplary relevance in this period as men required 'handbooks' for developing this acquiescent / feminine masculinity.

In the fourth section I will demonstrate that the 1620 translation of the Confessions participates in this cultural shift. By analysing the text in detail, I will disclose that Matthew rewrites Augustine's autobiographical text in order to mould its renunciation of the tropes of classical manhood (especially rhetoric and public life) into a disavowal of contemporary humanist masculinity. Thus, I will suggest, Matthew's work mirrors the circumstantial modification of Catholic gender ideology described in the third part, promoting a passive, private male identity which might have appealed to its intended audience of persecuted 'papist' men. Furthermore, I will reveal how the translation also follows the Catholic 'trend' towards feminine exemplarity: Matthew shines a paratextual spotlight on Mary and also, more significantly, adds to Augustine's emphasis upon his mother, Monica, moves which seem to subtly imply these women's suitability as models for the new 'compliant' manliness.

In this way I hope to revive the fascination of this forgotten work. It is a text which not only has much to tell us about the gender dynamics of the Catholic community in this time of tribulation, but also intriguingly illustrates how humanism could be used against itself. Thus whilst the humanist process of translation, with its male-oriented practical teleology, stays intact - Matthew is, after all, apparently producing this rendition to offer textual relief to Catholic men in crisis - this version of Augustine ostensibly alters
the aim of humanist learning. Hence the techniques of translation and pragmatic reading may, in Matthew's text, be seen to be employed to oppose civic action, to strategically generate an unworldly manhood, a manoeuvre which is arguably antithetical to the basic ethos of humanist erudition.29 I suggest that this apparent 'revision' of humanist praxis and the raison d'être of intellectual masculinity - which seems to have so infuriated Sutcliffe and Watts - offers us a challenging insight into the divergent usage of patristic literature in this period.

29 Although works such as Charles Trinkaus' *In our Image and Likeness: Humanism and Divinity in the Italian Renaissance*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Indiana: Notre Dame Press, 1988) have disclosed the intermingling of spiritual and secular interests in the texts of the early Italian humanists, the majority of experts in the field conclude that humanism was in essence a public-oriented form of intellectuality. Hence Rebecca Bushnell describes humanist education as being intended 'for a new generation of civic minded men' in *The Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca and London: Cornell U.P., 1996), p.11, and Quentin Skinner has discussed the way in which Northern European humanists, such as More, actively endorsed negotium - 'Political Philosophy' in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, pp.389-452 (p.450).
In the last section, we considered how the critical readings of Sutcliffe and Watts underline for us a pattern in the 1620 edition of the *Confessions* involving the diminishment of humanist forms of civic masculinity and the foregrounding of holy femininity. I asserted that they exhibited a desire to construe this movement in the text in purely biographical terms: if there was something 'wrong' with Matthew’s work it was because he had produced it. Sutcliffe, for instance, appears to (literally) 'gloss' what we will see to be the book’s deliberate denial of a public-oriented humanist manhood as the *consequence* of Matthew’s status as a Catholic ‘rinegued Translator’: his book is ‘bad’ because its ‘author’ uses his knowledge to contradict the Protestant commonwealth.

Watts, on the other hand, seems to interpret the text’s ‘anti-humanist’ backlash in terms of Matthew’s alleged philandering; Sutcliffe more explicitly suggesting that the work’s exemplary emphasis on women is due to the translator’s ‘addiction to the feminine gender’: there are too many women in the text because there are too many in his bed.

On the superficial level, the success of Tobie Matthew’s humanist career seems to suggest that Sutcliffe and Watts are presenting an inaccurate picture of his abilities and his political intentions. He had evident linguistic talent, being a prolific translator of religious texts, thus displaying a mastery of Latin and the European vernaculars, especially Italian and Spanish. However, he also composed literary pieces of his own. These included works of ecclesiastical controversy and devotional materials, such as studies of figures like Jesus and Mary, plus some critically acclaimed sonnets. He was, in
addition, a master of the epistolary format, the only available image of Matthew appearing in John Donne Jnr.'s collection of his letters (Figure 6).  

Yet Tobie Matthew was more than a writer. He was, as we shall see, a priest and, in good humanist fashion, a courtier who rose to prominence by using his linguistic and political talents as a diplomat for the English crown. Whilst precariously balancing his spiritual and secular vocations, Matthew was connected with some of the most outstanding figures of his time, including Francis Bacon - with whom he developed a deep intimacy - John Donne and, through his work as an art dealer, Peter Paul Rubens.

Matthew, thus, seems to have achieved a degree of civic eminence and to have excelled at humanist amicitia. However, a closer look at Matthew’s biography reveals that this apparently superlative humanist resume is an illusion, Tobie’s public and personal prospects being severely damaged as a consequence of his Catholicism. Before Matthew’s abilities became useful to James I in the early 1620s (a matter I will discuss later), he had endured the full force of persecution because of his new-found religious beliefs, facing imprisonment and two lengthy periods of exile in continental Europe. And, as we shall see, even when his services were exploited by the monarch, he was never truly trusted - or taken seriously - by his peers, more attention being paid to his acquaintances with women than his intellectual and political gifts or his solid friendships with men.

Much of the shock of Matthew’s apostasy was due to the fact that he was born - on the 3rd of October 1577 - into the heart of the Elizabethan establishment. As the son of Frances Barlow (who was daughter of the Bishop of Chichester) and Dr Tobie Matthew -

---

30 See Works Consulted. I will discuss the grounds for attributing certain texts to Matthew when I analyse the more significant ones in more detail later in the chapter.

the avid Catholic 'hunter' who became Archbishop of York in 1606\textsuperscript{32}—there were obviously hopes that Matthew ‘Jnr.’ would follow his father’s stellar path into the highest echelons of Protestant society. At first, this seemed to be the case. Matthew attended, as his father had done, Christchurch College, Oxford, where he became a noted orator,\textsuperscript{33} graduating in June 1594 and receiving his master’s degree in July 1597. Whilst still at university, in 1595, Matthew acted the ‘Squire’ in the Earl of Essex’s device at York House in London, where, according to Jardine and Stewart,\textsuperscript{34} he probably first encountered Bacon. In May 1599 his humanist career took another step forward when he entered Gray’s Inn for legal training. Then, in October 1601, Matthew entered the political arena, becoming M.P. for Newport, Cornwall, later standing in for Bacon as M.P. for St. Albans in March 1604.

The young Matthew was, then, a figure whose future seemed to hold much promise. Yet, privately, all was not well with Tobie. John Feil writes sensitively of the translator’s poor relationship with his kin in the years 1577 to 1607: ‘... there was no sympathy between him and his father, and he suffered from epileptic seizures precipitated by the violent quarrels he had with his family’.\textsuperscript{35} Indeed, as Feil discloses, Matthew’s father was capable of profound cruelty. Refusing to acknowledge his son’s ‘melancholy’ illness at Oxford, Matthew Snr. drew up a list of Tobie’s ‘crimes’ since birth\textsuperscript{36} which


\textsuperscript{33} Joseph Gillow, A Literary and Biographical History, or Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics from the Breach with Rome in 1534, to the Present Time, 5 vols (London and New York: Burns and Oates Ltd, 1895), iv, 531.

\textsuperscript{34} Jardine and Stewart, Hostage to Fortune, p.303.


\textsuperscript{36} Feil, Sir Tobie Matthew, p.9.
caused his son to (literally) have a fit when he received it, calling Tobie 'a reprobate, a castawaie, an example above example, of an irreverent and disobedient child'.

It is this emotional deprivation which Feil believes drove Matthew into the arms of the Catholic church. Lying to obtain parental permission to travel in May 1605, Matthew said that he wished to visit France, but headed for Italy instead. Once in Florence, Matthew, true to humanist form, dedicated his time to gathering language skills rather than spiritual self-discovery. As he was to write later in his memoirs: '... I laboured with much more ambition to speak like an Italian than to believe like a Christian'. Yet over time, constant immersion in Catholic culture altered his attitude. It was this gradual seeping in of 'Romish' ideas and the direct persuasions of Robert Persons that ultimately led to his conversion in the spring of 1606.

Persons was living out his 'autumn' years in Italy when Matthew decided to call on him in order to prevent the Jesuit from plotting against him: 'My chief reason for this acquaintance was to keep that cunning dark man (for so I esteemed him at that time) by the appearance of courtesy and respect from doing me any ill office ...'. But far from finding the Machiavellian figure he had expected, Matthew found himself enthralled by his political and theological debates with this formidable intellectual. It was Persons who encouraged Matthew's love for Augustine, the saint's De Unitate Ecclesiae revealing Protestantism's status as 'a mere innovation' to the translator. Hence it was textual

37 Quoted by Feil, Sir Tobie Matthew, p.9.
38 Feil, Sir Tobie Matthew, p.2.
39 Tobie Matthew, A True Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobie Matthew to the Holy Catholic Faith; with the Antecedents and Consequences Thereof, ed. by A.H. Matthew (London: Burns and Oates Ltd, 1904), p.11. All further references to this edition will be cited as Conversion.
40 There is confusion about the precise date. Feil suggests April / May (Sir Tobie Matthew, p.27), whilst David Mathew, for instance, states that it occurred in March - see Sir Tobie Matthew (London: Max Parrish, 1950), p.44.
41 Matthew, Conversion, p.15.
42 Matthew, Conversion, p.37.
engagement with patristic thought which could be said to have finally caused Matthew to leave the socially-secure way of the public-minded Protestant scholar.

Before taking the evidently extremely courageous decision to become a Catholic - to, therefore, opt, as we shall see in the next section, for oppression and even possibly death in England - Matthew contemplated the struggle ahead. He was particularly conscious of the impact of this choice upon his high-profile Protestant parents, considering that: ‘... it were more courtesy in me to cut their throats when they were asleep than thus to make them the example and instance of misfortune, yea, and the very by-word and proverb of all such as knew them’. Matthew was also loathe to present his ‘enemy’- Robert Cecil, Lord Salisbury - with the opportunity to destroy him, believing, as he stated in his memoirs, that he would ‘take extreme contentment in crushing me ...’. Tellingly perhaps, it was a prayer to the Virgin Mary which eventually galvanised his spirit so that he could proceed as planned.

Meanwhile, rumours of Matthew’s apostasy had already reached England. Early on in his sojourn in Italy, hearing such ‘bad’ tidings, his father had sent him a rarely-pleasant letter - to Tobie’s reasoning more ‘out of discourse, and upon design than out of nature and affection’- attempting to keep his son in the Protestant fold. To his family’s eternal disappointment, Matthew determined to re-enter England as an openly-avowed Catholic. Yet early in 1607, shortly before his homecoming, we see him endeavouring to quash gossip at home about his religious status. As he wrote to Dudley Carleton: ‘... for my beinge a Papist, I beseech you controule and quench the bruite, so as, at my return, I

43 Matthew, Conversion, p.48.
44 Matthew, Conversion, p.49.
45 Matthew, Conversion, pp.50-51.
46 Matthew, Conversion, p.5.
may be so freed, even from the very imputation’. Thus, possibly lacking trust, Matthew deceived the friend who had nursed him through his suicidal depression and epilepsy at Oxford.

However, this cautious dissimulation did not last. When Matthew did reach England (probably in June of 1607), he confessed his religious position with an audaciousness which could also be called temerity. Informing Bacon of his new faith, Matthew wished to ‘stage-manage’ the situation so that Bacon would show a letter announcing his new Catholic identity to Cecil. In this way Matthew obviously hoped to limit the ‘fallout’ caused by his revelatory bombshell. But Bacon himself had some reservations about this scheme and his friend’s conversion, writing to him later that: ‘I my self am out of doubt, that you have been miserably abused when you were first seduced ...’. Nevertheless, he set his Protestant convictions aside and Matthew spent a brief but tranquil period residing in Fleet Street and visiting this illustrious and supportive friend.

This was, though, the calm before the storm. Matthew’s troubles began when, following the advice of Bacon, he contacted Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury and was taken into custody at Lambeth Palace where ‘reconversion’ interviews commenced. Almost inevitably, Matthew proved unwilling to change his stance, defending his beliefs with the utmost vigour. Indeed, this time was made
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47 Quoted in Arnold Harris Matthew and Annette Calthrop, *The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew: Bacon’s Alter Ego* (London: Elkin Matthews, 1907), p.64.
48 Feil, *Sir Tobie Matthew*, p.20. Sir Dudley Carleton, Viscount Dorchester (1573-1632) was a diplomat who was posted consecutively to Venice and the Hague - see DNB, iii, 996-999.
49 Arnold Harris Matthew states that Matthew wrote to Persons from Calais on 19th June (*The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew*, p.66), this suggesting that he probably reached English shores shortly after that date.
51 Francis Bacon, *The Mirrour of State and Eloquence. Represented In the Incomparable Letters of the Famous S[i]rFrancis Bacon, Lord Verulam, St. Albans, to Queene Elizabeth, King James, and other Personages Of the highest trust and honour in the three Nations of England, Scotland, and Ireland.Concerning the better and more sure Establishment of those Nations in the affairs of Peace and Warre. ...* (London: 1656), p.79.
considerably more difficult by the presence of the ex-Jesuit, Sir Christopher Perkins, who
insinuated that Matthew had converted due to having fallen in love with an Italian nun!53

The ‘crunch’ finally came when Matthew refused to swear the Oath of Allegiance
which James I had instituted following the Gunpowder Plot54 (I will discuss these matters
in detail in the next section). Tobie’s opposition to the Oath was ostensibly a protest
against the maltreatment of the elderly Catholic archpriest, George Blackwell, who had
taken the Oath whilst imprisoned and was now asking his ‘flock’ to do likewise. As
Matthew saw it: ‘... they put him, in effect, out of his wits’.55 For this gesture of defiance,
Matthew was incarcerated in the Fleet in July 1607 and remained there for at least six
months.56

Whilst serving his potentially limitless sentence, Matthew still possessed an
active social life - even if many of his guests were unwanted. Although he was frequented
by some genuine well-wishers, such as John Donne,57 a variety of Protestant ‘do-gooders’
also beat a path to his cell door. One of these was William Crashawe, the Puritan who
claimed that he commissioned Healey’s translation, Matthew proclaiming that ‘there is
not a more intolerable kind of man than an ignorant, audacious, loud and false undertaker,
such as he ever was’.58 One other caller was a ‘Mr. Cooper’, an attorney in his father’s

52 Jardine and Stewart, Hostage to Fortune, p.304.
53 Matthew, Conversion, p.71. I will say more about the levelling of such sexual accusations at Matthew
later.
54 Matthew was later, rather implausibly, accused of being involved in this intrigue, William Prynne
referring to him as having ‘had a hand in the Gunpowder Plot’ when revelling in the fall of Archbishop Laud
with whom Sir Tobie had been supposedly connected - see Canterburie’s Doome..., quoted by Arnold
Harris Matthew, The Life ofSir Tobie Matthew, p.448.
55 Matthew, Conversion, p.77.
56 The length of time Matthew spent there is open to debate. Arnold Harris Matthew suggests that Tobie was
jailed for six months (The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew, p.89), whilst Feil claims he was confined for seven
months (Sir Tobie Matthew, p.44) and David Mathew declares that he was behind bars for ten months (Sir
Tobie Matthew, p.45).
57 Matthew, amusingly, does not have many positive words even for this visitor in his account of his
incarceration, calling Donne a ‘libertine’ - Conversion, p.86. For a discussion of their relationship see
58 Matthew, Conversion, p.85.
pay, who said (unwisely perhaps) to Matthew that: ' "St Austen" ... "was a villain"'. This comment provoked a violent reaction in the prisoner which attests to Matthew's intense attachment to patristic thought: 'By that time this lawyer was near my stairs, and, I confess, I was half tempted to throw him down, and break his neck'. Indeed, it was whilst Matthew was in the Fleet that the first Protestant anxieties concerning his relationships with women emerged, his supposed friend, Carleton, apparently writing to Thomas Edmondes to express his concern that prominent peeresses were seeking out the Catholic convert for spiritual instruction.

In the end, it was a plague epidemic which precipitated Matthew's release from prison. Using this health threat as a pretext, Bacon sued to have Tobie and his keeper lodge with him, promising - unknown to Matthew - that he would attempt to religiously 'rehabilitate' his friend. When Bacon failed in his task and negotiations with the government for 'tolerating' Matthew's presence in the isle fell through, our translator was forced to, rather sadly, settle for a travel permit. As he wrote to Robert Cecil:

I see that I am but where I was, and that my yeares increase, but not my hopes to change my habitation; and therefore I shall embrace the condition of living abroad, with the same resignation of minde that a merchant threatned with ship-wracke hath, in the casting his wares over boord.

Selling his estate at a loss, Matthew headed, once more, for the European continent - but this time it was not a pleasure jaunt. His biographers hold differing opinions concerning his itinerary after leaving England, Gillow stating that he visited Brussels and Madrid, whilst Feil holds that Matthew returned to Florence. Indeed, Feil claims that it was there that Matthew deliberately cultivated a relationship with

59 Matthew, Conversion, p.92.
60 Feil, Sir Tobie Matthew, p.52.
61 Matthew, Conversion, pp.111-112.
62 Quoted by Arnold Harris Matthew, The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew, p.93.
63 Gillow, Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics, iv, 535.
Salisbury's nephew, William Cecil, Lord Roos, securing his domination over the eighteen-year-old by arranging for the Inquisition to arrest his Protestant tutor who was, shockingly, still in prison thirty years later.\(^65\)

If this period, then, revealed the darker side of Matthew's character, it was also a time of deepening religious commitment for Tobie. According to Gillow,\(^66\) he took the decision to be ordained along with his close friend, George Gage,\(^67\) in Rome in 1614. In fact, although it is open to question, it is possible that Matthew also became a Jesuit during his exile, Feil asserting that he had certainly joined the Society of Jesus by 1619.\(^68\)

Despite the support of spirituality, these years were, however, agonising ones for Matthew. As Feil describes it, in the years 1614 to 1617, Matthew and his companion, Gage, 'wandered joylessly around Europe',\(^69\) his travels - according to Feil - including a visit to Spa, where he mingled with the 'glitterati' of his day, including James I's daughter, Elizabeth of Bohemia, Electress Palatine; Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke and the proto-feminist religious innovator, Mary Ward.\(^70\) Finally, though, Matthew and Gage settled in the Low Countries, near St. John's in Louvain. With his humanist career seemingly over and his prospects for return seeming slight, Matthew made the best of his

\(^{64}\) Feil, *Sir Tobie Matthew*, p.58.
\(^{67}\) George Gage (1582?-1640) rose - with Tobie Matthew - to political prominence because of the Spanish Match, being dispatched by James I to the Papal Court to obtain a dispensation for the marriage - see DNB, vii, 789.
\(^{68}\) Feil, *Sir Tobie Matthew*, p.79. In my view, his publications - their content and place of printing - also confirm his pro-Jesuitical stance, if not his direct membership of the order.
\(^{69}\) Feil, *Sir Tobie Matthew*, p.81.
\(^{70}\) Mary Ward (1585-1645) was the co-founder of 'The Institute of English Ladies', an active religious order which aimed to be a female equivalent of the Society of Jesus. The public educational and evangelical work of these 'Jesuitesses' was, however, ultimately too threatening to the male Catholic hierarchy, the movement being suppressed by the papacy in 1630. See Jo Ann Kay McNamara, *Sisters in Arms: Catholic Nuns through Two Millennia* (Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard U.P.,1996) and Elizabeth Rapley, *The Devotes: Women and Church in Seventeenth-Century France* (Montreal, Kingston, London and Buffalo: McGill-Queen's U.P., 1990).
situation by dabbling in art dealing and interior design for Carleton's house in the Hague.\textsuperscript{71}

Then, quite suddenly, Matthew's fortunes changed. After many 'behind-the-scenes' attempts to curry favour with various individuals, Matthew was permitted to go back to England. David Mathew credits King James' favourite, George Villiers (1592-1628) - who Tobie had met in 1611 - for this drastic change,\textsuperscript{72} while Feil believes it was due to the monarch's recent visit to Matthew's family.\textsuperscript{73}

Whatever the cause for James I's change of heart, Matthew landed in Dover around July 1617\textsuperscript{74} and subsequently attempted to revive his scholarly career. Spending most of his time with Bacon at York House or Gorhambury - Bacon's estate in St.Albans - he worked upon the introduction to the Italian translation of Bacon's \textit{Essays} and was involved in some capacity in the production of the version of \textit{De Sapientiae Veterum} in this European vernacular language.\textsuperscript{75} As Jardine and Stewart have pointed out, Matthew played a crucial role in Bacon's intellectual life, even whilst in exile. He read his friend's works and 'filtered' out any elements unsuitable for Catholic audiences\textsuperscript{76} and acted as 'a vital conduit between continental science and Bacon',\textsuperscript{77} procuring 'cutting edge' theoretical texts by thinkers such as Galileo.\textsuperscript{78} For Matthew, this intellectual intimacy with a 'monster both of wit and knowledge'\textsuperscript{79} was one of life's finest delights. As he


\textsuperscript{72} Mathew, \textit{Sir Tobie Matthew}, p.60.

\textsuperscript{73} Feil, \textit{Sir Tobie Matthew}, p.105.

\textsuperscript{74} Feil, \textit{Sir Tobie Matthew}, p.112. David Mathew suggests that he arrived in May (\textit{Sir Tobie Matthew}, p.61).

\textsuperscript{75} I am grateful to Alan Stewart who has pointed out that the current scholarly consensus seems to be that Matthew did not produce the preface to Bacon's \textit{De Sapientiae Veterum} as was once thought (written communication).

\textsuperscript{76} Jardine and Stewart, \textit{Hostage to Fortune}, p.307.


\textsuperscript{78} Jardine and Stewart, \textit{Hostage to Fortune}, p.307.

\textsuperscript{79} Matthew, \textit{Conversion}, p.112.
wrote years later, long after his friend's death: '... I passed my time with him in much
gust; for there was not such company in the whole world'.

However, this humanist bliss was not to endure. Still declining to declare the Oath
of Allegiance, Matthew was sent abroad again in January 1618/19. Interestingly, Tobie's
denial of the oath was not the true reason for his banishment according to his Protestant
contemporaries. Indeed, Reverend Thomas Larkin wrote to Thomas Pickering that: 'Toby
Matthew was yesterday, now a second time, banished the land, as a dangerous man for
our Collapsed Ladies'. Thus, as in Watts' account, Matthew emerges as being too close
to women for Protestant comfort, Arnold Matthew attempting to explain this slightly
strange supposed pretext for Tobie's deportation in terms of his being 'instrumental' in a
series of conversions.

Once on the continent, Matthew sought solace in the exiled religious orders based
in Brussels and Louvain. It is here (although possibly earlier) that he became acquainted
with Lucy Knatchbull, to whom he probably acted as a spiritual director and whose
biography he later wrote. Unfortunately, there is very little information available
concerning this period in Matthew's life, this deficiency being especially disappointing
since this is the time in which Tobie was at work on the Confessions, among other
projects. As Feil puts it: '... this period of political uncertainty was spiritually
productive'.

---

80 Matthew, Conversion, p.113.
81 Quoted by Arnold Harris Matthew, The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew, p.158.
82 Arnold Harris Matthew, The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew, p.159.
83 See Peter Guilday, The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795, 1 vol (London:
Longmans, Green and Co.,1914), i, for information about these institutions.
84 Feil, Sir Tobie Matthew, p.148.
85 I will discuss this biography more closely in the next section.
86 Feil, Sir Tobie Matthew, p.138.
This second span of exile was, nevertheless, fortunately short. Matthew entered England on 29th December 1621 after John Digby (1580-1653), then Lord of Bristol, had recommended that the monarch employ him in the negotiations for the marriage between Prince Charles and the Spanish Infanta. More than being an able linguist, Matthew was a Catholic with contacts at the courts of Rome and Madrid. Thus, rather than representing a political risk, Matthew’s apostasy was now a ‘fund’ for the government to draw on - this was the zenith of his humanist career.

Yet, on looking closer, even this high point does not seem very impressive. Whilst in the process of arranging this highly unpopular match, which was, ultimately, to come to nothing, Charles and George Villiers wrote a light-hearted letter to King James, including a verbal sketch of the Spanish princess by their Catholic cohort:

In the midst of our serious business, little pretty Toby Matthews, come [sic] to entreat vs to deliver to Your Majesty, which is, as he calls it, a picture of the Infanta, drawn in black and white. We pray yet, let none laugh at it but yourself and honest Kate [Villiers’ wife]; he thinks he has hit the nail on the head, but you will find it the foolishest thing you ever saw.

In this passage, I would suggest, it is possible to witness the way in which, whilst utilising the translator’s skills and experience as a valuable resource, the Protestant establishment continued to marginalise Matthew. He is depicted here as a risible figure, more interested in writing ‘ditties’ about ladies than ‘serious’ public business: a humanist ‘no-hoper’, if you like. Indeed, I would argue that the patronising phrase ‘little pretty Toby Matthews’ - said of a man in his forties - insinuates the feminisation of the Catholic

---

87 According to David Mathew, *Sir Tobie Matthew*, pp.64-65.
89 Horace Walpole believed it was a real sketch and thus catalogued Matthew as an artist - see *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, 4 vols (Strawberry Hill: 1762-71), ii (1762), 124 -125.
by these Protestant associates in a manner which may be seen to quietly echo Sutcliffe's remarks. 91

Nevertheless, whilst this dandyish image of Matthew circulated, he was engaged in high-level discussions to ensure that the Spanish marriage improved the situation of English Catholics. Writing to the King of Spain, he urged the monarch to make the match for the sake of his co-religionists in England, predicting (correctly, as it happens) that persecution would increase if Charles left brideless: ‘... the Prince departing thus, the Catholick Subjects of all my Lord the Kings Dominions are to be in lamentable case’. 92 Yet despite being perhaps more interested in furthering the cause of his Catholic countrymen than that of the Crown, James I knighted Matthew at Royston in October 1623. 93 As one commentator stated at the time: ‘For what services, God knows’. 94

Sir Tobie Matthew remained prominent in political circles in the period after this due to his participation in the arrangements for the marriage of Charles to Henrietta Maria of France which reached fruition in 1625, the year of James I’s death. Matthew acted as an interpreter to England’s new Catholic queen on her journey across the Channel, sharing gossip about this event with George Villier’s mother:

Me thought I discerned in her countenance a little remnant of sadnes which the fresh wound of departing from the Queen Mother might have made. ... Her attire was very plain, for so great a Queen can be thought to have nothing mean about her. 95

---

91 I will say more about the ‘feminising’ of Catholic men by Protestants and suggest some possible cultural origins for it in the next section.
92 ‘Sir Toby Matthew, to the King of Spain’, repr. in Cabala, Siue Scrinia Sacra, Mysteries of State and Government: In Letters of Illustrious Persons and Great Ministers of State ... (London: 1663), p.329. All further references to this edition will be cited as Cabala.
93 Brian Magee, commenting on the plurality of Catholics who were knighted in this era, has stated that it could be regarded as a much a punishment as an honour due to the financial strain that accompanied this ‘reward’ - see The English Recusants: A Study of the Post-Reformation Catholic Survival and the operation of the Recusancy Laws (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1938), footnote, p.135.
94 John Chamberlain quoted by David Mathew, Sir Tobie Matthew, p.67.
From these 'titbits' on the royal wedding we can deduce that Matthew did possess female friends and was able to express a fascination with 'feminine' topics (such as ladies' fashions) when his audience required it. However, these relationships with women received inordinate attention from his contemporaries. Take, for example, Matthew's association with Lucy Hay, the Countess of Carlisle (1599-1660), the wife of James Hay and close confidante of Henrietta Maria. This was heavily satirised by John Suckling in his 'A Session of Poets', Tobie's presence in his imaginary court being dramatised as due to her intervention:

_Toby Mathews_ (pox on him) how came he there?
Was whispering nothing in some-bodies ear:
When he had the honour to be named in Court,
But Sir, you may thank my lady Carleil for't:

For had not her care furnisht you out
With something of handsome, without all doubt
You and your sorry Lady Muse had been
In the number of those that were not let in.

Indeed, it is intriguing to observe that even contemporary Catholics reviled Matthew's social proximity to women, Tobie becoming the object of sexual slander due to his involvement in what historians refer to as the Chalcedon Controversy. In 1623 William Bishop had been established as the Bishop of Chalcedon in an attempt to re-institute an episcopal structure over the fractured fraternity of Catholic clergy in England. Unfortunately, Bishop did not live long and this post was given, in April 1625, to Richard

---

95 Cabala, p.328.
96 See Tobie Matthew, _A Collection of Letters ... With a Character of the most Excellent Lady, Lucy. Countesse of Carlisle: By the same Author. To which are Added many letters of his own, to severall Persons of Honour, Who were contemporary with him_, ed. by[ John Donne Jnr. ] (London: 1660).
97 _Fragmenta Aurea: A Collection of all The Incomparable Peeeces, Written By Sir John Suckling. And published by a Friend to perpetuate his memory_ (London: 1646), p.9. Suckling also produced a poem which involves the scurrilous fantasies of two men - apparently himself and Henry Carew, according to the DNB entry on Lucy Hay, ix, 272 - looking upon the Countess and 'undressing' her with their eyes - 'Upon my Lady Carliles walking in Hampton-Court garden' - _Fragmenta Aurea_ - pp.26-27. I would suggest that this sexualisation of Hay may have easily 'transferred' to her connection with Matthew, possibly adding a more salacious implication to the verse given above.
Smith (1566-1655), probably because of the influence of his patron, Cardinal Richelieu,\textsuperscript{98} possibly as part of the French marriage ‘deal’. Entering an already deeply divided ecclesiastical community, Smith was regarded as being ‘anti-Jesuit’ and as such was greeted with hostility by this faction. However, this antagonism reached new heights when Smith attempted to make priests subject to the authority of bishops by proposing that they could not offer absolution without episcopal approbation. The Jesuits - and also the Catholic nobility - strongly objected to this curtailment of their spiritual autonomy, Smith’s hierarchical imposition seeming especially inappropriate considering the adverse conditions the Catholic Fathers operated under.

Being possibly part of - or at least sympathetic to- the Society of Jesus, Matthew soon entered this furious ecclesiastical debate, producing a ‘Remonstrance’ with Basil Brooke (1576-1646?) and Thomas Brudenell (1585-1661?) in protest against Smith’s actions. While this circulated in manuscript, the dispute raged on, becoming so heated that the government - almost ridiculously - decided to intervene by issuing two proclamations for Smith’s arrest whilst he was living in the French embassy and serving the Queen! Eventually, the wrangles ended when Smith fled to France in 1629 after Pope Urban VIII officially ‘closed’ the matter, declaring that priests needed no episcopal approval for absolution.

Although this was a positive outcome for the Jesuits in England, this lengthy contention had its casualties, one of whom was Tobie Matthew, whose reputation amongst the so-called ‘secular’ Catholics became besmirched by his participation in this polemic. Indeed, the closet drama *Hieromachia, or the Anti-Bishop* (c.1635) - a text attacking Smith’s adversaries - emphasises the role of the ludicrously lecherous

Bitomatus, the play's version of our translator. In this work which was, as its modern editor states: ‘... disturbing enough to be mentioned in correspondence from England, Paris and Rome,’ Matthew is vividly represented as exploiting his religiosity to gain amorous access to women. Hence in Act IV, Scene i, Bitomatus flirts with Nivetta, a quick-witted ‘non-Jesuited’ female character, the dialogue taking the following turn:

Nivetta: ... servant, you can court as well as pray.
Bitomatus: Yes, madam; courtship is a prayer to saints.
Nivetta: What saints?
Bitomatus: To women, images of God.
Nivetta: You teach idolatry. ...
Bitomatus: ... from outward beauty that in women shines
I take a scantling of their molded souls
Into God's liking; thence I find a way
To court the Deity, so make my prayer.100

Thus, through this somewhat graceless dialogue, Bitomatus' piety is shown to play 'second fiddle' to his sensuality, the text making the character's lasciviousness more explicit when Nivetta recounts a story of Bitomatus / Matthew's lustful advances at court, when he apparently said:

Unto a modest Lady that her breasts
(Which then she would have covered) were not made
By nature to be canopied or hid,
But rather were laid open to invite
The curious eye to feast it with delight ... .101

Whatever the truth in this report,102 the Hieromachia suggests that Bitomatus / Matthew does not limit himself to the procuration of sexual favours, Nivetta also asking him why he endeavours to grasp women's fortunes:

99 Suzanne Gossett, 'Preface' to Anon, *Hieromachia or the Anti-Bishop*, ed. by Suzanne Gossett (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses Ltd, 1982), p.11. All further references to this edition will be cited as *Hieromachia*.
100 Anon, *Hieromachia*, IV. 1. ll.1827-1831; 1834 -1838.
... why
Among the ladies, are you such a [burr]
Especially the rich ones, as you stick
At ev’ry turn upon their sleeves, and strive
to rule their families?

In this way, then, we see how Catholics defined Matthew as a philanderer at a time of co-religionist rivalry. However, in Protestant (especially Puritan) circles, ‘Tobie hatred’ escalated throughout the 1630s until anti-Catholic feeling reached its peak at the outbreak of the Civil War. In the view of these spiritual opposites, Matthew embodied a distinct political threat. As in Sutcliffe’s notion of the ‘rinegued Translator’, Sir Tobie was portrayed in this period as a figure who schemed non-stop against the state. For instance, William Prynne’s work, Romes Masterpeece -published in 1645 - accused him of conspiring (with others) to poison the king and bring Scotland into a state of civil war, referring to him as a man ‘to whom a bed was never so dear, that he would rest his head thereon, refreshing his body with sleep in a chair for an hour or two, neither day nor night spared his machinations ...’.

Intriguingly, in this text the Puritan pamphleteer claimed that Matthew was joined by women in this collusion. These included the Countess of Arundel - a ‘strenuous She-Champion of the Popish Religion’- who, like Sir Tobie, was purportedly involved in passing on intelligence to the Papal Legate. Indeed, Prynne’s Hidden Works of Darkness (1640), as well as containing a seemingly forged letter from Urban VIII to Matthew confirming his status as a Jesuit, apparently also makes much of the translator’s feminine

102 Feil has discovered another anonymous account of 1632 which refers to Matthew’s dalliances with court ladies in their chambers, including, funnily enough, asking them to bare their bosoms! (Sir Tobie Matthew, pp.192-93.) However, this may merely mean that one was the source for the other.

103 Anon, Hieromachia, IV. 1. ll.1891-1894.

104 William Prynne, Romes Masterpeece, or, The Grand Conspiracy of the Pope and his Jesuited Instruments, to extirpate the Protestant religion, re-establish popery, subvert Lawes, Liberties, Peace, Parliaments ... (London: 1645). All further references to this edition will be cited as Romes Masterpeece.

105 Prynne, Romes Masterpeece, p.21.
‘co-confederates’, declaring the Pope’s intention to religiously ‘re-conquer’ England ‘by the help of those female Amazons and Instruments, who laboured, day and night, to effect this designe of his’.106

It was allegations such as these which led to Matthew being tragically forced to take flight into his final continental exile after the two Houses of Parliament united to petition for his banishment in November 1640,107 this following several earlier attempts to apprehend him.108 Matthew spent the rest of his life in the Low Countries, amongst the English expatriate religious orders in Brussels, Louvain, Antwerp and Ghent.109 In this time he pursued his literary interests, producing a selection of spiritual works,110 including ‘the life of ye glorious St Austin’,111 which may yet be extant. Matthew’s long and eventful life finally came to a close on October 13th 1655, being buried as a Jesuit at the English College in Ghent.

Examining this overview of Matthew’s history, it appears as if there was some consensus - even between Catholics and Protestants - concerning Tobie’s supposed treachery and libertinism. Thus it seems, at first, as if the biographical readings of the Confessions given by Sutcliffe and Watts can be supported. That is, what we will witness to be the translation’s denial of humanist scholarly techniques and paradigms of masculinity may be explicated in terms of the ‘rinegued Translator’’s religious and political ‘disloyalty’; whilst the ‘surplus’ of exemplary femininity in Matthew’s work may be construed as the product of the ‘author’’s carnality.

107 Mathew, Sir Tobie Matthew, p.87.
108 Arnold Harris Matthew states that Tobie had sought refuge at Raglan Castle, acting as chaplain to Henry Somerset, who was later Marquess of Worcester. He also suggests that Matthew would have been killed had he remained in England - The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew, p.311 and p.312 respectively.
109 According to Arnold Harris Matthew, The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew, p.325.
110 See Works Consulted. I will discuss a few of the works produced in this period in the next section.
111 Matthew’s will of 1647, quoted by Arnold Harris Matthew, The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew, p.339.
However, I would take issue with this interpretation. I would argue that the depictions of Sir Tobie we have seen are more about broad-based cultural anxieties concerning Catholic men as a category than Matthew as an individual. Yes, as we have discovered, Matthew *did* strive to intervene in political and ecclesiastical matters of international importance - but I would propose that Catholic men (especially Jesuits) were *invariably* regarded with intense suspicion, being severely persecuted because of these fears, as we shall see in the next section. As John Field wrote of the 'papists' in a dedicatory preface to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, in the Elizabethan era: ‘Trust not faire speeche, nor fained freendship in them that haue alwaies shewed themselves so false’.

Yes, Matthew *did* seem to have a fondness for women - but I would suggest that these relationships were only given prominence because this was a long-standing 'weapon' of inter-religious conflict in this period, anti-Catholic writers often focussing upon - and frequently *sexualising* - the 'papist' male's connections with women in an attempt to undermine their opponents. It is this polemical device which Catholics may be glimpsed using against 'their own' in the *Hieromachia*, a striking sign of the extent of the rift between the 'seculars' and the 'regulars'.

Alan Bray has written of how Jesuits were repeatedly characterised as 'sodomites' in the Renaissance and Alan Stewart has described how monastic culture became similarly negatively associated with homosexual activity in this period, yet, as Stewart's work also intimates, there also is evidence to suggest that Catholic men were

---

112 John Field, dedication, *A Caveat for Parsons Howlet, concerning his untimely flighte, and scriching in the cleare day light of the Gospell, necessarie for him and all the rest of that darke broode, and vnclene cage of papistes, who with their untimely bookes, seeke the discredite of the trueth, and the disquiet of this Church of England* (London: 1581), sig.Aiii. All further references to this edition will be cited as Caveat.
114 Alan Stewart, *Close Readers* - see Chapter Two on John Bale, pp.38-83.
further depicted as *heterosexually* excessive.\(^{115}\) Thus in the late sixteenth century, anti-Catholic treatises, such as John Baxter’s *The Toile for Two-Legged Foxes*, stressed that the most likely converts to ‘Rome’ were ‘loose professours ... who haue lent their loue to voluptuous delites or prodigalities ... ’,\(^{116}\) John Field correspondingly satirising the Catholic clergy’s allegedly immoral attitude to sex: ‘ ... they are such enemies to God, that they beleeue vndoubtedly, that if a priest or one in holy orders know a harlot carnally, hee sanctifieth and blesseth her in so doing ... ’\(^{117}\) Indeed, Field’s work sardonically dramatised the words of a man on an ‘ale bench’ being (drunkenly) nostalgic for the Catholic era: ‘... when no mans wife was in safetie, when few mens daughters were maryed vyrgins: ... ’\(^{118}\)

Although these words in some sense echo the moral attacks of Louvainists such as Harding, I would argue that the Protestants’ discursive eroticisation of Catholic men in the later sixteenth century far exceeded the sexual aspersions cast upon Anglicans by their religious opponents which - as we have seen - were often polemically ‘diluted’ amongst a range of other inter-confessional social criticisms, such as the issue of gluttony. Hence from at least the Elizabethan period onwards, I would contend that Catholic masculinity became propagandistically identified with licentiousness, with too much love for the ‘ladies’. Indeed, John Gee proves that this salacious image of Catholic men was still current in Matthew’s time when he instructs his (male) readers to mistrust these foppish figures:

> If, about *Bloomesbury* or *Holborne*, thou meet a good smug Fellow in a gold-laced suit, a cloke lined thorow with velvet, one that hath good store of coin in

\(^{115}\) Stewart, *Close Readers*, p.47.

\(^{116}\) John B[axter], *A Toile for Two-Legged Foxes: Wherein their noisome properties; their hunting and vnenelling, with the duties of the principall hunters and guardians of the spirituall vineyard is liuelie discovered* ... (London: 1600), pp.82-83. All further references to this edition will be cited as *Toile*.

\(^{117}\) Field, *Caveat*, sig. Eiiiiv*.

\(^{118}\) Field, *Caveat*, sig. E".
his purse ... ; then take heed of a Iesuite ... .This man hath vowed *pouerty*. Feare not to trust him with thy wife: he hath vowed also *chastity*.\textsuperscript{119}

In addition, Gee also makes manifest the way in which such Catholic men represent a menace to females who are seen to be vulnerable to apostasy due to their own secret desires. Apparently alluding to 2.Sam.15: 6 and 2.Tim.3: 6, he says of the Catholic fathers: ‘Easily can they steale away \textit{the hearts of the weaker sort}: and secretly do they creep into hou-ses, \textit{leading captiue simple women loaden with sinnes, and led away with diuere lusts}’.\textsuperscript{120} In this way we perceive how, as Patricia Crawford has pointed out, there was a particular anxiety around Protestant women’s contact with Catholic clerics, there being a concern that they would ‘succumb to the wiles of the priests’.\textsuperscript{121} In fact, Gee deliberately ‘names and shames’ one ‘operative’ in London who has a threatening familiarity with women converts: ‘F. Townsend, a Iesuite, a little black fellow, very compt and gallant, lodging about the midst of Drury-Lane[,] acquainted with collapsed Ladies’.\textsuperscript{122}

Thus we may begin to appreciate the fact that the sexual accusations directed at Matthew were no more than cultural commonplaces: the ‘collapsed ladies’ were just part of the abusive vocabulary of anti-Catholicism. Hence the allegations of lewdness levelled against our translator must be treated with scepticism. Whatever was the reality of Sir Tobie’s relationships with women, the ‘true’ situation was certainly moulded to fit the conventions of this deeply-sexualised Protestant polemical discourse, which was, as we have seen, also destructively utilised by Catholics against themselves in times of internal discord.

\textsuperscript{119} Gee, \textit{Foot out of the Snare}, pp.46-47 - missigned ‘56’,‘57’.
\textsuperscript{120} Gee, \textit{Foot out of the Snare}, p.3.
\textsuperscript{121} Patricia Crawford, \textit{Women and Religion, 1500-1720}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edn (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), p.64.
\textsuperscript{122} Gee, \textit{Foot out of the Snare}, sig.P'.
If we can thus deduce that the political and sexual distrust of Catholic men was merely a symptom of the anti-Catholic perspective in this period, then the biographical readings of the 1620 *Confessions* by Sutcliffe and Watts seem to lose their validity. Rather than providing an accurate ‘author-linked’ explanation of the text, these ‘critics’ now appear to be offering us a stereotypical ‘knee-jerk’ response to ‘papist’ thought which has little to do with Matthew specifically. Nevertheless, I would suggest that their readings remain valuable to us in that they accentuate for us the translation’s dismissal of humanist manhood and elevation of feminine exemplarity, even if they can only account for it in terms of anti-Catholic cliche.

However, there persists a subtle sense in which Matthew’s work might be seen to beg a biographical interpretation - but it is one very different from that presented by Sutcliffe and Watts. The translation may be seen to tacitly allude to its context, understatedly expressing, for instance, its status as one humanistically-trained individual’s attempt to ‘make sense’ of the condition of exile he had found himself in. Hence Matthew’s commentary on the text in Book III, Chapter viii, contains a remark which may be construed as an implicit justification for his costly decision to decline the Oath of Allegiance and thus deny the monarch. When the main body of the text states parenthetically that: ‘... it is a generall agreement of humane society, to obey Kings;’, the margin reflects that: ‘Kinges must be obeyed in all thinges that are not against God’. Thus whilst ‘diplomatically’ proclaiming his loyalty as a subject, Matthew may be perceived to set a limit on this allegiance, simultaneously rewriting and creating a

---

123 Matthew, printed annotation, *Confessions*, Book III, Chapter viii, p.110. The Latin edition reads: ‘Generale quippe pactum est societatis humanae, obediere Regibus suis, ...’ - *D. Avrei Avgystini, Hipponensis Episcopi Confessiunm* ... (Tournon: 1588), p.64. I cannot, of course, be certain which edition Matthew worked from, but this contemporary version, tellingly presented in a late-sixteenth-century binding with ‘I.H.S’ - the mark of the Jesuit society - inscribed on it, may have been a possible source for Matthew’s version. It is also clear that he turned to Peter Ribadeneya’s Spanish translation of the *Confessions*, whose preface is extensively quoted in Matthew’s own - see p.13 onwards.
reading of the patristic text which supports him in his refusal. Hence Matthew’s relationship to the Augustinian work may be observed to be fundamentally shaped by a humanistic perception of textual practicality, yet the ultimate goal of his literary engagement is anti-civic action, Matthew ostensibly employing the text to legitimate his prioritisation of spiritual interests over secular ones.

Furthermore, Matthew may perhaps be viewed to be utilising the process of translation in a very ‘private’ manner, making the Confessions’ story of moral recovery and conversion his own and thus celebrating - and sustaining himself in - his difficult apostasy. David Mathew has written of his belief that Augustine’s autobiographical book had a personal resonance for Tobie following his religious rebirth and this opinion does seem to have some credibility, especially when we consider the text’s many references to the ‘Prodigal Son’. In a work which consistently avoids a detailed humanistic marginal marking of allusions (a point in which the Catholic translation distinctly differs from Watts’ version), this Biblical parable (Luke 15: 11-31) receives an unparalleled amount of paratextual attention. Over and over, Matthew shows himself eager to invoke the ‘Son’, even when the main text does not directly mention this scriptural figure. For example, when (in Book II, Chapter x) the ‘central’ part of the work asserts: ‘I fell from thee O my God, & I wandred [sic] from thy stability, in that youth of myne; and became vnto my self thereby, as a whole Prouince or Country full of misery’, the margin states: ‘He alludes to the Prodigall Son’.

---

124 Matthew, printed annotation, Confessions, Book III, Chapter viii, p.110.
125 David Mathew, Sir Tobie Matthew, pp.39-40.
127 Matthew, printed annotation, Confessions, Book II, Chapter x, trans. by Matthew, p.81.
I would suggest that such repeated comments\textsuperscript{128} permit us to not only to witness the way in which Matthew might be seen to be partly rewriting the Augustinian text in order to express his sentiments concerning his own 'redemption', but also enable us to glimpse the possibility that the image of the 'Prodigal Son' played a significant role in the 'self-fashioning' of our translator.\textsuperscript{129} Indeed, Matthew might be thus conceived to be using the text \textit{pragmatically} - as a good humanist should - but to shore up his own (and others') \textit{spiritual} subjectivity, rather than a civic-oriented form of manhood.

In fact, as I intimated earlier, it may have been this 'introverted' use of humanism that may partly have so irritated Sutcliffe and Watts, Sutcliffe viciously deriding Matthew's adoption of the 'Son's identity in his preface to Mary:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Behold, sayth hee, a prodigall Child of thine. As if such a wanton young man, that hath so often runne from his Father, were the Sonne of a Virgin .... A prodigall Child, hee may well call himselfe, as one that hath dissipated his substance, uiuendo luxuriose... }\textsuperscript{130}
\end{quote}

Thus I would argue that our Protestant reader once more highlights an important feature in Matthew's text and yet fails to grasp its 'real' meaning, drowning its significance in what we have seen to be the mire of anti-Catholic banalities.

Yet whilst affirming that the translation of the \textit{Confessions} might be potentially seen to have been produced by Matthew as an attempt to spiritually support himself in exile, my main point here is to stress that even this biographical analysis falls short of fully explaining the purpose of the 1620 edition. The links I have just discussed, whilst intriguingly presenting a 'personal', even meditative, motivation for Matthew's work, are, in my view, far too tentative to constitute a complete definition of the text's 'original'

\textsuperscript{128} Other references to the 'Prodigal Son' are annotated within the text, for instance, on p. 101, p.172 and p.356.

\textsuperscript{129} Intriguingly, Robert Southwell composed a poem entitled 'The Prodigal Child's Soul Wrack' - see \textit{The Complete Works of Robert Southwell, S.J. With life and death} (London: Burn and Oates, [1886]), pp.143-145, possibly suggesting that this image of biblical masculinity had a broad resonance for recusant men.
function. I would argue that whilst Matthew may have gained pious strength from the translation of the Augustinian narrative, the *Confessions* was also a practical, *published* text, thus suggesting that it was primarily intended to be a 'manual' more widely promoting a passive, private model of Catholic maleness appropriate to the current environment of persecution. Although the downgrading of humanist masculinity and raising of sacred femininity that we will see is present in the translation might be partially understood in terms of our vague knowledge of Matthew's seclusion and female contacts at the time of composing the *Confessions*, I would contend that this gender emphasis within the text can only be properly comprehended when we consider the work in the light of its poignant *historical* - rather than personal - context.

After examining this background in the next section, looking at a range of both primary and secondary materials, I will suggest that Matthew's text may be seen to be *participating* in a broader ideological trend in Catholic culture in this traumatic period, involving the modification of male gender ideals and a concomitant shift towards female exemplarity. Thus I will propose that in the 1620 *Confessions* Matthew aimed to offer English Catholic men (including himself) support in a time of crisis by appropriating and advertising an *already circulating* alternative model of recusant manhood. Hence I will demonstrate that despite what Sutcliffe and Watts say, it is not so much Matthew's past, but the *Catholic* past which allows us interpretative access to this translation.

---

130 Sutcliffe, *Vnmasking*, p.32.
In 1587 Richard Verstegan - Persons' 'man in Antwerp'\textsuperscript{131} - produced the extensive martrological work, \textit{Theatrum Crudelitatum Haereticorum Nostri Temporis}.\textsuperscript{132} Although giving prominence to the recent execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, the book, with its vividly violent engravings, was essentially an early modern 'photo-journalistic' attempt to bring to light the sufferings of English Catholics and to thus procure 'humanitarian' intervention from spiritually sympathetic nations.

Its images, with their coldly diagrammatic alphabetical labelling of gruesome situations, attempt to assert their status as a 'factual' visual dissection of the experience of religious oppression. In one figure (no.7), we witness the ordeal of incarceration and torture to the point of death. In the foreground, the body of an emaciated youth is stripped naked, whilst to his left an elderly man is pressed into a ball shape by an iron clamp-like instrument. On the right, meanwhile, we view two jailers in the course of burning their prisoner with torches. In another illustration (Figure 8), we view the more public exercise of punitive power in the form of the killing of Catholic priests. The fathers say their last prayers before being hung, drawn and quartered, their hacked heads and limbs lying strewn by a fire, as meaningless as the logs they so closely resemble.

Yet how realistic was Verstegan’s traumatic ‘reportage’? He gathered persecution stories from two periods of English history - 1535 to 1543 and 1570 to 1587. Thus whilst revealing the contemporary ‘scandal’ of spiritual tyranny under the rule of Elizabeth I, the text also sold its audience ‘old news’ - the tale of the Reformation in England - in order to stress the longevity of Catholic affliction.

\textsuperscript{131} Holmes, \textit{Resistance and Compromise}, p.135.
\textsuperscript{132} R[ichard] V[erstegan], \textit{Theatrum Crudelitatum Haereticorum Nostri Temporis} (Antwerp: 1587).
Whatever the pitfalls of Verstegan’s inflammatory propagandist approach, it cannot be denied that what Haigh has termed the ‘revolution in religion’ of the Henrician era signalled the beginning of the Catholics’ difficulties. ‘The Act of Supremacy’ (1534) - which established the monarch as the head of the church and state and thus discarded papal authority - isolated English non-Reformist believers from their European counterparts; whilst the subsequent dissolution of the monasteries (1535-1540) represented the fracturing of the traditional institutional structure of the English Catholic church.

After the nominal reign of Edward VI, which, as Haigh has put it, ‘denied, one by one, the major points of Catholic doctrine and practice’, the succession, in 1553, of Mary I - a Catholic zealot, who was later to marry Philip II of Spain - offered an improved future for those opposed to Protestantism. Indeed, the tables did turn - but with rather too much ferocity. It was the queen’s personal mission to eradicate ‘heresy’ by any means necessary, burning nearly three hundred individuals many from the working classes - in the purge that took place from 1555 onwards. This era of extreme oppression became part of the Protestant communal memory and may be seen to be part of Elizabethan society’s rationalisation of the castigation of Catholics.

In fact, the lack of social forgiveness concerning the ‘wrongs’ of the Marian age is visible in the work of writers such as Perceval Wiburn, who asks Catholics who lament their persecuted position to ‘looke into the former gouernement, when they of your side

135 Haigh, *Reformation and Resistance*, p.139.
136 Dickens stresses the monarch’s heavy involvement in these proceedings, *English Reformation*, p.363.
co[m]manded\textsuperscript{139} and even draws attention to the alleged persistence of Catholic brutality in Renaissance Europe: ‘...massacres, and hot burning execution haue bene and are the weapons of your side’.\textsuperscript{140} Interestingly, the Marian past also appears to have been a precedent for governmental policy towards Catholics in the late sixteenth century, William Cecil, Lord Burghley’s \textit{The Execution of Justice in England} - the ‘official’ justification of the killing of Catholic missionary priests - evoking the frequently-cited and highly emotive example of pregnant women sent to the stake, referring to: ‘... some great with Child, out of whose Bodies the Child, by fire was expelled alive and yet also cruelly burned: ...’.\textsuperscript{141}

Nevertheless, the Elizabethan state’s heavy-handed approach towards the Catholic community was motivated by more than the terrible mistakes of the previous generation. Following the new queen’s accession in 1558, the government faced the formidable task of re-imposing Protestant conformity upon its subjects. We have already seen the immense difficulties which confronted the Anglican hierarchy in the 1560s as the Catholic intelligentsia based in the Low Countries waged what I have argued to be a very significant war on paper. Yet in 1569 matters came violently to the head with the rebellion of the Northern Earls. Although this revolt was swiftly crushed by the government, the pope was emboldened by this high-level act of religious resistance. Pius

\textsuperscript{139} [Perceval Wiburn], \textit{A Checke or reproofe of M.Howlets vntimely shreeching [sic] in her Maistes eares, with an answere to the reasons alledged in a discourse thereunto annexed, why Catholikes (as they are called) refuse to goe to church ...} (London: 1581), fol.11\textsuperscript{v}. All further references to this edition will be cited as Checke.

\textsuperscript{140} [Wiburn], Checke, fol.10\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{141} \textit{The Execution of Justice in England, For Maintainance of Publick and Christian Peace, &c.} [orig. pub. 1583], reproduced in \textit{A Collection of Several Treatises concerning The Reasons and Occasions of the Penal Laws} (London: 1688), p.14. All future references to this edition will be cited as Execution. This story also surfaces in B[axter], Toile, pp.17-18 - note that Burghley makes the number of martyred expectant women plural. Significantly, Cardinal William Allen’s response to Burghley weakly excused, but did not deny these accounts. He claimed that noone knew that the condemned woman in question was having a baby, ultimately resorting to moral condemnation of the female victim, saying that: ‘... God discovered her filthie and shame ...’ - \textit{A Trve, Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholiques that Suffer for Their
V excommunicated Elizabeth in February 1570, issuing a bull which attempted to sever the ties of allegiance between Catholic subjects and the monarch, threatening to expel those who did obey her from the Roman church.\textsuperscript{142}

Although this bull was not even properly published in England and was generally disregarded by those who were familiar with its contents,\textsuperscript{143} there were subtle signs that this radical papal decree had made an impact on the attitudes of English Catholics in that, as Dures states, the subsequent years witnessed an increase in the numbers of those not attending Protestant services.\textsuperscript{144} However, as Haigh describes, this burgeoning of recusancy may be correlated with the advent of missionary priesthood\textsuperscript{145} which aimed to support besieged Catholics and to re-convert those who had lapsed into Protestantism. One hundred clerics arrived from the continental seminaries before 1580,\textsuperscript{146} the priestly presence becoming more profuse over the next decade.

With the possibility of a papal or Spanish threat in Ireland around 1579-80 and the disturbingly high influence of the French in Scotland, the menace of a pan-European invasion force was specically acute at the start of the 1580s. Whether or not senior Jesuit figures such as Allen and Persons were privy to these military plans,\textsuperscript{147} the Elizabethan establishment imposed a series of harsh measures against the Catholic missionaries in order to ease its political insecurity. An act was passed in 1581 which targeted the Fathers' evangelical work, making it a treasonable offence to reconcile or be reconciled to

\textit{Faith at home and abrode: ...} [Rouen: 1584], p.45. All further references to this edition will be cited as \textit{Defence}.
\textsuperscript{142} Alan Dures, \textit{English Catholicism, 1558-1642: Continuity and Change} (Essex: Longman, 1983), p.15.
\textsuperscript{143} Dures, \textit{English Catholicism}, p.16.
\textsuperscript{144} Dures, \textit{English Catholicism}, p.28. He also suggests that these growing numbers may be due to better detection by the authorities - \textit{English Catholicism}, p.28.
\textsuperscript{145} Haigh, \textit{English Reformations}, Chapter Fifteen, pp.251-267.
\textsuperscript{146} Dures, \textit{English Catholicism}, p.21
\textsuperscript{147} Dures thinks they were, \textit{English Catholicism}, p.34.
the Catholic faith. By 1585, the law meant that a priest’s very residence in the country constituted treason, with those who harboured them being also subject to the death sentence. This legislation proved a potent tool of oppression, as one hundred and twenty-three out of the one hundred and forty-five Catholics executed in the Elizabethan era fell prey to this statute. Although Catholic apologists, such as Allen, argued for the purely religious function of the priests, the fact that they were physically unarmed could not convince the government that they did not possess more potentially subversive ideological weapons. As Cecil stated at the time: ‘... their persons make not the War, but their directions and councils have set up the Rebellions’.

A parallel legal ‘clampdown’ occurred against those Catholics members of the community who refused to attend Protestant ceremonies. In 1581 a bill was put forward by parliament suggesting that the private saying of mass be made an act punishable by death and the fourth absence from church be penalised by praemunire, resulting in the confiscation of property. Eventually it was decided that - alongside the prohibition of apostasy already discussed - a gargantuan fee of twenty pounds per month be levied on all congregational absentees over the age of sixteen. Although few paid the full amount due to administrative inefficiency, many parted with considerable sums as a consequence of this law. Indeed, when further legislation was put in place in 1587 the amount charged accumulated from the time of the first offence. In fact, following this
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148 See Dures, English Catholicism, p.29
149 Dures, English Catholicism, p.30
150 Allen writes of the priests that have been executed, declaring that: ‘... nothing was ther [sic] in thos [sic] religious hartes but innocencie and true religion: ...’- Defence, p.13.
151 Cecil, Execution, p.27.
152 Dures, English Catholicism, p.30.
153 Dures, English Catholicism, pp.30-31.
154 Dures, English Catholicism, pp.30-31.
statute, courts had the right to confiscate two thirds of the recusant’s land for non-payment of fines\textsuperscript{155} - a testament to the immense financial threat this decree posed.

The situation for lay Catholics was to deteriorate even further throughout the 1580s and 1590s. This was mainly a result of various ill-founded Catholic schemes - such as the Throgmorton and Babington plots of 1583 and 1586 respectively - which aimed to depose Elizabeth and put in her place Mary, Queen of Scots. In addition, the queen’s fears for her safety were given even more grounding in the face of the arrival of the Spanish Armada off the English coast in 1588. Despite the fact that some leading recusants proffered their services in the defence of the realm,\textsuperscript{156} the Catholics’ spiritual similarity with the enemy meant that, in the eyes of the government, they could not be considered to be trustworthy subjects: looking out to sea, it was thought, there was too much tempting them to identification.

It was this fearful fantasy, together with the possibility that the Jesuit faction in the Low Countries was actually involved in the invasion projects, which ultimately served to push ‘ordinary’ peaceable Catholics further into a socio-religious corner. In 1593, the ‘Act against Popish Recusants’ was issued. This forced Catholics to keep within a five mile radius of their homes, thus heavily circumscribing travel for this section of the community and, in my view, potentially severely limiting Catholic men’s activities in the public sphere. Indeed, this was the soft option: the original bill had involved taking Catholic children from their parents and placing them under Protestant wardship,\textsuperscript{157} Leys suggesting that even without this legislation being passed, Catholic families felt so

\textsuperscript{155} Dures, \textit{English Catholicism}, p.31.
\textsuperscript{156} Dures, \textit{English Catholicism}, p.36.
\textsuperscript{157} Dures, \textit{English Catholicism}, p.31.
vulnerable that births would sometimes be hidden to avoid the confiscation of the newborn.\textsuperscript{158}

The Catholic community at the turn of the seventeenth century was, then, in a parlous state. The seemingly relentless external pressures on this group, quite inevitably, created problems within it, divisions becoming especially apparent amongst the clergy. Tensions which had surfaced whilst priests were being held at Wisbech prison in 1588 reached new heights with the appointment of Archpriest George Blackwell in 1598, a figure advocated by Persons.\textsuperscript{159} The 'secular' fathers (often referred to as 'Appellants' because of their appeal to Rome for restitution) resented what they saw to be the Jesuitical domination of this ecclesiastical post and this finally drove them to make an (unsuccessful) attempt to gain toleration from the state. Although this may seem to be an admirable aim, the loyalist pleas of Thomas Bluet and William Watson, as well as not being very original in their formulation -political fidelity had been a repeated theme of late sixteenth-century Catholic literature - employed a means to achieve acceptance which is slightly disturbing in its self-abnegation. Considering the innocent suffering of the majority of their co-religionists, it is, perhaps, a little startling to witness Catholics blaming themselves for their own mistreatment - even if it was a rhetorical gesture - proclaiming that: '... we our selues (certaine Catholikes of all sorts) were the true causes of it'.\textsuperscript{160}

Yet perhaps this was also a sign of the 'defeated' condition of the Catholics in this period. Jesuit 'direct action' was itself on the wane at this time, Dures claiming that the

\textsuperscript{159} Basset, English Jesuits, pp.90-91.
\textsuperscript{160} [Thomas Bluet], with preface by W[illiam] W[atson], Important Considerations, Which Ovght To Move All True and Sovnd Catholikes, who are not wholly Iesuited, to acknowledge without all equiuocations, ambiguites, or shiftings, that the proceedings of her Maiesty, and of the State with them, since the beginning of herHignesse raigne, haue bene both mild and mercifull ... ([n.p.]:1601). [Bluet], p.7.
order had resigned itself to Catholicism's sectarian status by 1603. Indeed, John Bossy encapsulates the history of the Catholic 'movement' in this era as 'Inertia to inertia in three generations'.

Nevertheless, there was, literally, one last blast left in English Catholicism: the Gunpowder Plot. The arrival of James I, the son of Mary, Queen of Scots, in London in 1603 had seemed a positive prospect for the persecuted recusant population in England. Yet after an initially lenient start, the king shattered the optimism of his Catholic subjects by issuing a proclamation banishing the priests in February 1603/4 and resuming the imposition of fines for recusancy in November of that year. With external international intervention made highly improbable by England's peace with Spain in 1604, Robert Catesby and his cohorts famously took matters into their own hands in November 1605, attempting to blow up parliament and the monarch.

This strangely celebrated act of terrorism, created, according to Dures, not by fanaticism but by a broad-based frustration with the new regime, caused the terrified James to demand that the Catholics of his realm take the Oath of Allegiance. This was instituted in 1606, with refusal resulting in praemunire. It was a felony to go abroad without having sworn it and to travel to Rome without this avowal was treason. Also, as a consequence of this scare, Catholics were (theoretically, at least) forbidden to be at court or work in the professions. It was this oath which, as we have seen in the previous section, Tobie Matthew fell so unfortunately foul of.

Dures, English Catholicism, p.39.


Dures, English Catholicism, p.43.
In his *Apologie*, James I seemed to show himself sympathetic to the sentiments of the politically pacifist ('quietly minded', in his terms) majority of Catholics who he understood 'were put out of despai're by the extremist scheme. Yet what also emerged in this text was that the oath represented a battle to establish the true *paternity* of English Catholics. The monarch's text reproduces Pope Paul V's epistle to his spiritual 'sonnes' in England, describing the 'Fatherly care which we doe continually take for the saluation of your soules' and stating categorically that: '... you cannot without most evident and grieuous wronging of Gods Honour, binde your selues by the Oath, ...'. I would suggest that this forbidding letter is only cited by James in order to contrast it with his own more 'benign' paternal love, declaring, quite reasonably, that: ' ... it might haue bene that his Maiestie for the fatherly care he hath, not to put any of his Subjectes to a needlesse extremitie, might haue bene contented in some sort to haue reformed or interpreted those wordes: ...'.

In this way we can see how Catholic consciences - such as Tobie Matthew's - were caught up in a, literally, *patriarchal* power struggle for their filial fidelity. Yet if this state of torn loyalties was not confusing enough, as I mentioned earlier, the elderly Archpriest Blackwell, the semi-official father figure for English Catholics, took the oath whilst in prison in 1606/7, feasibly capitulating under duress (as Tobie Matthew believed). In his letter to Catholic clerics and laymen, tellingly written in the Clink, Blackwell also evoked a paternal discourse, imploring young men not to follow in the allegedly seditious footsteps of their fathers, saying: 'If your owne children (who are
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164 James I, *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus. Or An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, Against the two Breues of Pope Pavls Qvintvs, and the late Letter of Cardinal Bellarmine to G. Blackwel, the Arch-priest* (London: 1607). All future references to this edition will be cited as *Apologie*.
fathers) or your owne fathers (who are children) should persuad you to any of these courses, doe not follow their counsell, for it is not of God: ...'.

In reality though, with the galvanising force of Allen and Persons gone, the Jacobean state had ever less and less to fear from the Catholic politically activist minority. James was, ultimately, a fickle father to his 'papist' sons. As time passed, he began to appreciate their usefulness in foreign policy matters - in dealing with Rome and the Catholic nations of Europe - and as a consequence the condition of some Catholics improved, such as Tobie Matthew, who was, as we have seen, transformed from a banished subject to a knight by his participation in the marriage negotiations of the 1620s.

Indeed, whilst fines were still levied for recusancy, there was a rise (albeit slight) in toleration for Catholicism amongst the elite court circle of James' ill-starred son, Charles I. This was primarily influenced by the presence of England's new Catholic queen, Henrietta Maria, a figure who David Mathew claims was generally 'unpopular'.

In fact, it appears that Charles' tacit sanctioning of his wife's co-religionist associates may have played a significant part in his undoing. Mathew has suggested that the position of Catholics at the close of the 1630s was the best it was to be for the next to hundred years. If so, then this may partially explain anti-Catholicism's heightening hysteria in these years, which, as I discussed earlier, contributed to the outbreak of the Civil War. As the contemporary historian, Clarendon, diagnosed: 'The imputation to bring in or ... of

169 James I, Apologie, p.7.
170 A Large Examination taken at Lambeth, according to his Maiesties direction, point by point, of M. George Blakwell, made Archpriest of England, by Pope Clement.8 ... Also M. Blackwells Letter to the Romish Catholickes in England, aswell Ecclesiasticall, as Lay. ... (London: 1607), p.163. This quote intriguingly discloses what was possibly so problematic about the Oath for Catholic men: the language surrounding it powerfully interpolated them on a paternal level and yet simultaneously potentially plundered them of their traditional patrilineal role models in both the public and private spheres (they were pressed to choose between the king or the pope and the king or their fathers). This paradigmatic bereavement may, I suggest, have amplified the gender anxieties of Catholic males and perhaps further stimulated the search for other, feminine, exemplars - an issue I will return to later in this section.
conniving at and tolerating Popery did make a deep impression upon the people generally. It was this phobic atmosphere which, as I relate earlier, pushed Tobie Matthew and others like him into exile.

On concluding this historical summary, then, we are able to discern that Verstegan's version of events in Protestant England, although inevitably imbued with an inherent sensationalism, also contained a fair amount of pointed Elizabethan reality. Although the situation of Catholics in the upper echelons of society may have been ameliorated during the reigns of the two Stuarts, as we have seen in the case of Tobie Matthew, Catholics of all classes still faced an enormous amount of hostility and deprivation. The late sixteenth century had seen the decline of the English Catholic community from 'majority to minority', as Haigh would put it. Despite the bold initiatives of missionary priests and the private strength of recusants, the everyday war of attrition waged by the Elizabethan government inescapably took its toll. When Tobie Matthew became a Catholic in the early seventeenth century, he thus allied himself with a broken part of English culture, damaged by oppression on spiritual, political, financial and emotional levels. Fined, searched, imprisoned, banished, killed, hated: that was the 'reward' of Catholicism for far too many individuals in Renaissance England.

If an outline of 'events' almost automatically highlights the moments of political activism - the points where there is a 'blip' in the 'flatline' of history - the 'fact' finally becomes apparent is that this model of narration fundamentally fails to tell the 'true' story of English Catholics in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. As I understand it, the predominant experience of Catholic subjects in this period was one of
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172 Mathew, Catholicism, p.85
173 Quoted by Dures, English Catholicism, p.80.
being on the receiving end of trauma. In Robert Beddows’ words, the existence of Catholics in this era was one ‘of negatives, hiding, refusing, suffering’.  

It is my contention that for most part - excepting the Persons and Catesby-type figures - history happened to English Catholics. As Arnold Pritchard phrases it: ‘The persecution fell on many people who took little active interest in politics ...’.  

It is my belief, then, that the Catholics’ sense of their own lack of social agency is visible in the consolatory literature of the late sixteenth century. In this we see writers attempting to rationalise their afflicted state and explicitly make a virtue out of powerlessness.  

For instance, H.B. (who was possibly the poet and martyr, Robert Southwell) utilises a seasonal metaphor to press an optimistic vision of the future upon a perhaps fatalistic readership: ‘... : It is now winter with you ... . Feare not the pinching colde of this hard season nor the sharpe stormes of persecution. For shortlye the spring tyme of the resurrection shal come, and then your plentiful fruites shal appeare ....’  

Note here how change is depicted as occurring by environmental means, that is, means interestingly beyond human control. Thus while H.B. suggests that Catholic fortunes will change, his chosen analogy subtly exposes an awareness that any betterment of the community’s condition will not, or cannot, come from their own volition.  

Yet if H.B. literally naturalises the Catholics’ impotence in the face of their oppression, Thomas Hide’s explanation of the current hardship may be seen to express some of the self-hatred which can result from discrimination. He tells his audience: ‘God
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178 Peter Holmes, Resistance and Compromise, p.88.
179 H.B., A Consolatory Letter to All the Afflicted Catholikes in England (Rouen: [n.d.]), pp.104-105. All further references will be from this edition cited as Consolatory Letter.
dealeth with you as the angrie father dealeth with his childe, whom after he hath beaten, casteth the rodde into the fire, maketh muche of him, and leaueth to him his patrimonie'. Hence the sufferings inflicted by domestic religious policy become figured as sacred domestic violence: Catholics are shown to be *infantilised* in front of the punitive parent, be it God or Elizabeth.

If it is intriguing to observe the (once more) *patriarchal* quality of this conceptualisation of retributive justice, it is intriguing to perceive how Catholic texts of this period may also be seen to specifically register the impact of persecution on male subjects. These texts may be seen to particularly lament the loss of the conventional ‘seats’ of masculine influence in the humanist model: maltreatment means that Catholic men are less able to rule a secure household or act in public life. Thus Persons complains about high-ranking males being imprisoned for their faith and of ‘so many good howses broken up: so mani [sic] howsholders dispersed and fled away, so many yonge Gentlemen and seruantes unprouided ...’. In this way he betrays the circular decay of male domestic dominance due to affliction: Catholic men are deprived of their homes and hence cannot exert masculine control over the private sphere or help more junior males establish households and thus assert *their* manhood (so the story continues ...). Similarly, Hide refers to the tortured history of the early Christian church, making a significant parallel to his own times: ‘Then were not Catholikes permitted to beare office in the comonweale [sic], only because they were Catholikes’. In this understated comparison we can begin to appreciate the circumstances which, I will propose, made the classical /
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180 Thomas Hide, *A Consolatorie Epistle to the Afflicted Catholikes*, (Louvain: 1580), sig.[Dviii']. All further references to this edition will be cited as *Consolatorie Epistle*.

181 [Robert Persons], *A Brief Discovrs containing certayne Reasons Why Catholiques refuse to goe to Church. Written by a Learned and vertuous man, to a frend of his in England And Dedicated... to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie* (Douai: 1580), fol.[1']. All further references to this edition will be cited as *Brief Discovrs*.

182 Hide, *Consolatorie Epistle*, sig.[Bvii'].
humanist concept of the *vir civilis* an unreachable fantasy for many Catholic men in this era.

Hence we can glimpse the way these texts are sensitive to the deterioration of the social authority of Catholic men, a shift which, I will argue, had a destabilising effect on their gender identity. But if these works are thus seen to be male-oriented, to be foregrounding the crisis in Catholic manhood, what behavioural solutions do they suggest?

In a move which, for me, represents a vital attempt to re-envisage Catholic masculinity in the face of cultural pressure, these texts counselled men to take the option of *submissiveness*, of political quietism. For instance, movement along the road of progress, according to H.B., involved staying put: pro-active conduct was beyond the Catholic's remit. He advised his readers that 'patience is necessarie for you', 183 going on to recommend to them the positive possibility of a *passive* death, including the 'patient shedding' of their blood'. 184 For H.B., the accent was on *emotional* apathy. In the case of one's goods being expropriated, the reader was directly urged *not* to react: '... they that trouble you shall reioyce yf you be moued, ...'. 185 Correspondingly, in Hide's view, an elevated state of spiritual sacrifice could be achieved through such acquiescence, instructing his readers that: '... you may be Martyrs without stroke of sworde, if you keep patience in your heartes', 186 his text closing with an image of a collection of figures carrying crosses and further Biblical quotations exhorting the value of bearing affliction (Figure 9).

---

184 H.B., dedication, *Consolatory Letter*, p.6 - my emphasis.
186 Hide, *Consolatory Epistle*, sig. Fiili*".
While such texts, therefore, function to persuade men to cultivate a resigned response to their situation, they also promote what may be regarded as a form of passive resistance: recusancy. These works all strongly assert that it is not right for faithful Catholics to attend Protestant services - as the so-called 'Church Papists' or 'schismatics' did to avoid fines and harassment - advocating instead a form of socio-religious separatism or 'spiritual apartheid', as Alexandra Walsham calls it.\(^{187}\)

The reasons for 'refusal' (as it is often designated in contemporary texts) may be seen, once again, to be directed at male believers, since these books - amongst other highly emotive arguments, such as spiritual 'suicide' and heretical 'infection' - accentuate the emulative visibility of men in the community. Indeed, Walsham has stated that these works 'appear unduly concerned with instilling in upper-class males the stamina for dissent'.\(^{188}\) Hence Persons declares that a prominent Protestant church-going Catholic male is causing a 'scandal' by inciting others to negative imitation: '...: if he be a man of any calling, his example shall induce some other, as wyfe, children, frendes, servantes, or the lyke, to doe the same'.\(^{189}\) In a similar vein, Thomas Hill's *The Quartron of Reasons* betrays a self-consciousness concerning his position as a societal role model, stating twice in the text that his 'scandalous' presence at Protestant services would 'encourage others by mine example to help forward the same'\(^{190}\) and that 'others would by this myne example, bee Confirmed in Schisme, and Heresie ...'.\(^{191}\)

These quotations serve to confirm not only the vital significance of exemplarity in Renaissance culture, but also, once more, the 'maleness' of this consolatory / recusant literature, the 'masculinity' of its interests. However, what fascinates me is that the

\(^{187}\) Walsham, *Church Papists*, p.35. 
\(^{188}\) Walsham, *Church Papists*, p.36. 
\(^{189}\) Persons, *Brief Discovrs*, fol.14'. 
\(^{190}\) Tho[mas] Hill, *The Quartron of Reasons of Catholike Religion, With As Many Briefe Reasons of Refusall* (Antwerp: 1600), p.172. All further references to this edition will be cited as *Quartron of Reasons.*
strategies Catholic men are being encouraged to adopt to cope with their oppression are, arguably, feminine. These texts instruct Catholic males in the ways of personal passivity and submissiveness, to be recusant and thus withdraw into the private sphere. Hence they might be viewed to teach men how to perform the behaviour ‘normally’ expected of their mothers and sisters. Thus these treatises, I would suggest, ask Catholic males to transform their gender identities, to be ‘ladylike’, to develop the qualities of ideal *femininity* as it was represented in Renaissance society. Put another way, these works seem to intimate that the best man in a time of persecution is *like* a woman.

But would men in Renaissance England have recognised that the new passive, recusant form of manhood was approximate to femininity? I believe that this is possible. I will return to the question of the ‘womanish’ nature of recusancy later on, but for now I want to demonstrate the way in which the *docility* championed by the late sixteenth-century literature we have examined was widely regarded to be a specifically *female* attribute within Catholic literary culture in this period. By analysing a selection of devotional works of this era, we will be able to witness the fact that the passive qualities promoted in consolatory / recusant texts were believed to be powerfully possessed by women saints. Indeed, I will propose that the abundance of female hagiographies produced in this period may possibly have been due to their being utilised as exemplary ‘handbooks’ helping Catholic men to attain the state of ‘feminine’ meekness which, as I have argued, was ideologically constructed as the appropriate response to suffering.

It is in this light that I turn to the extensive religious *oeuvre* composed by Tobie Matthew (excepting the *Confessions*, which I will explore in detail in the next section). The content range of Matthew’s texts reveals that the issues which were so important to the late Elizabethan Catholic writers were still intensely relevant in his era. Hence we see

---

Matthew creating a series of 'self-help' manuals concerning the development of the already familiar characteristics of patience, humility and benignity.\(^{192}\) These translations may be seen to purposely provide support for those seeking the 'suitable' approach to subjection as set out in the consolatory / recusant treatises of the previous century. Thus Matthew may be seen to rewrite these European works in order to bring them into new use in the English Stuart context where - although things may have slightly improved for the upper classes - his fellow 'papists' still needed practical literary sustenance.

Indeed, his tracts could be seen to directly relate to the recusant ideology of managing the current socio-religious crisis through *acquiescence*. In one text we read: 'By this most precious [sic] vertue of *Patience*, wee shall obtaine, and conserue all the gifts of God, and become superiours to all our enemies. For *Patience* will fortify vs in the confession of our Faith, against tirants [sic]; giuing vs strength to endure all their torments'.\(^{193}\) Meanwhile, another of his translations suggests self-abasement as a mode of braving tribulation: '... the humble man acknowledges his faults and sines [sic] and considers himselfe to be whorthy [sic] of any punishment; and no affliction comes to him, which he esteemes not to be lesse, then it should haue bene, in respect of his faults; ...'.\(^{194}\) Furthermore, in Matthew's *Missive of Consolation* - which Feil claims is a translation,
rather than an 'original' work - the role of a (male) Christian is precisely defined as one
of passivity: '... his pay is conditioned rather upon his suffering, then his acting,...'.

Yet if these works may be thus seen to function in and for English Catholic
culture, a culture in which submission had been made ideologically desirable through the
dissemination of recusant texts, Matthew’s works also, more intriguingly, make manifest
the proximity of this passive ideal to femininity. In Matthew’s corpus, women are
represented as excelling at the virtues men are advised to acquire in these troubled times.
This is particularly true of the Virgin Mary, who is displayed as a superlative model for
docility. ‘This Humilitie was founde after a most perfect manner, in the most sacred
Queene of Angells: ...’, reads one of his translations, while The Missive of Consolation,
tells us that ‘being the purest of all creatures, she was ... the greatest of all patients’.

But is not only the Madonna who is depicted as being so acquiescently able. In
1619 - the period in which he also translated the Confessions - Matthew produced the life
of Maria Maddelena de Patsi (1566-1607) and later, in the 1640s, when the Civil War
had pushed him into exile once more, he went on to render Saint Teresa’s Spanish
memoirs into English. I would suggest that this intellectual focus on the lives of female

195 Feil suggests that this text’s prefatory comments about struggling with the English language are
inappropriate to Matthew - Sir Tobie Matthew, footnote, p.249.
196 Missive of Consolation Sent from Flanders, to the Catholikes of England, [trans? by Tobie Matthew]
(Louvain: 1647), p.16. All references will be from this edition cited as Missive.
197 Roderiguez, Humilitie, trans. by [Matthew], p.279.
198 Missive, [trans? by Matthew], p.27.
199 Vincentio Puccini, The Life of the Holy and Venerable Mother Suor Maria Maddelena de Patsi, a
Florentine Lady, & Religious of the Order of the Carmelites. Written in Italian by ... her Ghostly Father..., trans by [Tobie Matthew] ([St.Omer]:1619). All further references to this edition will be cited as Maria
Maddelena de Patsi. Allison and Rogers - Literature of the English Counter-Reformation, ii, 106-107 -
ex inexplicably suggest that Matthew may have only edited this work, adding the dedication and marginal notes
- I would propose that since they cannot put forward an alternative translator then it seems likely that it was
Matthew was involved - Feil agrees, Sir Tobie Matthew, p.137. See The Oxford Dictionary of Saints, ed. by
Farmer, p.270 and The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. by E.A.Livingstone, 3rd edn

200 The Flaming Hart or The Life of the Glorious S. Teresa, Foundresse of the Reformation, of the Order of
the All-Immaculate Virgin-Mother, our B. Lady of Mount Carmel. The History of her life, was written by
the Saint her selfe ..., trans. by [Tobie Matthew] (Antwerp: 1642). All future references to this edition will
religious figures exposes the exemplary requirements of Matthew’s audience. Although I am conscious of the female readership of the biographies of women saints in the medieval era, I would argue that there was a growing male ‘market’ for these texts in Renaissance England. Since the men of the persecuted Catholic community had been, as we have seen, pressed to adopt a posture of passive endurance, it seems plausible that such hagiographies might have been helpful guides to men striving to achieve this compliant stance. Indeed, even if evidence of the actual readership (marginalia, entries in commonplace books) of such Renaissance texts is notoriously hard to find, there is some proof that these works were at least intended for a male audience, as I will demonstrate later.

Concentrating on Matthew’s lives of Teresa and Maria Maddelena, we can easily see how these female protagonists might have offered Catholic male readers rich illustrations of the qualities required to withstand suffering as first set out by late sixteenth-century polemical literature. For instance, his preface to the edition of Teresa’s story lists her ‘most profound Humility; ... ; A most strict loue of Pouerty; A most vnshaken, and inuincible Patience; in despight of sharpe Sicknesses, tormenting paines, and endlesse persecutions; ...’. Thus Teresa is clearly advertised as owning the emotional survival techniques we have seen to be promoted by recusant ideology.

Yet here - as we will see is also true in the case of Maria Maddelena - there is a problem: women are just ‘too good’ at this self-sacrificing behaviour. Matthew beseeches


his readers to question the validity of Teresa’s consistently harsh criticisms of her own conduct, stating that: ‘... she gaue her self too great scope ... to violate her owne excellent fame, by certaine too venturous dashes of her penn, which was driuen too too hastily on, by the impulse of a kind of inordinate Humilitie’. 203

Maria Maddelena’s ‘inordinate humility’, however, exceeds beyond verbal self-degradation. Matthew’s translation reveals her life to have been a disturbing catalogue of physical self-harm, eating disorders and depression. As Matthew informs us in the prefatory material: ‘... she wore a girdle sometymes next to her skin, all imbrodered as it were with sharp iron nayles ...’. 204 Yet even more shocking is the way she apparently cured a fellow nun’s leprosy: ‘... with her tongue she began to licke her handes and armes, in those places where the pestiferous euill did most afflict her ...’. 205

The glorification of such, arguably, self-destructive actions may have had some resonance for the Catholic community who were, as we saw earlier, evidently trying to find value in their painful experiences. Indeed, Matthew’s preface to the reader apparently echoes ‘an ancient Romane’ in saying that: ‘O yong man ... thou art borne in such an age, as wherein thy mind hath need to be fortifyed by such examples...’. 206 However, our translator also attempts to limit Maria Maddelena’s power as a paragon, reminding us that: ‘... in the reading of Saints Liues men ought to carry themselves with great sobriety. Catholikes must be sober, and not venture to [sic] freely upon the imitation of euery thing, wherof they find an example in the life of Saints ...’. 207 Here one might argue that we

203 [Matthew], ‘The Preface, of the Translatovr, to the Christian, and Civil Reader’, St. Teresa, Flaming Hart, sig. ***:

204 [Matthew], ‘The Preface to the Reader’, Puccini, Maria Maddelena de Patsi, sig.[****8].
205 Puccini, Maria Maddelena de Patsi, trans. by Matthew, p.148.
206 [Matthew], ‘The Preface to the Reader’, Puccini, Maria Maddelena de Patsi, sig.[*6].
207 [Matthew], ‘The Preface to the Reader’, Puccini, Maria Maddelena de Patsi, sig.**3’ - my emphasis.
witness Catholic males being straightforwardly enjoined to 'follow' holy women - but only so far.

Aside from these two extensive, sometimes outlandish, hagiographies, Matthew also published a description of the personal history of his friend, Lucy Knatchbull. Acting as an abbess in the Low Countries, she becomes, in Matthew's text, a paradigm of passive courage in the context of persecution: '... by her Blessed Life and happy Death, [she] did giue such rare Documents of all piety and virtue, both by her examples and instructions ...'.\(^{208}\) Similarly, Matthew's Missive of Consolation praises a selection of women whose conduct since the beginning of the Civil War had been exemplary in the expected 'inactive' fashion. These are, significantly, women of the world, the text describing the Marchionesse of Winchester, asserting that: '... the singularity of her suffering, requireth an extraordinary animadversion', further commenting that 'her zeal, patience and humility is reported [to] be such, as they seeme to haue moved God to illustrate them by such a triall, as only the Primitiue Saints have had, ...'.\(^{209}\)

Indeed, as we may witness in the work of Richard Smith - Matthew's ecclesiastical enemy - this textual construction of female 'secular saints' was part of a popular literary trend. Acting as models for imitation, these texts also paid homage to contemporary women's crucial role in the survival of Catholicism (an issue which I will discuss in detail later). Smith's treatise focuses, posthumously, on the celebrated priest-harbourer, Lady Montague, to whom he had once been chaplain. Quite predictably perhaps, rather than emphasising the audaciousness of her religious enterprise, the work eulogises her patience which, we are told, brought two of her adversaries, literally, to their

---

\(^{208}\) Tobie Matthew, *A Relation of the holy and happy Life and Death of the Lady Lucy Knatchbull Abbess of her Founding the English Monastery of Benedictines at Ghent ...*, ed. by David Knowles (London: Sheed and Ward, 1931), p.22. This text was originally written 1642 and circulated in manuscript. All future references to this edition will be cited as *Lucy Knatchbull*.

\(^{209}\) Missive, [trans. by Matthew?], pp.325-326.
knees before her\textsuperscript{210} and highlights her humility, informing us that she was 'frequently accustomed to say, that she was a sack of dung ...'.\textsuperscript{211} Smith completes this 'canonisation' process by comparing Lady Montague to Augustine's mother, St. Monica ('to whome she may be resembled'), a juxtaposition which may suggest the paradigmatic significance of Monica in seventeenth-century Catholic culture - a point which it might prove useful to bear in mind during the examination of the \textit{Confessions} in the next section.

In this brief survey of sacred and secular female hagiographies, we are thus able to comprehend the immense importance of \textit{feminine exemplarity} in Catholic Renaissance England. I would suggest that the passivity and self-denial involved in the hegemonic concept of female gender identity in this period, taken to extremes in the lives of 'saintly' ladies, made such literary depictions of women the 'natural' archetypes for men struggling to achieve the quiescent reaction to oppression asked of them by recusant ideology. The women in these accounts have been seen to possess an almost frightening superbundance of patience and humility - the virtues contemporary texts stated were requisite for men in persecution - and therefore it would seem credible that Catholic males might such texts as emulative aids for developing these traits.

But was there a masculine 'price' to pay for this strategic adoption of a 'feminine'/docile identity? Looking at the example of Christ as he is portrayed in Matthew's devotional work, \textit{Of the Love of ... Jesus}, one might say yes. In this text, submissive behaviour is represented as being so identifiably \textit{female} that 'performing' it appears to actually lead to \textit{feminisation}, even for the Deity. In Matthew's work, Jesus' life is shown

\textsuperscript{210} \begin{small}The Life of the Most Honorable and Vertuous Lady The Lady Magdalen, Viscountesse Montague. Written in Latin, and published soone after her death, By Richard Smith, Doctor of Divinity, and her Confessour..., trans. by [John] C[uthberth] F[ursdon], ([n.p.]:1627), p.23. All further references to this edition will be cited as Montague.\end{small}

to be replete with illustrations of non-participatory heroism suitable for persecuted Catholics to mimic, the text teaching us that: 'Fortitude is both actiue and passiue, yea and the Passiue is farre the greater, and farre the harder of the two'. Nevertheless, what is most fascinating is that this pacifist godhead, whose heart, we are told, was 'a mine of patie[n]ce', is explicitly depicted as a maternal figure. We are enlightened by the text that one of Christ's functions is 'of a Mother by cherishing', Matthew later referring to the Bible as 'another manner of store-house, of the tender and maternall loue of our Lord God to man'. Thus it appears that the passivity of Jesus has ultimately cost Him his masculinity. Matthew, it seems, cannot imagine an acquiescent God who has not fallen into femininity and I would propose that this is because meekness was so inescapably gendered female in his cultural context.

Thus even the most pervasive and long-standing image of patient male suffering, the icon of the non-retaliative Christ, is seen to be ostensibly transformed into a feminine archetype in the Catholic literature of this period. Richard Rambuss, in his discussion of

---

213 [Tobie Matthew], Of the Love of ovr only Lord and Saviovr, Jesvs Christ. Both that which he beareth to Vs; and that also which we are obliged to beare to Him. Declared By the principall Mysteries of the Life, and Death of, our Lord; as they are deliuered to vs in Holy Scripture ... ([St.Omer]:1622), p.305. Attributed to Matthew by Allison and Rogers, Literature of the English Counter-Reformation, ii, 104. All further references to this edition will be cited as Jesus.
214 [Matthew], Jesus, p.392.
215 [Matthew], Jesus, p.8.
216 [Matthew], Jesus, p.217. Carol Walker Bynum has pointed out in her discussion of Bernard of Clairvaux's recourse to the maternal that the female, nurturing God is 'an image of dependence' - Jesus as Mother, Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: California U.P., 1982), p.160. I am grateful to Ana-Elena Gonzalez for this reference. Hence it may be that the emergence of a 'motherly' God in the Catholic literature of Renaissance England embodies a sense of the community's religio-political vulnerability and possibly even betrays an 'over-reliance' upon women in Catholic spiritual and social life. Catholic writers in the Renaissance period made frequent recourse to the work of St. Bernard - see Gregory Schweers, 'Bernard of Clairvaux's Influence on English Recusant Letters: The Case of Robert Southwell', American Benedictine Review, 41: ii (1990), 157-166.
217 Suffering is also constructed as feminine in Matthew's translation of Juan de Avila's work, The Audi Filia, or a Rich Cabinet Fvll of5piritvall Iewells... ([St. Orner]:1620). Attributed to Matthew by Allison and Rogers, Literature of the English Counter-Reformation, ii, 105. There Christ's crucifixion is depicted in startling terms, this text declaring of the Passion: '... who shall recount that great loue, and great griefe, wherewith thou [Christ] dewrest all men into the wombe of thy hart, groaning deeply for their sins, with the groanes of labour, like them of child-birth' - p.413. All future references to this edition will be cited as Audi Filia.
the homoerotics of Renaissance religious poetry, has insisted upon the persisting masculinity of the ‘feminised’ Christ. Nevertheless, I would suggest that because of the contemporary culture of exemplary female docility I have identified, there might have remained a feminine frisson around a passively portrayed Jesus for Catholic readers.

However, as I gestured towards stating earlier, hagiographies of women may be also seen to attempt to restrict the play of female exemplarity. As we noticed earlier when examining the somewhat distressing life of Maria Maddelena de Patsi, Matthew stresses that the emulation of such drastic women must be kept within ‘safe’ bounds. Nevertheless, this is not the only way in which Matthew and his contemporaries attempt to curtail the imitation of specifically feminine figures. In a move which is the inverse of many Renaissance writers’ portrayal of Christ, much literature of this period endeavours to masculinise sacred females.

For instance, Matthew defines Maria Maddelena’s devotional and intellectual capacities in male terms: ‘... an example of a venerable, & most holy creature, by sex a woman, but in spirit, and strength of mind, more then a man’. Thus even as Matthew compliments the ‘clever lady’, he contrives to isolate the talents worth emulating from femininity. Indeed, a similar operation occurs in Smith’s description of Lady Montague, who, he says, faced the heightened persecution following the ‘Powder Treason’ with ‘a manly courage’, in this way separating the female from the fearlessness men might profitably mimic. In fact, Rambuss has noticed a parallel pattern in the Catholic poet, Richard Crashaw’s poem on St. Teresa, where she is described as: ‘... a WOMAN for the

---

219 [Matthew], ‘The Preface to the Reader’, Puccini, *Maria Maddelena de Patsi*, sig.[*7*].
Angelical heighth of speculation, for Masculine courage of performance, more than a woman'.

For Rambuss, this statement represents a realignment of 'gender identifications from the realm of essence to the space of performative hyper-gender', further stressing that the saint 'seems not to transcend but rather occupy all imaginable gender space'.

For me, though, such textual attempts to render the power of such female role models as somehow male - or at least, non-feminine - seem much less liberating. Although this is may be seen as typical of the Renaissance humanist discursive depiction of female scholars, I believe that the motives of this specific seventeenth-century literary manoeuvre can be clearly comprehended if we consider the specific quandary of contemporary Catholic Englishmen.

Coerced - as I have said before - by religious oppression and recusant ideology to cultivate the passive qualities 'usually' accorded to women, Catholic males desperately needed 'female-starring' texts as guides to assist them to develop these virtues. Nevertheless, I would suggest that the very concept of a man imitating a woman would have been deeply disturbing at the level of gender. This is why these texts strive to 'dress up' these saintly women in male 'outfits', to enact a kind of exemplary tranvestism.

These works nervously tell their male readers that it is 'okay' to mirror these females because their strengths are 'really' male preserves, even insinuating that 'deep down' these formidable religious females are actually men. Therefore, this literature may be seen to venture to smoothe over the 'cracks' in this particular cross-gender emulative process.

In this way these texts offer us not only an intriguing insight into the sexual dynamics of

---

221 Quoted by Rambuss in Closet Devotions, p.39.
222 Rambuss, Closet Devotions, p.39.
223 Rambuss, Closet Devotions, p.42.
224 See HH, p.49 and King, 'Book-Lined Cells', p.76.
exemplarity in Renaissance culture, but more importantly for our argument, provide indirect evidence of the *male-orientation* of these female hagiographical books. These works, arguably, would not need to endeavour to make exemplary women 'men' if they were angled towards a feminine audience who might have had a more 'comfortable' imitative empathy with these female-identified figures.

Yet there are more specific signs that these texts were intended for a masculine readership. It has come to my attention that while these female saints' lives are sometimes dedicated to women, they often ultimately betray themselves as being essentially made for men. For instance, using Matthew's *oeuvre* for demonstration, we can see that his biography of Lucy Knatchbull is - quite appropriately - addressed to the members of her convent. But when Matthew asks his audience to take him at his word concerning his friend's character, he divulges the *masculinity* of his imagined (cynical) reader, calling him a 'bastard' (in a very circumlocutory manner!). Matthew declares that his account:

...will much better prove to be true than he, whosoever he be, shall be able to prove himself the man he is. I mean not that he should prove himself to be his Father's Son (which is much harder task), but even so much as his Mother's, whereof he will easily be apt to think that he cannot possibly fail. 225

Analogously, Matthew's translation of *Audi Filia* is a text which from the title forward seems to announce its textual femininity, its content recounting a confessor's relationship with Donna Sancha, a young woman of exemplary piety. 226 Nevertheless, Matthew opens it up to universal usage in his preface to the text: '... you cannot chuse but discerne, that it is not only meant for Virgins; but for all others also, if they be Christians...'. 227 However, what is more telling is that the chapter headings unveil the

---

225 Matthew, *Lucy Knatchbull*, p.117.
226 The title is drawn from the patristic heritage of literary advice to women, 'Hear o daughter' being the opening words of St. Jerome's letter to Paula's daughter, Eustochium, on the subject of guarding her virginity - Epistle 22.30 in the Erasmus edition.
227 Avila, *Audi Filia*, trans. by [Matthew], sig.[***4'}.
The fact that the text is a handbook for male behaviour, the work describing the matter of one section as: ‘Of the great peace, which our Lord God giueth to them that fight manfully against this Enemy; & of the much that it importeth vs, for the overcomming of him, to fly from familiarity with women’. Even if Matthew perhaps did not heed his own text’s counsel in this issue, this labelling still makes it blatantly obvious that even when women were the focus of a Catholic text men were the expected audience.

Looking, then, at an overview of English Renaissance Catholicism, it becomes apparent that there was a fairly coherent ideological shift towards the promotion of a passive, politically inert masculinity in the face of the persecution of the Elizabethan period. From the concerns of Tobie Matthew’s translations (humility, patience and so on), it is manifest that this alternative version of Catholic male gender identity remained current in the seventeenth century. As we have seen, there are grounds to suggest that this ‘new’ model of Catholic manhood was palpably / perilously close to docile requirements of ‘conventional’ womanhood as it was understood by English Renaissance society as a whole and set out in contemporary Catholic devotional works. Indeed, as I have attempted to demonstrate, there are some indications that Catholic men utilised female hagiographical texts as a means of imitatively generating the passive / feminine

---

228 The text tells us that the ‘original’ writer actually taught in seminaries and was thus involved in the pedagogical development of Catholic masculinity - *Audi Filia*, sig.**3**.
230 I am aware that Persons produced treatises justifying rebellious civic action, Peter Holmes stating that the chameleon-like Jesuit altered his stance to suit the circumstances of the time - see *Resistance and Comprimise*, p.111 and p.129. Arnold Pritchard also questions Persons’ loyalist claims - *Catholic Loyalism*, p.10. Indeed, Field’s response to Persons casts contemporary doubt upon the Jesuit’s advocacy of political passivity, stating that: ‘... if it had ben done with such modesty and humilitie you speake of, you would not so haue betrayed her maiestie with a ludas Kysse...’ - *Caveat*, sig.AIiiii*. However, I would argue that beyond this core of international ‘power brokers’, most Catholic Englishmen wanted a ‘quiet’ life and hence I believe that they would have taken this literature’s pacifist message at face value, despite the possibly duplicitous intentions of authors such as Persons. Indeed, even if this ideological trend towards a docile / feminine manhood was occasionally punctuated by works propagating a more militant masculinity, it does not follow that previously endorsed gender ideal was eradicated - the overall impression is of Catholic men striving to find a form of manhood to match, not resist, their subjection.
masculinity demanded of them by the conditions of oppression and the recusant worldview.

Renaissance Catholicism was, then, a culture which had ostensibly laid aside the humanistic paradigm of civic manliness when confronted by repressive regimes which circumscribed ‘papist’ men’s socio-political participation. In its place had been instituted a ‘private’, docile male ideal, which, apparently, turned to women for exemplary support. It is this ideologically modified form of Catholic masculinity that I will - in the next section - show to be present in Matthew’s Confessions. I will suggest that Matthew drew upon this already circulating alternative version of manhood and it is this - rather than his personal proclivities - which explains the ‘anti-humanist’ perspective of the text and its emulative emphasis on female figures, as brought to our notice by Watts and Sutcliffe. Without understanding the work’s social and intellectual context, we would never appreciate the translation’s purpose to further popularise a particular type of passive / feminine male gendering and to thus offer Catholic men a practical mode of existence suitable to their crippled circumstances.

Yet before we analyse the Confessions in detail, there are a few more social factors which may have impacted upon Catholic masculinity in this period that need to be considered - that is, the practises of recusancy and priest-harbouring. Recusancy was to all intents and purposes, the idee fixe of ‘papist’ literature in the late sixteenth century. These texts thus advanced, I will propose, a form of social behaviour which effectively diminished, even feminised, Catholic men. Having already seen their professional prospects dwindle, the exercise of recusancy meant that such males were also denied another significant part of their public life - churchgoing - and were in this way apparently
severed from their Protestant male associates.\textsuperscript{231} Hence the experience of recusancy, arguably, resulted in men being forced back into the house, once more exhibiting the inappropriate nature of the civic humanist notion of masculinity for such oppressed Catholic males.

Furthermore, the propagation of this ‘homely’ reaction to persecution - like the championing of patience - requested a response to the contemporary crisis for which women’s social conditioning and positioning gave them a ‘head start’. Indeed, the increasing tendency in Renaissance culture to define domestic space as \textit{female}, necessarily involved men entering a \textit{feminised} domain when they were pushed back indoors by this advocated policy of recusancy and tyranny in general.\textsuperscript{232} Yet while their husbands’ masculinity was thus revised and even damaged by the ‘domestication’ of Catholicism in this period, the same shift worked to the advantage of English wives. Indeed, according to John Bossy, this new exigent emphasis on religion ‘behind closed doors’ accounts for the preeminent role played by females in the survival of Catholicism in this arduous era,\textsuperscript{233} women being so dominant that Bossy has described Catholic society in Renaissance England as a ‘matriarchy’.\textsuperscript{234}

In fact, historians generally agree that women were brilliant recusants, featuring prominently in the court records for the offence, even though they were notoriously difficult to charge due to their social ‘invisibility’ at this time (their spouses were seen as

\textsuperscript{231} There is some evidence, however, to suggest that social interactions between Catholics and Protestants continued unimpeded. As Walsharn writes: ‘... Tudor and Stuart Catholicism might also be better characterised as semi-separating’ - \textit{Church Papists}, p.95.

\textsuperscript{232} Although the male ‘secular’ sphere might have been seen to stretch \textit{into} the Renaissance household - as I argued to be especially the case in colonial Virginia - I would suggest that by being denied the fluidity of movement between the \textit{oikos} and \textit{polis}, civically deprived Catholic men were put in a ‘womanly’ position in this era.

\textsuperscript{233} Bossy, ‘Character of Elizabethan Catholicism’, p.225.

being liable for their actions). Thus even if a Catholic man opted to avoid the difficulties of a 'housebound' recusant ideology and become a 'Church Papist' or 'Schismatic' - to frequent Protestant services without believing - his wife's non-attendance could still have compromised his masculine image in the community. Significantly, Bossy, following Rowse, calls such an inability to enforce a wife’s superficial conformity ‘a weak-kneed evasion of patriarchal responsibility’. Indeed, a recusant wife could further undermine a Catholic man’s already limited civic aspirations, Rowlands citing the example of York’s Lord Major Dinley who was castigated for such an ‘evasion’ in the late sixteenth century, being consequently, as she puts it, ‘formally lectured on the disgrace of a man set to govern a city who could not govern his household’.

Furthermore, even if, as Alexandra Walsham argues, the prevalence of women in the recusancy records does simply suggest a ‘division of labour’ in dissent - the man going to church to fend off fines, while the woman kept the spiritual ‘home fire’ burning - it is still feasible that this dynamic would have had a debilitating effect on the Catholic male’s sense of authority as the family’s religious future would have been in female hands.

Moreover, those men who did decide to take the recusant position in the private sphere, also possibly saw their command compromised there too, not only because of their financial insecurity, but because their wives had carved out influential roles for themselves as priest-harbourers. Since the advent of the missionary movement, the

235 Marie B. Rowlands has discussed this issue concerning various governmental attempts to deal with women recusants in this period - ‘Recusant Women, 1560-1640’ in Women in English Society 1500 - 1800, ed. by Mary Prior (London and New York: Methuen, 1985), 149-180 (p.156).
236 Bossy, English Catholic Community, p.155.
237 Rowlands, ‘Recusant Women’, p.151. The desperation of Catholic men who saw their already dubious civic aspirations threatened by their recusant partners is obvious in Rowland’s detailing of the situation in York: one man said he had dragged his wife to church, whilst another apparently beat his spouse in a failed endeavour to end her ‘refusal’ - p.151.
238 Walsham, Church Papists, p.81.
Catholic clergy had been obliged to rely on sympathetic members of the aristocracy and gentry for protection from the authorities. Whether they were seeking an itinerant or settled religious existence, the fact remained that the fathers needed the shelter of households. Thus the 'female' space became absolutely central to the apostolic enterprise. Indeed, women as wives, widows and spinsters played a key part in the hiding of priests, as Rowlands has highlighted, three being executed for it.\(^{239}\) As she points out, women performed this dangerous task with breathtaking professionalism, even ingeniously evoking their femininity to disarm the governmental pursuivants: 'They exploited their supposed frailty and innocence; they provided the searchers with meals which distracted their attention; they pleaded bodily infirmity'.\(^{240}\)

Hence the married Catholic man may have witnessed his wife assuming more control in the house after the priests arrived. In fact, in the case of there being a resident chaplain, there was, as Bossy has suggested, the potential for the cleric's alliance with the female partner to upset the balance of the marital relationship.\(^{241}\) Intriguingly, it was this weakening of the Catholic husband's domestic dominion which was picked up on by the ex-Jesuit, John Gee, writing of how:

> Many a poore Gentleman, that cannot rule his wife ... is faine to weare their [priests'] mark \textit{in capite} ... . They must be fed with the daintiest cheere, ... that can be got; when oft-times the poor husband is fain to slink away hungry to his rest.\(^{242}\)

From the preceding discussion, it is simple to see how being driven by persecution and recusant ideology back into the household - the realm of the 'weaker sex ' - would, arguably, have had an altering, if not downright detrimental, effect not only on Catholic

\(^{239}\) Rowlands, 'Recusant Women', p.158.  
\(^{242}\) Gee, \textit{Foot out of the Snare}, pp.18-19.
men's sense of their masculinity, but also upon Protestant perceptions of their religious opposites' manhood. It is perhaps no surprise, then, that recusancy was rapidly correlated with *femininity* in Renaissance culture, even by Catholics. Hill's *The Quartron of Reasons*, for instance, discloses that to occupy this principled position was to also be seen to adopt a 'feminised' stance. Employing an epistolary format, the 'narrator' sets out to defend his recusancy against his critical correspondents, who goad him by saying that it is an option only taken by the 'inferior' sex, recalling that: '... you write, that you suppose me to haue more knowledge, then to answere with sillie women, it is against my conscience, &c. ...'.

Whilst the 'narrator, with his '&c', seems here to be dismissive of this notion of the 'feminisation' of the recusant male, his final refusal to become a schismatic ultimately mirrors the 'female' response his adversary attacked, concluding his argument in the following terms: '... now to come to the aunswere, which you say women, & such sillie soules are accustomed to make; I should do contrary to my conscience: which thing in no case is lawfull to be done'.

If Catholic men could not separate their recusancy from femininity, it is hardly incredible that anti-Catholic writers propagandistically punished recusant men, identifying this behaviour with females and a deficient kind of masculinity. As John Baxter stated it, recusancy was the stuff of 'olddoting [sic] dames, and yoong minions, old foolish fathers, and yoong boyes, that cannot tell why they were borne ...'.

In this section, then, I have attempted to lay out the cultural context in and for which Tobie Matthew's *Confessions* was 'written'. We have seen the way in which Catholics were persecuted in Renaissance England, being subject to crippling fines, property confiscation, oaths which divided their loyalties, professional ostracism and even

---

244 Hill, *Quartron of Reasons*, p.181.
the death penalty. I showed how Catholic literature of the late sixteenth century specifically registered the impact of this suffering on the men of the community, offering them a passive, recusant model of masculinity to replace the civic humanist paradigm which was increasingly unattainable for them. I discussed how this revised model of Catholic manhood was similar to the hegemonic version of docile femininity in Catholic devotional works and Renaissance culture in general, and how there is evidence to declare that men utilised female hagiographies in pursuit of their 'redesigned' submissive manliness.

Following this discussion of the feminisation of Catholic men through the dissemination of an masculine ideal of acquiescence, I went on to show how these late sixteenth-century texts also placed men, literally, in a female position through the advocation of recusancy, this practice putting men in the domestic sphere and giving women a religious source of familial power which could be used to undermine their husband's authority in the household.

With this backdrop in place, it is tempting to consider why Catholic men, such as Tobie Matthew, were characterised by their religious adversaries as being too close to women, either in their relationships or in their gender identity (sometimes both). I believe it is conceivable that the sexualisation and feminisation of Catholic men in the Protestant polemical discourse of this period might represent evidence that the modification of Catholic masculinity we have discussed was apparent to the contemporary Protestant community.\footnote{Lisa Jardine has drawn my attention to the way in which the 'spin' concerning Prince Charles' supposedly 'reckless' dash with Villiers to Spain to 'woo' the Infanta in 1623 might represent interesting supporting evidence for the 'feminine' gender identity of recusant men. By staging this officially organised event as an, apparently, 'laddish' act, the Jacobean hierarchy might be seen to have worked to reassure the English public that the heir apparent was securely Protestant - he was a virile male and, therefore, not a recusant (verbal communication).} The preoccupation of anti-Catholic discourse with 'papist' hetero- and

\footnote{B[axter], Toile, p.106.}
homosexual excess and effeminacy might, then, be regarded as an imprecise reaction to a Catholic maleness which was, arguably, evolving towards a passive 'femininity' under the pressures of persecution and recusant ideology. Becoming closer to women in the domestic setting and at the level of gender 'performance', Catholic men were, perhaps, both sexually menacing because of their apparently privileged access to female privacy and effete due to their submissive homeliness. Indeed, this may be the deeper meaning of Sutcliffe's description of Tobie Matthew as 'addicted to the feminine gender'.

Yet whatever the cause of Protestant apprehensions concerning Catholic men's 'proximity' to women, the most important thing we can grasp from analysing this historical context is a crucial understanding of the way in which Matthew's Confessions is embracing and evangelistically promoting this 'new' ideal of a patient, anti-secular masculinity. As we shall see in the next section, Matthew's translation may be seen to draw upon this recusant gender ideology, using Augustine's work to reject the classical/humanist civic version of manhood and espouse instead a more historically apposite private, spiritualised selfhood for Catholic men. Additionally, Matthew's text will be witnessed as following the apparent 'trend' of establishing holy females like Mary and Monica as exemplars for this re-organised 'feminine' manliness. It was, I shall argue, Matthew's purpose to produce a rendition of Augustine that would bring Catholic Englishmen comfort in their time of crisis, using the patristic text to ratify and further disseminate the recusant version of masculinity which persecution had compelled into being. With knowledge of this background, then, we can move on to analyse the Confessions with, hopefully, more sensitivity than Watts and Sutcliffe.
At the end of the last section, I suggested that the ostensible aim of Tobie Matthew’s *Confessions* was to translate the Church Father’s work in a way that validated and advanced the private, passive type of manliness which was initially established by late sixteenth-century Catholic ideology. In this part of the chapter, I hope to support this by close analysis of the text. Yet I shall also aim to demonstrate that this recusant rewriting of the patristic text also required a modification of intellectual methodologies: this Augustinian work is, fascinatingly, a humanist text against humanism. Thus I hope to show that whilst Matthew’s work subtly, but purposively, addresses the needs of subjugated Catholic men - thus preserving the practical, male-oriented teleology of the humanist process of translation - his Augustinian rendition may be also seen to ‘twist’ the meaning of humanism in ways that provoked his Protestant contemporaries and should excite modern scholars.

Hence Matthew’s text will be seen here to deliberately demand a different sort of pragmatic reading of its male audience, textual engagement with this work ideally leading to an unfamiliar sort of action: the repudiation of civic humanist manhood. Indeed, I will suggest that even the *emulative* aspect of humanist learning is recast in the Catholic *Confessions*, becoming a form of cross-gender identification as men are asked to imitate sacred women - rather than Roman men - as we have already seen to be the case in contemporary female hagiographies. Thus Matthew’s translation, as well as fostering a pre-existent version of ‘feminine’ recusant manhood, also implies a new praxis and ‘introverted’ goal for intellectual masculinity, one perhaps appropriate for learned Catholics deprived of the ‘traditional’ public objective of humanist scholarship.
In the second section of this chapter, we saw how there are tentative ways in which the *Confessions* gestures towards its author’s biographical context, presenting us with Matthew / ‘The Prodigal Son’’s possible personal, even contemplative use of the patristic piece. However, I also argued there that the text is not entirely decipherable in terms of Matthew’s private life, that whilst the work may have had a strengthening function for the translator, its publication signified a desire to more widely transmit its message concerning Augustine’s ostensive support for the new ideal of Catholic manhood.

Indeed, Matthew displays a keen awareness of his text’s cultural context. He clearly defines the intended *restorative* usage of his translation in an environment of religious persecution, where Catholics are vulnerable to falling away from their faith. The preface calls Augustine’s autobiography: ‘... a most substantiall food, if they [the readers] were Catholikes; ... a most soveraigne and potent phisicke, if through the misery of the tymes, they should be infected with the plague of heresy’. Hence the *Confessions* very conspicuously announces its design of *sustaining* and *reclaiming* Catholics in this season of tribulation.

In fact, the text makes a similar allusion to the contemporary situation when the margin specifically addresses those Catholic ‘splitters’ who attend Protestant church in Book VIII, Chapter ii. The main body of the work tells of how the Early Christian convert, Victorinus, was initially reluctant to go ‘public’ about his new-found beliefs, but finally overcame his dread of victimisation: ‘... by reading & praying, he had gathered stre[n]gth and did fear least he might be denyed by Christ before his Holy Angells, if he

were afraid to confess him before men; ...'. 248 Here Matthew coldly comments: 'Let Schismatikes looke well to this'. 249 In this way we see that the translation is utilitarian, it is intended to cause action - only the reading of this work is, arguably, meant to produce a kind of 'not doing', i.e. recusancy. 250

As we witnessed in the last section, the ideology of recusancy involved a particular ideal of masculinity which was submissive and 'domesticated'. It is no surprise, then, that the package of the Confessions contains this alternative paradigm of Catholic manhood. The translation obliquely promotes this substitute form of Catholic gender identity by various methods. Firstly, the since the translation of the texts in this period - as I have discussed before - means that such texts assume a status of 'originality' in being rewritten for a fresh context, it then follows that Matthew comes to ostensibly 'own' Augustine's words in a way which may be seen to permit him to articulate his own perceptions concerning contemporary humanist masculinity through the anti-classical statements of the main body of the text. By disparaging the classical / humanist version of manliness in this 'ventriloquised' way, Matthew's work ostensibly speaks against the paradigm of the vir civilis which was probably poignantly out of reach for many Catholic men, thus also subtly making a space for the recusant manly ideal to 'grow'. In addition, Matthew may be seen to give paratextual emphasis to the Augustinian text's distaste for

248 Confessions, Book VIII, Chapter ii, trans. by Matthew, p.350. 'Sed posteaquam legendo & inhando auxit firmitatem, timuitque negari a Christo coram angelis sanctis, si eum timeret coram hominibus confiteri ...' - p.195. Intriguingly, H.B. also cites this paragon to incite contemporary Catholics to openly profess their faith: 'A notable example, to be followed [sic] by many a Victorinus in our age: ...' - Consolatory Letter, p.28.

249 Matthew, printed annotation, Confessions, Book VIII, Chapter ii, p.350.

250 It also becomes apparent that the text has a subsidiary fundraising function. In Confessions, Book XIII, Chapter xxvi, the 'main' part of the translation reads: 'The gift is the thing it selfe, which he giueth, that doth impart those necessaries; as money, meate, drinke [...] cloths, lodging, assistance; but the fruite is the good, and the right will of the giuer' - p.782. In response to this Matthew adds the aside: 'Catholiks may heere learne how to be charitable to the Priests of God; who labour for the good of their soules' - p.782. Although this recommends action, it may be noted that this is once more aimed at the spiritual realm. 'Datum est res ipsa, quam dat, qui impartitur haecc necessaria, veluti est nu[m]mus, cibus, potus, vestimentum, tectum, adiutorium' - p.438.
the particular manliness advocated by the ancients and to also use the margins to extol the virtues of an anti-secular, anti-active male gendering.

As the work of a rhetorician ‘in recovery’, the Augustinian text expresses an ex-addict’s revulsion for ancient culture which offers Matthew an ideal opportunity to attack the contemporary civic humanist notion of intellectual masculinity. Early on, the text launches its assault on the very *pedagogical* foundation of classical / humanist learning, the main text making the following derogatory observation: ‘It is true, that there are hangings put vp at the entrance of our Grammar-schooles; but they serue not more for keeping things in a decent kind of priuatenes, then to couer and hide the foolish faults that are committed within’.

Furthermore, Matthew / Augustine recollects with anguish the violence inflicted upon young students by their tutors, asking God: ‘Is there any man, ... who be deuoutedly adhering to thee, is so affected to thy service, that he can thinke so sleightly of those racks, and hooks, and other torments ... , which we children susteyned at our Maisters hands?’.

Indeed, when the main text recounts how Augustine was thrashed as a child for playing ball instead of studying, Matthew bitterly remarks: ‘The schoole-maister deserved to be the better beaten of the two’.

In this way, I would suggest, Matthew’s translation presents a damning critique of the humanist educational system in Renai ss s sance England.

However, by being especially critical of the corporal punishment at the heart of contemporary teaching, Matthew’s text might also be possibly seen to subtly censure the particular kind of masculine gender identity which was theorised to be formed by this

---

251 *Confessions*, Book I, Chapter xiii, trans. by Matthew, p.35. ‘At enim vela pendent in liminibus grammaticarum scholarum, sed non illa magis honorem secreti, quam tegumentum erroris significant’ -p.23.

brutality. Indeed, Rebecca Bushnell has suggested that the physical cruelty inflicted in the
grammar schools in this period was part of a planned process of male definition.
Analysing Thomas Ingelend’s play The Disobedient Child (1570), she describes the way
in which ‘strong arm tactics’ were theoretically rationalised as generating boys’ self-
control, thus preventing them from later becoming ‘subject to the tyranny of women’. 254 If
recusant ideology, as we have seen, actually encouraged the cultivation of a ‘feminine’
persona, offering women as exemplars, then, arguably, Catholic males in this period felt
less need for this vicious humanist training in gender separation and Matthew’s
disparagement of ruthless tutors perhaps reflects this.

In addition, the text questions the morality of classical / humanist instruction by
challenging the ethical value of pagan literature for Christian culture. Matthew /
Augustine asserts that: ‘In those studyes I learn’t many wordes which might be profitable;
but they might also haue beene learn’t in thinges which were not vaine, and that is the safe
way, wherein children were to walke’, 255 the margin offering approval, calling this: ‘A
good lesson for Parents and maisters’. 256 Moreover, when the main text criticises the
supposedly salacious content of the classical / humanist educational curriculum which is
‘thought a matter of high importance, being countenanced in the eye of the world, and in
the sight of the laws, which ordeyne stipends for the Maisters; ...’, 257 Matthew comments
in the margin that this is: ‘An extreme abuse still on foot’. 258

254 Bushnell, A Culture of Teaching, p.28.
255 Confessions, Book I, Chapter xv, trans. by Matthew, p.40. ‘Didici enim in eis multa verba vtilia: sed &
in rebus non vanis disci possunt, & ea via tuta est, in qua pueri, ambularent’ - p.26.
256 Matthew, printed annotation, Confessions, Book I, Chapter xv, p.40.
257 Confessions, Book I, Chapter xvi, trans. by Matthew, p.41. ‘Et tamen o flumen Tartareum, iacantur in te
fillii hominem cum mercedibus vt hec discant, & magna res agitur, cu[m] hoc agitur publice in foro, in
conspectu legum super mercedum salaria decrementium ...’  p.27.
258 Matthew, printed annotation, Confessions, Book I, Chapter xv, p.42.
This doubt had, of course, emerged early on in the history of the humanist movement, Erasmus' youthful dialogue, the *Antibalbarians* (1520), seeking to defend the new scholars of Latin and Greek letters by strategically *feminising* humanism's detractors (one interlocutor, Batt, says that censorship of ancient texts is advocated by 'foolish women'\(^{259}\)) and, intriguingly, attempting to circumvent Augustine's hostility to classical erudition, Batt arguing that the Father: "'despised' heathen culture ... but only after becoming a prince of learning in the field'.\(^{260}\) In this somewhat simplistic line of reasoning ('you can't knock it until you've tried it'), we begin to grasp that the sense in which Augustinian antipathy to classical thought may have represented a constantly fresh wound in the side of humanism. Thus the *Confessions* offered a Catholic such as Matthew the perfect justification for condemning civic humanism and proposing an alternative 'private' masculinity more appropriate to the contemporary reality of religious oppression, just as *The Citie of God* had ostensibly offered Healey and his male Virginian readers an anti-worldly gender identity suitable for a chaotic colonial environment where the ancient / humanist paradigm of public-oriented manliness was, initially at least, impracticable.

Even more momentous, perhaps, is the translation's rejection of what might be regarded as the primary preoccupation of humanist learning: eloquence. As I have described before, Renaissance humanism had embraced the Ciceronian ideal of persuasive masculinity, with 'how to' books such as Thomas Wilson's *The Art Of Rhetoric* - first published in 1553 - achieving great popularity.\(^{261}\) Yet strikingly, in Matthew's text, this articulate manhood is distinctly *devalued* as a gender model. The main text expresses a profound lament concerning the futile experience of classical / humanist rhetorical


\(^{260}\) *CWE*, xxiii, 55.

\(^{261}\) See Skinner, *Reason* for a lucid analysis of such 'textbooks'.

training: ‘Oh God my God, what miseries did I heere find, and what mockeryes, when it was propounded vnto me ... that I, being a child, must obey my teachers, that so I might prosper in this world, & excell in certaine talking Artes, ... ’ 262

Furthermore, Matthew / Augustine emphasises the ethical ambivalence of forensic oratory, considering the possibility of miscarriages of justice through the tricks of forceful language:

When a man aspires to haue the fame of Eloquence, pleading before a Judge, inuironed by a great multitude of people, ... he takes extreme care not to speak the least word awry, by any errour of his tongue, in the hearing of Men; but he takes no heed at all, least indeed he commit so great a sinne, through the malice of his hart, as to destroy a Man. 263

Thomas Wilson had declared that: ‘... the lawyer can never want a living till the earth want men and all be void’, 264 hence Matthew’s translation not only casts negative aspersions on a key humanist career - one that his Catholicism had forced him to set aside - but he also condemns the pervasive notion of persuasive manliness.

In fact, according to Matthew’s Confessions, not only should a man abjure persuasiveness as a personal skill, but he must also develop an immunity to it as a listener. The main text relates the story of when Augustine heard Faustus speak after his conversion and remained appropriately unintoxicated by him: ‘Already myne ears were glutted with those toyes, nor did they therfore seeme better to me, because they were...'


better sayd; or true, because they were eloquent; ...',\(^{265}\) the margin didactically stating: 'Note & imitate'.\(^{266}\) Indeed, this 'anti-oratory' message is made even more manifest in Matthew's comment on this part of the Augustinian text that: 'Wee must not iudg [sic] of the truth of thinges, according to the estimation or eloque[n]ce of persons more or less'.\(^{267}\)

Thus Matthew's work \textit{doubly} attacks what was, conceivably, the core of Renaissance humanist maleness, Walter Ong confirming how: 'Renaissance educators ... were particularly explicit in connecting the study of rhetoric to the development of masculine courage'.\(^{268}\) In this way, I would suggest, the \textit{Confessions} consoled professionally isolated, 'home-bound' Catholic men for whom the techniques of worldly eloquence were less relevant and also quietly opened the door for recusant ideology's alternative gender ideal. Indeed, it is interesting to observe that verbal sophistry is explicitly identified with Protestantism in Matthew's preface where he refers to his religious opponents' alleged criticism of Augustine, taking them to task for 'calling him, by name \textit{Superstitious}, with such other figures, & flowres of Rhetorique, as these'.\(^{269}\) In this remark, I would suggest, we can gain insight into the way in which the anti-rhetorical stance proposed by Matthew is, in his view at least, a specifically \textit{Catholic} position, ostensibly representing the new masculine prototype. Whereas Harding and his associates had desired the rhetorical crown - imagining the access to religio-political power it might bring - later recusant men thus seem to value oratory less highly, such

\(^{266}\) Matthew, printed annotation, \textit{Confessions}, Book V, Chapter vi, p.190.
humanist gifts, arguably, having less civic potential for Catholics in this more oppressive context.

Indeed, the translation draws closer to explicitly professing the 'private' manhood advocated by contemporary Catholic culture in its clear dismissal of the secularity of classical / humanist worldview. Hence when the main text presents a contemptuous commentary on school life, remarking that 'the playes and toyes of men, are called Buisines [sic]; ...', Matthew takes the opportunity to question the worth of earthly achievements in the margin: 'The ordinary busines of men is indeed but boyes-play; the true busines, is to serue God'. In fact, this 'anti-mundane' theme is reiterated over and over in Matthew's commentary on the text, which states, for instance, that: 'All the wayes of this world, are painfull' and that Augustine 'could not find comfort in God till he had forsaken that of the world'. Hence, in these repeated remarks, the translator might be seen to intimate that 'real' men are not interested in public activity, thus obliquely offering succour to socially-excluded, even 'domesticated' recusant males. Indeed, this 'unworldly' outlook may, once more, be seen to reflect a particularly Catholic masculinity as Matthew's preface straightforwardly declares Protestants to be 'interessed by their loue to liberty and temporall ease ...'. By doing what the earlier Louvainists were, arguably, not prepared to do - eschewing the secular sphere - recusant men were, then, carving out a gender identity more appropriate for their circumstances, one very different from that of their religious opposites.
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270 Confessions, Book I, Chapter ix, trans. by Matthew, p.25. 'Sed maioru[m] nugae negotia voca[ban]tur, pueroru[m] aute[m] taia cu[m] sint, puniuntur a maioribus, & nemo miseratur pueros, vel illos, vel utrosque' - p.18.
271 Matthew, printed annotation, Confessions, Book I, Chapter ix, p.25.
272 Matthew, printed annotation, Confessions, Book VIII, Chapter i, p.345.
273 Matthew, 'A Preface to the Piovs and Covrteovs Reader', Confessions, p.92 -my emphasis.
274 It is intriguing to consider this apparent distinction in masculine ideals in relation to the polemical thought of Max Weber who famously regards Protestantism as being inescapably capitalistic. He states that
In fact, this anti-civic attitude is further promoted by the *Confessions*’ account of two ‘courtyers’ who stumbled upon a copy of St. Athanasius’ life of St. Anthony, the hermit, with startling consequences. Matthew / Augustine narrates that:

One of them began to read the same, and to wonder at it, and to be inflamed by it; and even whilst he was reading to resolve upon the leading of such a life as that; & leaving the service of the world to become wholly thine.276

This is a course of anti-secular action which Matthew applauds, stating in the paratext: ‘The service of the world is laborious, and dangerous; the service of God, is the only way to true happiness [sic].’277 Thus Matthew ostensibly promotes a form of private, spiritualised masculinity which - being resonant of recusant gender ideology - might, I suggest, have been reassuring for Catholic Englishmen who had prioritised their religious principles over their professional prospects.

Yet aside from this renunciation of classical / humanist civic manhood, the case of the courtiers’ contact with the biography of Antony also gestures towards the way in which the translation might be seen to recommend that Catholic men ‘re-think’ their relationship to humanist public-oriented forms of intellectual masculinity. Here the text might be viewed to subtly suggest that recusant males must change the goal of their studies to suit their oppressed situation, since the textual encounter in this exemplary anecdote leads away from the world in a manner which apparently reverses the intended teleology of humanist erudition - public-oriented reading is, after all, only relevant for public-oriented men. In fact, as well as ostensibly attempting to replicate the anti-civic effect which Antony’s history had upon the ‘courtyers’, telling his audience ‘it is yet

Luther - more than classical culture - inaugurated the concept of ‘the fulfilment of duty in worldly affairs as the highest form of moral activity the individual could assume’ - *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. by Talcott Parsons, 2nd edn (London: Allen and Unwin, 1976), p.80.

extant, and I much advise my Reader to read it. Matthew's work also quite specifically discards the humanist philological methodology, his preface sharply castigating those who would read the *Confessions* in this way:

Others there are, who play the *Critikes* vpon this Booke; because the Saint, sometimes, doth repeate the same thinges and words more then once; and so falleth, as they say, into the error of *Tautology*. I pity them, and I will pray for them; that they may read such books as this, with a mind which may rather become ingenuous, and noble *Christians*, then wofull [sic] and illiberall Grammarians.

After thus spurning the 'illiberall' humanist approach to texts, Matthew goes on to insist that his audience *resist* engaging with the Augustinian work in such a manner, saying: 'If, therefore, in the reading of these *Confessions*, you be subject to like temptation, I haue giuen you reason (to my thinking) to put it by'.

Furthermore, the dismissal of humanist textual praxis continues as Matthew demands that the translation be read in order and without omission, asserting that:

... if you inuert the method of the Saint; and (being lead either by the *Arguments* of the *Chapters*, or els by some former confused notice, which you may haue had of the Worke), you cull out some partes according to your owne fancy, and lay the rest aside; assure your selfe it wit not please you. And I am the bolder, to begge your firme beliefe of me in this particulier, because I know, it hath happened to so many: nay, I confesse, that it did so, at the first, to my selfe.

Hence Matthew admits his previous scholarly wrongs as in a meeting of 'Humanists Anon'. He divulges, from his own experience, the 'perils' of literary 'snacking' - regarding the text as a set of significant incidents to be selected according to
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279 Matthew, 'A Preface to the Pious and Covteous Reader', *Confessions*, p.5.
281 Matthew, 'A Preface to the Pious and Covteous Reader', *Confessions*, p.3.
the occasion of analysis and advocates instead digesting the Confessions as a coherent narrative.

Thus even though Matthew retains a strong sense of the practical exemplary importance of his translation, he distinctly denies the value of a humanistic 'businesslike' fragmentation of the text, seemingly prescribing a more leisurely, interiorised reading which was possibly more appropriate for the more 'private' life of contemporary Catholic men - a matter I will return to in a moment. Indeed, by 'vetoing' humanist reading practices, Matthew's work, I would propose, actually takes apart the mode of intellectual masculinity predicated upon such 'knowledge transactions'. Hence, as in the case of the translation's repudiation of humanism's civic-oriented, rhetorical manhood, this criticism of humanist study skills leaves room for the emergence of a more contextually congenial gender identity for intellectual recusant men.

It was, I suspect, this aspect of Matthew's Confessions which so exasperated Watts and Sutcliffe. I believe that they perceived its assault upon their 'orthodox' humanist manliness and that they were frustrated with the translation because they were reading it 'wrongly' - they were looking at it in precisely the kind of humanistic 'hairsplitting' way that Matthew warned against.

But before I outline exactly what sort of manhood Matthew suggested to replace the humanist paradigm, I want to make it manifest that we are still considering specifically male reading practices. Although, as we will see later, the text celebrates the exemplarity of female saints, 'real' women appear to be precluded from Matthew's conception of his intended readers. The Confessions is a 'boys' book', Matthew being quite candid in the paratextual apparatus about the 'impropriety' of women's spiritual
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282 See GJ.
283 See Jardine and Sherman, 'Pragmatic Readers'.
studies. Although this disapproval surfaces in the backlash against the 'individualism' of the Protestant approach to biblical interpretation, Matthew stressing that the Catholic Church rightfully presides over the multiplicities of scriptural meaning, it soon becomes clear that, in our translator's opinion, only men should exercise their exegetical faculties.

The main text comments extensively on the intricacies of biblical hermeneutics, propounding, quite poetically, that reader response was part of God's purpose: 'Nor were those groues, and woods of thy Scriptures, to continue without Harts or Staggs, who might retyre themselves thereinto; and might walke, and browse, and rest, and ruminate thereupon.' Matthew uses this part of the text to make a polemical point about the appropriate 'gender' of reading:

A most choyce noble metaphore, wherby the saint expresseth the office, & practise of the Doctors of the catholik Church, in the interpretation of Holy scriptur; but they must be Stagges, that is Doctors, & not Fawnes, or Prickets, or Hindes, that is, silly women ... .

Indeed, Matthew makes a corresponding remark later on, proclaiming: 'How unreasonable therfor is it, that every saucy & simple woman, should without lice[n]ce or distinctio[n], read this mysterious booke'.

At first it might seem as if this is a vilification of purely Protestant women as readers of religious works. Certainly, it is something which Watts and Sutcliffe take issue with, Watts directly replying to the above-cited observation:

Here fals my papist out with sawcy and simple women ... . I wish our women should read more, and interpret lesse. ... But if our women haue too much, I am sure yours haue too little reading.
In this comment we see how even the inter-faith controversy over exegesis discursively rotated around the axis of women. Yet what is more significant is that the Protestant perspective - wishing that women would 'interpret lesse' - is so similar in its denigration of female textual analysis that we are able to understand that Matthew’s disgust was part of a culture-wide phobia of women readers which included Catholic females. Indeed, this is how Sutcliffe understands Matthew’s remarks, saying that: ‘Vpon every Woman that readeth Scripture, hee rayleth ...’.289 In fact, Matthew’s criticisms are strikingly general for a man who has no bones about pointing his finger at the failures of ‘Calvinists’ (as he calls them). Thus, I would argue that Matthew’s elevation of the ‘doctors’- the trained male intellectuals - works to belittle the textual abilities of all women, no matter what their religious positioning, constructing a feminine exclusion zone around sacred biblical and patristic works.290

Matthew’s Confessions, then, like the recusant literature of the late sixteenth century, is seen to exclusively address men and male interests. Hence the translation seems more strongly to represent an attempt to mould Catholic masculinity - but into what form? Aside from its negation of classical / humanist manliness, what positive endeavours does the text make to produce an alternative gender paradigm?

On the intellectual side, Matthew puts forward a blueprint for a studious manhood which is noticeably different from that espoused by Renaissance humanism. Rather than relying on cerebral training, Matthew’s ideal reader thinks from the heart, the translator’s comments on the interpretation of the Bible proposing a prioritisation of the

289 Sutcliffe, Vmasking, p.79 -my emphasis.
290 The full title of Sutcliffe’s response to Matthew’s translation would seem to suggest that Protestant women had acquired access to this text. However, this naming may merely represent a collapsing of the distinction between the text and its allegedly ‘womanising’ author. Also, the translation’s actual readership is less significant, for my purposes, than the probability that it was designed to assist a masculine audience.
moral and emotional faculties for an ‘accurate’ appreciation of such texts, affirming that: ‘It is a good preparation for vnderderstanding [sic] of the Scriptur to depart from syn’.291 Yet more than striving for a kind of ‘innocent’ neutrality, Matthew suggests that the erudite Catholic male must develop meekness. The main text recounts Augustine’s first abortive attempts at biblical reading: ‘... I perceau, that it is a thing neither vnderstood by such as are proud, ... But I was not such a one, as that I could haue entrance into it, or submit my selfe to that kind of pace’ 292 To this Matthew responds: ‘The reading of the Scriptur is profitable to the humble ...’.293

Here we see how humility, the attribute which, as we have seen, was so vaunted by late sixteenth-century recusant texts, comes to the fore in Matthew’s work, becoming the centre of a revamped intellectual masculinity. Not only, then, did the 1620 Confessions demolish the civic, rhetorical values of classical / humanistic thought, thus offering support to secluded Catholic men for whom this masculine archetype was no longer viable, but it also aimed to specifically supplant the humanist textual methodology based on those now incongruous worldly aims. Matthew’s male intellectual reader was enjoined, I would suggest, to study in a way that was in keeping with recusant ideology, locating submissiveness as the core of literary skill, a quality which, as Matthew reminds us, classical / humanist education could not provide: ‘No heathen Philosophy euer taught Humility’.294 Thus the translation offers Catholic men the gift of an erudition oriented towards interiority - even domesticity - learning therefore apposite to the circumstances of persecution which had ostensibly forced men ‘inside’ in every sense.

291 Matthew, printed annotation, Confessions, Book XI, Chapter iii, p.585.
292 Confessions, trans. by Matthew, Book III, Chapter v, p.96. ‘Et ecce video rem non compertam superbis, neque nudetam pueris, sed incessu humilem, successu excelsam, et velatam mysteriis, et non erram ego talis, vt intrare in eam possem, aut inclinare ceruiuem ad eius gressus’ - p.56.
293 Matthew, printed annotation, Confessions, Book III, Chapter v, p.97.
Indeed, the recusant version of passive, private masculinity permeates the entire paratextual apparatus. There is definite support in the margins for an 'introverted' masculinity, Matthew writing that: 'We mustnot [sic] make effusion of our selues, but keep God co[m]pany in our own hartes'.\textsuperscript{295} In addition, humility is further praised as a personal virtue in the case of the previously-mentioned Christian convert, Victorinus, who Matthew asserts as possessing: 'A notable constancy, and contempt of himself'.\textsuperscript{296} Moreover, the translation may be seen to echo the emphasis on acquiescence as a mode of male survival when the margin advises: 'A man had need to pray to God for a great deale of pati[e]nce, when he is to heer the blasphemy of heretiques, and the absurdity of ignorant persons'.\textsuperscript{297} Furthermore, the sense of resignedly rationalising oppression might also be seen to be present when Matthew comments in the paratextual apparatus that there is: 'No greater signe, that God doth finally forsake a man, then when he doth not punish him heer for sinning'.\textsuperscript{298} Indeed, a sense of compliant dependence on God's will suffuses the entire translation, with Matthew making such remarks as: 'Our strength consists in knowing that we can doe nothing good, without Gods assistance'.\textsuperscript{299}

However, I would argue that the patient qualities required of recusant manhood appear most vividly in the female figures of the translation. In a manoeuvre which mirrors the accent on feminine exemplarity in Catholic culture in this period (as discussed in the last section), Matthew's \textit{Confessions} makes much of the text's female saints, especially Monica. Being encouraged by the translation to develop a passive / feminine gender identity resembling that advocated by recusant ideology, I would suggest that Matthew's male Catholic readers would have turned to the text's womanly archetypes for imitative

\textsuperscript{295} Matthew, printed annotation, \textit{Confesssions}, Book IIII, Chapter xii, p.156.
\textsuperscript{296} Matthew, printed annotation, \textit{Confessions}, Book VIII, Chapter ii, p.351.
\textsuperscript{297} Matthew, printed annotation, \textit{Confessions}, Book XII, Chapter xxv, p.694.
\textsuperscript{298} Matthew, printed annotation, \textit{Confessions}, Book V, Chapter ii, p.177.
\textsuperscript{299} Matthew, printed annotation, \textit{Confessions}, Book IIII, Chapter xvi, p.174.
inspiration, for clues how to ‘perform’ their new docile masculinity. Thus whilst the humanistic notion of imitation through literature stays in place, this Catholic version of Augustine metamorphoses the process into one of cross-gender recognition which is familiar to us from the previous examination of female hagiographies.

The work’s focus on sacred women starts at the very beginning of the book in the dedication to the Virgin Mary, which (slightly oddly, perhaps) gravitates towards her womb: ‘... those bowells of thy compassion, which is a true Hospitall of Mercy’. A glance at Matthew’s other literary pursuits reveals that he had an exceptional devotion to this sanctified icon of womanhood. Around the time he composed the Confessions he also produced The Widdows Mite, a whole work enunciating his defiant commitment to Mary in the face of her Protestant detractors, a text in which he, interestingly, implied that the honouring of Jesus’ mother actually defined ‘proper’ Catholic masculinity: ‘I think there is no man of modesty, and even common sense, who will not be induced ... to an imitation thereof.’

In his version of Augustine the very process of translation is dramatised as being dependent upon Mary’s intercession, Matthew’s dedicatory epistle asking her to pray to God for the success of his rendition, hoping that because of her pleas: ‘... his Grace may cooperate so far, as that the ignorance, & other sines of the Translatour, may not prejudice the working of the incomparable spirit of the Author’.
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300 Matthew, ‘To the Most Glorious, Perpetual, and Immaculate Virgin Mary, the Most Blessed Mother of God’, Confessions, sigs.[*7].
301 Tobie Matthew, The Widdowes Mite, Cast into the Treasure-house of the Preogatues, and Prayses of our B. Lady, the Immaculate, the most Glorious Virgin Mary, the Mother of God. With reasons why we are to have great confidence in her Prayers ([n.p]: 1619), p.86. Attributed to Matthew by Allison and Rogers, Literature of the English Counter-Reformation, ii, 104. Matthew also wrote a poem about the Virgin - and one about Monica - which were discovered by Antony G. Petti. See ‘Unknown Sonnets of Sir Tobie Matthew’, Recusant History, 9 (1967), 123-158.
302 Matthew, ‘To the Most Glorious, Perpetual, and Immaculate Virgin Mary ...’,Confessions, sigs.[*6]-[*7].
perhaps the most fundamental practice of humanism in Renaissance England becomes entangled with femininity in ways which were evidently uncomfortable for the likes of Matthew Sutcliffe. Instead of being an intellectual procedure under erudite masculine control, translation appears here as something you need a women saint’s help with.

Indeed, Mary also makes a magnificent appearance in the main body of the text, Matthew referring to her, for example, in the paratext as: ‘An unspeakably immaculate Virgin’, once more alluding to her womb in elevated terms as: ‘More pure the[n] al the purityes of heaue[n] only God excepted’. Yet partly because of the prominence the Augustinian text gives to the saint’s mother, Monica, it is she who is the feminine ‘star’ of the translation, even, arguably, outshining her son.

This focus on Monica commences in the text’s preface. Here Matthew takes issue with Calvin’s negative opinion of Augustine’s establishment of the mass for the dead apparently because of a maternal request. The reformer, to our translator’s eyes, seems to insultingly insinuate that the saint’s ‘excellent Mother, S. Monica, must be no better than an ignorant old doting Woman …’. Yet more fascinating is the preface’s subsequent instruction to the reader: ‘... if you will remember S. Augustine, you willbe sure to consider, and wonder, at the admirable woman, S. Monica; …’. In Matthew’s view, she was responsible for her son’s moral recovery, affirming that: ‘... she prepared for him such a Bath of teares, as serued to asswage his woundes; and not only to keep him in life,'
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303 Brian Jay Striar has stated that to study this period’s translations ‘is to probe into the very heart of the Renaissance ...’ ‘Theories and Practices of Renaissance Verse Translation’ (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1983), p.1.

304 This part of the text also begs the question of the femininity of the translator. Not only is he ostensibly in a reliant / feminised position here, but, more significantly, the way in which a translator’s function is, arguably, one of ‘intercession’ also makes him parallel to Mary in some sense. For a related discussion, see Lori Chamberlain, ‘Translation and the Metaphorics of Gender’ in Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology, ed. by Lawrence Venuti (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), pp.57-74.
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but to restore him, to a most eminent degree of Beauty, Health, and Strength.\textsuperscript{309} Indeed, Matthew seems to assert that a reverence for Monica is a precondition for being a ‘true’ Catholic man, declaring that: ‘... he is not a good Christian, who resolueth not, to honour her memory with sincere devotion; who was the Root of that happy Tree, which hath replenisht, refresht, and enricht the world’.\textsuperscript{310} In this way we see how Matthew’s\textit{Confessions} could almost be cited as a female hagiography, since she is presented here as being at least\textit{ equal} to the Church Father in exemplarity, perhaps surpassing him, since there is a strong sense here of Monica as the ‘power behind the throne’. Without his mother’s intervention, the translation appears to say, the great Father Augustine would not have existed.\textsuperscript{311}

Nevertheless, what is most significant for the purpose of our argument, is that, like the female saints described in the previous section, Monica is explicitly advertised as possessing the pivotal (passive) traits made desirable by recusant ideology. In the prefatory material, Matthew summarises her personal characteristics in the following list: ‘\textit{Humility, Patience, Longanimity, Prudence, Temperance, Prayer, Industry, and Charity’}.\textsuperscript{312} All of these attributes, but especially the first two, were - as we saw earlier - championed in the late sixteenth century as absolutely essential survival techniques for persecuted Catholics. Thus, I would suggest, Matthew’s translation usefully ‘flags’ Monica as an exemplar for his afflicted male readers, who were ostensibly seeking to attain the new submissive ideal of Catholic masculinity.

\textsuperscript{311} Matthew’s fascination with maternal power is further evidenced by his accentuation of the role of Flaminia in his translation of the life of a repentant bandit - [Guiseppe Biondi], \textit{A Relation of the most Illvstrious Lord, Sig.’ Troilo Saeuillez; a Baron of Rome... (St.Omer):1620} - pp.108-109. This text is attributed to Matthew by Allison and Rogers, \textit{Literature of the English Counter-Reformation}, ii, 105 -106. This emphasis on mothers might be possibly seen as part of an altered respect for women in Renaissance Catholic culture due to their prominent position in this religious movement. However, it is also necessary to
Reading on into the main body of the text, then, Matthew’s male recusant audience would, I believe, have considered Monica’s passive reaction to the sometimes difficult circumstances of her life as emulative ‘food’ for their own (ideally) unresisting response to tribulation. Looking for a model for their revised ‘feminine’ gender identity, Catholic men would have gleaned important imitative information from Monica’s subdued conduct, especially in her unhappy marriage to Augustine’s father. For instance, we are told that she suffered her partner’s infidelity in silence, the text proudly declaring that: ‘... she was obsequious to her husband, ... . She so endured her husbands dishonouring of her bed, that she neuer had any dispute with him vpon that reason’. Indeed, Matthew obliquely asks his readers to mimic this compliant behaviour when he states: ‘Note the leniety, and piety of holy S. Monica’. Furthermore, recusant men might have been supported in their, resigned response to oppression by Monica’s ‘positive’ refusal to defend herself against her spouse’s rage, the translation stressing that: ‘... she knew how, not to resist her angry husband, not only in deed, but not so much as in word; only afterward ... she would render an accompt of her actions, if she found that she had beene in the wrong’.

Being familiar with the experience of female exemplarity in contemporary hagiographies, I would propose that Monica’s docile reaction to her domestic miseries would easily have been transformed by Catholic male readers into a paradigm for passively accepting their own more far-reaching socio-religious distress. Although we remember that while females achieved exemplary status on the page, in reality, influential women such as St. Teresa and Mary Ward were given very short shrift by the Catholic establishment.

Matthew, 'A Preface to the Piovs and Covrteovs Reader', Confessions, p.98.

Confessions, Book IX, Chapter ix, trans. by Matthew, p.434. "EDucata itaque pudice ac sobrie, poiusque a te subdita parentibus, quam a parentibus tibi, vbi plenis annis nubilis facta est tradita viro, ... . Ita autem tolerauti cubilis injurias, vt nullam de hac re cum marito haberet vnquam simultatem" - pp.241-242.
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Confessions, Book IX, Chapter ix, trans. by Matthew, pp.434 -435. "Erat vero ille praeterea sicut beneuole[n]tia praeccipus, ita ira feruidus. Sed nouerat haec non resistere irato viro, non tantum facto, sed ne
cannot be certain where the imitative attention of Matthew's male readers lay, if recusant ideology recommended that men adopt a submissive, 'homely', even feminine identity, then I believe it is plausible that Monica might have represented a formidable role model, stepping into the breach left by the classical/humanist men who - as Matthew's text enlightens us - were inadequate as gender ideals for Catholic men in the political climate of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

One point which might suggest to us that men were intended to emulate the Monica of Matthew's *Confessions* is that, as in the case of the female saints described in the previous part of this chapter, Matthew ultimately attempts to undermine her exemplarity by 'unyoking' her empowering characteristics from her femininity, referring to her 'manly Soule' and the way in which she 'forgot her Sexe' in her long-distance endeavours to 'save' her sinful son. Nevertheless, if Sutcliffe's response to the first of these comments is a moderately reliable guide, then the translator's supposed 'addiction to the feminine gender' is perhaps a sign that Matthew's bid to make Monica 'male' to enact what I have labelled 'exemplary transvestism' - has failed and that a disturbing frisson persists around this still womanly figure.

In this section, then, I have attempted to demonstrate the way in which there is a dynamic at work in Matthew's *Confessions* involving the depreciation of civic-oriented, rhetorical masculinity and the appreciation of a passive,'introverted' style of manhood. By rewriting St. Augustine's antagonism towards classical culture, Matthew possessed an excellent occasion to deride the contemporary form of humanist manliness which was predicated upon the ancient models maligned in the 'original' patristic text. In this way
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verbó quidem. Iam vero refracto, & quieta cum opportunum videret, rationem facti sui reddēbat, si forte ille inconsideratius commotus fuerat” - p.242.


Matthew’s translation served to discredit the public-directed male gender identity which was less pertinent to persecuted Catholic men and to put in its place a submissive, anti-secular masculine intellectual ideal more applicable to the context of oppression which had - as we saw in the third section - ostensibly driven recusant men back into the domestic sphere. Thus, I suggest, Matthew’s text seemingly has recourse to and further advances the paradigm of masculinity first set out by recusant polemicists of the late Elizabethan period, an ideology which was apparently still current in the Jacobean era. Indeed, the text seems to aid its readers’ development of this docile / feminine manliness by exploiting a concept of female exemplarity which, as we witnessed in the last section, was prevalent in Catholic Renaissance literary culture.

Without this frame of reference, it would, I contend, be difficult to comprehend the purpose of the 1620 Confessions. Rather than articulating the seditious and / or sexually excessive tendencies of Tobie Matthew / ‘the rinegued Translator’, the text has emerged as a guide helping Catholic men to recover a sense of their masculinity by offering them an attainable ideal. Humanism is alive, but mutated, in Matthew’s translation and it is this and the notion of a ‘feminine’ Catholic masculinity which, I would suggest, caused Watts and Sutcliffe so much anxiety.
In 1638 two new editions of Tobie Matthew's *Confessions* were issued at Paris: *The Kernell or Extract of the HistoriCall Part, of S. Avgvstins Confessions* and one apparently emended by the translator's recently re-converted friend, Sir Kenelm Digby (1603-1665). Both versions exhibited admiration for the 1620 publication. *The Kernell* attempted to vindicate Matthew's work against Watts' acerbic disapproval, the anonymous editor stating that he chose to reprint Matthew's rendition of Augustine because of his high opinion of it: '... esteeming it to be much better, then the Protestant Translation, which followed it; and which censured the former, both very uniustly in some places, and uery unciuilly in some other'. Indeed, Digby - unsurprisingly perhaps - declared of his associate's text: 'I haue not in any language mett vvill [sic] a more iudicious and weighty translation: ...'.

However, despite these words of commendation, *both* of the these later imprints of Matthew's *Confessions* were immensely condensed, in this way betraying the fact that even these Catholic readers are not entirely 'sure' about the 1620 edition. At first it seems
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318 *The Kernell or Extract of the HistoriCall part, of S. Avgvstins Confessions; togeather with all the most affectuous passages thereof; Taken Ovt Of That Whole Booke & seuered from such parts, as are obscure*, trans. by [Tobie Matthew], ed. by anon (Paris: 1638). All further references to this edition will be cited as *Kernell*.

319 *The Confessions of S. Avgystine Bishope of Hippon and D. of the Church*, trans. by T[obie] M[atthew], ed. by [Kenelm Digby], 2nd edn, (Paris: 1638). All further references to this edition will be cited as *Confessions*. The preface has been attributed to Digby by E.W. Bligh who states that the manuscript draft of this foreword exists amongst Digby's papers - see *Sir Kenelm Digby and his Venetia* (London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co. Ltd, 1932), pp.221-222. Digby possibly first encountered Matthew at Madrid in 1623 where he had been invited by John Digby to join those involved in the negotiation of the Spanish Match. Being the son of everard digby who had been executed for his role in the Gunpowder Plot, he had been raised as a Catholic, however, in 1635 he apostasied, only to return to his former religion shortly after. His political allegiances were equally complicated - as a Royalist, he was imprisoned by the House of Commons in 1642 for his monarchical sympathies, but there is also evidence that he later became a confidant of Oliver Cromwell, perhaps in an attempt to win the Protector's support for Catholic toleration. He was a distinguished scientist, being connected intellectually with both Descartes in France and Hobbes in England. See *DNB*, v, 965-971; Bligh, *Sir Kenelm Digby* and R.T. Peterson, *Sir Kenelm Digby, The Ornament of England, 1603-1663* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1956).

320 Anon, 'The Preface to the Civill reader', *Kernell*, trans. by Matthew, sig. [a iii'].
as if these fresh versions of Matthew’s work are merely striving to make the text more accessible and to thus expand its potential audience. For example, The Kernell focusses on the biographical - rather than theological - sections of Augustine’s reminiscences, its title telling us that the text which remains is ‘seuered from such parts, as are obscure’. In this manner the editor hopes to make the Father more approachable, to open up to more popular use the text which he has read over and over, saying enthusiastically: ‘still it tells me newes’. Furthermore, Digby’s preface expresses a ‘desire to haue all men frequently conversant with it’, an aspiration which was allegedly impeded by the extent of the 1620 edition, Digby asserting that: ‘... the bulke it was growne unto by the Translators worthy additions, made the booke fitter for a library then a pocket’.

Hence Matthew’s paratextual apparatus which - as we saw in the last part - so strongly promoted the recusant ideal of a passive / ‘feminine’ masculinity, was decisively cut from both of the later publications of the Confessions. I would suggest that this particular amendment in the two editions was about more than creating a ‘slimline’ version of the patristic text. As we witnessed in the second section of this chapter, the period just prior to the beginning of the Civil War was a time of aggravated anti-Catholicism in England. In this social climate it might, then, be considered sensible to cautiously ‘correct’ a text which - while remaining beneficial to Catholics in their current trials - had incited a vehemently hostile reaction after its earlier publication in politically quieter times.

By removing the paratextual apparatus Matthew’s editors eliminated much of what was problematic for Sutcliffe and Watts, material which would have, arguably, been
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even more provocative for Protestant readers in the late 1630s. That is, they amputate that part of Matthew's translation which, as we have seen, worked to make the Augustinian text endorse the recusant version of passive, private masculinity and also gave emphasis to female saints by tacitly prescribing them as exemplars for the new male gender identity. The 1620 Confessions' frank rejection of civic humanist masculinity and open exploration of the revised 'feminine' Catholic manhood was too much of a political 'hot potato' to be 're-cited' in 1638. Indeed, Digby's edition seems determined to re-invent Matthew's piece as an orthodox literary enterprise, his publication containing an image of an arguably 'humanist' Augustine engaged in the process of textual production (Figure 10).

Tobie Matthew's Confessions was, then, I would suggest, perceived as a radical text in its own era, one which even the translator's co-religionists realised required 'censorship' in the run up to the Civil War. Like Sutcliffe and Watts, Matthew's Catholic editors seem to have experienced the 1620 publication as highly significant and disconcerting - although for ostensibly different reasons. While Matthew's two known Protestant readers were apparently affronted and perplexed by the anti-humanist aspect of Matthew's text and its priorisation of female figures, one might presume that Matthew's later editors were comfortably familiar with the modified form of gender identity contained in Matthew's work, but perhaps considered the translation's exposition of a Catholic passive / 'feminine' manhood in the margins of the text simply too bold for distribution in the late 1630s.

Whatever the reasoning behind these reactions to the text, it is vital that we acknowledge what Watts, Sutcliffe and the 1638 editors are telling us: that Matthew's 1620 print of the Confessions was immensely important in its own period and should not, then, be neglected by modern scholars. Even if Watts and Sutcliffe may have had a very skewed view of Matthew's work, they draw our attention to a dynamic in the text - civic
humanists out, female saints in - which might not be immediately identifiable to twenty-first century readers. Thus, although they, in my opinion, misdiagnosed the cause of this textual pattern by making biography into etiology, they offered us a valuable way into Matthew's translation and the unexplored territory of Renaissance Catholic masculinity.

Hence in the second section, looking at Matthew's remarkable life, I was able to show that while he may have been involved in high-level political and religious affairs, Sutcliffe's depiction of Sir Tobie as the 'rinedgued Translator' - utilising his intellectual talents against the Protestant commonwealth - could not convincingly explain the cause of the humanistic discomfort felt by Watts and himself in the presence of Matthew's text. Although, as we witnessed, Matthew was the subject of suspicious scrutiny by his contemporaries, I argued that all Catholic men were distrusted in this period and therefore Sutcliffe's apparent equation: 'Matthew's bad so his text is' does not really add up. Similarly, I showed that Watts' analysis of the 1620 Confessions' humanist 'downfall' as being due to Matthew's supposed philandering was merely part of the sexualisation of recusant men in Protestant polemical discourse - a controversial tool which Catholics were, as we saw in the case of the Hieromachia, quite capable of using against their own side. In this way, then, the depiction of Matthew as a womaniser by Watts, Sutcliffe and others of his peers became open to question. Thus I suggested that no matter what was the 'truth' about Matthew's behaviour, it reaches us through the filter of anti-Catholic perception and therefore, ultimately, cannot be regarded as representing a reliable basis for a biographical reading of Matthew's text.

Hence after briefly discussing some possibly more personal 'author-linked' interpretations of the translation, concerning Matthew's conceivable use of the work as spiritual sustenance, I went on to contend that the publication of Matthew's text meant that his version of the Confessions was intended for more than his own private meditation.
I proposed that as well as meeting his own devotional needs, Matthew's translation aimed to support a broader readership of persecuted Catholic Englishmen, appropriating the Augustinian work in order to authenticate a particular version of recusant masculinity which was already circulating in culture. The socio-religious context of Matthew's text was, then, I argued, the place to seek out a more plausible justification for the anti-humanist / pro-feminine pattern in the text so helpfully highlighted by Watts and Sutcliffe.

In the third section, then, I turned to the origins of this modified gender ideal. Examining the history of Catholic oppression in Renaissance England, I demonstrated the way in which this part of the country's population was subjected to intense juridical pressures, being fined, exiled, excluded from the professions and even executed. I then reviewed the polemical literature produced by Catholics in the late sixteenth century, proposing that, in response to this affliction, these texts strived to create a new form of passive, recusant manhood more suitable for the social circumstances of the period. Considering this fairly systematic ideological shift in more detail, I put forward the possibility that this revised form of Catholic masculinity came suggestively close to the Renaissance's hegemonic ideal of femininity in its emphasis on submission. Indeed, I asserted that there is evidence to suggest that Catholic men in this era actually utilised female hagiographies as exemplars for the cultivation of this new 'feminine' manliness. Moreover, looking at way in which Catholic men in this period were forced by tyranny and the ideology of recusancy to retreat into the domestic sphere, I suggested that such men found themselves further feminised by being in the place of the 'weaker sex', a space

Looking at Matthew, who managed - despite the odds stacked against him - to forge some sort of career in public life, we might be tempted to think that civic opportunities still existed for Catholic men. However, we must remember that these were the exception, not the rule, and that Matthew - as we saw in section two of this chapter- was still deeply mistrusted and even mocked by the Protestant establishment.
in which Catholic women were increasingly strong. Recusant masculinity was, then, ostensibly a ‘feminine’ form of gender identity, replacing the contemporary humanist paradigm of the *vir civilis* which was now less practicable for Catholic men.

It is this metamorphosis of masculinity which, as I revealed in the last part of this chapter, seems to clarify the anti-humanist tendency in Matthew’s translation and its homage to sacred female figures, as brought to our notice by Sutcliffe and Watts. Matthew, as I revealed in the previous part of this chapter, rewrote this patristic text in a way which appears to validate the recusant vision of manhood, consoling his persecuted Catholic male readers by using Augustine’s aversion to classical thought to repudiate the now less attainable civic humanist version of masculinity, embracing instead a more viable type of patient, private intellectual manliness. In fact, in a move which is also in keeping with the cultural trends mapped out in the second section of this chapter, we saw how Matthew’s work seems to subtly present holy women -especially Monica - as models for the development of a male ‘feminine’ passivity. Thus, although Matthew’s text ostensibly denied the value of the *public* goal of humanist masculinity, I would suggest that he may be seen to retain a humanistic sense of literature’s pragmatic usage: once again, we see how the humanistic process of translation may be perceived as supporting Renaissance men in crisis.

With an understanding of this cultural background, I would hope that we grow closer to comprehending the original function of Tobie Matthew’s *Confessions*, a fascinating translation written by an exceptionally fascinating man. Whilst being grateful for the insights which the anxieties of Sutcliffe and Watts made available to us, we can also appreciate that our historical distance permits us to see the ‘bigger’ issues encasing the text. Even though the 1620 edition’s re-imagining of the humanist experience, implying a practical intellectual methodology which *eschews* civic action, is surely
compelling to scholars of the field, I would suggest that the translation’s shaping of a particular recusant masculinity should also be deeply exciting for those engaged in Renaissance gender studies. We may never know precisely to what extent recusant ideology effected the quotidian masculinity of Catholic men in this period, but it is possible that the sexualisation and especially the feminisation of recusant males in the polemics of their Protestant adversaries represents an inexact response to a broad-based gender revolution. By being ‘addicted to the feminine gender’ Matthew’s work has much to teach us.
CONCLUSION:  

Translating the Past / Translating the Future

Five years ago, before I began my master's degree, I chanced upon some intriguing remarks in the prefatory notes to Quentin Skinner's *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*. In a section entitled 'Gender', Skinner sensitively states why he decided to use the pronoun 'he', rather than the more politically correct 'he or she' in his discussion of classical culture and Renaissance humanism, declaring that to do so:

... when presenting the views of the rhetoricians would have the effect of attributing to them a social theory they not only did not hold, but would I think have found almost unimaginable. The exclusion of women from the story is an important part of the story itself.¹

This thesis represents, in some sense, the fruits of my subsequent thoughts on this cursory comment.

It was apparent to me that if, as Skinner also asserts, in ancient and Renaissance discourse 'the figure of the good orator, whom they equate with the good citizen, is always and necessarily male',² then the 'exclusion' of women from the 'story' was readily explicable in terms of the prescribed 'domesticisation' of sixteenth century women which Hutson, among others, have discussed: Renaissance women could not 'victoriously' utilise humanist techniques, with their rhetorical basis, since these intellectual forms tended dangerously towards the (forbidden) civic sphere. The impact of a public speech or a published text upon others - the goal of such pragmatic literary production - would, then, have represented a

terrible trespass of this spatial - and sexual - boundary for female scholars, hence the plight of learned ‘ladies’ such as Isotta Nogarola and Lady Bacon.

Yet if I could in some way ‘comprehend’ women’s almost automatic disqualification from high-powered humanist achievement, Skinner’s observation left me eager to ‘imagine’ what the Renaissance humanists, in Skinner’s terms, found ‘unimaginable’: that their scholarship was specifically masculine in its operation and intent; that rather than being a ‘neutral’ condition, their intellectuality and eloquence embodied a particular paradigm of male gender identity.

Hence as well as being an attempt to offer original insight into a ‘trio’ of previously neglected Renaissance translations, to explore the significant role such ‘engrlished’ patristic texts played in the inter-confessional strife of the Renaissance period - showing that the Fathers’ were ideologically important to both Protestants and Catholics alike - this dissertation has primarily aimed to use the three works analysed in this study as ‘sites’ on which to investigate the classical / humanistic ‘assumption’ of manhood which Skinner alludes to.

Thus through the exercise of an ‘historicist’ approach, I have aimed to present a ‘picture’ of the way in which one form of humanist praxis - translation - might be seen to have directly worked for male interests, examining texts which were evidently crucial to the cause of Erasmian humanism. I have endeavoured to display how this methodology might be seen to be expediently mobilised in the English Renaissance in response to ‘crises’ which

---

3 Rice has commented on the Reformers’ distaste for patristic thought, stating that the ‘Catholics rapidly occupied the patristic bulwarks that Protestants were beginning to leave so weakly guarded’ - *Saint Jerome*, p.143. However, I would suggest that this thesis had shed light on the way in which the Fathers’ texts were crucial to both religious ‘sides’ in English Renaissance culture, a point which Kristeller has made with respect to the broader pan-European theological impact of Augustinian works - ‘Augustine and the Early Renaissance’, p.360.
specifically affected certain groups of Englishmen. I have suggested that the male translators of the works I have described - whether Protestant clerics, colonisers or persecuted recusants - confidently assumed that their manly readers shared a humanistic utilitarian conceptualisation of textual engagement which strategically sought out exemplars for male experience. Indeed, I have proposed that it was precisely the static nature of this gendered goal of pragmatic humanist praxis which facilitated the 'leap' between supposedly separate types of 'secular' and 'spiritual' literary material: in both types of text the humanist, arguably, sought models for his own manhood.

In fact, whilst thus being deeply indebted to contemporary scholarship on pragmatic humanism, this thesis has also strived to extend the scope of the work of Botucher, Grafton and Jardine. I have not only wished - as I have just intimated - to present the ways in which sacred texts might have been the objects of such practical study, but hoped additionally to stretch the definition of the 'public' end of humanist praxis. These translations I have examined do not, I have asserted, have a simply 'careerist' or 'political' function in any straightforward sense: they seem to address a broader 'problem' which has had an insidious impact upon a contemporary group of men. This, as we have seen, may involve the vernacular versions offering 'counsel' on a range of issues, some of which might be of what we would call a 'personal' nature - such as sexuality - which, I argued, were expected to be interpretatively 'absorbed' by their humanistically trained readers. I would assert that such obliquely given textual advice does not constitute the 'limit' of pragmatic humanism - the work does still potentially contribute to social action by moulding the manliness of its audience - but it, literally, necessitates enlarging our notion of its 'final destination'. Hutson has stated in her discussion of the role of the husband in Renaissance England that he
'occupies both spheres ... is both “indoors” and “outdoors” all at once ...' and, indeed, I would contend that this implies that men in this period might be seen to translate or read in order proffer or seek ‘advice’ on a greater ‘range’ of masculine experiences than has been considered by Grafton and Jardine. Pragmatic humanist scholarship was ‘secular’ in the sense that it probed the text for ‘worldly’ guidance (rather than for spiritual insight or aesthetic pleasure), but this instructive form of manly interpretation might easily have been exercised on issues which were more to do with the kitchen than the commonwealth. Hence Gabriel Harvey - an unmarried man with a waning career - might be seen to have possibly turned to Augustine’s Citie of God at the end of his life to find ‘precedents’ for a more ‘affective’ manhood which gave less credit to civic success.

Indeed, it has been one of the more fascinating - and poignant - outcomes of my research to come to appreciate that what I have described as the intellectual model of humanist masculinity - with its emphasis on erudition, eloquence and public-spirit - actually caused English Renaissance men great difficulty. For instance, this gender ideology, arguably, placed the ill-equipped Protestant clerics of the 1560s under immense pressure to ‘perform’ this learned manliness in order to maintain their religio-political dominance, forcing them to compete against the Catholic exiles for this perilously mutual notion of male identity. Furthermore, the inability to ‘measure up’ to this paradigm might also have caused the settlers in Virginia - without wives, houses and government posts - to experience an acute loss of masculine confidence in their new environment. Indeed, for English Catholics who possessed extremely limited opportunities for public achievement, the model of the vir civilis was, as I argued in the last chapter, tragically unattainable.

However, I would suggest that while humanist masculinity was also potentially a problematic issue for contemporary men, it also simultaneously represented the 'answer' to their dilemmas. For as I have contended throughout this dissertation, men were - unlike their female peers - able to marshal the translation techniques of pragmatic humanism in order to offer their male audience a 'souped up' version of humanist manhood which would work more profitably in the reader's particular milieu. This might have - as in Drant's case - entailed the didactic promotion of 'orthodox' humanist manliness, but it might also have required the rejection of elements of this 'conventional' gender paradigm, such as we witnessed in Healey and Matthew's 'rewriting' of Augustine's 'anti-worldly' agenda. The 'letter' of Renaissance humanist masculinity 'killed', but it also cured.

Thus in this thesis I have tentatively presented potential readings of the function of these renditions, proposing textual elements which might have seemed to 'protude' from these three patristic renditions for those men who endured the difficulties of their original contexts. These hesitant 'meditations' - as I regard them - hence represent, in a loose sense, the result of my response to Skinner's remarks on gender. As E.G. Rupp has declared: 'we cannot help asking our own questions of the past', and, indeed, I acknowledge that to 'read' Renaissance translations for issues of masculinity is to seek out 'answers' which are pertinent to my own historical moment: I am, after all, a distant descendant of the pragmatic humanists.

In my opinion, gender has a history, it is made by history, and it is, therefore, by examining the textual traces of gender formation in the past that I believe we may come to a better awareness of our gendering in the present. Indeed, I would suggest that the analysis of the humanist construction of male identity offered in this thesis particularly presents students
and teachers of the humanities with a valuable insight into their own positioning in relation to
the ostensibly masculine-oriented origins of their scholarship. This gender dynamic certainly
explains to me why female students of the 'arts' often experience a sense of estrangement
and loss of confidence at those elite institutions which still, arguably, retain the Erasmian
educational ethos. However, I believe that where there is knowledge, there is always hope:
material circumstances may mould our identities as men and women, but if - as our analysis
of these renditions has possibly showed us - the individuals of the English Renaissance might
be seen to have elastically 'translated' their gender in response to their conditions, then
perhaps it is possible for us too to 'translate' ourselves into a new future.

---
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THE
SEVENTEENTH BOOKE
OF THE CITTIE OF GO:
Written by Saint Augustine Bishop of Hippo, vnto Marcellinus.

Of the times of the Prophets.

CHAP. I.

Hus haue we attained the understanding of Gods promises made vnto Abraham, and due vnto Israel his seed in the flesh, and to all the Nations of earth as his seed in the spirit: how they were fulfilled the progress of the Cittie of God in those times, did manifest. Now because our last booke ended at the reigne of Dauid, let vs in this booke, proceed with the same reigne, as farre as is requisite. All the time therefore betweene Samuels first prophecy, and the returning of Israel from seauenty yeares captiuitie in Babilon, to repair the Temple (as Hieremey had prophesied) all this is called the time of the Prophets. For although that the Patriarch Noah in whose time the vniuersall deluge befell, and divers others living before there were Kings in Israel, for some holy and heavenly predictions of theirs, may not vndeservedly be called (a) Prophets especially seeing wee see Abraham and Moses chiefly called by those names, and more expressly then the rest: yet the daies wherein Samuel beganne to prophecy, were called peculiarly, the Prophets times. Samuel anoynted Saul first, and afterwards (he being reioiced hee anoynted Dauid for King, by Gods expresse command, and from Dauid loines was all the bloud royall to descend, during that Kingdomes continuance. But if I should rehearfe all that the Prophets (each in his time) succeffively, prefaged of Christ during all this time that the Cittie of God continued in those times, and members of his, I should never make an end. First, because the scriptures (though they feeme but a bare relation of the successue deedes of each King in his time, yet) being considered, with the assistence of Gods spirit, will proove either more, or as fully, prophecies of things to come, as histories of things past. And how laborious it were to stand vpon each peculiar hereof, and how huge a worke it would amount vnto, who knoweth not that hath any insight herein: Secondly, because the prophecies concerning Christ and his Kingdome (the Cittie of God) are so many in multitude, that the disputations arising hereof would not be contained in a farre bigger volume then is necessary for mine intent. So that as I will restraine my penne as near as I can from all superfluous relations in this worke, so will I not omitt any thing that shal be really pertinent vnto our purpose.

L VIVES.

(a) Prophets] The Hebrewes called them Sear, because they saw the Lord (in his predictions or prefigurations of any thing:) with the eyes of the spirit, though not of

Figure 4- The opening of Book XVII of St. Augustine, Citie of God, trans. by I[ohn] H[alely] (London: 1610), p.620
Figure 5 - 'Take up and reade' - engraved title page from St. Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. by William Watts (London: 1631)
Figure 6- Portrait of Sir Tobie Matthew from *A Collection of Letters* ... ed. by [John Donne Jnr.] (London: 1660)
Figure 7- Catholics incarcerated - image from R[ichard] V[erstegan], *Theatrum Crudelitatum Haereticorum Nostri Temporis* (Antwerp: 1587), p.75
Figure 8- Catholics executed - image from Richard Verstegan, *Theatrum Crudelitatum Haereticorum Nostri Temporis* (Antwerp: 1587), p.83
He that taketh not his cross and followeth me, is not worthy of me. Math.10.

All that will live godly in Christ, shall suffer persecutions. 2 Tim.3.

If then you suffer not for Christ, weigh whether you have yet begun to live godly in Christ. August. in Psal.57.

Figure 9- Catholics carrying the cross of persecution - from Thomas Hide, A Consolatorie Epistle to the Afflicted Catholikes (Louvain: 1580), sig.[G7*]
Figure 10- Engraved title page from St. Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. by T[obie] M[atthew], ed. by [Kenelm Digby], 2nd edn (Paris: 1638)