The Auspices of The World and the Child

Ian Lancashire

On 17 July 1522 Wynkyn de Worde published at his Fleet Street shop in London's west suburbs a "propre newe Interlude of the worlde and the chylde / otherwyse called [Mundus & Infans]." This play was not exactly "newe," for it had been inventoried on 5 November 1520, as "mundus a play," in the stock of John Dorne, an Oxford bookseller, at a price of two-pence. De Worde probably reprinted the interlude in July 1522 to take advantage of that summer's political spectacle: the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, visited England from 25 May to 6 July, and on 6 June his royal entry into London was celebrated by seven civic pageants, at each of which the Emperor was saluted by a child with certain Latin verses. These were written by the grammarian William Lily (John Lyly's grandfather), and because the throngs of curious Londoners who lined the streets to welcome Charles found the verse incomprehensible, Henry Pynson, printer to Henry VIII, published a pamphlet translation of the Latin. Some weeks after the royal entry de Worde also began to exploit this public interest. He issued a lytell treatys called the wyse chylde of tbye yere olde, a dialogue between an infant and the Roman Emperor Adrian, and reprinted Mundus, which also begins with the meeting of an "emperour" (204), the World, and the child Infans. The interlude, of course, has nothing to do with the outdoor civic triumph of 1522, but dramatizes the ages of man as he develops from Infans through Lust-and-Liking, Wanton and Manhood to Age, and vacillates between bad counsellors, the World and Folly, and good ones, Conscience Clear and Perseverance, until a final moral conversion takes place. De Worde's redating of the play not only tended to mislead his customers about its subject, but also obscured its original auspices. The World and the Child, as I shall argue, is a provincial household interlude written about fifteen years earlier and addressed to a particular feudal lord at his banquet-hall festivities at Christmas. Critics have, like de Worde, glossed over evidence of the play's staging, date, and auspices, in their case to discuss the "morality's" place in an evolutionary theatrical development from the fifteenth-century Macro plays to the works of Marlowe and Shakespeare. Here my aim will be to see how precisely we can set Mundus in its original date, locality and historical context.

We must first establish what general kind of auspices the play had, as there has been some disagreement about the matter. Richard Southern and the play's latest editor, Mallory Chamberg, Jr., accept Mundus as a conventional hall interlude, acted before an elite audience, but David Bevington, analyzing how performance circumstances and troupe size (ten parts doubled by only two actors) explain many of the playwright's departures from his main source, says that the World's exiting remark, "Now wyll I fare on these flourys" (235), shows that the play "was intended for acting on the green" outdoors before a popular audience. The characters themselves can be trusted, however, "flourys" means "floors," not "flowers," and the playwright wrote for an indoor performance. The World tells the spectators he is with them "in sale" (12), or "in hall," and Wanton also assures them he has served this emperor "in hall and in boure" (121). Later Manhood orders Folly, who has entered rudely, to "Stonde vttre" or "out" (527, 530), and the vice's greeting then, "good eue" (526), suggest a play-hour after dark, when torch-lit hall performances were possible but outdoor staging was not, as Queen Margaret's inability to see, for lack of light, the last Coventry Corpus
Christi pageant in 1457 (the Doomsday play) indicates. In other ways Mundus is quite consistent with hall auspices. The audience is seated both by "rew" or "row" (532, 563), presumably on stools along tables, and "all aboute" (237; cf. 562) or "on every syde" (292); and in great halls interludes were generally acted on the central floor. When Perseverance greets the spectators twice, once as "This company" and again as "this symlytude [identical group] that semely here syttес" (750-51), he must be facing the hall's two long sides in turn. Manhood and Folly call the acting area "this way" or "the waye" (318, 545); it must be the wide aisle separating these rows and leading from the hall entrance up to the dais, where the World's and Manhood's "se" or "sete" (22, 285), an elevated throne, is found. Finally, Folly's quick on-stage provision for Manhood of "a draught of drynke" (651) suggests that a banquet was in progress (as during Henry Medwall's Fulgens and Lucre, ca. 1497) and that the voidée, the wine service towards a feast's end, had been reached.

Court records and household ceremonialia show that winter, particularly the twelve days of Christmas and Shrovetide, was the traditional season for manor-hall interludes in Henry VII's reign, and Mundus is again typical of such plays in this respect. Lust-and-Liking reckons his age in winters (144, 155). Manhood's boast, "Brestplates I haue beten as Steuen was with stony" (260), hardly suits its subject, knightly combat-at-arms, but makes sense as an allusion to St. Stephen's feast on 26 December. Thomas à Becket and Thomas the Apostle are also mentioned (193, 872, 877), and their feast days are, respectively, on 29 and 21 December. More important, the play reflects the medieval "Fest of Fools," when the inferior clergy, both in England and on the continent, took the place of the usual celebrants and high clergy at mass; the deacons on St. Stephen's, the priests on John the Evangelist's (27 December), the choirboys on Innocents' (28 December) and the subdeacons on the Circumcision (1 January). In English churches this inversion of authority survived mainly on Innocents' day, when, according to the Sarum office of the Boy Bishop, the bishop's baculus or staff was held by a choirboy, who presided from the bishop's own seat. The World and the Child seems to echo this ceremony twice. The World calls himself at the start a king "ouer all fodys" (4), that is, children, and yields his seat, livery, sword and authority to the renamed Infans, Manhood (196-97, 210, 285). Secondly, Folly is called a "sayned [blessed] shrew" (530), and after entering with a staff (634) he succeeds in inverting established order by luring Manhood, dedicated to "Mayntayne Holy Chyrches ryght" (446), down from his seat or throne and by enslaving him. Here we should note that Conscience warns Manhood to think on the life of the monarch Robert of Sicily (350-52), who was transformed into a loathed court fool because he had scoffed at a verse in divine service that became the keynote of the Innocents' feast: "Deposuit potentes de sede: et exaltavit humiles."12

John Dorne's inventory sets the terminus ad quem for this Christmas interlude at 1520, and the earliest date so far proposed is 1497. Using Manhood's boast to have conquered some thirteen places as a knight (245-49), E. H. Sugden identifies references there to Kent and Cornwall as ones to Henry VII's suppression of the fifteen thousand Cornish rebels on Blackheath in Kent on 17 June 1497, and to his quelling of Perkin Warbeck's invasions of Kent at Deal in July 1495 and of Cornwall in September 1497. Five place-names seem non-topical (Salerno, Pontoise, Florence, Gascogne and "Ynde the loys" — that is, India the Less), but the remaining six concern Henry's French wars of 1489-92. "Samers" must be St. Omer's, Pas de Calais, which the English evidently took on 10 February 1489.
This is in "Pycardye," and near "Caleys," where Henry landed in person on 2 October 1496 to besiege Boulogne, in the course of which he must have threatened bordering "Artoys."^1

Finally, in June 1489 lord Daubney invaded "Flandes" and relieved the garrison at Dixmude.\(^{17}\) Place-name catalogues, true enough, are conventional in early plays and romances and need not recall specific events, but 1497-1520 limits are verified by Folly's use of a proverbial expression, "there the cocke crewe" (531), that is only used elsewhere, as far as we know, by John Skelton at this time.\(^{18}\)

T. W. Craik for unstated reasons dates The World and the Child ca. 1508.\(^{19}\) This guess is confirmed by an until-now unnoticed historical allusion in Folly's self-description, a matter not in any of the interlude's known sources. After Manhood asks Folly his birthplace, and Folly admits to being a Londoner, this exchange occurs:

\[
\text{Manb.} \quad \text{In London? Where, yf a man the sought?}
\]

\[
\text{Folye.} \quad \text{Syr, in Holborne I was forthe brought; And with the couryers I am betaught; To Westmynster I vsed to wende.}
\]

\[
\text{Manb.} \quad \text{Herke, felowe! why doost thou to Westminster drawe?}
\]

\[
\text{Folye.} \quad \text{For I am a seruaunt of the lawe; Couetous is myne owne felowe, — We twayne plete for the kynge; And poore men that come from vplande, We wyll take theyr mater in hande, — Be it ryght or be it wronge, Theyr thryfte with vs shall wende. (571-82)}
\]

Folly claims to be a lawyer, educated at the Inns of Court, employed at Westminster to plead on behalf of the king, and partnered with Covetous in unscrupulously prosecuting and impoverishing men from the provinces there. Elsewhere there are slights at sword-and buckler rowdiness (540) and revels (654) typical of lawyers then,\(^{20}\) but the brunt of the satire strikes, not at the already frequently attacked profession, but at two individual members of the king's own legal council who were thought guilty of extortion, as well as at the crown itself, for Folly says that the friars crowned him "a kynge" (602) and that he is "gretely beloued with many a lorde" (620). Because Conscience Clear has already equated Folly with the seven deadly sins, including "Couetous" (457-61), the playwright's choice of just that one sin as Folly's law-partner is allegorically inconsistent and invites a special explanation. That choice must signal an attack on William Empson and Edmund Dudley, Henry VII's two lawyer-administrators. They did not technically "plete for the kynge," but they initiated, presented and judged cases in his "Council Learned in the Law."^21 Empson was Commons' speaker in 1491-92, a knight by 1503-04 for service to the crown and chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster in 1504, while Dudley was a common lawyer who rose to prominence as under-sheriff of London from 1496 to 1502, and who by 1506 had become one of Henry VII's paid counsellors.\(^{22}\) In 1506 Dudley was president of the council, and he and Empson together assumed principal responsibility for instituting Hen repressive policies toward the feudal nobility. These "suspended penalties," systematic fi-
nancial sanctions in the form of bonds and recognizances, had ancient royal precedent, but Henry VII greatly accelerated their use from 1502 to his death in 1509: no fewer than thirty-six peers then had to sign such documents. The king, not Empson and Dudley, was the prime mover in these measures, perhaps because of political fear: his older son Arthur had died in 1502, followed by the queen the next year, Henry's own health was uncertain, and in 1501 a Yorkist pretender to the throne appeared, Edmund de la Pole, formerly duke of Suffolk. The public, however, made the king's two counsellors scapegoats, and a London chronicle records this news for 1506-07:

And this yere sprang much sorwe thowr the land, ffor by meane of a ffewe ungracious personyes which namdy theym sylf the kyngis promoters many unleffull & ffforgotyn statutis & actis made hunderyth of yeries passid / were not [sic] quykenyd & sharply callid upon to the grete Inquyetnesse of many of the kyngis Subjectis as well the Rych as the othyr that hadd any competent substaunce . . . Yit now & Specially syne Empson & dudley were sett In auctoryte, many moo In numbyr were callid belfore them ffor many surmysid causis, [Of] The which noon escapid wythowth payyng of ffynys lytyll or moch, and If It were such a matier as soom wold abyde the tryall of the lawe, Then hadd they theyr fffalse Juryes soo ffyxyd unto theym that they were well assured that they wold not passe agayn theyr meyndis, ffor alle was doon In the kyngis name & yit the mooest proffyt cam to they[r] coffyrs.

Empson's and Dudley's "promoters" sometimes gave dubious information, and the infringements for which penalties were exacted often amounted only to minor offences under disused statutes, but the process itself was legal. Consequently, when both men came to trial after Henry VII's death in 1509 they were charged, not with extortion, but with constructive treason for plotting against the king's life. No case existed. Their enemies, however, included the nobility and apparently Margaret, duchess of Richmond, the new king's grandmother, whose chaplain, John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, preached strongly against Henry VII's avarice at his funeral. On 17 August 1510 Empson and Dudley were executed on Tower Hill, not for their own sins, but for the "Folly" and "Covetous" they had served in the previous reign.

As far as we know, this allusion does not extend to political allegory. Folly's antics are common to other dramatic vices, such as New Guise, Nowadays and Nought in Mankind and Imagination in Hick Scornor: they too haunt the stews, jest scatologically, mock clerics, and brawl. Nevertheless little is known about the anti-Empson-and-Dudley propaganda, and political attacks can take unusual forms. Empson, for instance, was mocked for his low birth in Northamptonshire, and his father (incorrectly) made out to be a sievemaker. This ridicule may be behind both Manhood's guess that Folly is a "craftes man" (538), and the vice's reply: "Ye, syr, I can bynde a syue and tynke a pan; / And, therfo, a coryous bucker-player I am" (539-40). If Folly's sieve-binding experience explains, as he suggests, his expert swordsmanship, he may bear a sieve in the comic combat-at-arms between himself and Manhood to epitomize, in caricature, the lawyer. While this allusion is uncertain, and others possibly existing may never be recognized for lack of historical evidence, the overall political point is clear, and Mundus must have been written after the powers of Empson and Dudley peaked ca. 1506 and before Henry VII's death on 22 April 1509, when the two were arrested. Indeed, Craik's guess as to the interlude's date, ca. 1508, is probably right. Composition late in this
forty-month period is rendered likely by Folly's admission that his "thedom[e] [time of thriving] is nere past" (533).

At this point we have considerable information about the play's first auspices. *The World and the Child* must have been performed in a noble or well-off household celebrating Christmas ca. 1506-09. Folly's sardonic references to friars, abbeys and nunneries (600-06) and to the inns of court rule out monastic or legal sponsorship. On the other hand, Manhood's titled rank (239, 241) and preoccupation with courtly love (135-39), estate administration (162-63), chivalric enterprise (200) and warfare (243-66) point to the aristocracy, since the man-type of a moral interlude generally, though not inevitably, reflects the playwright's intended audience. When Perseverance closes the play by taking "leue of kynge and knyght" (977), he is using an alliterative formula that need not imply royal court performance, but the terms do indicate an elite audience. The sponsor probably had a library, as one of the interlude's sources apparently existed only in manuscript, but he need not have — in fact he is unlikely to have — supported a troupe of actors. These usually numbered four or five, but *Mundus* was written to be doubled, very economically, by only two persons, and they apparently lacked a minstrel's or singer's talents (to judge from the play-text). The interlude in this respect looks like a one-time venture, and possibly the sponsor lacked money or regular interest in plays, or both. His seat must have been rural, within about a full day's ride from London (forty to fifty miles), because when Manhood objects to Folly that "it is hens a grete waye" (to London) the latter answers, "Parde, syr, we may be there on a daye" (669-70). The playwright's sympathy with "poore men that come from vpplande (that is, from the interior) also points to provincial auspices. The attack on Empson and Dudley — or at least on the king's domestic policy — means that the sponsor had a particular grudge against their exactions. Finally, he may have had some obvious dealings with Wynk de Worde: printers seem to have had access to interlude manuscripts, which were naturally private, only where the owner otherwise patronized their shops.

Only one man, to my knowledge, had a rank, a seat, financial circumstances and political troubles that correspond to those apparently true of the sponsor of *Mundus*: Richard (Grey) thirteenth earl of Kent and lord (in the barony of) Grey of Ruthin (1484?-1523). Despite his earldom, Richard Grey's authority and seat lay north of London; after 1503 he served as justice of the peace in Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Huntingdonshire, and his family seat was at Ampthill, Bedfordshire, about forty miles from Tudor London. Though the late queen's cousin, the earl was one of four noblemen who suffered most from Henry VII's monetary sanctions as administered by Empson and Dudley. These, as well as the earl's personal debts, climaxed together in 1505-08. In 1505 he had to surrender the lucrative wardship and marriage of Elizabeth Trussell to Henry VII, from whom the earl's father had purchased it. This action was evidently unjust: Dudley's petition from the Tower in 1509-10 said that the earl "ought in conscience to be well Recompenced" for it. Grey owed the king about £1,700 in 1506, partly for the earl's late father's debts and partly for livery of his own lands, and he had to sign a recognizance of 4,000 marks and redirect income from certain lands to cover these debts. By 1507 the situation had worsened. Henry obtained, in a "recovery" to Edmund Dudley and other foecfees, 18,000 acres of the earl's lands in Wales and Shropshire, the incomes of which were to be applied against his debts (then up to £1,800 over and above the 4,000 marks' recognizance), and the titles to which were to go, after his death, to the crown. Another blow fell in August 1507, when Rich-
ard entered into a £10,000 recognizance that he would not transact land business, grant offices and annuities, or sell his estates' timber without royal permission, and when the earl had to submit the charge of his household to a crown officer, Sir William Gascoigne, and had to wait daily in the king's court, except for eight days each quarter and other periods specially licensed by the king. The final, decisive loss came, apparently, on 28 November 1508, when Grey made over to the king, with Thomas Wolsey as a witness, all his manors and lands, including his seat Ampthill. As far as is known, the earl's losses were never gained back after Henry VIII came to the throne. The bitterness that this ruin created came welling out in "A Balade of Empson," written in the first months of the new reign. The London chronicle attributes it as follows: "The maker of this Balad or cawser thereof was Therle of kent ffor soo much as the sayd Empson had dyssayvyd hym of a part of hys land, and In Synystir wayes had soo enfourmyd the kyngis grace of hym that he was long holdyn undyr and put to grete hynderaunce & punishmment, wherffor he In his dyspyte & shame cawsid this to be made of hym." The chronicler says that this ballad was one of five he had "hard of & seen," so that it was probably printed. De Worde may have brought it out, as he published ca. 1507 a verse account of the Justes And tournemt Of ye Moneth Of June, Parfurnysshed And Done By Rychard Gray, erle Of Kent, By Charles brandon, wh Theyr Two Aydes Agaustry All Comers. In 1509 de Worde also styled himself printer to Margaret, duchess of Richmond, who was strongly critical of her son's extortions. These, in the earl's case, helped so deplete his estates that in 1523, when he died, his heir and brother Henry could not claim the earldom for lack of funds.

Richard Grey, then, would have relished Mundus' satire of crown extortions, even if, as appears to be the case (his regular patronage extended only to a bearward), he did not much like moral interludes. His own household counsellors, who would have had (as masters of the earl's seasonal revels) complete discretion as to the interlude's contents, would have had an even better reason for sponsoring it. Some of the playwright's manipulations of his source material can be understood if Manhood were modelled partly on the earl himself in an effort to warn him of his precarious circumstances. The earl's advisors, especially those inherited from his father's time, certainly had cause to speak out. Richard's father, in his will of 1503, said he feared the young man "will not thrive but will be a waster," and at his own death in 1523 Richard was reported to have wasted his estate "by gaming." He undoubtedly had a gallant's reputation. While in London at Henry's pleasure, the young earl, as a new member of the order of the Garter (1505), engaged in both the 1507 jousts with Brandon and a tournament before the Spanish ambassador on 5 March 1508, when he tilted with Henry Stafford, brother of the duke of Buckingham. The first tournament, we know from de Worde's poem, provoked some "To reporte of gentylmen vylny" and to say "The entrepyse was fondly vndertake" (154, 265). Richard was "fyrst of all" (198) at these games, and they were violent: one challenger was injured (133), and

Pyece of harneys flewe in to the place
Theyr swerdes brake they smote thycke & a pace
They spared not cors / armyt / nor yet vambrace
They lyst not sporte (85-88)

This behaviour, and the earl's calamitous love of gambling, both characterize Manhood and are not obvious in the play's sources. The World teaches him to "haunte alwaye to chyaulry"
(200), which Manhood interprets as mindless battlefield conquests, the mutilation and slaying of fellow knights (254-66). Conscience Clear later rebukes him for exceeding a healthy "sportyng of playce" (470), much as Richard and his fellows were apparently criticized in 1507 because "They lyst not sporte." When Folly takes Manhood off to London "to lerne reuell" (706), they go to the earl's own vice: Folly says, "we wyll with Lombardes at passage playle" (673), a game from which Age enters later financially ruined (791-94). Interestingly, Folly suggests they seek lodging during this prodigal spree at the Pope's Head Tavern (674-75): this inn could be found in Lombard Street, where also stood, at the sign of the George, the earl's London house in which he would have stayed while at court.

These points of similarity between the circumstances of Manhood and those of the earl lead to an obvious question. Is it possible that Manhood's London visit and his loss of estates mirror the earl's experiences in 1507-08? The twelfth earl, like Manhood, fought against France in 1491-92 and commanded certain royal forces, in whose ranks perhaps stood his teenaged son Richard, at Blackheath against the Kentish and Cornish rebels in 1497. Manhood is fleeced of all his "rentes" and "rychesse" (769) by a royal "seruaunt" (612) he has accepted and followed to London to gamble and revel. Even so, Grey incurred staggering losses of wealth and land at the time he was forced to accept a royal servant to run his household and to go to London to reside at court. One of the earl's counsellors might, not unreasonably, have interpreted the king's London confinement of the young heir, already publicly known as a "waster," as a tempter's deliberate exposure of the earl to his well-attested weaknesses. Folly is no knight, and Sir William Gascoigne (the official who took charge of Richard's household in 1507) seems not to have been a lawyer, but the two are similar in some respects. A great-grandson of the Lord Chief Justice who, in Shakespeare's 2 Henry IV, jailed prince Hal, Gascoigne was created a knight of the Bath in 1487 (when he came into his father's mainly Yorkshire lands) and faithfully attended the Tudor court on ceremonial occasions, such as the reception of Catherine of Aragon in 1501 and the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520. Like Folly, Gascoigne had good "felowes" in abbeys (605-06), was litigious, and unscrupulously strongarmed other men's goods: complaints against him appear in the Star Chamber and the Court of Requests, the latter resulting in fines against him and the abbot of Fountains Abbey for instigating "a riott" ca. 1495-1500. The distinction between Empson and Dudley, and their instrument Gascoigne, might not be significant as far as the earl's household was concerned. In telling Richard Grey, "wayte well that thou suffre no shame / Neyther for londe nor for rente" (162-63), the interlude may well speak for the earl's old retainers, displaced by an upstart Tudor favorite. Perhaps a strong warning could only be given in a Christmas interlude, acted at one of the few times Richard would be allowed home and by, not regular players, who would be a frivolous expense to Gascoigne, but two loyal household members. Auspices at Ampthill, Bedfordshire, in Christmas 1507-08, after the earl's shocking loss of authority to Gascoigne but before utter ruin struck the following November, fully accord with what we know at the present time about this play.

This argument is a tentative one. New research and newly discovered documents may alter or controvert it, but until some thesis is put, one cannot be tested; more critically, because records from the reign of Henry VII are largely uncalendared, until a thesis is put none at all may be thought possible. Yet in an age of John Skelton's verse attacks on Cardinal Wolsey, and of deceptively lovely carols that in fact pose allegorical political com-
mented on Henry VIII's relations with his wives Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn, extensive political references in interludes must be expected. Indeed two other plays printed by de Worde, *The Interlude of Youth* and *Hick Scorer* (both ca. 1514), appear to deal with national politics. To general audiences like de Worde's clientele *The World and the Child* must of course have seemed an abstract "moral" play, but to the household that sponsored it the impulse to give "to airy nothing / A local habitation and a name" must have been as irresistible as it was necessary.
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Notes

*Specimens of the Pre-Shaksperean Drama*, ed. J. M. Manly (Boston, 1897), I, 353-85. All citations will be to this text. A facsimile of the 1522 edition has been edited by John S. Farmer, *Tudor Facsimile Texts* (London, 1909). My "Provenance of *The Worldde and the Chyld*," *PBSA*, 67 (1973), 377-88, discusses some problems of the unique extant copy.


9 Southern argues that this entrance must have had a screen with at least two doors, since otherwise Conscience could not have exited easily just as Perseverance entered (pp. 140-41).


12 The late Cambridge text of this romance (ca. 1475-1500) is in "Nachträje zu den Legenden" [ed. C. Horstmann], *Archiv*, 62 (1879), 426-31 (see lines 40-41).


15 *State Papers and Manuscripts existing in the Archives Collection of Milan*, I (1359-1618), ed. A. B. Hinds (1913), no. 379, p. 248; for the name in this form, see [Pierre Deschamps], *Dictionnaire de Géographie ancienne et moderne* (Paris [1870]), col. 1133.

17 Temperley, pp. 92-93.


19 *The Tudor Interlude: Stage, Costume, and Acting* (Leicester, 1958), p. 140.


27 Chamberlin thinks the phrase indicates Henry VII’s presence (p. 27), but see *Songs, Carols, and other Miscellaneous Poems*, ed. Roman Dyboski, EETSES 101 (London, 1907), p. 18, line 5. The World, Manhood and even Conscience Clear are also termed kings.


29 This relationship is most plainly true of the Rastells and playwrights in More’s circle, men like Henry Medwall and John Heywood (for whom see A. W. Reed, *Early Tudor Drama* [London, 1926]).


31 The others were Henry Algeron Percy, fifth earl of Northumberland, Thomas Grey, marquis of Dorset, and George Neville, lord Burgavenny (Lander, p. 341). Richard Grey’s mother was the sister of Edward IV’s queen Elizabeth, herself mother of Henry VII’s queen.


34 Lander, p. 346. The acquisition of some of the earl’s Cheshire manors by Dudley and others may be part of this “recovery” (Brodie, “Edmund Dudley,” p. 160).

35 *The Victoria History of the County of Bedford*, ed. William Page, II (London, 1908), 37-38. Some of Empson’s and Dudley’s promoters may have been involved: a late document states that the earl’s possessions “were taken into the King’s hands in consequence of entries [on lands] without licence, &c., by virtue of certain inquisitions” (*LP* IV.5336.8).
The Great Chronicle, p. 347. The earl’s persona in the poem says: “My miend It Is, thow shalt have thy duty / Becawse thow crafftyd, part of myne herytage / I wyll doo my best, to promoot the on hy [i.e. to hang him] / For thy ffals glose, & dyssymlyd Curtesy.”


N. F. Blake, “Wynkyn de Worde: The Later Years,” Gutenberg-Jahrbuch 1972, ed. Hans Widmann, pp. 131-32. Margaret’s patronage, however, can be traced as well in 1508.


The Complete Peerage, VII, 167.


My forthcoming Revels edition of these two plays will discuss their politics.