Staging Foxe at the Fortune and the Red Bull¹

MARK
BAYER

Résumé : *Cet article considère jusqu'à quel point deux pièces de théâtre jacobéennes, If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody (1604), par Thomas Heywood, et The Whore of Babylon (1606), par Thomas Dekker, promouvaient l'éducation religieuse et le zèle protestant des spectateurs londoniens de la classe populaire après la Réforme pas encore achevée. Pour ce faire, elles disséminaient des histoires choisies aussi bien que l'idéologie du livre hautement significatif de John Foxe, Acts and Monuments (dit The Book of Martyrs), à un public plus large que celui que l'auteur lui-même avait visé.*

Even the most zealous of playwrights would hardly consider dramatizing John Foxe's popular *Book of Martyrs* (first ed. 1563) in its entirety, or even in substantial part. Yet the ideology of militant Protestantism so abundant in that work clearly permeates much early modern English drama, where, through rich allusions and a wealth of furtive commentary, it contributes to the factional ecclesiastical controversy in the largely unsettled aftermath of the Reformation. Too often, studies which elegantly underscore the synergistic interplay among drama, religious polemic, and early modern Londoners do so by focusing either on individual playwrights, sweeping ideological trends over the course of several decades, or specific instances where plays are actively imbricated in facets of the ongoing debate.² What is lost is a sense of how the drama resonated locally, for those communities who might be reached most effectively through the stage and who may have received a considerable part of their religious education through plays. After all, playgoing was significantly more than an opportunity for dramatists to parade different points of view; it was an entertainment service that mandated vigorous engagement in order to achieve profitability and to influence its often heterogeneous audiences. I will argue that dramatic popularizations

of Protestantism, and particularly of the perspective of one of its most strident avatars, John Foxe, constitute forceful interventions in an ongoing religious debate, not merely by reflecting the established views of their audiences, but by educating them and modeling new forms of religious orthodoxy. The propaganda in these plays is designed not as a complacent celebration of the Elizabethan religious settlement, but, by invoking the spectre of an ongoing — and growing — Catholic insurgency, as a warning to a nation that was incompletely and inadequately reformed. Part of the mission of these plays seems to be to popularize history for a broader audience,³ rendering it more useful as religious and political propaganda, since the very features which differentiate the dramatic versions from their originals in *Acts and Monuments* are inspired by aspects of the latter calculated to intensify that work's appeal.

Both Thomas Heywood's *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody* (1604) and Thomas Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1606), which take episodes of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* as source material, were originally staged at theatres north of London's city wall: the former at the Red Bull in Clerkenwell, the latter at the Fortune a half-mile to the southeast in Finsbury.⁴ Although there is much we do not (and probably cannot) know about the audience demographics at particular London theatres, both the Red Bull and the Fortune are usually described as purveyors of popular low-culture entertainment to often raucous audiences who, because of their limited access to other forms of news media and political and religious propaganda, might be more susceptible to the ideologically motivated statements disseminated in dramatic performances. Even more than other London neighbourhoods, Clerkenwell and the environs to the east in Finsbury around Golding Lane and Whitecross Street in the parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate contained disproportionate numbers of tradesmen, their apprentices, and the working poor, all frequent consumers of theatrical productions.⁵

London's Suburbs in Reformation Historiography

Evaluating these plays' impact upon local religious controversy entails confronting numerous contested issues among historians of Reformation England, who have joined a surprisingly acrimonious debate concerning the spread of the Reformation throughout English society. Since both of the works I am discussing are engaged in the construction of Renaissance historiography, an interpretation of these two plays in their performance contexts will depend largely on competing narratives concerning the spread of the theology of the Protestant Reformation to the poorer environs of London, which were clearly not at the cusp of intellectual or ideological

change. If we accept that England had become a stable and unified Protestant nation with the Elizabethan settlement of 1559,⁶ the numerous editions of *The Book of Martyrs* published over the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries are partially evacuated of their polemic force, as there would be little urgency about spreading the ideology of Protestantism at a time when its basic tenets and institutional hegemony were well established.⁷

But if we follow those who consider the English Reformation a largely unsettled movement, active reformers as anxious and vehement proponents of radically new theological and political ideas, and the majority of the common populace as confused and relatively unversed followers of a new church, who residually maintained older Catholic traditions and beliefs until well into the seventeenth century, Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* and popular dramatic versions of its contents are rendered important polemic and propagandistic interventions, leading to the eventual mastery and thoroughgoing dissemination of the ideology of the reformed church. The spread of Protestantism was far from complete, as the activities of recusants and their Jesuit leaders continued, to a greater or lesser extent, even into the eighteenth century. The government continued to view recusancy as a destabilizing presence and instituted taxes and other regulatory measures against Catholics, until these policies were finally abandoned in 1733.⁸ This latter narrative comprises a more persuasive version of the history of the Reformation, especially of its spread among skilled and unskilled urban workers — the last to receive the reformed gospel.

The situation in London was even more urgent than elsewhere in the realm. Susan Brigden notes that though the “men of London were notoriously easy to rally to a cause” and had a long history of supporting interests contrary to the crown, widespread acceptance of emergent religious movements was difficult to achieve due to the diversity of London's population and its constant fluctuation and growth.⁹ During the return to Catholicism under Mary, many embraced the return to the old faith, while many others, for whom religious debate rarely entered everyday life, conformed willingly to whatever doctrine prevailed at their local parish church, which, of course, was dictated by the diocese at the behest of the crown. Although such conformists were not actively engaged in any kind of Counter-Reformation, more vociferous churchmen interpreted their weak religious convictions as more or less the same thing. Many parishes, including St. Botolph Aldersgate near the Fortune, enthusiastically returned to Catholicism even before the order from Archbishop Edmund Bonner in 1554, and only reluctantly conformed to Protestantism again under Elizabeth.¹⁰ For some, moreover, religious orientation was a matter less of personal conviction than of financial gain. Many Londoners reaped the rewards of the dissolution of monas-

tery lands and the seizure of monastic wealth and were willing to embrace Protestantism less out of a conviction that they had discovered the “true” church than because it was a relatively effortless path to prosperity and increased social standing. At the same time, as certain individuals were profiting from the ongoing ecclesiastical turmoil, parish churches often experienced financial crisis and simply did not have the resources to expand their evangelical mission.¹¹ Clearly, even when it was possible to determine the allegiances of London churchgoers, their religious zeal was neither as homogeneous nor as ardent as suggested by impassioned apologists on both sides. The urban poor, furthermore, represented a different but no less serious problem for zealous reformers. According to Peter Clark, this group represented a “third world” of the spiritually ignorant, many of whom attended church infrequently, if at all, and could hardly be relied upon to rally to any spiritual cause.¹²

The tenuous grasp of Protestantism and the psychological divisions it exposed within once harmonious local communities are forcefully registered in John Swinnerton’s *Christian Love-Letter* (1606), addressed to his beloved. In it, the author, believing that “they cannot agree in love that disagree in faith,” appeals to her to turn away from Catholicism, so that they may be married.¹³ He fashions himself among the poorer and relatively uneducated classes, thereby effectively aligning himself with a large majority of the playgoers at the larger public theatres. He admits that though he has “no special place allotted me in the building of the holy temple of our savior,” in circumscribed arenas he is able to “set [his] hand thereunto though I rank myself among the meanest of the laborers.”¹⁴ In this work, which rehearses typical Protestant beliefs in justification by faith and *sola scriptura*, Swinnerton is “determined . . . to write something unto you, that should concern you, and whereby that . . . Egyptian darkness where your soul is benighted, might in a timely manner be expelled” so that “the principal impediment betwixt us two” may be eradicated.¹⁵ *The Christian Love-Letter* demonstrates the important ways in which religious controversy impinged on the everyday lives of ordinary working Londoners far from the locus of this debate, while suggesting that the lack of a widely-held consensus on these matters had unanticipated social and personal consequences. The fact that a “mean laborer,” or one who would choose to label himself as such, would take the trouble to pen and eventually publish an extended tract on his personal reflections on the ongoing religious differences attests further to the tenuous hold of the official religion on the general public, even into the seventeenth century. Though Swinnerton was obviously the beneficiary of some sort of education and was well-connected enough to publish the letter, his imaginative and impassioned approach to ecclesiastical controversy suggests that

Protestants were well aware of local fissures within parish churches and recognized their precarious sway over the souls of Londoners. Clearly Reformers were in need of some sort of galvanizing pressure to solidify the popular support of the new religion and to repair the divisions created within families and communities, divisions that are largely unnoticed by historians interested in the beliefs of the city or kingdom as a whole.

The emergent Church of England also confronted other, more substantial, obstacles to its hegemony. Recusancy was a well understood, if not always visible phenomenon: a network of Catholic houses throughout London provided food and money to poor papists; tradesmen's guilds often provided protection to Catholic members, offering them their only access to the mass and other sacraments;¹⁶ numbers of Jesuits traveled throughout the nation and were especially active in ports. In addition, since there was no way of judging the religious convictions of individuals within Protestant parishes, which included outwardly conforming Catholics, zealous Reformers felt obliged to entrench their cause at any opportunity and to envisage effective ways of localizing their message. The fear of mounting Catholic activities among those at all levels of society was especially acute in Clerkenwell, home since 1185 to the erstwhile priory of St. John of Jerusalem and St. Mary's nunnery. The estates of this priory were confiscated by Henry VIII in 1546,¹⁷ and the attached chapel became a parish church in 1559 with the accession of Elizabeth, but it is probable that, as a result of nearly 400 years of intimate ties to the Church of Rome, members of this community maintained Catholic allegiances longer than the general London populace, distressing neighbouring Protestants. Indeed, of those cited for recusancy and "failing to attend church" in the Session records of Middlesex County, a disproportionate number were parishioners at St. James's, Clerkenwell. Fears of Catholic activity in the community were confirmed on 14 March 1628, when a Jesuit College located in a mansion belonging to the Earl of Shrewsbury adjacent to St. John's in Clerkenwell was discovered and raided by order of parliament (see figure 1). Subsequent investigations demonstrated that this brotherhood of ten priests was well funded and well supplied with utensils, relics, and books containing the emblem of the Society of Jesus. These documents also indicate that this group evaded persecution only through the patronage of influential members of the nobility, civil service, and municipal authorities.¹⁸ Records do not reveal how long this "conclave" was in operation but suggest that it was in existence at least by 1614. But regardless of the date on which the college was established, the decision to locate it in Clerkenwell suggests that at least some members of the community maintained Catholic sympathies to a greater degree than in other London parishes. *The Whore of Babylon*, perhaps in an

effort to alert its audience to the close proximity of the Jesuit threat, specifically alludes to the existence of these and similar safe houses, claiming that some “fill our [*i.e.*, English] rooms . . . to watch our entrance, / And arm all against us” (1.1.179–81).¹⁹

The impact of these religiously oriented plays, therefore, was not confined to fortifying specifically Protestant sympathies, but extended to the rectification of those who maintained Catholic allegiances; like the nation as a whole, certain communities remained divided on ecclesiastical issues. Works of popular culture, like the plays in question, are certainly not limited to the advancement of a univocal agenda. Rather, relying on their ability to evoke a strong affective response, as opposed to a rational, hermeneutic one, their value lies in the ability to reconcile apparent ideological conflict, erase contradiction, and convert various opposed factions to a single point of view. This, after all, is the vision of playgoing propagated by religiously motivated theatre-haters, who often regarded theatrical spectacle as blasphemous, tending towards “idolomania,” to use John Gee’s term, and therefore indispensable to advancing the Catholic agenda. Plays, for Philip Stubbes, “are quite contrary to the Word of grace, and sucked out of the Devil’s teats, to nourish us in idolatry, heathenry, and sin.” He delivers a stern warning to players that “whosever abuses the word of our God on stages in plays and enterludes abuses the majesty of God in the same . . . purchasing to himself eternal damnation.”²⁰ The overriding anxiety for Stubbes and other antitheatricalists was that plays inherently promoted a mystical — and emotionally appealing — way of understanding the world that had undeniable affinities with Catholic doctrine and therefore served as an aid in maintaining habitual ties to the old religion. These writers were unable and unwilling either to recognize the potential value of dramatic productions of any kind, even when they seemed undeniably to advance the Protestant cause.

But there is no reason to think that the theatre might not work to promote Protestant orthodoxy. Almost a century after the official reform of religion in England, John Gee, despite the usual misgivings of those inclined to Puritanism, actually implicated the theatres in the sluggish spread of the reformation and the growing insurgency of the old religion: “the Jesuits being or having actors of such dexterity, I should see no reason that they should set up a company of themselves, which will surely put down the Fortune, Red Bull, Cock-Pit, and Globe.”²¹ Gee’s argument is not that the theatre is inherently papist, but rather that Catholics, through an ensemble of stage tricks integrated into their service of worship, have been much more adept at manipulating theatrical resources to promote their cause. Jesuits, like poets who play on the emotions of their readers, “well knew that deep passions, especially affright and astonishing admiration, do for the time

Figure 1: A Jesuit Priest captured. From *The Rat-Trap*. (London, 1641), sig. A1^r. Wing R 294. Reproduced by permission of The British Library (shelfmark: 100.a.48).

bereave and suspend exact inquiring discourse.”²² Protestants, he feels, might use the theatre to reoccupy some of the sanctity eradicated in the turn away from transubstantiation, the performance of miracles, adulation of the saints, and other “fabulous tricks” by using the emotional dimension of playgoing to alert the audience to the error intrinsic to these abandoned practices. The goal, as he conceived it, was to use the very things that were reminiscent of Catholic ritual to “shake off [our] gracious grand-fathers the priests and Jesuits, and so to bid . . . the Roman Religion farewell.”²³ The affective appeal projected in drama is able to engage, colonize, and reorient

ideological beliefs in any number of ways, given specific historical and topographical circumstances.²⁴

Many Protestants, of course, did recognize the utility of the theatre. Protestant heroes were regularly lionized in stage plays at the outdoor playhouses; the life of *Thomas, Lord Cromwell* was dramatized at the Globe in 1600, while the same actors who performed *The Whore of Babylon* at the Fortune staged the two-part *Sir John Oldcastle* in 1599 and 1600, undoubtedly capitalizing on the Chamberlain's Men's miscalculation in depicting a roguish figure of the same name negatively in Shakespeare's *Henry IV*. Another play, quite possibly by Heywood, *Captain Thomas Stukeley* (c. 1597), like *The Whore of Babylon*, consistently portrays the Catholic forces of Spain, Portugal, and Ireland as wholly incompetent and effective only through treachery and duplicity.²⁵ These popular plays merely continued a well-established tendency initiated by various itinerant players (especially under Henry VIII and Edward VI), the grammar schools, and universities dating from the early years of the Reformation to treat controversial religious issues on stage. Many Protestants realized that collectively experienced intercessions, ranging from sermons to printed broadsheets, to stage plays, offset a deficiency in the indwelling faith prioritized in Protestant theology and, moreover, that the playhouse was often perceived as a welcome alternative to tedious sermonizing. Thus the theatre was a natural analogue to the catechism, which likewise strove to distill essential religious principles in a simplified form that the ignorant could readily grasp.²⁶ The plays I discuss in the following pages, like *The Book of Martyrs* itself, sought to do just that by erasing inner conflict within the populace, who — as a result of personal misgivings, inadequate access to statements of theology, or whatever other causes — were incompletely reformed.

Thomas Heywood, *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* (1604)

It is within this climate of nervous Protestantism that Heywood's dramatization of Foxe's "Miraculous Preservation of Princess Elizabeth" first appeared on the public stage. This play, taking Foxe's narrative as its primary source, shares his most general goal, to spread effectively and polemically the theology and politics of the Reformation to the widest possible audience and to instill an ideology of reform in those segments of society not usually targeted by religious ideologues, Protestant or Catholic. The play's performance at the Red Bull had the capacity to extend bellicose Protestant ideology to those who were completely illiterate, as well as those not disposed to attentive churchgoing and ordinary sermonizing. Yet despite its obviously close relationship to its Foxeian counterpart, Heywood's drama

not only incorporates but also enhances and extends the martyrologist's distinctive techniques of popular appeal, rendering the rhetoric of Reform in an idiom understandable to playgoers. To view these works in dialogue, therefore, is to witness the interplay of two locally viable forms of popular education, both suited to particular communities, one obviously literate and at least somewhat familiar with the nuances of English ecclesiastical history, the other less educated and even, in some measure, illiterate.

The Book of Martyrs undertakes to disseminate the ideology of Reform in an effort to maintain and complete that project and simultaneously ward off the spectre of a Counter-Reformation and, in so doing, thwart a return to the massive and violent persecutions of Protestants under Mary. Evidence suggests that this goal was achieved beyond the hopes of either its compiler or its printer, John Day. It, along with the vernacular Bible, was one of the few books with which the illiterate and semiliterate public was familiar in any detail. By order of the Privy Council, a copy of the 1570 edition was placed in every cathedral church in England and in the homes of clergy.²⁷ Subsequent editions, especially those of 1576 and 1583, project a significant role for the *The Actes and Monuments* in pursuit of an actively Protestant foreign policy throughout Europe in the interests of the "elect nation."²⁸ This increased emphasis on nationalism and England's place in an emergent Reformed Europe served to entrench the connection between the English nation and the Protestant agenda. Those not compelled by the theology and doctrine native to the Protestant cause could perhaps be swayed through an appeal to their patriotism.

Much of the credit for the success of *The Book of Martyrs*, however, must be given to its zealously Protestant printer, John Day. Day had a personal stake in the printing and publication of such a large and unwieldy work, which would have taxed both the capital resources and skilled labour force of most Elizabethan printers. It was Day, in keeping with the Reformation desire to spread the word of God, who encouraged Foxe to translate his Latin martyrology, *Rerum in Ecclesia Gestarum* (1559), and to include numerous iconographic woodcut illustrations precisely to appeal to those who were less scholarly disposed.²⁹ Not only was *The Book of Martyrs* effectively distributed and financed, but it was more affordable to sections of the reading public that could not otherwise afford such a capacious folio volume. The third edition of 1576, often known as the "cheap" edition, is much smaller, printed on paper of poorer quality, contains fewer typefaces, and generally uses smaller type to reduce the amount of paper required for each volume.³⁰ It also reprints many features, initiated in the 1570 edition, which ameliorate the book's daunting complexity among the class of readers I have been concentrating on. The book contains numerous appendices,

tables, and indexes, which assist the reader in finding specific accounts by year, author, or martyr.³¹

But even these devices may not have been enough to educate a large segment of the population in London's poorer neighbourhoods. Craftsmen, apprentices, the poor and dispossessed — in short, the uneducated — make up a substantial portion of Foxe's intended audience. In "The Epistle Dedicatory to the Queen's Majesty," he states, "though the story being written in the popular tongue serveth not so greatly for your own peculiar reading, and for such as be learned . . . [it is] in the necessity of the ignorant flock of Christ committed to your government in this Realm of England."³² But despite his desire for inclusiveness and interpretive coherence, Foxe relied on his audience's ability to read and decipher Elizabeth's plight in terms familiar to those already engaged on either side of this theological debate. "Elizabeth's Preservation," like the *Book of Martyrs* in general, is presented in terms of an Augustinian dichotomy between the visible and invisible church (interpreted by Reformers as that between the false Roman church and its true, reformed counterpart), a context with which semi-literate theatre-goers at the Red Bull would not necessarily be familiar.

Heywood's play successfully remedies this deficiency by transforming the abstract interchange between reader and text into a palpable, dialogic interaction, whereby Clerkenwell audiences were invited to fashion themselves among the persecuted and thereby become participants in Elizabeth's plight. The playwright attempts to "naturalize the politics of Protestantism" by placing religious concerns within a more "human" agenda. This strategy not only enhances the play's "dramatic emotion" and more general affective appeal, but, I argue, was also necessary to render the play intelligible and enhance its educative value for less educated audiences.³³ Heywood does this by enhancing moments of spectacle, magnifying the role of lower-class characters, and focusing on the economic charity of Elizabeth towards her subjects.

Attesting to the success of these dramaturgical innovations, the prologue to the first authorized quarto edition in 1639 mentions the widespread popularity of the play; so popular, in fact, was it "that some by stenography, drew / The plot" and printed it without authorization from the players or the playwright eight times between 1605 and 1639, forcing "the Author to vindicate that wrong" decades later. Heywood attributes its notoriety to the play having been "well performed at first" among the citizens of Clerkenwell at the Red Bull and, later, at other theatres, citizens who "did throng the seats, the boxes, and the stage."³⁴ The epilogue suggests that this original success was due to the strength of the historical subject matter, that the narrative serves a didactic function, "that now in you does *rest* / To know

... the princess young Elizabeth.”³⁵ The audience, hopefully, will leave the theatre with a more intimate and visceral knowledge of the princess than any written work could convey. Elizabeth’s story not only provides an example of godly perseverance but, in the process, offers a Protestant figure who would become the locus for a new discourse of positive national history during the “halcyon days” (Foxe, sig. q1^r) of her reign, juxtaposed with her antithesis Mary Tudor, one of the obvious targets for the vitriol of Foxe and in both the plays I am discussing.

In *The Book of Martyrs*, Mary’s reign is introduced as “the utter destruction of the Realm,” the lowest point in the history of the English Church, precisely due to that monarch’s vehemently anti-Protestant policies (Foxe, sig. GGGg4^v). In this narrative of Elizabeth’s deliverance, it is Mary and the Bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner, who are singled out as culprits in an account where very few of the perpetrators are demonized for fear of ongoing harassment and likely censorship. In the play, both characters, especially the latter, take a much more active role in endangering the life of the princess: in Act One of Part One Mary explicitly gives the order to commit Elizabeth to the Tower, shunning all appeals for mercy (1 *If You Know Not Me*, ll.111–32). The play’s principal villain, however, is Gardiner, who, even after Elizabeth’s release and while on his own deathbed, vows to charge one of Elizabeth’s servants “upon suspicion, of some treachery, / Wherein the princess shall be accessory” (ll.133–35). The choice of Winchester as villain serves a dramatic purpose: true to exaggerated dramatic conventions, especially popular with Queen Anne’s Men at the Red Bull, Heywood provides his audience with a kind of antagonist akin to the vice figure of the earlier Protestant drama of John Bale and R. Wever, among others.³⁶ The dialogue as reported in Foxe is rendered dramatically as a rancorous condemnation of ideal Christians like Elizabeth and her supporters. Under a veneer of civility, Gardiner reports to Mary that Elizabeth is “saucy,” and later pursues the princess’ execution with a haste not warranted by the queen or her other advisors. In the play, the Bishop of Winchester’s duplicitous and increasingly acrimonious tone is clearly intended to have the same inflammatory effect on an audience as would a traditional stage villain. Like Richard III, Barabas, and other stage machiavels, the bishop orchestrates the political intrigue; he urges the queen to manipulate her supporters and accuse her half-sister falsely, suggesting that “she in Wyatt’s expedition, / And other insurrection lately quelled was confederate” (ll.100–2). Whereas Foxe’s demonizing of Gardiner emphasizes an apocalyptic context relying on scriptural typology, beast fables, and illustrated broadsheets, such as *The Hunting of the Romish Wolf* (1555),³⁷ Heywood places this villain firmly

within *dramatic* conventions, which need not presuppose any knowledge not readily available to avid consumers of the public theatre.

Many elements in the Foxeian narrative that have the appearance of artful embellishments act as symbolic details. Among these are the seemingly superfluous roles played by Elizabeth's servants, a little boy who brings Elizabeth flowers, and an ensemble of impoverished onlookers who greet Elizabeth on her various journeys. In keeping with the task of popularizing history, the play accentuates these decorative episodes at the expense of the visually dull council scenes and examinations that form the centrepiece of Foxe's account. In the play, these more austere scenes are represented through a series of rapidly executed dumb shows, which depict entrances, exits, and the delivery of various petitions to and from various nobles without the tedious discourse which an audience of apprentices might find difficult and unengaging. After all, in 1612, the audience at the same theatre reproved Webster's *The White Devil* for the overuse of unintelligible — not to mention boring — court dialogue and complicated intrigue.³⁸ Apart from providing expedient narrative devices, the dumb shows have the added benefit of heightening the dramatic spectacle by injecting supernatural elements not mentioned in Foxe but expected by this audience, who were enthusiastic about fantastical “drum and trumpet” plays such as John Day's *Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1605), Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London* (1600), *Fortune by Land and Sea* (1609), and his numerous “Age” plays (1610–12).³⁹ In one dumb show, for example, Heywood introduces the prominent device of the English Bible as symbolic of the truth and faith embodied by Elizabeth. Rather than merely alluding typologically to the English Bible as the Book of Truth with reference to Matthew 29:25 (Foxe, sig. RRRr4^r), Heywood silently depicts Gardiner, Barwick, the Constable of the Tower, and various Friars entering along with two angels “at the other door”: “. . . the Friar steps to [Elizabeth], offering to kill her: the angel drives them back. . . . The Angel opens the Bible, and puts it in her hand as she sleeps” (ll. 1050–53 s.d.). Upon waking, Elizabeth finds the Bible open to Proverbs 29:25 (“whoso putteth their trust in the Lord shall not be confounded”) and, upon learning that none of her ladies-in-waiting has placed the book in her hand, exclaims “then ’twas inspiration, heaven I trust / With his eternal hand will guide the just” (ll. 1062–63). This providentialism is later confirmed by Gardiner's grudging admission that he believes Elizabeth's “life is guarded by the hand of heaven” (l. 1150), a line with no analogue in Foxe's account.

The dramatization of these profound religious experiences through dumb shows offers a “combination of magic and superstition” that illustrates the affective dimensions of popular religion. But they do more than simply

reify the aura of mysticism and regality around the future queen. By simplifying convoluted matters of faith, these vignettes emphasize Elizabeth's commonality, the trials of faith and the need for religious protection endured by all believers, and the signal importance of the scriptures in the religious experience of all Christians (see figure 2).⁴⁰ The familiar tropes of time, truth, and the Bible as aids to the princess recall Elizabeth's triumphant entrance into the city prior to her coronation, an event that became part of the cultural memory of this and subsequent generations of Londoners. A pageant, erected by citizens at the Little Conduit in Cheap, as narrated in Richard Mulcaster's *Queen's Majesty's Passage* (1558), similarly provoked Elizabeth to remark that "'Time has brought me hither'. . . [and] in the opening, when Her Grace understood that the Bible in English should be delivered unto her by Truth, which was therein represented by a child, she thanked the city for that gift and said she would oftentimes read over that book."⁴¹ As in Foxe and Heywood, the emphasis upon iconic figures and symbols in Mulcaster's text is designed to forge a triangular link between Elizabeth, the citizens of London, and the Protestant faith as represented by the vernacular Bible. By foregrounding these memorable events in London's recent past, both Mulcaster's popular text and Heywood's play, despite the considerable chronological distance between them, inflect the familiar narrative with a more local appeal designed to evince nostalgia for Elizabeth specifically for Londoners. It's quite possible that the figure of this queen might well have proved more inspirational during the Stuart period than during her own reign, as is suggested by the almost constant reissue of Elizabethan texts like *The Book of Martyrs* throughout the early seventeenth century.⁴²

The princess' interactions with those of lower rank in *Acts and Monuments* are amplified in the play and handled in such a way that the audience is able to apprehend viscerally Elizabeth's affinity with and charity for her poorer subjects, with whom they would identify. After a young child is examined for bringing flowers to the princess, Elizabeth "smiled, but said nothing." Here, the boy and his exchange with Elizabeth are used to underscore the surveillance visited on all those, regardless of age or station, who sympathize with the imprisoned princess. In Foxe, the boy is examined by various authorities for purportedly delivering to the prisoner a letter from the Earl of Devonshire. He acquits himself adequately, and "the discretion of the child, being yet but four years of age," is commended by the narrator (Foxe, sig. RRRRr4^v). In the play, the scene concentrates and expands the boy's interaction with and devotion to the princess, while eliminating the monotonous interrogation:

Elizabeth. Welcome sweet boy, what hast thou brought me there.

Boy. Madam, I have brought you another nosegay,

But you must not let it be seen, for if it be,

I shall be soundly whipped, indeedla, indeed I shall.

Elizabeth. God a mercy boy, here's to requite thy love. (ll.781–85)

Foxe's version diminishes the singularity of the boy's gift by indicating that, though he did "bring her grace flowers," he "did likewise to the other prisoners that were there" (Foxe, sig. RRRRr4^v). At the Red Bull, however, where the boy and the boy playing Elizabeth would most likely have been of the same stature, an audience would be able to view the monarch's verbal interaction with the admiring child as an expression of solidarity with a plebeian community, despite their religious affiliation, while also providing a sense of meaningful participation in the alleviation of her grief.

Perhaps the most significant encounter with commoners, when considered in the context of lower-class playgoers, occurs *en route* from the Tower of London to Woodstock, where Elizabeth again plays a more purposeful role than in Foxe. In *The Book of Martyrs*, though her loyal followers "were very desirous to see her," Elizabeth reportedly said: "yonder I see certain of my men: go to them and say these words from me: *tanquam ovis* [like a sheep — *i.e.*, being led to the slaughter]" (Foxe, sig. RRRRr5^r — an allusion to Isaiah 53:7 and Acts 8:32). These Latin words, though intrinsically potent in a book aimed at a knowledgeable audience, would be lost on the majority of the crowd at a raucous public theatre like the Red Bull. Though the play preserves these words, they are followed by a brief exchange between some of these "lower" characters, whose misprision of Latin terminology satirizes the unintelligibility of the Roman Catholic service of worship:

1 Poor Man. Tanqus Ovrus pray what's tanqus Ovrus neighbor.

2 Poor Man. If the priest were here he'd smell it out straight.

Cooke. Myselfe have been a scholar, and I understand

What *tanquam Ovis* means.

We sent to know how her grace did fare,

She *tanquam Ovis* said, even like a sheep

That's to the slaughter led.

1 Poor Man. Tanqus Ovrus, that I should live to see, Tanqus Ovrus.

2 Poor Man. I shall never love *tanquam Ovrus* again for this trick. (ll. 889-97)

Aside from the satiric content of the passage, this interchange is likely a realistic portrayal of an uneducated populace forced to decipher Latin phrasing. "Tanqus Ovrus," is, of course, gibberish, but the poor men do not grasp, even after explanation, the difference between the two phrases and tend to view the entire discourse as some kind of treachery perpetrated by

the Catholic authorities persecuting Elizabeth. Also lost in the play is the scriptural and liturgical significance of the phrase “*tamquam ovis*.” Learned church-goers would recognize that Acts 8:32 constitutes part of the epistle said on the Tuesday after Whitsunday. Nevertheless, the play effectively interprets and conveys the verse’s scriptural significance for its plebeian audience, as well as for potential recusants. The gloss on this verse in the 1599 Geneva Bible suggests that, as an image of Christ’s sacrifice, it teaches that “those things which seem most to be governed by chance or fortune . . . are governed by the secret providence of God.”⁴³ The poor men fear the event portended by “*tamquam ovis*,” but they cannot understand or “love,” and they thereby enact man’s failure to compass God’s wisdom, which passes human understanding. The poor men’s misprision, therefore, comments on the play’s mission. Their inability to comprehend this phrase and recognize its place in the rituals of the church calendar illustrates the necessity for other, more popular, means of religious instruction. These two seemingly insignificant characters in Foxe’s narrative figure much more prominently in the play and stand as important models of the average Christian for a Clerkenwell audience. The ordinary, albeit amusing, parlance of these familiar figures affectively fosters religious awareness and conviction — not to mention anti-Catholic sentiment — more effectively than would be possible by ordinary sermonizing and other theological channels.

Finally, Heywood’s Lady Elizabeth presides over the assembled crowd, offering a moralizing speech:

It shall not need the poor are loving, but the rich despise,
And though you curb their tongue, spare them their eyes,
Your love my smart always not but prolongs,
Pray for me in your heart, not with your tongues. (ll. 856–59)

Continuing the play’s preoccupation with indwelling faith, Elizabeth teaches that outward formalities — or idolatrous religious practices — are incommensurate with prayers from the heart. The play’s Elizabeth therefore confirms that this audience, which “pray[s] in [the] heart,” might be counted among the godly, despite their lack of education and their common station. Her speech is also an invitation to those with residual Catholic leanings to participate in the mission of the former queen, the English nation, and the reformed church. Her gesture, drawing obliquely upon Matthew 19:24, extends the Foxeian binary between “blessed” and “cursed” to include “poor” and “rich,” allowing the audience’s fixation on their own material subsistence to merge with more abstract Protestant ideology.

Heywood also infuses Elizabeth’s material munificence with a symbolic dimension for the Red Bull audience. Upon learning of her impending

imprisonment, she appreciates the service of her humble servants, imploring them to “divide these few crowns among you” (l. 334). This action highlights the princess’s charity but also contributes to the overall didacticism of the play through an emphasis on humility. After distributing the coins, Elizabeth comments on her actions, explaining that “being possessed of that [*i.e.*, faith in the Lord], / I shall need nothing” (ll. 338–39). Again, during her initial incarceration in the Tower, she “spend[s her] labors to relieve the poor,” instructing Gage to “distribute these [gold coins] to those of need” (ll. 809–10). Such charitable gestures would have appealed to the poorer audiences that undoubtedly witnessed this play.

Confirmation of the enhanced emotional appeal and didactic force of the dramatic version of this narrative for a popular audience through these celebratory representations of common life is suggested by the absence of these features in Heywood’s prose version of the same narrative, entitled *England’s Elizabeth* (1631).⁴⁴ In this version, based on both Foxe and the slightly more recent *If You Know Not Me*, Heywood accentuates political intrigue and seeks to arouse pathos through the emotional turmoil of the Lady Elizabeth’s desperate and misunderstood plight, rather than highlighting the role played by apprentices and other commoners in her eventual deliverance. This divergence highlights the role of the undistinguished members of the community for the pleasure of Heywood’s theatrical audience, while deemphasizing these concerns in his more learned and scholarly account, which was addressed to Henry, Lord Hunsdon. Unlike the play and the Foxeian narrative, whose polemical thrust is obvious, this “short tract” styles itself more as a “superficial remembrance then an essential expression of the passages of Queen Elizabeth’s Life in her minority” (sig. A5^{r-v}), reading more as a factual biography than as political propaganda.

Thomas Dekker, *The Whore of Babylon* (1606)

Whereas *If You Know Not Me* seeks to disseminate Protestant ideology through the sentimental rendering of a specific historical manifestation of the struggle between the two churches, *The Whore of Babylon* capitalizes on anxieties resonant in the daily lived experience of the burgeoning Protestant nation. If *If You Know Not Me* merely suggests the many potential geopolitical incursions lurking to disrupt the steady ascendancy of English Protestantism, *The Whore of Babylon*, staged almost immediately after the Gunpowder Plot (5 November 1605), focuses on the frequent and potentially disastrous attempts to destabilize the English state. The play was likely performed in repertory at The Fortune during the spring and summer of 1606, entered in the Stationer’s Register on 20 April 1607, and published shortly

Figure 2: Princess Elizabeth with a Bible. The corresponding text makes explicit that this is a vernacular Bible: “And because God understandeth, pray not thou therefore in a language which thou understandeth not” (sig. *2^v). The prominence of the English Bible in Heywood’s play draws upon this and other woodcut illustrations depicting the future queen with the Bible. From Richard Day. *A Book of Christian Prayers*. (London: John Day, 1578), sig. *1^v. STC: 6429. Reproduced with permission of The British Library (shelfmark C.24.a.4).

after by Nathaniel Butter (who also printed *If You Know Not Me*). During this period, tracts denouncing the Gunpowder Plot abounded, and the event was frequently—and tendentiously—discussed and alluded to in sermons, woodcuts, and broadsheets, forging it in the popular imagination.⁴⁵ In this way, Dekker's play can be seen as more topical, attempting not only to reinforce the founding ideological tenets of Protestantism, but to maintain them in the face of a clearly active Counter-Reformation. In addition to documenting instances of treacherous Jesuit activity, Dekker's play readily confronts the fractional hold of Protestantism in England. The First Cardinal initially acknowledges that, in England, "the stream of ceremony / Is scarcely settled," imploring his colleagues to "trouble it more" so that "Babylon / And all we are, is not driven clean from thence" (1.1.197–203). Titania laments the threat to the emergent Protestant order in England posed by Jesuit "leopards" who "build caves / Even in our parks" (4.2.132–33). Statements of this kind forcefully bring the play's concern with international religious politics within the purview of Dekker's audience by suggesting that individual Protestant communities must shoulder the blame for not maintaining faithful guard against Catholic incursions. The play seeks to continue and solidify their Protestant education in order to obviate the possibility of any return to the old religion.

The immediacy of the Gunpowder plot did much to alert average Londoners to the threat against the emergent Protestant regime. In a rare instance where patriotism trumped intramural religious debate, nearly everybody, it seems, understood Fawkes's capture as a sign of "special providence" for England, even while they became even more paranoid about future popish plots.⁴⁶ Somewhat surprisingly, given such broad topical interest, commentators suggest that Dekker's overtly allegorical representation of little-known continental figures made for an unintelligible and initially unsuccessful play, especially given its performance at The Fortune before an audience that was probably unfamiliar with historical minutiae. For these scholars, it is precisely the play's indebtedness to Foxe's apocalyptic pattern and its consistent rehearsal of commonplace antipapal tropes and ideology that produced an indecipherable piece for the public stage.⁴⁷ Allegory, for many, was not a natural dramatic mode, and the style of this play is anomalous in the repertory of the Prince's Men during these years, which was dominated by citizen comedies and chronicle history plays. I contend, however, that this allegory aroused popular animosity toward various Catholic forces by concentrating figural representations on momentous events like the Armada, assassination attempts against the Queen, and the well-publicized actions of Jesuits.⁴⁸ It is unlikely that the behind-the-scenes orchestrations of the Marian regime against Elizabeth, nearly fifty

years before, would be part of the living memory of audience members, but the Armada—not to mention the Gunpowder Plot—certainly was.

Many, in fact, were inclined to view the Gunpowder Plot in dramatic terms. William Barlowe's sermon, preached at Paul's Cross on 9 November, four days after the apprehension of the perpetrators, suggests that the plot itself was a "tragi-comical treason," implying that the dramatic form might usefully capture and explicate the events, just as it was employed to describe other apocalyptic subjects, including the book of Revelation.⁴⁹ In a similarly apocalyptic vein, Francis Herring's account of the Gunpowder Plot, *Mischeefes Myserie*,⁵⁰ illustrates the cumulative effect of foreign and domestic Catholic plots by demonstrating how the combined actions of English recusants, foreign Jesuits, and Spanish invaders perpetrate a multi-faceted attack upon vulnerable Protestants (see figure 3). In Dekker's play, although the allegory is registered globally, the consequences would have been felt within individual consciences, thereby allowing plebeian audiences, who might otherwise feel removed from the arena of conflict, to participate in the spiritual struggle and apprehend their role in maintaining the stability of the English nation and its inchoate Protestant church. Whereas negative portrayals might backfire and pique the ire of the vilified group, given the likelihood that some Catholics were in the audience, *The Whore of Babylon* seeks to escape this undesired result by using the Gunpowder Plot to render its claims plausible and coherent. The undeniable, yet sufficiently oblique, correspondence between current events and those represented in popular and theatrical texts offered a measure of protection for authors who could not resist trafficking in contentious and potentially seditious subject matter. Protestant polemicists had long relied on allegory and other forms of figural representation to mitigate the correspondences implicitly made in their work. The abundant anti-Catholic invective in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, for instance, is left out of the prefatory letter to Raleigh, where he claims that "the *general* intention and meaning . . . of *all* the book is to fashion a gentleman or noble person" without ever hinting at a potential ecclesiastical subtext.⁵¹ Drawing on the medieval mystery play tradition, Bale and other early sixteenth-century dramatists frequently used allegory to disseminate anti-papal propaganda in provincial towns where loyalty to the Roman church was often strongest. And, of course, many others also resorted to allegorical representation to advance various causes; in Nicholas Udall's *Respublica*, performed before the queen during Christmastide 1553, Truth is invoked in support of the Marian regime. In this way, Renaissance writers developed a nuanced hermeneutic code to convey sensitive religious and political material while still avoiding censorship and persecution, especially when dealing with highly charged topical events.⁵²

The Whore of Babylon implicates its audience in religious controversy by underscoring religious affiliation as a choice between competing ways of life and visions of society. Dekker suggests that political and religious authority among Catholics coheres centripetally around a central figure — the Empress of Babylon — who dictates and coerces her subjects' obedience. The portrayal of that church's dictatorial and corrupt global leadership shows an autocratic regime unresponsive to local concerns and the cohesion of traditional neighbourhoods. Agency in Protestant England, on the other hand, is distributed among large segments of the populace, drawing strength from individual members of the community consciously functioning collectively. At the play's outset, Plain-Dealing illustrates to Titania the importance of the different conceptions of agency under both churches, offering the view that "in some games of chess, knights are better than pawns, but here a good pawn is better than a knight" (2.1.96–97). The nature of the "game" is fundamentally different in England, where individuals are invited and expected to develop their own indwelling faith and sense of religious obligation. Plain-Dealing exhorts Titania to "let them cure themselves first, and then they may better know how to heal others: then have you other fellows that take upon them to be surgeons" (2.108–9). Plain-Dealing's remarks not only emphasize the importance of cultivating an individual response to religious matters through personal devotion and the reading of scripture, but also register a distrust of any authoritarian apparatus which seeks to coerce religious opinions and enforce collective action. This recognition is partly due to the difficulty — especially in a nation incompletely reformed and infiltrated by Jesuits — of determining the religious allegiances of the citizenry: "If I give you a copy of the City's countenance, I'll not flatter the face, as painters do; but show all the wrinkles in it" (2.1.124–25).⁵³ Plain-Dealing's words here are intended both as a warning to Titania to beware of Catholic insurrections within London of the type that allegedly led to the Gunpowder Plot, and as an example of the flattery which permeates the Empress' court and will eventually lead to her downfall.

The play's concern with the "city's countenance" mirrors contemporary sermons dealing with the religious and political loyalty of Londoners. Both posit that the religious and spiritual health of individual citizens in their communities must necessarily precede the emergence of a robust nation state and the effective operation of foreign policy. In a sermon preached in 1608 at Hampstead in Middlesex county, in close proximity to both Clerkenwell and Finsbury, William Bailey compares the dangerously volatile religious situation in London with that of the wandering Israelites at the time of the dispensation of the Ten Commandments. He suggests that, because of the prevalence of dissimulation among religious and political leaders, Lon-

doners, like the Israelites, “could not, or would not distinguish between the sign and the thing signified.”⁵⁴ Bailey assesses religious controversy as essentially a problem of interpretation, suggesting that history — whether of biblical or contemporary times — must be read diachronically in order to determine whether a given sign is true or false. Interpretation, according to this author, is a process of accumulating facts that not only engenders personal faith but also, by providing a hermeneutic key developed through the ages, offers protection during turbulent periods, when the proper course of action is not readily apparent or disguised through treachery. This approach enables the exegete — and invites the congregation — to apprehend current events in terms of ongoing religious struggle.

Although the Gunpowder Plot was prevented, the narrowly averted disaster highlighted the failure of civil or religious authorities properly to identify Guy Fawkes and his accomplices well in advance of the planned conspiracy, making the identification of potential Jesuits, other Catholics, and those that harbored them within London and its suburbs of paramount importance. In this way, the Gunpowder Plot itself became an important instance of properly divining the message portended by this sign. Although less tendentious historical accounts of the scheme viewed it as a poorly planned and disorganized attempt to disrupt the official religious trajectory of the new Jacobean regime, militant Protestants consistently and vocally interpreted this event as a mark of God’s special providence for the English state in His deliverance of the king, Prince of Wales, and parliament from death and the English people from a Catholic subjection which would surely follow. Contemporaneous accounts of the plot are ideologically motivated to capitalize on public anxieties and accentuate the potential religious implications of the plot and its fortunate discovery.⁵⁵ The government’s official pronouncements, issued in a series of nine proclamations, all bearing the usual “by the king” preamble and printed by the king’s official printer, Robert Barker, forgo the moderate and inclusive rhetoric typical of these publications. Instead, the pamphlets refer to the narrowly averted “Romish servitude” and, while considering Guy Fawkes, Thomas Percy, and their accomplices guilty of treason, diminish the degree to which they are truly culpable, since they are “so utterly corrupted with the superstition of the Romish religion.”⁵⁶ Still more vehement tracts soon appeared, continuing to refract the identities of the handful of perpetrators to include all English Catholics. The goal of all the commentators seems to be to raise the spectre of Catholic rule in England and heighten public uneasiness by interpreting the Gunpowder Plot allegorically, as just another of the pope’s devious stratagems. Even those maintaining Catholic sentiments are prompted to question the basis of that faith, since those beliefs, polemicists argued, are

causally linked to anomie in the state, widespread public disorder, and social and economic instability to the detriment of all citizens. A Catholic regime is like Spenser's House of Pride, appealing from the outside, but built "on so weake foundation . . . on a sandie hill, that still did flit" and wholly disorganized in its governance.⁵⁷

The play, therefore, capitalizes on current public phobias, as well as the perennial binary between the true and false church in a way that advances the ideological agenda of the Protestant church, but it also actively instructs its audience in living a godly life. Both the physical and spiritual action of the play revolves around the "discovery" of the names and hiding places of the perpetrators as their true identities are obfuscated through their feigned service to the Fairie Queene. Just like the legion of clandestine Jesuits and other Catholic plotters, they are expressly instructed by the Empress to "turn your selves then to moles, / Work underground and undermine your country. / . . . / Fly with the bat under the eyes of night / And shift your nests" (3.1.150–59). The figure of Plain-Dealing is obsessed with issues of identification; he initiates debate on proper identification and interpretation, asking Truth, "how shall I know thou art the right truth?" (3.3.1). Truth's response suggests that his truth is signified by his plain aspect, which is in marked contrast to the "strange ugliness" of the Empress of Babylon. This rather simplistic response to complex hermeneutical matters is refuted by Plain-Dealing, who asks how, since there is no way of physically distinguishing a Christian from a Turk by outward appearance alone, it would be possible to distinguish truth from falsehood or Protestant from Catholic in this manner (3.3.29). Plain-Dealing argues that a true Christian's conscience must match his plain apparel and demeanor in a way that implicitly condemns multiple social groups within the city for their lack of outward modesty and its concomitant reflection on inward humility: "I saw no more conscience in most of your rich men than in tavern faggots: nor no more soberness in poor men than in tavern spigots" (3.3.38–40).⁵⁸ This answer, despite the rebuke of contemporary lifestyles and the attendant instruction to reform, leaves the matter of discernment ambiguous. Plain-Dealing's insistence on adopting a "plain" lifestyle, however, draws upon a tactic utilized by earlier Reformers. A number of earlier works in the Reformation tradition — biblical translations by Tyndale and others, as well as sermons by Hugh Latimer and Thomas Cranmer — maintain that the true Protestant religion ought to be expressed in a "plain style," including not only a modest lifestyle, but a clear, unadorned, and accessible elocution of its principles.⁵⁹ A majority of the audience at the Fortune could hardly be faulted for self-congratulation here, as their economic conditions necessitated a closer approximation of a plain lifestyle, regardless of their individual aspirations.

The Whore of Babylon explores and extends the possibility of the “plain style” by presenting ecclesiastical politics in an intelligible and compelling manner to a fearful, yet largely uneducated audience. The prologue intimates that the actors “present / Matter above the vulgar argument / Yet drawn so lively, that the weakest eye, / . . . / . . . may reach the mystery” (ll. 3–7). It goes on to draw a direct parallel between this straightforward narrative mode and the “wakening” of “truth” (l. 26). The play, like *If You Know Not Me*, attempts to blend didacticism and entertainment in order to engage its audience in the Protestant cause. But there were those who believed, apparently, that the play might be rendered even more transparent and who sought just that. Dekker himself, in his address “Lectori,” admits that the play may not have achieved this goal as successfully as he might have wished, blaming actors that “are for the most part out of tune” and therefore failed to effectively circulate the spiritual message. One early commentator made numerous manuscript additions and changes to one copy of the 1607 printed version in order to amplify its political dimension and to make the allegory explicit.⁶⁰ In this version, the names of characters, places, and concepts are changed across the board: “Fairie Queene” becomes “English Queen”; “Fairie” is changed to “English”; “sooth sayers” are identified unambiguously as “holy priests”; “the spring in Fairieland” is rendered as “religion in England”; “Babylon” is frequently changed to “Rome”; and “Babylon’s proud queen” becomes “Rome’s proud prelate.” In addition, some scenes, usually those relying on more extensive external knowledge of religious and political history or current events than the average Fortune theatre-goer might be expected to have, are marked for deletion. In many cases, remarks concerning Catholics are even more inflammatory than in the original, perhaps in an effort to return to an uncensored original. While the intent of these emendations is unknown, they render the play more understandable and likely more palatable to those vehement Protestants who comprised at least some portion of the play’s original audience. It is even possible that these changes were intended for later stage performances, given its original disappointment at the Fortune.⁶¹ Since the allegory may have been too convoluted for some playgoers, hinting at a more literal and overt meaning might have heightened dramatic immediacy.

Both the original play and sermons like Bailey’s seek to alleviate questions of mistaken or false identity, feigned allegiance, and true faith, such as are posed by Plain-Dealing, by positing a fundamental distinction between the structure of conscience of Protestants and Catholics. Of course, the prevailing understanding of the operation of the conscience under each doctrinal system had ramifications for the social structure mandated by the respective regimes. *The Whore of Babylon* presents England, and more

specifically London, as a collection of dispersed, free-thinking individuals, as opposed to the hierarchical structure of the Catholic church and the nations under their sway, especially Spain.⁶² It is this myth of collective individualism that guarantees the importance of “pawns” in England and diminishes the individual in Catholic regimes. Due to their placement within a strict hierarchical organization, the actions of individual Catholics are dictated from above, and any discretionary actions are circumscribed and even discouraged. Because of this, in the event that the Empress or other important elements in this hierarchy are disabled, individuals are ill-equipped to continue the fight.

The marked contrast in the council scenes that depict the strategic deliberations of English and Catholic forces display this important distinction. The Empress of Babylon presides magisterially and unilaterally over her followers, explicitly dictating their orders in details that cover numerous contingencies, without explaining the underlying purpose of her requests or the overarching goals of the mission. A similar order characterizes a Cardinal’s leadership of the Jesuits who have infiltrated England:

. . . we have driven
With full and stiff winds to the Fairie Stronds,
Should all break in at once, and in a deluge
Of Innovation . . .
Swallow the kingdom up. (3.1.194–98)

The First Cardinal describes the Catholic forces as embodying a single, mystically unified, collective agency able to disrupt the English forces in a single “deluge of innovation.” The results of such a blow are “all” registered “at once,” implying that the force that applies it is a singular will rather than a collection of entities whose impact would necessarily be diffused across space and time.

Titania’s court, on the other hand, is a much more discursive and consensual forum, where her decisions are constantly tempered by the advice of her councillors. This disparity is exacerbated by the fact that each of the two courtly groups self-consciously reflects on the other’s form of adjudication and dispute resolution. The Empress and her followers soon recognize that a single, unilateral strike against “Fairieland” or an assassination attempt against the Fairie Queen herself will prove unproductive, since, in contrast with her own court, all power in Titania’s administration does not reside solely in a single agent, whose followers act merely as receptacles for this singular will. The First Cardinal realizes that “to fell down their queen is but one stroke / Our axe must cleave the kingdom, that’s the Oak” (3.1.246–47).

The English “kingdom” offered in the play is a collection of individual wills that come together in support of a common cause. Titania’s remarks

to her soldiers, modeled on Elizabeth's 1588 speech at Tilbury, seek to attain their fealty through an appeal, not to "oathed allegiance," but to individual "courage." Titania vows that "your queen will to the field," offering an example for her subjects rather than dictating orders *in absentia* (5.2.221–29). Later, she exhorts her soldiers to exhibit commensurate courage: "My fellow soldiers I dare swear you'll fight, / To the last man . . . / . . . strength, courage, zeal, / Meet in each bosom like a three-fold flood" (5.6.12–18).⁶³ As monarch, Titania is a leader among fellow soldiers who still retain decision-making authority and responsibility, each of whom exhibits individually the attributes necessary for success in this martial and spiritual endeavor. By contrast, the Empress compels the submission of her followers; her Herald summons her forces to arms in the name of

her who has power given her to make the backs of stubborn kings her foot-stools, and emperors her vassals . . . no captains generals of armies, generals of squadrons, admirals, colonels, captains, or any other officers of her magnificent, incomparable, formidable, and invincible Armada . . . shall presume to set one foot on ship-board, till her sacred hand has blessed the enterprise by sealing them all on the forehead, and bowing their knees before the beast. (4.3.29–40)

The Empress, riding onstage a "beast" reminiscent of that depicted in Revelation 17, uses the "sacred" and mystical "power" allegedly granted her directly by God to exercise complete psychological control over her followers, whose autonomy has atrophied within the rigid hierarchy and ritual observance demanded by the Catholic regime. Protestants would likely notice the biblical allusion (taken up also in *The Faerie Queene*, 1.4.36–38), while habitual theatre-goers would recognize the parallel with Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, a popular play frequently in repertory at the Fortune, where the title character makes Bajazeth "the footstool of great Tamburlaine" and, later, yokes the kings of Trebizond and Soria to drive his chariot.⁶⁴ Those familiar with the Geneva Bible would recall the direct association of the Whore of Babylon with the Roman Catholic church. Glosses on this chapter by Junius in the 1599 edition depict the whore similarly, in a magnificent procession "with deadly gidiness," upon a "beast" ("that Empire of Rome"), attired "with a red and purple garment . . . that the Romish clergy [wear] with such delight."⁶⁵ But unlike the annotations, the ugliness of the "damnable harlot" and her grotesque mount on stage is not just metaphorical but provides audiences with palpable visual reinforcement of the quotidian rhetoric.

Militant Protestants were keen to highlight the perceived disparities in the exercise of free will propounded by the two religious persuasions. The play, the editorial commentary glossing the narratives in Foxe, and the

Figure 3: Clouds of Ignorance, Fear, Rome, Hell, and Spain threaten England. From Francis Herring. *Mischiefes Myserie*. (London: E. Griffin, 1617) sig. A4^v. STC: 13247. Reproduced by permission of the Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California (shelfmark 61307).

annotations in the Geneva Bible all emphasize the strange and unexplainable mystical authority from which the “whore” derives her power. Tyndale argues that, like the Empress of Babylon, Catholicism employs a kind of psychological tyranny to regulate its congregations.⁶⁶ Tyndale believed that, through the sacraments and the mandatory observance of an ensemble of rituals, Catholic authorities were able to “sit in the consciences of the people and lead them captive.”⁶⁷ These alleged encroachments are pernicious not only for the surveillance they employ, but, more importantly, because they detract from the spiritual comportment of the individual by replacing “God’s

word in [one's] heart" with worldly and corrupt doctrine.⁶⁸ By contrast, Protestantism allows for, and, indeed, mandates individual volition because of the necessity of justification by faith. Bailey's sermon similarly recognizes that it is only through "gird[ing] up the loins of our minds, and taking our states in our hands" that it is possible to discern and combat the spiritual enemies causing social distress in London.⁶⁹ The strategy of Protestant ideologues, therefore, is twofold: to demystify this mystical authority and assert its alternative. In the play, the Third King recognizes the Whore's grotesque procession as "but tyrannous pride, and not your due" (4.4.35). Prompted by the cardinal's belief that "earth and heaven are all one when you are here," he intimates that the terrible magnificence attending the queen might be apprehended just as easily as "a hell on earth, or if not hell" (4.4.18). By locating the site of her authority explicitly within individual consciousness and not in objective reality, the tyrannical spell is broken, and the Whore is no longer able to control the external world, leaving her wondering why "the base earth [feels not] our weight" (4.4.18).

As with Heywood's depiction of the role of ordinary citizens within the overall struggle, Dekker demonstrates the structural importance of individual faith and the localized actions of community members in preserving a healthy state. All members of the audience are invited to take partial credit for the numerous victories celebrated in the play precisely because they possess virtues of truth and plain-dealing, which are arguably more pertinent to and more conspicuous in average Londoners without the economic capital, rhetorical skill, or military training to contribute otherwise to the campaign. The play's representation of Catholic treachery and Protestant virtue is also a useful means of quelling the latent discontent of ordinary Londoners, who, in reality, are trapped in a no-less-pernicious hierarchy, because of the immense obstacles to social mobility. Due to the acute affective appeal of the play, the process of alleviating dissatisfaction with prevailing social and economic disparities through supposed inclusion in state interests might be seen as a constructive form of psychological domination, which operates through permissiveness rather than interdiction or obligation. Whereas the Catholic church seeks to efface individual identity through psychological manipulation, Protestantism enhances it. In the play, the Reformed church contributes to an atomized society, which functions as a collection of individual wills coming together in ways that are not rigidly defined, yet still securing positive outcomes that would be beyond the reach of a centralized authority.

The topical and polemical Protestantism of both *If You Know Not Me* and *The Whore of Babylon* are self-evident even on a cursory reading, but considering their polemic impact for audiences in large public amphitheatres

both elaborates on and subtly differentiates the more general messages they offer. The two plays complete the didactic project initiated by Foxe and other English Reformers to instruct a large segment of the populace in the importance of scriptural authority, justification by faith, discerning the true church from the false, and other tenets of the Protestant religion. Beyond this, the plays situate the audience directly within the ongoing controversy as defenders of the faith, along with monarchs, soldiers, and diplomats. Although, in the absence of adequate records, it is difficult to determine precisely what social impact religiously motivated drama like this had on its audiences and the communities from which they were drawn, the plays' obvious didacticism clearly has ample capacity to educate audiences and, in so doing, to enlist them in the religious struggle. It seems plausible, then, that these two plays exercised considerable force in the devotional life of suburban London's developing Protestant parishes.

American University of Beirut

Notes

1. John N. King, Christopher Highley, and Nicholas Moschovakis provided valuable commentary on earlier drafts of this article. I would also like to acknowledge a fellowship from the Henry E. Huntington Library during July and August 2002, during which time the manuscript was largely completed. Finally, I would like to extend special thanks to Julia Mahfouz, who verified the text for accuracy. Spelling of quotations has been silently modernized throughout, with the exception of those from Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* are taken from the edition of Madeline Doran (London: Malone Society, 1935). Citations from *The Whore of Babylon* are from Fredson Bowers, ed., *Thomas Dekker: Dramatic Works*, 4 vols., vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).
2. See Alan Sinfield, *Literature in Protestant England* (London: Croom Helm, 1983), pp. 106-28; Paul Whitfield White, *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage and Playing in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Huston Diehl, *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism and Popular Theater in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997); Chris R. Hassel, *Renaissance Drama and the English Church Year* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979); James C. Bryant, *Tudor Drama and Religious Controversy* (Atlanta, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984). Studies of individual playwrights include Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theater: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama Under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Donna B. Hamilton, *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England*. (Louisville: University Press of Kentucky, 1992); and James H. Sims, *Dramatic Uses of Biblical Allusions in Marlowe and Shakespeare* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1966). More focused discussions of religious politics in the theatre tend to centre on noteworthy events like the fiasco surrounding the staging of Middleton's *Game of Chess* at the Globe in 1624. See, for instance T. H. Howard-Hill, "Political Interpretations of Middleton's *A Game of Chess*," *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 282, and Paul

Yachnin, "A *Game of Chess*: Thomas Middleton's 'Praise of Folly,'" *Modern Language Quarterly* 48 (1987): 109.

3. See Julia Gasper, "The Reformation Plays on the Public Stage," in *Theatre and Government Under the Early Stuarts*, ed. J. R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 190–216. Gasper canvasses the potential impact on the religious and political sentiment of the general populace in a number of Jacobean pseudo-historical plays, including the two discussed here.
4. Both plays were relatively popular. *If You Know Not Me* was revived numerous times both at the Red Bull and at the Cockpit in Drury Lane and printed numerous times before the closing of the theatres. Despite a poor beginning, *The Whore of Babylon* was successfully revived later in the decade and prompted the author to pen similar plays, such as *If It Be Not Good, The Devil Is in It* (1611) and *The Virgin Martyr* (1620). See Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Playing Companies* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), pp. 132, 247.
5. See Susan Cerasano, "'More Elbow Roome, but Scant Better Aire': The Fortune Playhouse and Its Surroundings," *Indiana Social Studies Quarterly* 35 (1982): 70–84, and Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage: 1574-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 64–66, 72, and 216–20. A ballad by W. Turner, "Turners Dish of Lenten stuff, or, A galymaufery to the tune of Watton townes end" (London: [S. Stafford?] for J. W[right?], 1612), points to a marked distinction between the plays performed in Southwark and those common at the Shoreditch theatres: "The players of the bankside / the round Globe and the Swan/ Will teach you idle tricks of love / But the Bull will play the man" (p. 2). Theatre historians suggest that, by the Jacobean period, the playhouses were becoming increasingly stratified, with the Fortune and the Red Bull capturing the emerging market in lowbrow productions for "the meaner sort of people"; see Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage*, pp. 216–20. For the history of Clerkenwell and Finsbury, see W. I. Pinks, *The History of Clerkenwell* (London: Charles Herbert, 1881), p. 12; Ilana Ben-Amos, *Adolescence and Youth in Early Modern London* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 84; and R. Finlay, *Population and Metropolis: The Demographics of London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 67.
6. The definitive statement of this view is by A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964), p. 333.
7. The first edition of *The Acts and Monuments* was printed and published by John Day in 1563 with subsequent editions by the same printer in 1570, 1576, and 1583. Other complete editions were printed in 1596, 1610, 1632, and 1692. In 1589, Timothy Bright printed an abridgement, and "Short Views" of the complete edition, entitled *The Mirror of Martyrs*, published in 1613, 1615, 1625, 1631, and 1633.

Given this conception, *The Book of Martyrs* contributed to the institution of a formal and liturgical infrastructure—like *The Book of Common Prayer*, *The Book of Martyrs* had an enormous presence in Protestant churches and households—and the enhancement of the scope and precision with which Protestant ideology might be applied to an array of social and religious practices. *The Book of Martyrs* thus functioned as an analogue to what Kuhn labels "normal science," a period concerned with the articulation and consolidation of an established mode of discourse after the rapid and overwhelming reorientation of the basic tenets and goals attendant upon the succession of an emergent paradigm. See Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 36–39. See also Ivo Kamps, *Historiography and Ideology in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 67.

8. See Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 12 *et passim*, and Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400–c.1500* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992). On recusancy, see Brian Magee, *The English Recusants* (London: Burns Oates, 1938), pp. 176–77.
9. See Susan Brigden, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), pp. 130–33, 155; Ian Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 23; and Robert Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns of England: Politics and Political Culture, c.1540–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 208.
10. Brigden, pp. 579–86.
11. See Robert Whiting, *Local Responses to the English Reformation from the Reformation to the Revolution: Religion, Politics, and Society in Kent, 1500–1640* (New York: St. Martin's, 1998), p. 40.
12. See Peter Clark, *English Provincial Society* (Sussex: Harvester, 1977), p. 156, and Patrick Collinson, *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* (London: Macmillan, 1988), pp. 216-17.
13. John Swinnerton, *A Christian Love Letter* (London: William Jaggard, 1606), sig. B3^v.
14. *Ibid.*, sig. A2^r.
15. *Ibid.*, sigs. B2^v-B3^r.
16. J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984), p. 158.
17. The dissolution of this priory occurred much later than that of other monastic lands throughout England. During the reign of Mary (1553-58), the buildings belonging to the former priory were repaired for the purpose of celebrating mass for the merchant-tailors and other London companies. The order was not completely abolished until 1559. See Pinks, pp. 218-19.
18. Account books indicate that annual expenses amounted to £227 10s. 5d., and that the books seized were valued at £400. See British Library MS. 5506, fol. 67^r. For a more detailed description of the conclave, see Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesuits*, 2 vols. (London: Burns and Oates, 1877), 1: 99-111.
19. Later accounts attest to the anxieties aroused by this discovery. Sir John Elliot, in the parliament of 1628, exclaimed, "here is a ground laid for a new religion, and a foundation for the undermining of the State" (quoted in Foley, 1: 104). In a quasi-fictional religious "vision" set in early Stuart London, entitled *Messis Vitae* (1886), John Stuart Blackie expresses anxiety that "In St. John's at Clerkenwell / Subtle Jesuits are training / Simple English youths for hell!" The fear is not merely that Jesuits are active throughout England as a whole, but that the "simple" or relatively uneducated lower class "youths" of Clerkenwell are especially susceptible to their influence. See Foley, 1: 179-81.
20. Phillip Stubbes, *The Anatomy of Abuses* (London: Richard Jones, 1583), sigs. L5^v-6^r.
21. John Gee, *New Shreds of the Old Snare* (London: Robert Mylbourne, 1624), sig. D2^r.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*, sig. C4^v.

24. See Steven Mullaney, "Reforming Resistance," in *Print, Manuscript, and Performance: The Changing Relations of the Media in Early Modern England*, ed. Michael D. Bristol and Arthur F. Marotti (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000), pp. 236-37, and Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 129.
25. Other candidates for the play's authorship include George Peele, with Dekker as a possible collaborator. See Judith Levinson, ed., *The Famous History of the Life and Death of Captain Thomas Stukeley*, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. vii-ix. The play was printed by Thomas Pavier in 1605.
26. Jeffrey Knapp, *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation, and Theater in Renaissance England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), pp. 32-37.
27. Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 287. Although not required to do so, many parish churches followed suit of their own volition and displayed a copy of the *Book of Martyrs* along with an English Bible. See David Loades, "Introduction: John Foxe and the Editors," in *John Foxe and the English Reformation*, ed. David Loades (Aldershot: Scolar, 1997), p. 4.
28. Glyn Parry, "Elect Church or Elect Nation? The Reception of the *Acts and Monuments*," in David Loades, ed., *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), p. 172.
29. Julian Roberts, "Bibliographical Aspects of John Foxe," in Loades, ed., *John Foxe and the English Reformation*, pp. 37-38. Day was one of the most successful printers of the sixteenth century. After being awarded an exclusive patent, he printed over forty editions of ABCs, Catechisms, and metrical psalms during the years 1558 to 1571 — especially in those years in which an edition of Foxe was *not* published — using the proceeds of these immensely profitable works to subsidize the printing of *The Acts and Monuments*. By 1572, Day sought to integrate his business vertically; he had completed the plans and secured financing to retail these works at a new bookshop in the most lucrative corner of the already crowded Paul's churchyard before the mayor and aldermen refused to grant him the lease in June 1574. See Peter N. Blayney, "John Day and the Bookshop That Never Was," in *Material London, ca. 1600*, ed. Lena Cowen Orlin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), p. 340. On woodcuts in the *Book of Martyrs*, see Margaret Aston and Elizabeth Ingram, "The Iconography of the *Acts and Monuments*," in Loades, ed., *John Foxe and the English Reformation*, p. 56, and John N. King, *Spenser's Poetry and the Reformation Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 133.
30. Simon Parret, in a 1582 letter, complains of "the foul paper and obscure print" of this inferior publication (see Julian Roberts, "Bibliographical Aspects of John Foxe," in Loades, ed., *John Foxe and the English Reformation*, pp. 48-50). It seems that Day used the capital-intensive editions of 1563 and 1570 to generate the revenue necessary to make the 1576 edition readily available at a reasonable price and in a slightly less unwieldy format.
31. One unique innovation consists in a table "to help the unlearned," in which the compilers "thought it good to set forth the plain numbers with Ciphers in algorithm, whereby they might understand the numbers better" (sig. q9^r). Here, for instance, a Roman numeral will be given alongside its Arabic equivalent, leading to what many might consider the over-simplified explanation that "ii [the Roman numeral]=2." The 1576 edition also introduces various readerly "helps" of its own, including a previously unpublished set of concordances, for scriptural references and theological doctrines,

- as well as an expanded index. See Susan Felch, "Shaping the Reader in the *Acts and Monuments*," in Loades, ed., *John Foxe and the English Reformation*, p. 62.
32. John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments of These Latter and Perilous Days* (London: John Day, 1576), sig. q1^v. Subsequent references to this edition are included within parentheses in the text.
 33. I cite Kathleen McLuskie, *Dekker and Heywood: Professional Dramatists* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1994), pp. 41-42.
 34. Thomas Heywood, *If you know not mee, you know no body, etc.* (London: J. Raworth for N. Butter, 1639), sig. A2^r. The play went through an astonishing nine editions in Heywood's lifetime, the first eight of which were not authorized by the author or by Queen Anne's Men and their successor troupes. Because the play was perennially popular on stage, the troupe likely feared that publication might attenuate its theatrical market. It was first entered in the Stationers' Register on 5 July 1605 by Nathaniel Butter and published by him in 1605, 1606, 1608, 1613, 1623, 1632, and 1639; Thomas Pavier published editions in 1608 and 1610. Nearly continuous reprinting throughout the reigns of James and Charles attests not only to the play's popularity but also to the undiminished nostalgia for Elizabeth during that period.
 35. Heywood, *If you know not mee* (1639), sig. G3^r (my emphasis).
 36. See John N. King, *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985), p. 274.
 37. On stage machiavels, see Katharine Eisaman Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp. 47-48; for Reformation typology, see John N. King, "Fiction and Fact in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*," in Loades, ed., *John Foxe and the English Reformation*, pp. 29-30. It is also likely that many of these editions capitalized on various current events, like the Spanish Match (1623) or the Laudian trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick (1637), as is proposed by Martha Robinson, *Writing the Reformation: Acts and Monuments and the Elizabethan History Play* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), p. 164.
 38. In a prefatory note, Webster suggests that it was partially the inclement weather which led to the play's dismal reception in February and March 1612, but also that the production wanted a "full and understanding auditory . . . [and that] most of the people who come to *that* playhouse resemble . . . ignorant asses" (John Webster, *The White Devil*, ed. Christina Luckyj [New York: Norton, 1966], ll. 6-9). As many commentators have noted, the play's focus on subtle court intrigue and deception is anomalous in the Queen's Men's repertory during these years. See Luckyj, ed., p. xxix, and Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage*, pp. 110-11.
 39. See Dieter Mehl, *The Elizabethan Dumb Show: The History of a Dramatic Convention* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 89.
 40. McLuskie, p. 44. See John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), pp. 110-13.
 41. Richard Mulcaster, *The Queen's Majesty's Progress Through the City of London* (London, 1558), sig. C2^f. Cf. Dekker, *The Whore of Babylon*, 2.1.53-145.
 42. See Kamps.
 43. *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1599 Edition*, ed. Michael H. Brown (Buena Park, CA: Geneva Publishers, 1990), sig. Ggg4^r.

44. Thomas Heywood, *England's Elizabeth, Her Life and Troubles during Her Minority from the Cradle to the Crown, etc.* (London: J. Beale for P. Waterhouse, 1631). The book was reprinted twice in the next year.
45. See David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfield and Nicholson, 1989), pp. 142-45, and John N. King, *Milton and Religious Controversy: Satire and Polemic in Paradise Lost* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 61.
46. See Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 246-48, and Peter Lake, "Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice," in *The English Civil War*, ed. R. Crust and Ann Hughes (London: Arnold, 1997), p. 188.
47. See Cyrus Hoy, *Introductions, Notes, and Commentaries to Texts in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, Edited by Fredson Bowers, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 2: 303; Susan Kranz, "Thomas Dekker's Political Commentary in *The Whore of Babylon*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 35 (1995): 271; McLuskie, p. 52; and Julia Gasper, *The Dragon and the Dove: The Plays of Thomas Dekker* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 63.
48. A Greenwich native, Squire befriended in Spain the Jesuit Richard Walpole, who, after converting him to Catholicism, urged him to assassinate the queen by poisoning the pommel of her saddle. These events are narrated in *A Letter Written Out of England to an English Gentleman remaining at Padua, containing a true report of a strange conspiracy, contrived between Edward Squire, lately executed for the same treason as actor, and Richard Wallpole, A Jesuit, as Deviser and Suborner against the Person of the Queen's Majesty* (London: Christopher Barker, 1599), and in a much later book, likely by Heywood, that retrospectively looks at numerous popish plots: *The Rat-Trap: Or, The Jesuits taken in Their Own Net* (London: John Oakes, 1641) — see figure 1.
49. Barbara K. Lewalski, *Paradise Lost and the Rhetoric of Literary Forms* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985), pp. 50-51.
50. Francis Herring, *Mischeefes Myserie*. (London: E. Griffin, 1617). This, apparently, is John Vicars's translated and "largely dilated" version of an earlier Latin poem by Herring (sig A3^v).
51. Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton, Longman Annotated English Poets (London: Longman, 1977), p. 737 (emphasis added).
52. See Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), pp. 53-55. Dekker would have been keenly aware of the serious consequences incurred by Thomas Nashe and Ben Jonson over the performance of *The Isle of Dogs* in 1597.
53. Cf. 2.1.96-97, 2.1.108-9, and 2.1.124-25.
54. William Bailey, *A Rumor of Wars among the Times and Signs of Peace* (London: Blount, 1608), sig. A4^r.
55. See Mark Nicholls, *Investigating the Gunpowder Plot* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), pp. 21-27, and C. N. Parkinson, *Gunpowder: Treason and Plot* (New York: St. Martin's, 1976), pp. 74-77. Immediately following the failed plot, a large-scale investigation ensued, which consisted in rapidly sifting information obtained from a variety of sources throughout the city and the counties, including the meticulous examination of Guy Fawkes, Thomas Winters, and other conspirators. The plot and the results of this preliminary investigation were made public in a Paul's Cross sermon preached by William Barlow on 9 November and through the publication of

the *King's Book* later in the month, which included transcripts of the examinations and attendant commentary.

56. James I, *Prayers and Thanksgiving to be used by all the king's majesty's loving subjects For the happy deliverance of his majesty, the Queen, Prince, and States of Parliament, from the most traitorous and bloody intended massacre by gunpowder, the 5th of November, 1605* (London, Robert Barker, 1605), fol. 1^r.
57. *The Faerie Queene*, 1.4.5.
58. Cf. 3.1.150-59, 3.3.1, and 3.3.38-40.
59. See King, *English Reformation Literature*, pp. 140-43.
60. This text and corresponding manuscript notes are currently located in the library of Worcester College, Oxford (Plays 2.1[1]).
61. Although a contemporary scholar may have made these emendations to assist readers of the play, I think this unlikely, since anyone with any kind of scholarly disposition would not have required annotation of these lines and would probably have viewed such glosses as amateurish, if not completely absurd. See Richard Dutton, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1991), p. 76.
62. According to Kranz, the Catholic Church and the Spanish nation are uneasily conflated throughout the play in order to preserve the opposition between the true and false church and in an effort to indict both parties in the Gunpowder treason. See Kranz, p. 273.
63. Cf. 5.2.221-29.
64. Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Great, Parts I and II*, ed. John D. Jump, Regents Renaissance Drama Series (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), 1, 4.2.14, and 2, 4.3.
65. *The Geneva Bible*, sig. Ppp6^v. The depiction of the whore in the Geneva Bible is quoted nearly verbatim when the Third King describes her at 4.4.25-31.
66. See Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 99.
67. William Tyndale, *The Obedience of a Christian Man* (Antwerp, 1528), sig. N2^v.
68. *Ibid.*, sig. N1^r.
69. Bailey, sig. B2^r.