

‘O London, London’: Mid-Tudor Literature and the City

This article explores the ways in which mid-Tudor writing addressed and imagined the city of London. Scholarly reactions to mid-Tudor writing have been mixed: where Nineteenth-Century editors were drawn to the anti-urban aspect of these texts, later criticism has tended to denigrate it on ethical or aesthetic grounds. This essay joins recent efforts to reassess the qualities of Tudor writing by focusing on its highly emotive imagining of the city. It focuses on a ‘cross-section’ of mid-Tudor literature, including poetry, prose, and sermons, all produced in the period c. 1542 – c. 1550. These number works by Robert Crowley, Henry Brinklow, Hugh Latimer, Henry Howard, Thomas Lever and John Bale. It argues that mid-Tudor writing was persistently drawn to represent England’s capital in particular ways. The imagined urban landscapes of this writing are strongly biblical in nature, partly because of the continued significance of biblical rhetoric and figures in the religious landscape of the time. However, mid-Tudor writing can also be seen to focus consistently on images of the urban poor, and use a rhetorical technique of satire by listing which blurs distinctions between forms of religious and commercial invective. This sub-genre of Tudor writing also needs to be understood in terms of its rich literary debts to earlier, particularly medieval, forms of urban writing. The latter part of the essay focuses on two such debts: those of Henry Howard to Petrarch’s ‘Babylonion Sonnets’ in the *Canzoniere*, and of Robert Crowley to William Langland’s *Piers Plowman*.

The literature of the period 1530-1580, ‘mid-Tudor’ as it might now be named, has not traditionally enjoyed the most enthusiastic reception from scholars. On grounds both aesthetic and ideological, mid-Tudor writing has frequently found itself at the periphery of literary history. This critical status has, for a long time, been shaped by the rather high-handed perspective of C. S. Lewis’ mid-twentieth-century literary history. In Lewis’ volume, mid-Tudor writing was not ‘mid-Tudor’, but ‘drab’, a term he – perhaps rather disingenuously – wrote was

not used as a dyslogistic term. It marks a period in which, for good or ill, poetry has little richness either of sound or images. The good work is neat and temperate, the bad flat and dry.¹

Lewis’ literary-historical scheme shaped the century’s writing as an inevitably progressive movement from the ‘late medieval’, to the ‘drab’, and finally to the ‘golden’ age of Sidney and Spenser. The grounds of this assessment were strongly aesthetic: ‘richness of sound or images’, or lack thereof, damned with the faintest of adjectival praise (‘neat’ and ‘temperate’, rather than ‘flat’ and ‘dry’).

More recent scholarship on mid-Tudor writing has taken aim at Lewis’ formulation, and clearly reassessed this literature in vital ways. In particular, Mike Pincombe’s and Cathy Shrank’s *Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (2009) set out to put mid-Tudor writing at the heart of their copious collection of essays and the period it covered, and opened the collection with a polemical defence of the period’s writing, made partly in a combative Lewisite assessment of Tudor writing on aesthetic grounds.² However, James Simpson’s trail-blazing volume in the Oxford Literary History, *Reform and Cultural Revolution* (2002), has threatened to

reinter mid-Tudor writing as the part of a very different literary-historical narrative. While this newer literary history has served to renegotiate the grounds of periodization between medieval and early Modern literature, its polemical focus on the Henrician Reformation as a violently centralised, tyrannical culture has – at least tacitly – left mid-Tudor writing in an awkward position. If not the central object of Simpson’s powerful, ethical critique, mid-Tudor writing has inevitably been caught up in this new counter-teleology: it has become part of the ‘narrowing’ of literary culture that apparently occurred as Henrician Protestantism worked to produce a ‘revolutionary’, ‘fundamentalist’, and ‘iconoclastic’ modernity.³ Some have questioned the place of mid-Tudor writing in this narrative, and attempted to shape mid-Tudor literature as a partial return to the ‘reformism’ of pre-Reformation culture, but it is clear that the nascent re-evaluation of mid-Tudor literature found in Shrank’s and Pincombe’s volume has been impinged upon by this new anti-Reformation literary history.⁴

This essay furthers Shrank’s and Pincombe’s reassessment of mid-Tudor writing by directing our attention to one particular aspect of mid-Tudor writing: its representation of, and obsession with, the city of London. This focus intersects with both Lewis’ and Simpson’s agendas in their literary histories, as mid-Tudor literature’s relationship with urban imagery is at once aesthetic and ideological. By focusing on the nature of mid-Tudor images of the city, we might be forced to reconsider Lewis’ adjectives: mid-Tudor writing is neither ‘temperate’ or ‘neat’, let alone ‘flat’ and ‘dry’, when addressing or imaging the urban world. Similarly, the way in which much mid-Tudor writing has been caught up in Simpson’s more ideologically-driven focus on iconoclasm and ‘fundamentalist’ Henrician tyranny seems problematic when we note how consistently and strongly ethical mid-Tudor reformist writing was when it addressed London. In part, this essay furthers the *Oxford Handbook*’s line of argument in suggesting that

the urban imaginary of mid-Tudor writing might be seen as one of its most striking features, a characteristic of ‘Tudor-ness’ to add to Pincombe’s and Shrank’s suggestion that ‘[t]he writing of this period recurrently displays enduring traits: copiousness, generic hybridity, a combination of playful ambiguity and political or moral seriousness; an uneasy synthesis of didactic purpose and leisurely digressiveness’.⁵ The strongly biblical and reformist nature of mid-Tudor writing of the city is only one feature, though, to which we might also add its persistent focus on the image of the urban poor, its regular use of lists of commercial objects for rhetorical purpose, and a rich intertextual relationship with earlier writing of the city.

While twentieth-century scholarship on the representation of London in early Modern literature has tended to efface this feature of Tudor writing, it was precisely what earlier, nineteenth-century editors valued.. Joseph Meadows Cowper, who edited a number of Tudor texts for the *Early English Text Society*, was quite clear about what readers might find in the work of Robert Crowley, for example. His introduction overtly connects the mid-Tudor and Victorian city by stating that Crowley’s writings ‘present a picture of London life not yet extinct’, and asking rhetorically ‘Are we *much* better than those whom Crowley sketched upwards of three hundred years ago?’ The *Early English Text Society* edition of this mid-Tudor writer presents the mid-Tudor text as an ethical and rhetorical precursor to Victorian imaginative and political responses to the city of London. This is the cityscape described by Mayhew, Engels or Dickens: the reformer’s, philanthropist’s, and novelist’s horrified reaction to the industrial slums of the nineteenth century.⁶

However, if we turn to other points at which readers might be introduced to mid-Tudor writing, we might be forgiven for thinking that ‘the city’ as a point of literary and cultural interest doesn’t exist. I refer here to a striking oddity in the structure of the *Cambridge History of*

Early Modern English Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). It is striking to find that the first chapter entitled 'Literature and London' appears only in the section on Elizabethan and Jacobean writing. Whilst the chapter in question, an excellent essay by Lawrence Manley, refers back to early- and mid-Tudor writing, and indeed medieval cultures, the bare fact of London's apparent absence from Tudor writing before the Elizabethan reign is arresting.⁷ There is a demonstrable gap in the literary history of 'London literature' which runs counter to the interests of earlier scholars. If one picks up an *EETS* volume, it seems that what mid-Tudor writers largely have to offer is their engagement with a quasi-Dickensian cityscape; but if one turns to canonical critical volumes on the period, 'Literature and London' does not really seem to exist until the Elizabethan period.

On some levels this might be understandable. The mid-Tudor period produced a body of important civic chronicles but didn't provide us with anything as compendious, meticulous, or as powerfully mythologizing as John Stow's *Survey of London* (1598, 1603).⁸ Indeed, while continuities and appropriations can be seen in this later work – such as Stow's annexing of William FitzStephen's twelfth-century description of London to the 1603 edition of the *Survey*, the specificity of topographical reference in Stow's work which makes itself felt so energetically in the drama of Jonson, Dekker and Middleton which we now call 'City Comedy', is usually comparatively absent from mid-Tudor evocations of the city. Similarly, the powerful and longstanding tradition of mythologized historical origins for England's capital which one finds in so many medieval texts, from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, through Wace and Layamon, to *St. Erkenwald* or 'London, thou art of townes A *per se*', are distinctly absent as a generic touchstone for many mid-Tudor writers.⁹

Mid-Tudor evocations of the city in which much of the period's writing was produced and read are, however, a great deal less drab than they have been made to seem. England's capital, and the reactions and representations it produced, are a vital and energetic aspect of this writing, especially if we begin to read it with less automatic hostility, and with different expectations and interests in mind. This essay focuses on a kind of 'cross-section' of mid-Tudor literature, including poetry, prose, and sermons, all produced in the period c. 1542 – c. 1550. These number works by Robert Crowley, Henry Brinklow, Hugh Latimer, Henry Howard, Thomas Lever and John Bale. A number of things become apparent when reading this reasonably focused 'canon' of mid-Tudor literature, and its relationship with London: particular imaginative and stylistic characteristics grow into distinct phenomena. These imaginative preoccupations include the focus upon and rhetorical importance of the image of the urban poor; the rhetorical strategy of description through listing, a technique that allows reactions to theological and devotional reform to intersect with the sensual evocation of the urban marketplace; and a persistent medievalism. By looking at the use which two of these writers make of medieval literary precedents – Henry Howard's partial translation of some of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and Robert Crowley's interests in William Langland's *Piers Plowman* – we can begin to see how rich these mid-Tudor texts are in the way they reconfigure literary debts into ways to represent the London of the late Henrician and Edwardian reigns.¹⁰

I

Literary representations of the city are necessarily archetypal and overdetermined. One cannot encounter a written cityscape which entirely escapes from the shadows cast by Troy, by Rome,

by Babylon, by Jerusalem. All textual evocations of urban bodies are already produced by sedimentary layers of previous cities, piled one on top of the other like a diachronic archeological site of identifications and continuities. We should not be surprised to find Geoffrey of Monmouth's hugely influential description of the founding of London echoing the prophetic, Virgilian narrative of the foundation of Rome.¹¹ Neither should we be surprised, or disappointed, to find that mid-Tudor representations of the city are almost invariably related to the cities described in Genesis, the Old Testament prophetic books, particularly Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and Revelation. While John Bale was not a Londoner, and wrote much of his work in exile from England, his influential *Image of Both Churches* (1548) is adamant in its application of archetypal urban metaphors to confessional identities:

He that deliteth not to beholde the condicion of his owne cyte, is there unto no louinge citizen. And after the true opinion of saint Austen, eyther we are citezens in the new Ierusalem with Jesus Christ, or els in the old superstitious Babilon with antichrist the vicar of Sathan.¹²

Bale's civic vocabulary applies not, of course, to civic bodies, but theological and ethical positions. Augustine's metaphorical dichotomy between the cities of man and God in the *De Civitate Dei* acts as an archetypal template for Bale to describe the historical continuity of reformed theology and devotional practice, the continuous battle between the Godly and their Papal persecutors. Part of the modern antipathy towards much of this mid-Tudor writing can perhaps be traced to this impulse to cleave to the familiar outlines of archetypes, particularly biblical ones. The modern reader might often feel more aesthetically and morally (or

mischievously) engaged by the incorrigible energies of Greene's Cony-Catchers or Hal's sojourn in the taverns of Eastcheap, than by the repetitive castigations of 'old superstitious Babilon'. But while we can sense a shift in moral sensibility between the indignation of mid-Tudor writing and the more ambivalent moods of modern taste, there is no escaping the archetypes. As scholars working on modern, indeed postmodern, urban writing have written, 'urban realities are located over against the assumed innocence of an Eden now lost, but somehow promised again in a New Jerusalem, which itself may only be understood in the contrast of a sinful Babylon [...] In western letters, literary representations of city life are haunted by biblical figures'.¹³ This haunting, captured here by the enclosed, inescapable syntactical connections drawn between the three biblical sites, can be seen to surround and consume mid-Tudor writing about the city. The strongly biblical language of Bale's civic-sounding formulation is clearly an important part of the reformism of much mid-Tudor writing – something which had a huge impact on the Jeremiad-like quality of this period's evocations of the city. But archetypes can be energizing, vivid things, rather than characteristics to be dismissed as somehow automatically dull, 'drab', or commonplace.

One of the most striking characteristics of this writing in the 1540s is the way in which it addresses England's capital, for so often the city is personified and addressed directly as a single body. Henry Brinklow writes *A Lamentation of the Christian against the City of London* (1545); Surrey composes 'A Satire against the Citizens of London' (1543), which begins with the indignant 'London, hast thou accused me'; Hugh Latimer's famed 'Sermon on the Plough' (1548) quickly changes its addressee from 'the citizens' to 'O London, London'.¹⁴ This direct address, of course, places the poet, preacher, or polemicist in a particular relationship with the London he addresses. These writers all use a similar voice, a *vox clamantis*, a stance of the

prophetic reformer addressing the city from an authoritative moral space. Latimer shapes himself after Isaiah, depending on a running comparison between London and Nebo. Brinklow synthesizes quotations from Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Isaiah to shape his own polemical voice in a similar way. Surrey's Tudor stone-bows shattering the windows of wealthy London citizens have rhetorical counterparts in Jeremiah. Crowley shapes his poetic voice with the comment: 'the same Spirite that sent Ionas to the Niniuits, Daniel to the Babilonians, Nathan to Kyng David, Achior unto Holofernes, Iudith unto the Priests and Elders of the Iewes, the prophete unto Ieroboam in Bethal, Iohn the Baptist unto Herode, and Christ unto the Iewes, wynneseth wyth my conscience that I renne not unsent'.¹⁵ John Bale is persistently drawn to the figures of John the Baptist and St. Paul.¹⁶ This is, of course, paradoxical, given that both these writers and their readers were very likely to be, in some way, Londoners. The voice crying in the wilderness, at least in Latimer's case, was shouting 'O London, London', while preaching in the heart of the metropolis, at Paul's Cross.

However, the geographical, spatial disparity between the physical speaker and the generic associations of his speech makes more sense when placed in context, for these archetypal biblical-Tudor voices gain a great deal of their resonance from the specific context in which they were heard. The period following the *Act of Six Articles* (1539) featured not only serious setbacks for reformist patronage after Cromwell's fall from grace and execution in 1540, nor just the notoriously harrowing attempts to implicate various court factions in heresy which resulted in Anne Askew's torturous death in 1546; it also produced a city which was rendered through bitter religious power-struggles into a fractured, contested site of spiritual meaning. London could be figured simultaneously, from opposed positions, as dangerously reformist and stolidly recalcitrant. While civic events which celebrated the numerous, rather frantically paced, dynastic

happenings of the period continued, other performances and gatherings, from bible-reading to interludes, were the subject of heightened surveillance and proscription.¹⁷ The year of Surrey's poem was also that of the *Act for the Advancement of True Religion* (1543), which attempted to limit contact with the officially sanctioned *Great Bible* (1539) along strictly defined limits of class, gender and income. The most important modern historian of London in the period entitles her discussion of the 1540s, 'Politics and Persecution'.¹⁸ It is in this context that John Bale imagines the readers of his text surrounded by hostility at once specifically Henrician and archetypically Hebraic: 'The boystuouse tyrauntes of Sodoma with their great Nemroth Winchester, and the execrable cytezens of Gomorra with their shorne smered captaines, wyll sturre about them'.¹⁹ Bale's sarcastically civic-sounding 'cytezens' and their quasi-biblical overlord Gardiner (Nemroth being an alternative spelling of Genesis 19's Nimrod) encircle Bale's readers, and it is this sense of surveillance and embattled persecution that made the archetypal cities of many mid-Tudor texts map so powerfully onto London in the later Henrician years. In some ways, while the court, and Henry's increasingly busy privy chamber, might have been the sites of the most catalytic decisions in the course of the early Reformation, London remained the most obviously significant site in which the elite politics of the court intersected with, and were in turn qualified by, a wider public. It is worth remembering that, as early as 1526, the place Wolsey chose to begin searching out embryonic English Lutheranism was in London's Hanseatic Steel Yards.²⁰ While resistance both radical and conservative from the West Country, East Anglia or Yorkshire could be more obviously threatening in military terms, the potentially un-policeable dark corners of London streets and taverns presented a nightmare of theological diversity and social mobility which lay far too close for comfort.²¹ The writers of the 1540s often elided both the potentially convertible population of the capital with its Babylonian

clerical ‘captaines’, using the threatening name of Sodom, while effacing the divine injunction laid on Abraham to find one just citizen in order to save it.

The 1540s, therefore, produced a potent anti-urban rhetoric, and those same writers under Edward continued to use biblical types, language, and parallels, but their situation now regarded the city as a convertible space, a cityscape which was, unfortunately, harrowingly similar in its ethical character to the one that had been lorded over by the Nemroths of the 1540s. While the political fortunes of reformism had changed dramatically between Surrey’s poem in 1543 and Latimer’s sermon in 1548, the imaginative and rhetorical texture of mid-Tudor literature remained imaginatively dependent on this mode of desperate, biblically-inflected persecutory discourse.

II

However, the biblicism of this writing is matched by a strong imaginative and rhetorical preoccupation with particular phenomena: both the image of the urban poor which appears so often in this writing, and rhetorical strategies that combine representations of the urban environment with polemical attacks on unreformed devotional practice. The first of these, the figure of the urban poor, is ubiquitous. Latimer’s sermon is a famed example, but hardly unique:

Oh London, London, repent repent; for I think God is more displeased with London than ever he was with the city of Nebo. Repent, therefore, repent. London, and remember that the same God liveth now that punished Nebo, even the same God, and none other [...] In times past, men were full of pity and compassion, but now there is no pity; for in London

their brother shall die in the streets for cold, he shall lie sick at the door between stock and stock, and perish there for hunger. Was there any more unmercifulness in Nebo?²²

Thomas Lever, Latimer's colleague in the reformist pulpits of Edwardian London, echoed Latimer's sentiment and the high rhetorical pitch which he used to describe the streets:

So nowe old Fathers, poore widows, and yong children, lie begging in the mirie streets. O mercifull Lorde, what a number of poore, feable, haulte, Blynde, lame, sycklye, yea, with idel vacabounds, and dissembelinge kaityffs mixt among them, lie and crepe, begging in the myry strates of London and Westminster?²³

While almost all of these writers struggle with the problem of conscience produced by their knowledge that at least some of those in penury carpeting the London streets were capable of labour, all of them return frequently to this image of the streets. One of Crowley's *One and Thirty Epigrams* (1550) figures a travelling merchant returning from 'strange lands' and mistakenly thinking that the beggars surrounding a luxurious building (which previously served as a more modest almshouse) own it. His comic misunderstanding ('is my contrey so wealthy / That the verye beggers houses / be builte so gorgiouslye?' (ll. 218-20) is quickly and brutally corrected: 'Alas! Syr (quod the pore man) / we are all turned oute, / And lye and dye in corners, / here and there about' (ll. 229-32). The urban poor are very rarely depicted busying themselves on the periphery of Bartholomew Fair or squabbling over capons and ale: they are almost always prostrate, 'lying' and 'creeping' their way across the surfaces of the urban street.

This concentration on the urban poor is, of course, a vital part of Protestant writing that goes back, at least, to Simon Fish's *Supplication for the Beggars* at the end of the 1520s.

Theological attacks upon the economic dynamics surrounding traditional devotional practices – purgatory and masses for the dead, devotion to particular saints – were from a very early stage of the Reformation linked inextricably with a plea for the financial relief of the poor. Latimer's nostalgia for 'times past', when 'men were full of pity and compassion', is immediately awkward in this framework: its hazy nostalgia invokes a time when there may have been more charity, but it would have come from the regime of almsgiving maintained by religious communities, the very institutions that the Henrician Reformation had reduced to ruins. Fish's attempt to use an idea of the economic bottom line against the clergy made sure that Thomas More was quick to have his purgatorial souls remind readers that 'menne should thinke and say that they haue in dayes passed seen as many sicke beggars as they se now [...] for of trouth there were pore people [...] sence almost as longe as Noyes floude'.²⁴ In other words, this aspect of mid-Tudor representations of the city was, in fact, part of one of the key flash points of religious controversy in the sixteenth century: the arguments over the nature, worth, and practice of charity. More's and Tyndale's philological wrangle over words like '*caritas*' and '*agape*' in Vulgate and Greek texts of the Bible had ramifications that reached down into the 'mirie streates' of England's capital.²⁵

The way in which theology and social practice intersect is often, however, full of paradox. James Simpson, following Max Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904-5), notes the 'paradox that a theology so hostile to works should have produced a work ethic'.²⁶ In the same way, Susan Brigden has noted that while early Protestants remained sharply hostile to the efficacy of charitable works in a theological sense, a significant number of them left substantial parts of their estate to the anonymous London poor. The massive rise in pauperism in the capital in the 1540s – surely driven in part by the sudden existence of a

whole sector of society who had previously held monastic or clerical employment of some kind – was met by a genuine attempt to provide for the poor via charitable means. Lear’s ‘houseless poverty’ in some ways began in the 1540s, but there was also in this period an increased awareness, anxiety and desire to take care of it:

The increase in charitable giving coincided – exactly – with the advance of Protestantism. The abandonment of Purgatory, and with it the need to care for the welfare of dead souls, left money available for the succour of the living, whose need was the greater.²⁷

In such a context, the bodies of the urban poor became a vital theological and rhetorical part of the social and imaginative world of mid-Tudor writing. In some ways, of course, this sharp focus on the intersections between poverty and religious controversy developed out of a long tradition – one that might easily take in Franciscanism, or the vivid poverty of Wycliffite variations on *Piers Plowman* like *Piers Plowman’s Creed*.²⁸ And, indeed, while the images of the urban poor that abound in mid-Tudor writing can be viewed as part of the ideological pastoralism that made ‘Langland’s ploughman [...] the main voice of Protestant dissent’ at least until Spenser’s *Shepherd’s Calendar* (1579) and even later, it is worth noting that this image of poverty was often quite specifically urban.²⁹ It was not, perhaps, the penitential draw of voluntary poverty, or the anticlerical connotations of the arch-labouring layman which preoccupied the mid-Tudor imagination as much as the vivid, harrowing image of London’s own population.

The energies circulating around the image of the urban poor in this literature, then, are at once emotive and rhetorical, social and theological. The aesthetics and religious politics of this

writing are closely interconnected. This network of connections also enlivens a stylistic aspect of mid-Tudor writing: its penchant for rhetorical, satirical list-making. These overflowing catalogues of material objects are certainly ways to address devotional practices in a sharply hostile way, but the lists also work by evoking the commercial, material diversity of the urban marketplace. Socio-economic and religious images and purposes work in tandem. Brinklow's *Lamentation*, again both archetypal and specific, is a fine example:

For euen as the whore is fallen in Englund already, thankes onely be geuen to God therefore, and yet her trishtrash remaynyng for our iniquities sake [...] Alas, the greate cytye Babilon, that myghtie cytie, for at one houre is her iudgenment come. And the merchants of the earth shall wepe and wayle in them salves, for no man will buy their ware any more; the ware of golde, and silver, and precious stones; neither of pearls, and raynes, and purple, and scarlet, and all thynne woddess, and brasse, and yron, and sinamm, & odours, and oyntmentes, and frakencense, and wyne, and oyle, and fine flower, and sowles of men. This fine flower haue they made the chefest of all their trishtrashe, and a cloke or a cloude to shadow all the rest [...] Yea, it is well knowen, that their pardons, and other of their tromperye, hath beene bought and solde in Lombard Streete, and in other places, as thou wilt bye and sell an horsse in Smithfelde. Yea, and thou must bye it [the sacrament], and paye for it, as men somtyme bought pyes in Soper Lane.³⁰

Brinklow's writing closely translates a long list from Revelation 18: 10-13, figuring the history of reformed (and unreformed) devotional practice in England as a part of the escatological narrative of the Bible's final book. But at the same time, Brinklow embellishes the archetypal,

biblical list of mercantile wares with specific London topography (Lombard Street, Smithfield, Soper Lane) and introduces a coinage (Brinklow's own, according to the OED) which is repeated throughout the passage – 'trishtrash'. A perhaps more predictable hostility to traditional devotional practices becomes a rhetorical preoccupation with a more general proliferation of material objects and commercial goods. Here, the 'trishtrash' of religious controversy is also the 'trishtrash' of the urban marketplace. The apparently endless sequence of gold, silver, fabrics, spices and so on acts like a giant conveyer belt of meaninglessness. While the list is taken, verbatim, from the biblical text, its proximity to London's markets for livestock and street food makes the archetypal enter into the commercial environment of mid-Tudor London.³¹ Brinklow's punchline at the end of the list ('and oyle, and fine flower, and sowles of men') leads him directly to the images of pardoners and financial racketeering. The objects which are not – and cannot be allowed to be – simply objects (souls, sacraments) come at the end of a list which cumulatively diminishes each object in particularity and importance. In this rhetorical strategy, a soul becomes just another 'trishtrash' object in the urban marketplace.

Everywhere one looks in this literature, for each list which berates the material aspects of Catholic devotional practice, there is one which lashes out at the ephemera and accumulated, dizzying noise of the commercial marketplace. Bale vents his spleen on the 'ueluetes, sylkes, miters, copes, crosses, curettes, ceremonies, sensinges, blessinges, bablynges, brawlynges' of the Mass, but Lever similarly warns 'you Marchantes of London that ye be not Marchauntes of myschyefe', eschewing 'substanciall wares' and instead 'bryngynge home sylkes, and sables, cattails, and folysh fethers to fil the realm'.³² In each case, the mounting heap of items ends in an alliterative rally designed to diminish the objects even further, to make the items, aurally, almost indiscriminate: a babble of foolish feathers whose accurate description stretches the limits of

speech. This rhetorical strategy always had close connections with the writing of satire, and even more so in an age of controversy over devotional practice. The multiplicity of religious orders, or the complex Latinity of the liturgy, could all be reduced to a linguistic chaos for polemical effect.³³ In one way, this is a familiar part of the English literary tradition of anti-Catholicism which links the denunciations of ‘bell, book and candle’ of the *Plowman’s Tale* with Spenser and Milton.³⁴ The plentitude and esotericism of these mid-Tudor lists are to some extent responsible for the eerie, occult-inflected ceremonies that send Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus to hell.³⁵ Catholic devotional practice is made to seem simultaneously emptily commercial and full of arcane material ritual.³⁶

Indeed, this aspect of Tudor writing has been noted by a number of scholars. James Simpson, in his polemically written account of reformist culture, writes how ‘Lists of this kind are an essential and recurrent weapon in the evangelical rhetorical arsenal. The verbal junk here could go on forever [...] it’s an infinite, jumbled, unsorted pile of rubbish, the only sane response to which is hammer and broom’.³⁷ In Simpson’s account, the stylistics of list-making (despite being illustrated by a quotation from Erasmus) are part of a deeper tendency towards iconoclastic violence in evangelical culture and its reading practices. Certainly, though, others have seen ‘the Tudor predilection for lists of things’ as a wider feature of its interest in ‘copious’ expression, an aspect of the ‘exuberantly proliferating energies of mid-Tudor literature’.³⁸ We might also look at the list-making in a different way, one which allows the barriers between theological and devotional ideas and social phenomena to be as porous as they are in much mid-Tudor writing. The reformers’ list is directed towards the world of the marketplace as much as that of the Rood screen. Lawrence Manley, writing about later, Elizabethan works which contain ‘delightfully swollen lists of individuals and species’ notes that ‘In the earlier Tudor period [...] such lists

portended the destruction of limits, a release into anarchy'.³⁹ But the anarchical aural and material diversity of the urban marketplace was not an impression that somehow disappeared in the later sixteenth century. What Wordsworth called the 'Babel din' of the London street was just what many mid-Tudor writers were evoking. The noise of the London street – human but particularly commercial – is a sensual impression of the city which reaches out across time from the random fourteenth-century shouts of 'hot pies, hot' in *Piers Plowman* or 'London Lickpenny' to Dickens' long lists of Victorian commercial bric-a-brac in the nineteenth century, and beyond.⁴⁰ In mid-Tudor writing, the aggressive lists of ecclesiastical objects – 'all the trishtrashe that Antichrist hath solde us', as Brinklow put it – were formed through the imaginative resources of a chaotic cityscape. Ecclesiastical and commercial images bleed into one another, both on the level of deliberate polemical effect, and on a more subconscious, imaginative level as well.

III

Having argued for the vitality of two distinctive aspects of mid-Tudor reactions to the city, we now turn to a pair of specific intertextual relationships involving the two better known of the mid-Tudor 'canon': Henry Howard, the 'poet earl of Surrey', and Robert Crowley. The literary debts of these two writers are in some ways closely analogous to those of Brinklow or Bale, Latimer or Lever. They both persistently take recourse to biblical types and rhetoric, from Crowley's self-comparison with 'Ionas [...] Daniel [...] Nathan', to Surrey's paraphrases of the Psalms and Ecclesiastes. But they both also utilize writing which we might more readily

recognize as ‘literary’ writing, rich sources of aesthetic as well as spiritual inspiration. The archetypal cities that these two writers mould and shape to fit their purposes are not just Gomorrah or Babylon, but in Surrey’s case include Petrarch’s Avignon, and in Crowley’s, the London of Langland’s *Piers Plowman*. There is a striking and under-valued medievalism at work in much mid-Tudor writing. All images of the city take recourse to previous images; modernists reading Eliot’s Dantean vision of London Bridge in *The Waste Land* witness something akin to Surrey’s and Crowley’s marshalling of fourteenth-century literature to mid-Tudor purposes.

Surrey’s Petrarchanism, along with Wyatt’s, is a commonplace of critical comment on earlier Tudor poetry. But the nature of Surrey’s encounter with Petrarch is – at least in 1543 – something striking and distinctly original. In 1543, Surrey was imprisoned after a night of violence on the streets of London. The situation of imprisonment, as so often with Surrey, provided the occasion for a poem.

London, hast thou accused me
 Of breche of lawes, the roote of stryfe?
 [...]
 In secret sylence of the night
 This made me, with a reckless brest,
 To wake thy sluggardes with my bowe:
 A fygure of the Lordes behest,
 Whose scourge for synn the Screptures shew.
 [...]
 Oh shamles hore! Is dred then gone

By suche thy foes as ment thy weale?

Oh membre of false Babylon!

The shopp of craft! The denne of ire!

Thy dredfull dome drawes fast uppon.

Thy martyres blood, by swoord and fyre,

In heaven and earth for justice call.

[...]

The flame of wrath shall on thee fall.⁴¹

This extraordinary poem is full of distinctively mid-Tudor language, images and rhetoric. The direct address of its opening captures that used by Latimer or Lever in London's pulpits. Indeed, a vital part of the poem is Surrey's self-fashioning as someone closely akin to, but differentiated from, a reformist preacher. A comparison with the way in which preachers work to castigate sin 'by words syns preachers know / What hope is left for to redresse' (ll. 9-10) is used to introduce his own role as 'scourge' of London's 'secret syn'. The central lines of the poem utilize a familiar, homiletic catalogue of the cardinal sins 'pryde...envy...wrath...slouthe...gredye lucre...lechers...gluttons' (ll. 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40) which results in the overt declaration of reformist intent, 'In loathsome vyce eche drunken wight / To stir to Godd, this was my mynd' (ll. 42-3). The claim to be 'a figure of the Lordes behest' shapes the imprisoned Surrey as marginalised, persecuted Old Testament prophetic figure – analogous with Crowley's claims to be sent by the spirit that sent a sequence of figures from Jonah to Christ.⁴² Where Surrey differs from his contemporaries is in his substitution of action for sermons, vandalism for verbal castigation. The poem is full of lapidary images which relate Surrey's volleys of 'peoble stones'

from his 'bowe' (something akin to a modern catapult) with the built environment of the city. The 'wicked walles' (l. 6) lead Surrey to an almost comic apology to the city's broken windows which 'had don me no spight' (l. 44) save harbouring 'prowd people' in the 'closures of thy wall' (ll. 44, 47). The 'rapp' (l. 25) of Surrey's stones on urban architecture ends in a prophetic fantasy of urban destruction, in which 'Thy prowde towers and turrets hye', victims of God's wrath, will be 'beat stone from stone' (ll. 62-3). The network of images bears obvious comparison with the prophetic curses laid on cities in Jeremiah (particularly 50: 9, 14, 29), which all call for 'archers', 'arrows', 'all who bend the bow', shoot at her, spare no arrows'.

But this complex tapestry of quasi-biblical images also shares space with what is, to my knowledge, the earliest English translation and appropriation – partial though it is – of Petrarch's 'Babylonian' sonnets in the *Canzoniere*. These poems, usually numbered 114, 136-8, have a place among a genre of writing – including Petrarch's own *Sine Nomine letters* and texts by Dante, Catherine of Siena and a number of spiritual Franciscans – aimed at the anti-Papacy at Avignon during the Great Schism.⁴³ Surrey's 'shamles hore! [...] membre of false Babylon! / The shopp of craft! The denne of ire!' is a rendering of Petrarch's 'putta sfacciata' (l. 11), 'Babilonia falsa e ria' (l. 3), and 'Fontana di dolore, albergo d'ira [...] o fucina d'inganni' (ll. 1, 5).⁴⁴ The prophetic line 'The flame of wrath shall on the fall' (l. 59) comes directly from Petrarch's curse-like opening to *Canzoniere* 136: 'Fiamma dal ciel su le tue treccie piova' (l. 1). The fantasy of London's earthquake-like disintegration, vaguely reminiscent of Jeremiah, is actually a close translation of *Canzoniere* 137's 'Gl'idoli suoi saranno in terra sparsi / E le torri superbe al ciel nemiche, / E'suoi terrier di for come dentro arsi' (ll. 9-11). The anti-Avignon Petrarch is stitched into a pattern of biblical images – the 'martyrs blood' of Revelation 18: 24, the prophecy of 'famyne and pest lamentable' of Ezekiel 5: 12 – to produce a poem of unusual verbal violence.

Strikingly, many scholars working on English Petrarchanism overlook Surrey's complex invocations of the Babylonian sonnets. For example, Anthony Mortimer prints translations of *Canzoniere* 114 and 136-8 by (probably) Harrington the Elder from the Park-Hill Manuscript (BL Add. 36529), followed by Thomas Howell's intriguing Elizabethan version and Fairfax's and Milton's in the seventeenth century. He also writes that 'The Petrarchan experience, central for Wyatt, is peripheral in Surrey'.⁴⁵ It depends upon which 'Petrarchan experience' we mean.⁴⁶ Mortimer notes that the Park-Hill translations 'inaugurate a significant Protestant appropriation of Petrarch'.⁴⁷ Being that the Park-Hill manuscript likely dates from the 1550s or 1560s, Surrey's poem is actually the text inaugurating an appropriative relationship with *Canzoniere* 136-8, and the mood of rebarbative indignation that characterises so much of Surrey's verse makes his reception of these particular Petrarchan poems absolutely central to his poetics.⁴⁸ Surrey's London is voguishly scriptural, but also distinctly *avant-garde* in its literary frame of reference. David Norbrook has noted Surrey's partial versions of Petrarch's poems, writing that 'These sonnets gave authority for identifying the Pope with Antichrist and duly took their place in Protestant polemics'.⁴⁹ But where Surrey is original by the sheer fact of his appropriative reception of the Babylonian sonnets, he is original too through his use of them. For the tradition of 'Protestant appropriation' and 'Protestant polemics' that Mortimer and Norbrook point out invariably used these poems to address a specific city. Petrarch's sharp satirical attack on the papal curia being 'Già Rome, or Babylon' ('Once Rome, now Babylon') was useful because for Protestant readers Babylon *was* Rome. But Surrey's version is not addressed to either Avignon or Rome, but London. Surrey transposes Petrarch's target onto another city, but not in a way which is commensurate with the long tradition of antipapal appropriation which was to follow.

Surrey's poem is uniquely mid-Tudor in its application of Petrarch's poem to an English urban context.

Surrey's peculiarly commercial sounding 'shop of craft' now brings us back, via Brinklow's 'trishtrash' perhaps, to the urban marketplace, and back to Robert Crowley. Just as Surrey's formulation of mid-Tudor London is shaped by an imaginative reaction to a fourteenth-century precursor, so Crowley's is too. Crowley's most important literary relationship is with William Langland's *Piers Plowman*, which he edited in 1550 when it appeared in print for the first time. Crowley's interest in Langland has received an increased amount of scholarly attention in recent years, much of which has refined or challenged earlier scholarship, particularly King's account of Crowley's editorial work on Langland's text.⁵⁰ But much of this interest in Crowley's Langlandianism takes recourse to generic terms which are sometimes perhaps too broad and indistinct. We hear of 'prophetic estates satire', 'anticlericalism', 'prophetic poetry' and so on.⁵¹ These are all important things and clearly aspects of both Langland's dizzying poem and Crowley's own writing. But while Crowley's interests in *Piers Plowman* are wide and rich, they can often be quite specific as well. One of the most important points of intersection is the representation of the urban environments of London's markets – a type of specifically anti-urban satire.

For Langland scholars, London is, as Derek Pearsall wrote, 'the problem that the poem cannot solve'.⁵² The commercial life of the city is among those things which the poem circles back around on time after time. It is important to see that this is an aspect of *Piers Plowman* in which Crowley shows a particular interest. While recent critics have noted that Crowley, like other mid-Tudor writers, focus intensely on avarice as the key to a myriad of social and political problems, London is the black hole which draws all of Crowley's avaricious imaginings

together.⁵³ London, or ‘Nodnoll’, as Crowley names it in *Philargyrie*, is the place which ‘Hypocrisie’ built:

Then builded he
 A greate Citie
 Nodnoll he dyd it name
 It was all one
 Wyth Babylon
 If it were not the same (ll. 509-14).

When Crowley describes London in *One and Thirty Epigrams*, it is with a tellingly Langlandian turn of phrase: ‘this is a citye / in name, but, in deed, / It is a packe of people / that seke after meede’ (ll. 193-6). In his editions of *Piers Plowman*, Crowley is careful to emphasize the economic concerns of Langland’s writing. It is worth seeing how Crowley guides the reader’s attention, for example, to a passage in passus 3. Langland writes:

For these ar men upon mold, that most harme worketh
 To the pore people, that percell meale byghe
 For they poysen the people, priuely and oft
 They richen through regratry, riches hem bighen,
 With that the pore people, should put in her wombs.⁵⁴

Crowley (and one imagines his own editor, Meadows Cowper) was especially interested in this. Next to the passage, Crowley prints the marginal comment: ‘What harm yll vitiliars do, & what abuses in regrating’. Crowley’s marginal annotations are often rather less ideological and rather more practical in nature than some scholars have thought, but Crowley’s interest in Langland’s satire on the London markets is the tip of a huge polemical iceberg.⁵⁵ Crowley’s *One and Thirty Epigrams*, published in the same year as the editions of Langland, is full of moments which suggest that Crowley is imagining mid-Tudor London through the lens of his reading of one of the great medieval dream-vision poems. In one passage, Crowley describes a ‘leasemongar / of London’ on his death bed, and ‘whilse he thus laye, / he fell in a sloumber, / and sawe in his dreame / pore folke a grete number’ (ll. 1177-80). Crowley, inspired by Langland’s ‘fair felde of folk’, writes a moral proverb in which all the people appearing in the dream are notably poor, and come to tell the conscience-stricken dreamer that ‘leasemongars’ ‘haue hell / by ryght inheritaunce’ (ll. 1191-2). Later in the text, Crowley’s narrator mimics an alliterative long-line, as well as a dream vision frame: ‘Of late, as I laye, / and lacked my reste / At suche tyme as Titan / drewe faste to the Easte’ (ll. 1389-92), ‘Than slombred I a little, / and thoughte that I sawe / Thre sortes of vayn menne / condempned by Gods lawe’ (ll. 1405-8). The vision is a gruesome one – vain talkers, writers, and speakers deforming each others’ skull, ears and tongue in nightmarish fashion – but the framework of the narrative is distinctly Langlandian. In an even more telling passage, Langland’s ‘yll vitiliars’ are writ large:

Well, let thes forestallars
 repent them bytyme,
 Lest the clarke of the market

be with them ere pryme.
 For he, when he cometh,
 wyll punysh them all,
 That do any nedeful thyng
 ingrose or forestall.
 For wel I wotte thys,
 When he went laste awaye,
 He sent vs his seruaunt,
 And thus dyd he saye.
 Se that emong you
 None seke his owne gayne,
 But profyte ech other
 With trauayle and payne (ll. 965-80).

What Lawrence Manley calls the ‘esoterica of early Tudor economic coinages’ – the regrating, forstalling, ingrossing – is here densely packed into a passage which figures Crowley’s ‘what harm yll vitiliers do & what abuses in regrating’ as a prophetic, scriptural warning to the urban marketplace of mid-Tudor London.⁵⁶ Langland’s hostility towards those who ‘richen through regratry’ was particularly focused on trades in what ‘the pore people should put in her wombes’, and so Crowley’s warnings are focused particularly on any ‘nedeful thyng’. There is a shared economic, commercial frame of reference in the worlds of both Langland’s poem and the writing of someone who was probably Langland’s most attentive and appreciative early modern reader.

What is also demonstrative of Crowley's preoccupation with the city here is the threat of the returning 'clarke of the market'. Crowley suggests to his reader that this figure of commercial regulation has acted before, sending his 'seruaunt' to police the urban spaces of the marketplace. The 'clarke of the market' is, of course, God, and his servant, as we can tell from the rhymed version of 1 Corinthians 10: 24 (ll. 977-80), was St. Paul. The Pauline injunction 'Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth' is Crowley's 'commonwealthsman's answer to mid-Tudor London: 'An hell with out order, / I maye it well call, / where euerye man is for him selfe, / And no manne for all' (ll. 201-4). When a writer imagines Paul as Christ's commercial official, required to govern and amend the commercial life of the urban market, we have to notice how vital the city has become, not just in moral, social terms, but in imaginative, literary terms as well. Mid-Tudor figurations of London may frequently tend towards scriptural Babylons and Babels, but they are also haunted and energized by the regrators and leasemongers, the chaotic trishtrash and poverty of the alleys, streets and marketplaces of Henrician and Edwardian England. The mid-Tudor literary city is ultimately rather less drab than C. S. Lewis might have imagined. Indeed, the writing of London in the mid-sixteenth century needs to be reevaluated and, perhaps, placed closer to the centre of critical attention, as it was for the nineteenth-century scholars who first edited many of these texts, and on whose work scholars of the period still depend.

¹ C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama* (Oxford, 1954), 64.

² Pincombe and Shrank, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford, 2009). For the renegotiation of Lewis' aesthetic distaste for the period's verse, see especially 'Prologue: The Travails of Tudor Literature', 1-17, esp. 3.

³ James Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution* (Oxford, 2002). In Simpson's subsequent work, Edwardian reformism has been subsumed into a broader narrative about the putative violence of Protestantism more broadly conceived. See, for example, the use of Cranmer and the mid-Tudor rebellions in *Burning to Read: English Fundamentalism and its Reformation Opponents* (Harvard, 2007), 13-15, 267-8.

⁴ See Thomas Betteridge, 'The Henrician Reformation and Mid-Tudor Culture', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 35 (2005), 91-110, especially 104-5.

⁵ See Pincombe and Shrank, 'Prologue: The Travails of Tudor Literature', 1-17, 13. 'Tudoriness' is Pincombe's coinage in an associated essay: 'Introduction: New Lamps for Old?', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 38 (2008), 1-16, 2.

⁶ One thinks particularly of Mayhew's *London Labour and the London Poor* (1851, 1861); Engel's *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (German, 1844; English, 1887), although Engels was admittedly focused on Manchester and Liverpool; and many of Dickens' early novels, particularly the London street scenes in *Nicholas Nickleby* (1838-9) or *Oliver Twist* (1838).

⁷ Manley's chapter is a concise summary of some of the engaging discussions in his *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge, 1995). On London in Tudor complaint literature see 63-122.

⁸ On the importance and impact of Stow's *Survey* see, for example, *John Stow (1525-1605) and the making of the English past: studies in early modern culture and the history of the book*, eds. Ian Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie (London, 2004).

⁹ On this tradition, see Sylvia Federico, *New Troy: Fantasies of Empire in the Late Middle Ages* (Minneapolis, 2003).

¹⁰ We might also observe here that a number of the characteristics of mid-Tudor writing about London inspired later Elizabethan works which clearly found this writing relevant and vital much later in the century. One might, for example, relate the biblicism of much reformist writing to texts such as

Thomas Lodge's and Robert Greene's *A Looking Glass for London and England* (1594), set in Jonah's Nineveh, the prophetic, 'preacherly' mode of Latimer or Lever to Thomas Nashe's *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem* (1593), or note that Crowley's neat reversed naming of the capital as 'Nodnol' (discussed below) spawned Philip Stubbes' 'Munidnol' in *The Anatomie of Abuses* (1583).

¹¹Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, ed. and trans. Lewis Thorpe (London, 1966), 65. The passage, translated by Wace and Layamon and evoked in numerous later medieval texts, is very closely modeled on *Aeneid* III. 159-71.

¹²John Bale, *The Image of Both Churches* (London, 1548), sig. A3v. Bale's text also opens with a sequence of short quotations requiring the reader to conflate cities such as the Sodom of Genesis 19 and the Babylon of Revelation.

¹³Jamie S. Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley, 'Eden, Babylon, New Jerusalem: A taxonomy for writing the city', in *Writing the City: Eden, Babylon, and the New Jerusalem*, eds. Peter Preston and Paul Simpson-Housley (London, 1994), 331-341, 331-2; see also Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (London, 1973), 6-7.

¹⁴Surrey's poem is untitled in MS Add. 36529; the title is editorial but descriptive. I refer to the following texts of these works: J. Meadows Cowper, ed., *Henry Brinklow's Complaint of Rodericke Mors*, EETS e.s. 22 (which includes the *Lamentation*), Emrys Jones, ed., *Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey: Poems* (Oxford, 1964), n. 33, 30-1; Latimer, 'Sermon on the Plough', in John Chandos, ed., *In God's Name: Examples of Preaching in England from the Act of Supremacy to the Act of Uniformity, 1534-1662* (London, 1971), 12-15.

¹⁵Crowley, *An Information and Petition* (1550), in *Select Works*, 159.

¹⁶Latimer's London-Nebo comparison is demonstrated in the quotation below, and Brinklow frequently takes recourse to prophetic parallels like Isaiah, see *Henry Brinklow's Complaint of Rodericke Mors*, 49, 106. Similarly, Bale's autobiography, the *Vocacyon*, makes absolutely explicit biographical

parallels between Bale's experience in Ireland and Europe in 1553 and St. Paul's biography. See Peter Happé and John N. King, eds., *The vocacyon of Johan Bale* (New York, 1990), 11-12.

¹⁷ On the continuities in civic performances which connect processions for Catherine of Aragon to her successor Anne Boleyn, to pageants for Ann of Cleves, Catherine Howard, Katherine Parr, and Edward VI, see Gordon Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford, 1998), esp. 209-221, 330-3, and Ian Lancashire, *Dramatic Texts and Records of Britain: A Chronological Topography to 1558* (Cambridge, 1984). On the Elizabethan period onwards, see David M. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry: 1558-1642* (London, 1971). Manley notes too that during the 1540s the inauguration of a new Lord Mayor developed into the 'preeminent civic event' of the year. See Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, 404.

¹⁸ Brigden, *London and the Reformation*, 325-77.

¹⁹ Bale, *The Image of Both Churches*, sig. B1v.

²⁰ Brigden, *London and the Reformation*, 109-10; Allan G. Chester, "Robert Barnes and the Burning of the Books", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 14 (1951), 211-21.

²¹ I refer here to the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536), Western Rebellion (1549) and Kett's Rebellion (1549). On these, see Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions* (London, 4th Ed., 1997) and Andy Wood, *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2007). The worrying potential of London's artisan population in terms of literacy, civil disorder and heretical opinion is something that appears regularly in Thomas More's work. See, for example, More's *Apology* (1533); J. B. Trapp, ed., *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More* (New Haven, 1979), IX. 163-4; also Trapp's introduction, xx.

²² John Chandos, ed., *In God's Name: Examples of Preaching in England*, 13-14.

²³ Thomas Lever, *A Sermon Preached the Third Sunday in Lent before the king's majesty* (London, 1550), STC. 15548, sigs. D5r-v.

²⁴ Thomas More, *The Supplication of Souls* (1529), in *The Workes of Sir Thomas More Knyght* (London, 1557), 292, 311.

²⁵ For More's attack on Tyndale's translations of key words, see *The Complete Works of St Thomas More*, VI. i. 285-90.

²⁶ James Simpson, *Burning to Read: English Fundamentalism and its Reformation Opponents* (Cambridge, MA, 2007), 6.

²⁷ Brigden, *London and the Reformation*, 481-2.

²⁸ On this connection, see particularly David Aers, "The Humanity of Christ: Representations in Wycliffite Texts and *Piers Plowman*", in Aers and Lynn Staley, *The Powers of the Holy: Religion, Politics, and Gender in Late Medieval English Culture* (Pennsylvania, 1996), 43-76. On continuities between Franciscan, Lollard and Protestant formulations of poverty, see Mike Rodman Jones, *Radical Pastoral, 1381-1595: Appropriation and the Writing of Religious Controversy* (Aldershot, 2011).

²⁹ Andrew Hadfield, "Foresters, Ploughmen, and Shepherds: Version of Tudor Pastoral" in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603*, eds. Mike Pincombe and Cathy Schrank, 537-554, 545. On this see also Sarah Kelen, *Langland's Early Modern Identities* (London, 2009) and John Bowers, *Chaucer and Langland: The Antagonistic Tradition* (Notre Dame, 2007).

³⁰ Henry Brinklow, *The Lamentation of a Christian Against the City of London* (1545), in J. Meadows Cowper, ed. *Henry Brinklow's Complaynt of Roderyck Mors*, EETS e.s. 22, 99-100.

³¹ The list is a slightly shortened version of that which appears in Revelation, missing a few items at the end of the biblical list.

³² Bale, *The Image of Both Churches*, sig. B2r; Lever, *A Sermon Preached at Paul's Cross the fourteenth Day of December* (London, 1550), STC. 15546.3, sig. F6r.

³³ See, for example, Tyndale's similar list in *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, ed. David Daniel (London, 2000), 18. Bale's most effective rhetorical list appears in his play *King Joban*, in which he manages to fit

sixty five religious orders into the space of nineteen lines. See *The Complete Plays of John Bale*, ed. Peter Happé (Cambridge, 1985), I. 441-460.

³⁴ See, *The Plowman's Tale: the c. 1532 and 1606 editions of a Spurious Canterbury Tale*, ed. Mary Rhinelanders McCarl (London, 1997), 5, ll. 38-40. Spenser's easy familiarity with much medieval and mid-Tudor writing is often most obvious in the *Shepherd's Calendar* (1579). On Spenser's debt to mid-Tudor writing see, in particular, John N. King, *Spenser's Poetry and the Reformation Tradition* (Princeton, 1990) and Katherine K. Little, *Transforming Work: Early Modern Pastoral and Late Medieval Poetry* (Notre Dame, 2013).

³⁵ *Doctor Faustus*, scene 7. Marlowe's rendering of Catholic ritual is part of a long dramatic history. See, for example, the lurid, cannibalistic rendering of the Mass in Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* (1681).

³⁶ On this tradition, see Alison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy, and the English Literary Imagination, 1558-1660* (Cambridge, 1999); *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts*, ed. Arthur F. Marotti (Basingstoke, 1999); and Marotti's *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Notre Dame, 2005).

³⁷ Simpson, *Burning to Read*, 22.

³⁸ Pincombe and Shrank, 'Prologue: The Travails of Tudor Literature', 12, 6.

³⁹ Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, 88. The exuberance of urban listing-making is clearly part of a pejorative rhetoric in much mid-Tudor literature, but for a less negative use of the trope, see Isabella Whitney's extraordinary 'Wyll and Testament', which closes her *A Sweet Nosegay* (1573). On this, see Patricia Brace, 'Isabella Whitney, A Sweet Nosegay', in Anita Pacheco, ed., *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing* (Oxford, 2002), 97-109, esp. 106-7.

⁴⁰ *Writing the City: Eden, Babylon, and the New Jerusalem*, 3-7.

⁴¹ Surrey, 'A Satire Against the Citizens of London', in *Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey: Poems*, ed. Emrys Jones (Oxford, 1964), 30-31, ll. 1-2, 18-22, 51-7, 59.

⁴² This particular piece of self-fashioning has resulted in at least one scholar viewing the poem with a certain amount of scepticism, describing the ‘obvious arrogance of [Surrey] turning himself into a Hebrew prophet’ which results in a poem which risks being an ‘absurd gesture and childish rationalisation’: William Sessions, *Henry Howard: The Poet Earl of Surrey: A Life* (Oxford, 1999), 234-8, 236-7. See also Sessions’ discussion in *Henry Howard, earl of Surrey* (Boston, 1986), 83-7. Other scholars have seen in the poem’s biblicism evidence of the poet’s religious sensibilities. See Susan Brigden, “Henry Howard, earl of Surrey, and the ‘Conjured League’”, *The Historical Journal*, 37 (1994), 507-37. The best readers manage to resist using the poem as straightforward religious document and see the possibility of deliberate play or ambiguity in Surrey’s work. See especially, Elizabeth Heale, *Wyatt, Surrey & Early Tudor Poetry* (London, 1998), 142-6 and Greg Walker, *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation* (Oxford, 2005), 398.

⁴³ See Robert Coogan, *Babylon on the Rhone: A translation of letters by Dante, Petrarch and Catherine of Siena on the Avignon Papacy* (Madrid, 1983) and Giuseppe Mazzotta, *The Worlds of Petrarch* (London, 1993), 25-6.

⁴⁴ Petrarch, *Canzoniere*, ed. and trans. Anthony Mortimer (London, 2002), 72-5. Mortimer translates as ‘impudent whore’, ‘Babylon false and fell’, ‘Fountain of grief, house of iniquities [...] burning forge of lies’ (138), ‘May flames from heaven fall upon your hair’ (136). Mortimer omits 137 from his edition. A translation might be: ‘Babylon’s idols will be scattered on the ground, / And her proud towers, threatening heaven, / And her guards burned as they burn within’. Surrey’s ‘Thy proud towers and turrets hye / Enmyes to God [...] Thyne idolles burnt’ (ll. 62-4) is strikingly close.

⁴⁵ Anthony Mortimer (ed.) *Petrarch’s Canzoniere in the English Renaissance* (Amsterdam, 2005), 15-17, 85-91, 15.

⁴⁶ My point here runs parallel to that of Cathy Shrank, 'Matters of Love as of Discourse: The English Sonnet, 1560-1580', *Studies in Philology*, 105 (2008), 30-49. Surrey's politically- and morally-focused Petrarchanism is a for-runner to the diverse Petrarchanism of later Tudor sonnets described there.

⁴⁷ Mortimer, *Petrarch's Canzoniere in the English Renaissance*, 17.

⁴⁸ On the dating of the Park-Hill Manuscript, which is uncertain, see Mortimer, *Petrarch's Canzoniere in the English Renaissance*, 18; Kenneth Muir, 'Sonnets in the Hill Manuscript', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society*, 6 (1950), 464-71.

⁴⁹ My discussion of Surrey's Petrarchism here runs parallel to that in Andrew W. Taylor, "Glass Houses: Surrey, Petrarch, and the Religious Poetics of the 'London' Invective", *Review of English Studies* (2006) 57, 433-455. Also, David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London, 1984), 45-7.

⁵⁰ On Crowley's editorial work see especially J. R. Thorne and Marie-Claire Uhart, "Robert Crowley's *Piers Plowman*," *Medium Aevum*, 55 (1986), 248-53; Charlotte Brewer, *Editing Piers Plowman: The Evolution of the Text* (Cambridge, 1996), 7-19; R. Carter Hailey, "'Geuyng Light to the Reader': Robert Crowley's Editions of *Piers Plowman* (1550)", *Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 95 (2001), 483-502; Michael Johnston, "From Edward III to Edward VI: *The Vision of Piers Plowman* and Early Modern England", *Reformation*, 11 (2006), 47-78; Larry Scanlon, "Langland, apocalypse, and the early modern editor", in *Reading the Medieval in Early Modern England*, eds. Gordon McMullan and David Matthews (Cambridge, 2007), 51-73; R. Carter Hailey, "Robert Crowley and the Editing of *Piers Plowman* (1550)", *Yearbook of Langland Studies*, 21 (2007), 143-170.

⁵¹ King's reading of the editions is focused particularly on anticlericalism; see *English Reformation Literature*, 319-57. On the prophetic associations of sixteenth-century receptions of *Piers Plowman*, see Lawrence Warner, "An Overlooked *Piers Plowman* Excerpt and the Oral Circulation of Non-Reformist Prophecy, c.1520-55," *Yearbook of Langland Studies*, 21 (2007), 119-42; Wendy Scase, "*Dany*

Dycars Dreame and Robert Crowley's Prints of *Piers Plowman*," *Yearbook of Langland Studies*, 21 (2007), 171-98; Mike Rodman Jones, "'Thys is no Prophecy': Robert Crowley, *Piers Plowman*, and Kett's Rebellion (1549)", *The Sixteenth-Century Journal*, 42 (2008), 37-55.

⁵² Derek Pearsall, "Langland's London", in *Written Work: Langland, Labor, and Authorship*, ed. Steven Justice and Kathryn Kerby-Fulton (Philadelphia, 1997), 185-207. For work on Langland's interaction with London, see C. David Benson, *Public Piers Plowman: Modern Scholarship and Late Medieval English Culture* (Philadelphia, 2004).

⁵³ See, for example, Christopher Warley, "Reforming the Reformers: Robert Crowley and Nicholas Udall," in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603*, ed. Cathy Shrank and Mike Pincombe (Oxford, 2009), 273-290, 276.

⁵⁴ Robert Crowley, ed., *The Vision of Piers Plowman* (London, 1550), sig. D1r. The lines in a modern edition are passus 3, ll. 80-84. I have quoted here from Crowley's edition, only modernizing abbreviations.

⁵⁵ On the practical, rather than ideological, nature of Crowley's annotations, see especially Scanlon, "Langland, apocalypse, and the early modern editor", and Johnston, "From Edward III to Edward VI: *The Vision of Piers Plowman* and Early Modern England".

⁵⁶ Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, 97.