

CONTENTS

Abbreviations Used in Notes	4
I. Introduction	7
II. ‘The comyn wele of the realm of Engelande’: Patriotism, Politics and the State	29
III. From ‘barbarous tongue’ to ‘copious and pithie language’: The Educated Elite and the Vernacular	53
IV. ‘Casting pearls before swine’: Translation into the English Language	69
V. ‘Diversity in tongue, language, order and habit’: Tudor Governments and Minority Languages	83
VI. ‘Albion’s Champions’: Patriotism in Elizabethan Drama	94
VII. ‘The renowned Isle of Great Britain’: National Consciousness in Sixteenth-Century Poetry	108
VIII. ‘Hans van Belch’ and ‘bursten bellied sots’: Foreigners in Sixteenth-Century Literature	123
Bibliography	147
Index	157

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES

- Cal. S.P., Sp* *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*, 13 vols, 1862-1954 and 4 vols 1892-1899
- D.N.B. *Dictionary of National Biography*
- L. & P.* J.S. Brewer and James Gairdner, eds, *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547*, 21 vols, 1862-1910, and R.H. Brodie, 1920
- S.P. Henry VIII* *State Papers Published under the Authority of His Majesties Commission. King Henry VIII*, 11 vols, 1830-1852
- T.R.P. P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin, eds, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3 vols, New Haven, 1964, 1969
- Ven. Cal.* *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, 1864-1898

I. INTRODUCTION

This study examines English patriotism in the sixteenth century to decide upon its nature, its modes of cultural expression and to consider its use in political and religious propaganda. In considering sixteenth-century English people's feelings for their country we are going back to a time before patriotism had been conceptualised. The first recorded use of the word 'patriot' in the sense of 'fellow-countryman' was in 1596. The patriot as 'one who disinterestedly exerts himself to promote the well-being of his country' was first used by Ben Jonson in the play *Volpone* in 1605, but the term occurs only rarely before the 1680s and it was the early eighteenth century before 'patriotism' came into use. The word 'nation' was used in the medieval universities to apply to a body of students who came from a certain district, country or group of countries,¹ and the same terminology was used for Church Councils. As voting was by nation rather than individuals, discussions as to what constituted a nation had power implications. At the Council of Constance in 1414 the French argued that the English could not be regarded as a separate nation from the Germans. English claims suggest an awareness of nationhood:

Whether nation should be understood as people marked off from one another by blood relationships and habit of unity or by peculiarities of language, the most sure and positive sign and essence of a nation be understood as it should be, as a territory equal to that of the French nation.

But nation and state did not coincide. The English delegates argued they were a 'general nation' representing eight particular kingdoms: England, Scotland, Wales, The Isle of Man and 'four large and notable kingdoms in Ireland, near to England, Connaught, Munster, Galway and Meath'. Diversity of language was stressed: 'They comprehend five languages, English, Welsh, Irish, Gascon and Cornish.'² Throughout the sixteenth century 'nation' continued to be used to apply to any distinctive group as in Roger Ascham's reference to 'the nation of scholars'³ and it was unusual for the word to denote country until the seventeenth century. 'Nationalism' was a much later phenomenon.

Although I intend to stay firmly grounded in the sixteenth century, I have inadvertently strayed into the controversy between modernist and revisionist writers concerning the timing of the birth of nationalism. The former, led by Eric Hobsbawm, John Breuilly, Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson interpret nationalism as a facet of modernism and place its origins firmly in the late eighteenth century.⁴ They therefore play scant attention to the early modern period. There is currently a vogue for scouring medieval and early modern

texts for signs of early nationalist tendencies. Adrian Hastings, for example, traced the origins of English nationalism back to Bede:

The benefits of a defined territoriality, the politically unifying impact of ecclesiastical unity, the contribution of two geniuses, Bede and Alfred, the stabilising of an intellectual and linguistic world through a thriving vernacular literature, the growth of the economy and of an effective royal bureaucracy, all these are contributive to a firmly affirmative answer to ‘Was England a nation-state in 1066?’⁵

He was critical of the modernist approach, writing that ‘Understanding nations and nationalism will only be advanced when any inseparable bonding of them to the modernising of society is abandoned.’⁶ Liah Greenfeld also criticises the modernist approach, but locates the birth of English nationalism firmly in the 1520s. She claims that a shift of attitude ‘which was expressed in the application of the word nation to a people, and which in more than one way signified the beginning of the modern era, was already well under way by the 1530s.’⁷ This conclusion is surprising in view of her definition of nationalism as a phenomenon which arises when sovereignty of the people provides the central object of loyalty and the basis for collective solidarity.⁸ Few students of the early modern period would recognise her description of sixteenth-century England as a society which was ‘fundamentally homogeneous’, ‘only superficially divided by the lines of status, class, locality . . .’ and which was ‘a nation perceived as a community of free and equal individuals.’⁹ It will be my contention that the approaches of both Hastings and Greenfeld are problematic. I will suggest that their definitions of nationalism are different from those of the modernists, that they are too eager to attribute nationalist feelings to anyone who mentions the words ‘England’, ‘English’, ‘country’, or ‘nation’ and that they are insufficiently familiar with sixteenth-century historiography to interpret many of the texts they cite.

For present purposes, ‘patriot’ is defined as one who is loyal to and loves his country of origin. Patriotism does not have to be related to a nation state but can manifest itself in loyalty towards a town, city or province.¹⁰ However, when one is dealing with patriotism towards a nation state, as England was becoming in the sixteenth century, there is inevitably some degree of national awareness involved and one should be careful not to confuse patriotism and nationalism. Barnaby Keeney, in an article on military service and the development of nationalism in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, criticised H.M. Chadwick for interpreting nationalism as ‘a virulent disease to which foreigners are subject and patriotism as a virtue peculiar to the British.’¹¹ I hope I will not be similarly accused for suggesting that the distinction should be clarified. In fact the emotions involved in, and the actions consequent on, patriotism and nationalism are different. The patriot tends to be less aggressive towards or resentful of foreign influences than the nationalist and is more likely to approve of patriotism in others. Perhaps more importantly, patriots love their country despite its failings and do not have the nationalists’ belief in the superiority of their own nation. For the

nationalist, personal ambition and religious and family loyalties are subordinated to the interests of the country; but patriots can love their homeland without it becoming an over-riding priority.

Graham Holderness attempts to relocate patriotism as a postmodern phenomenon. He argues that the nationalist needs a powerful state and, because Britain is no longer a 'great Imperial aggressor' its adherents are left with 'patriotism'. He explains the difference as follows:

Patriotism as associated with 'poetry' with emotion, with the heart, with tears; 'nationalism with 'mindless aggression, with tub-thumping jingoistic assertiveness.'¹²

Some writers, either through carelessness or conviction, fail to make the distinction between patriotism and nationalism. E.D. Marcu brought together examples of what she called 'nationalism' in Europe in the sixteenth century. John Breuille in his study of nationalism, which he recognised as of eighteenth century origin, assumed the difference must come because Marcu was dealing with cultural rather than political nationalism.¹³ In fact she was dubious of meaning, beginning her work with the statement 'We should not ask too much of definitions, ideas might best be understood approximately,' and she preferred not to define nationalism. The consequent failure to differentiate between patriotism and nationalism undermined the value of her conclusions. She referred to the 'patriotic declarations' and 'patriotic sentiments' of her writers, yet used this as evidence for the existence of nationalism in the sixteenth century.¹⁴ I will suggest that, in the cultural as well as in the political domain, sixteenth-century Englishmen were patriotic but were not nationalists. The patriotism of the educated elite had a variety of facets: they were proud of England's origins and history, her countryside and cities. Linguistic patriotism was increasing in the sixteenth century as pride in the vernacular replaced the idea that English was only for the uneducated and that the language itself was unsophisticated. However, the views of the elite were far removed from linguistic nationalism. They welcomed foreign influences on English, approved diversity of language within the political unit and celebrated national victories in a variety of languages.¹⁵

Definitions of nationalism emphasise the need for action to gain or to protect independence, whereas patriotism applies to existing boundaries so tends to be more passive. Elie Kedourie used three criteria in defining nationalism: that humanity is naturally divided into nations; that nations are known by certain characteristics which can be ascertained; and that the only legitimate type of government is self-government.¹⁶ K.R. Minogue's definition of nationalism as 'an attempt to make the boundaries of the state and those of the nation coincide'¹⁷ also implied a need for aggression. In *Nationalism and the State* Breuille defined political nationalism as follows:

There exist nations with an explicit and peculiar character. The interests and values of the nation take priority over other interests and values. The nation must be as independent as possible. This usually requires the attainment of political sovereignty.¹⁸

Anthony Smith mirrors Breuille's three points and adds two of his own, suggesting the nationalist ideology included the beliefs that:

3. To be free, human beings must identify with a nation
5. World peace and justice can be built only on a society of autonomous nations.¹⁹

Hastings adopts a definition of nationalism to suit his own agenda:

Nationalism does not necessarily or always imply that national values are placed above all other values, or that they alone are recognised as real, important and worth defending.

Among competing loyalties he mentions 'religion, family and class'.²⁰

If one wants to engage with the modernists' position one should adhere to their definitions. I will argue, in chapter 3, that England's national identity was sufficiently developed in the sixteenth century for the first of Breuille's criteria to apply but there were many patriots whose views did not fit the second and third. Priority was given to personal, religious and regional rather than national considerations; and foreign influences, or in some instances even foreign rule, could be accepted in the interests of the country. In the 1520s Henry was able to offer sovereignty to Charles V to protect the Tudor dynasty without arousing criticism. Although there was some hostility to Queen Mary's marriage to Charles's son, Philip II of Spain, in 1554, there were many who shared Stephen Gardiner's view that a Hapsburg marriage would bring peace to Europe, security to England and a boost to their careers. Gardiner's patriotism and that of other conservative clerics such as Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, was compatible with adherence to the international Catholic Church as was that of later opponents of the Elizabethan Religious Settlement such as Robert Parsons and Cardinal Allen.

As Elizabeth's reign drew to a close and interest in the succession again dominated the political scene, religion played a crucial role in determining polarities. Catholic exiles continued to advocate a Spanish heir as being in the best interests of the country and the faith. The authors of *The Conference about the next Succession to the Crown of England*²¹ believed that the Commonwealth had the right to choose the most suitable monarch from the potential claimants. Of the nine discussed they favoured the Infanta of Spain, daughter of Philip II. The Protestants also looked to a foreign succession to secure their faith, that of James VI, King of the traditional national enemy, the Scots.

Patriotism is often seen as a precursor of nationalism. Leonard Doob explained the connection as follows:

Patriotism is a predisposition of nationalism. Its most common definition, 'love of country' is obviously subjective and psychological. Nationalism arises psychologically when patriotism leads to demands and possibly also to action.²²

The image is conjured of a harmless, docile patriotism awaiting transformation into something more hostile. John Edwards writes of 'pre-nineteenth century nations waiting as it were for the spark of consciousness which brought them alive'.²³ Gerald Newman refers to the 'low flame of

patriotism, of irrational local attachments which were fanned into the consuming fire of nationalist demands and actions.²⁴ These writers were concerned with nationalism and they were right to see patriotism as one of its components. The aim of the present study, however, is to deal with patriotism in its own right and not merely as nascent nationalism.

Studies of patriotism have been especially prone to subjective treatment. Many writers in the early to mid twentieth century saw patriotism as something to admire and emulate. Esme Wingfield-Stratford regarded patriotism as ‘an emotion the purest of which our nature is capable, and its object which next to God is the utmost to which we can aspire’. In discussing Anthony Marten’s response to the Armada he wrote:

It is difficult even now to read this noble and stirring appeal without feeling something of the emotion which must have thrilled the nation in that glorious dawn, and ask ourselves, perchance, whether the England of George V be faced with perils less urgent than that of Elizabeth, and whether Marten’s counsel does not equally apply to ourselves.²⁵

Wingfield-Stratford rewrote his thesis on patriotism for publication in 1939, admitting earlier prejudices but explaining that he had not ‘ceased to identify patriotism with the cult of the British Empire’ in the earlier work but that he had now ‘eschewed a patriotic or any other belief.’ However, he had merely exchanged one ideology for another, as is indicated by his opening paragraph:

I have in these pages, offered my infinitesimal contribution to the task of revealing Britain to herself, in the belief that an enlightened patriotism can only be built on a foundation of self-knowledge. That I cannot help feeling to be of supreme urgency at a time when free civilization, and all it stands for, is threatened with imminent destruction and when its sole guarantee of survival is the quality of greatness of its patriotism.²⁶

With such an approach it is hardly surprising that Wingfield-Stratford painted a romanticised and distorted picture of the development of patriotism in England.

Writers in the 1940s were especially prone to see events in the 1580s as a mirror of their own predicament. The defeat of the Armada was taken as the embodiment of the spirit of Tudor patriotism. Garrett Mattingly began his account of the situation leading to the Spanish invasion plan with a reference to its contemporary relevance:

The idea of writing this book about the defeat of the Spanish Armada first came to me, as it must have come to others in June 1940, when the eyes of the world were once again turned to England and their surrounding seas.

He was aware that it was the myth that was remembered and ended his work as follows:

Meanwhile, as the episode of the Armada receded into the past, it influenced history in another way. Its story, magnified and distorted by a golden mist of time, became a heroic apologue of the defence of freedom against tyranny, and the eternal myth of the triumph of David over Goliath.²⁷

Some historians were less interested in distinguishing legend and fact. In 1946, A.L. Rowse published a collection of essays, most of which were written during the war, to which he gave the title *The English Spirit*. These essays provide a clear example of propaganda superseding historical methodology. In an essay on Drake, July 1940 was compared to the time of the Armada; and in reference to Drake's ideas on defence, Rowse wrote that:

It is inspiring to recall them, still more the man who held them and the memory of that great moment in our history when an altogether smaller people with vastly smaller resources than we have today faced undismayed the greatest power in Europe and America.²⁸

In 1958, J.E. Neale published a collection of essays to commemorate the 400th anniversary of Elizabeth I's accession to the throne. He also compared Elizabethan times to his own:

We recognise the Elizabethan period as an age strangely like our own and, understanding its problems see in the Queen a leader made for our own times: one endowed with wisdom, courage and tolerance, able to inspire a nation, save it from its perils and conjure immortal glory from its aspirations.

In referring to respect for the Queen he stated 'The like had never been seen before and has perhaps only been repeated since in the unique hold on Englishmen's affections won by Sir Winston Churchill during the late war.' This style of comparison can lead to a misunderstanding of sixteenth-century events, in general, and sixteenth-century patriotism, in particular. I will suggest, in chapter 2, that Neale's claim that 'the Virgin Queen identified herself with patriotism and the people to the exclusion of all earthly attachments'²⁹ is inaccurate.

A comment made by Hastings leads one to suspect that he also empathises with expressions of 'nationalism': 'Perhaps as I am myself very much an Englishman, they (i.e. sightings of 'nationalism' in sixteenth-century texts) may seem an expression less of historical enquiry than of English nationalism'. He seeks to justify rather than to deny the possibility of bias: 'Yet if there is such a thing as English nationalism it is surely right that an Englishman should explore it.'³⁰

Neale would have been gratified by the amount of publicity the 400th anniversary of the Armada myth received in 1988. In general the many publications avoided presenting a view of the invasion plan which was too Anglocentric. Nor did they try to make national heroes out of the English seaman. However, although few still believe that Sir Francis Drake completed a game of bowls before going to beat the Spaniards single-handed, some myths do remain intact. For example, Elizabeth is still supposed to have made a patriotic and rousing speech to her forces at Tilbury:

I am come among you as you see, at this time, not for my recreation and disport, but being resolved, in the midst and heat of battle, to live or die amongst you, and to lay down for my God and my kingdom and my people, my honour and my blood, even in the dust. I know I have

the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too, and think foul scorn that Parma of Spain, or any Prince of Europe should dare to invade the borders of my realm.

Modern writers stress that the crisis was virtually over and the content was mere rhetoric, but most assume that the speech was made and was favourably received. Geoffrey Parker and Colin Martin, for example, quote the above version with the comment 'she delivered a short speech which has passed into legend.'³¹ Felix Barker, however, writing in *History Today*, has reminded us that the speech was probably a seventeenth-century invention. The only eyewitness account is from James Aske whose poem, *Elizabetha Triumphans*, published in 1588, quotes a different speech which stresses devotion to the person of the Queen. According to Aske, she spoke of her subjects' 'loyal hearts to us their lawful Queen' and she promised to 'march with them like the Roman goddess Belladona'. Barker points out that neither Camden's *Annales* nor Nichols' *Progress of Queen Elizabeth*, quote the content of the speech. The version which is currently accepted first became known in 1691 when a letter, which had been written to the Duke of Buckingham by Leonel Sharp, was published. The letter was undated but must have been written before 1631, the date of Sharp's death. He was at Tilbury as Chaplain to the Earl of Essex and was asked to repeat the Queen's speech to the army the following day.³² It is possible that the speech may have been Sharp's rather than Elizabeth's and it is interesting that it is the patriotic version that has become accepted. According to David Cressy, the legend of Elizabeth as a 'Protestant saviour and paragon of Princely virtues' was largely an invention of the seventeenth century. There had, of course, been flattering depictions during her lifetime mixing propaganda with literary conceit and genuine admiration. The legend grew slowly in James I's reign but became more potent in the 1620s and 1630s as the Stuarts fell short of the perceived success under Elizabeth and the war with Spain revived old memories. The anniversary of Elizabeth's accession date became an occasion for popular celebration. During each successive crisis monarchists and parliamentarians alike appealed to the memory of Elizabethan events. Cressy suggests that:

It is not without significance that the anti-Catholic processions in Charles II's reign culminated around the statue of Elizabeth at Temple Bar. Nor that Queen Anne adopted Elizabeth's motto, *semper eadam*, and attempted to attach the Elizabethan virtues to herself. Nor that the cult of Elizabeth should serve both Whig and Tory propagandists in the early eighteenth century.³³

In considering sixteenth-century patriotism one must be aware, not only that much of the information is the product of the Tudors' effective propaganda machine, but also of the way in which successive generations have moulded personalities and events to suit their own circumstances. It is a testament to the success of Tudor propaganda that historians dealing with the sixteenth century have tended to regard loyalty to the monarch and loyalty to the state

as synonymous. Wingfield-Stratford wrote of sixteenth-century government as follows:

and when we speak of the people we speak of the nation as a whole, the essential John Bull, that undefinable unity of souls and purpose which is the condition of patriotism. It is the King's purpose to be the living symbol of that patriotism.

Although conceding that Henry VII could not be made into a 'patriot hero', he stated 'there happened to be a great deal of John Bull embodied in the billowing contours of Henry VIII'.³⁴ R.U. Lindabury's study of patriotism in Elizabethan drama includes a chapter on the Queen which fails to recognise the possibility of loyalty to the monarch and loyalty to the crown being in conflict.³⁵ More recently, Gerald Newman made the following statement about patriotism:

In early times this sentiment usually focuses upon the King as the nation's chief in battle and the personification of political unity against the foreigner, and also upon the native land, the realm which he guarded – hence for example, Shakespeare's identification of king with nation.³⁶

Greenfeld echoes Tudor propaganda in assuming that 'For nearly half a century the person of the Queen was the chief object on which the national sentiment focused.' She also assumes that the reign was 'remarkably tranquil' and that 'the dominant motivation of the period – patriotism – 'was coterminous with the devotion to the reigning monarch and ensured zealous concern for the preservation of her government.'³⁷

Richard Helgerson is one of the few modern writers to recognise the distinction between loyalty to the country and loyalty to the monarchy.³⁸ His *Forms of Nationhood* is a generational study which looks at a variety of texts produced by people who were born between 1551 and 1564, the most important of whom are Shakespeare, Spenser, Coke, Camden, Drayton, Hooker and Hakluyt. He criticises recent work, which has been categorised as the 'new historicism', for putting too much emphasis on the ideological power of the Court to the extent that Elizabeth and James become the 'authors' of Elizabethan and Jacobean literature.³⁹ He is especially convincing in his section on cartography and choreography. He traces the way that Christopher Saxton, the producer of a collection of county maps, gradually developed a higher profile than that of his patron, Thomas Seckford, who commissioned the work, or Lord Burghley, who paid for it on behalf of the government. This process is an example of the Renaissance discovery of self and the maps form part of what Helgerson refers to as a 'Renaissance discovery of England'. He thus links individualism and nationalism both of which operated in opposition to royal absolutism:

Not only does the emergence of the land parallel the emergence of the individual authorial self, the one enforces and perhaps depends on the other. Nationalism and individualism, to use dangerously convenient terms for these two tendencies, are as I have been arguing,

deeply implicated in one another. The mutual implication begins with the sharing of a common term of difference. Each comes into being in direct opposition to royal absolutism.⁴⁰

In referring to the term ‘nationalism’ as ‘dangerously convenient’, however, Helgerson hints at the key problem with his approach. He assumes that there was an ‘intense national self-consciousness’ in Elizabethan England, and argues that:

in most of that writing [i.e. about England] some other interest or cultural formation – the nobility, the law, the land, the economy, the common people, the church – rivals the monarchy as the fundamental source of national identity.⁴¹

A major consideration of *Patriotism, Power and Print* is to examine the way these alternative power bases provide a focus which works in opposition to loyalty to the country as well as to the monarchy. One should not assume, as Helgerson does throughout, that writings in or about the political and social conditions in England at the time, or writings in or about the English language were automatically engendered by a predominantly nationalist self-awareness. Helgerson’s difference of approach can, perhaps, be traced to the way that his ideas on the development of the nation state in England are based on the theories expounded by G.R. Elton in his *Tudor Revolution in Government*. Elton’s thesis, that a revolution occurred in the 1530s which transformed England from a medieval feudal to a modern sovereign state, has been challenged, especially by the work of Richard Starkey and John Guy.⁴² England was still undergoing the transition to a nation state during the Renaissance and this was reflected in cultural as well as political formations.

There was a danger that national consciousness could develop into a force which could threaten the monarchy, and there are indications that the Tudors were aware of that possibility. Henry VIII and Elizabeth certainly sought to increase their power by identifying themselves with the nation. But the attitude of sixteenth-century monarchs to patriotism was ambivalent. They and their councils realised that their use of the notion of loyalty to England could be turned against them. Appeals to patriotism were made in response to fears of internal disunity. When he broke with Rome to enable the Archbishop of Canterbury to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, Henry VIII claimed to be acting in the interests of the country against the jurisdiction and financial exactions of a foreign Prince. He called for unity against internal danger in the form of the Pilgrimage of Grace and against external invasion threats.⁴³ In the 1540s his return to a policy of dynastic expansion in France led to failure; but there was no patriotic propaganda campaign to sell the war to the English people at this stage as there was no threat to internal unity. It will be argued, in chapter two, that during Mary’s reign the use of patriotic propaganda by opponents of the government was at its most effective. Although willing to identify herself with the interests of the country as her father had done there are indications that Elizabeth was aware of the dangers of patriotic enemies. She was careful to emphasise the duty of obedience to

her person, especially in the early stages of her reign. In the 1580s, as had happened in the 1530s, danger from abroad, this time in the form of the Spanish Armada, highlighted internal disunity, and patriotic propaganda from the governing elite aimed to ensure the obedience of potential dissidents.

For Elizabeth, the 1590s were a retreat from, rather than a consolidation of the patriotism drawn upon during the previous decade. National expansion had provided an impetus for the patriotic element in Elizabethan propaganda. English activities overseas, whether involving trade, piracy or colonization attempts, provided writers with opportunities to express pride in their country. Richard Hakluyt, George Best and John Dee claimed that they wanted to publicise English exploits for the glory of the nation. Hakluyt explained that in travelling in France:

I both heard in speech and read in books other nations miraculously extolled for their discoveries and notable enterprises by sea, but the English of all others for their sluggish security, and continual neglect of the like attempts, especially in so long and happy a time of peace, either ignominiously reported or exceedingly condemned.

He had undertaken *The principal navigations, voyages and discoveries of the English nation, made by sea or over land*, for ‘stopping the mouthes of reproachers.’ The purpose of the work was to encourage the ‘honour of her majesty, the good reputation of our country, and the advancing of navigation, the very walles of this our island.’⁴⁴ George Best had a similar outlook in *A True Discourse of the late Voyages of Discoverie, under the conduct of Martin Frobisher*, published in 1578. He enumerated the riches to be gained overseas and hoped the English would not fall behind as they had in the reign of Henry VII. He listed Englishmen who had shown courage and enterprise abroad and praised them for the ‘everlasting renoune, glorie and fame’ they had brought to the English nation.⁴⁵ John Dee’s patriotic vision was especially imperialistic. His *General and Rare Memorials Pertayning to Perfect Arte of Navigation*, was partly made up of tables for the use of mariners, but it also had a theoretical section pleading for a strong navy, not just to defend England, but also to provide for her expansion. He justified this by referring to the lands reportedly held by King Arthur. Dee expressed the conventional devotion to his monarch as well as his country and he hoped the work would form a ‘world-wide monument to the historical renown of Queen Elizabeth.’⁴⁶ But his efforts were not appreciated by the object of his dedication: he spent 1583 to 1589 on the continent and returned to disgrace and failure. Frances Yates has pointed out that his return ‘coincided with a time after the defeat of the Armada which might have been seen as a triumph on the seas of the patriotic movement in which Dee had a share,’ and that one reason for the way he was treated may have been that Elizabeth had abandoned any idea of the expansion associated with Dee’s style of patriotism.⁴⁷

Protestant polemicists also tried to give Elizabeth a role which she wanted to avoid – that of figure-head for Protestant Europe.⁴⁸ A Dutch engraving showed a similar representation of Elizabeth as leader of Europe. She was

portrayed as Europa, her right arm made up of Italy and her left of England and Scotland, her feet planted in Poland. To her left was the defeated Armada, to the right a triple-headed Pope escaped in a boat rowed by clergy and escorted by a fleet of ships which were numbered to allude to papal allies. English depictions of the Armada defeat, however, emphasised Elizabeth's domination of England.⁴⁹ An engraving by Crispin de Passe shows Elizabeth standing between two columns on which are the Pelican and the Phoenix. She holds the orb and sceptre of rule and behind her is an island with forts, surrounded by shipping again depicting the defeat of the Armada. The two columns represent imperial power, not the power of world domination but of Elizabeth's authority in England.⁵⁰ The 'Ditchley portrait' is indicative of the image Elizabeth wished to project. It was a pictorial sequel to an entertainment provided by Sir Henry Lee in 1592. Standing with her feet in Oxfordshire Elizabeth towered over a map of England, symbolizing her domination over the realm.⁵¹

The image of Elizabeth's reign, which has survived into the twentieth century, is one of triangular identification of the crown, the Anglican Church and the nation. If we look at the strands which tied these aspects of the establishment power structure together we may detect that, although strained during Elizabeth's reign, they only began to fray with the accession of the Stuarts. The survival of the crown/religion link depended on the acceptability of the Anglican episcopacy, and this was not to survive the development of Arminianism in the reign of James I. The continuation of the crown/nation strand was based on patriotic propaganda which was ephemeral and which did not survive the changed outlook of the Stuarts towards diplomacy and the nature of their kingship.⁵² The third side of the triangle – the link between Protestantism and the nation – was becoming stronger and it was this link which eventually caused the downfall of the monarchy in the reign of Charles I.

William Haller, in his *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation*, popularised the idea that English Protestants believed their country to have a special role in God's providence. Critics of Haller have a point when they say that this conception of England cannot be found in the writings of John Bale and John Foxe, as Haller suggested, even though their account of the persecution of the faithful in England was interpreted by contemporaries as reflecting such a role.⁵³ Religious euphoria after the defeat of the Armada, spawned a more optimistic interpretation of the Apocalyptic prophesies and an enhanced perception of England's role as leader of the fight against Anti-Christ. Protestant support for the monarch was dependent upon them pursuing that role. John Foxe might have seen Elizabeth as the potential saviour of his faith – he dedicated his *Book of Martyrs* to her and the decoration in an initial letter shows her victorious over the Pope⁵⁴ – but the dedication contained an implied threat. He wanted people to learn about 'ecclesiastical history' and 'rules and precepts of doctrine' but he also warns of God's judgement in:

Overthrowing tyrants, in confounding pride, in altering states and kingdoms, in conserving religion against errors and dissensions, in

relieving the godly, in bridling the wicked, in loosing and tying up again of Satan the disturber of commonweals.⁵⁵

In the sixteenth century, religion was only rarely seen as an adequate justification for the overthrow of a monarch.⁵⁶ A claim to be acting in the interests of the commonwealth of England had greater propaganda value than a claim to be serving God. Although patriotism was used only rarely to justify opposition to specific policies or even the rights of individual rulers, it was not used to question the validity of the institution of monarchy. This was to change in the seventeenth century. In discussing the role of God in the English Revolution, Christopher Hill distinguishes between the God of the Parliamentarians, the God of the establishment and the God of the people.⁵⁷ His conclusions make it clear that, by the early seventeenth century the reluctance to use religion or patriotism directly to oppose the monarchy had been overcome. The strength of the appeals to national interest combined with Puritanism in the seventeenth century, in opposition to the crown, suggest that Elizabeth was right to be apprehensive about the way patriotism was used against her by opponents.

If one is interested in the role played by patriotic propaganda in bolstering or challenging the power of a regime it is useful to consider the ideas of Antonio Gramsci, many of which were formulated while he was in prison for opposing the fascist regime in Italy after 1926. His early experience of Sardinian nationalism, his need to provide an antidote to fascism and his study of Italian history stimulated his interest in the role of the concept of the nation in the establishment of class hegemony. He argued that to achieve hegemony a ruling group must be seen to represent the interests of all sections of the society it wished to control. He used the term 'national-popular' to apply to a coincidence of popular and national interests, the formation of which was to be achieved by the intellectuals whose contribution to 'moral and intellectual reform' was essential. His conception of hegemony had important consequences for the way he envisaged the role of the state:

It is true that the state is seen as the organ of one particular group, destined to create favourable conditions for the latter's maximum expansion. But the development and expansion of the particular group are conceived of and presented, as being the motor force of a universal expansion, of a development of all 'national' energies.

He recognised the place of patriotism in the overall concept of hegemony as follows:

the particular form in which the hegemonic ethico-political element presents itself in the life of the state and the country is 'patriotism' and 'nationalism' which is popular religion, that is to say it is the link by means of which the unity of leaders and led is effected.⁵⁸

Aspects of the 'national-popular' were often the basis for a fierce struggle between classes fighting for hegemony; and Gramsci discussed the way such terms as 'patriotism' and 'nationalism' underwent changes of meaning as they were appropriated by different classes.

In his earlier works, Gramsci had been mainly concerned with the establishment of hegemony by the proletariat but in *Prison Notebooks* he used the concept to analyse practices by ruling groups in general. He discussed the way that rule by a 'concrete individual' could only work on existing national feeling:

Its (i.e. the government based on the power of an individual) underlying assumption will be that a collective will, already in existence, has become nerveless and dispersed, has suffered a collapse which is dangerous and threatening but not definite and catastrophic, and that it is now necessary to reconcentrate and reinforce it – rather than that a new collective will which must be created from scratch. . . .⁵⁹

Henry VIII endeavoured to work on existing patriotic feeling within Parliament, the Church and the country as a whole and to further his identification with the nation. When Elizabeth attempted to re-establish the link between ruler and country, which had broken down during Mary's reign, she became involved in a struggle to retain authority against different groups who were trying to use the national will for their own hegemonic pretensions – a struggle similar to that recognised by Gramsci as a stimulus to changes in the nature and meaning of patriotism.

A key aspect of Gramsci's interpretation of hegemony was that a relationship must be secured, not only in the economic and political domains but also with a basis of intellectual, cultural and moral unity. Anthony Smith sees an emphasis on cultural themes as a way to make the debates between modernists and revisionists fall into place. He writes:

Ethnosymbolic approaches point to ways in which these earlier collective cultural identities may be related to modern nations while allowing for historical discontinuities between them. . . .⁶⁰

Gramsci put special emphasis on linguistic unity, believing that the lack of a unifying vernacular was one of the reasons why there was no strong Italian state in the sixteenth century. In the *Prison Notebooks*, he dealt with the failure of the bourgeoisie at the time of the communes to unite nationally and blamed such factors as the attitudes of intellectuals and the Church, and what he called the 'language problem'.⁶¹ In sixteenth-century England there was a dominant vernacular but Latin continued to be used by members of the intellectual elite. During the Middle Ages the Church fought to protect the status and power it derived from the use of Latin for religious purposes and the struggle continued into the sixteenth century as conservative clergy continued to portray Latin as the language of God and English as the language of the uneducated masses. Even when they conceded the inevitability of an English translation of the Bible, the conservatives were accused of keeping their version as obscure as possible. John Cheke was critical of Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who said that ninety-nine words were sacred and therefore should not be translated into English. Cheke suggests that Gardiner deliberately wanted to keep the Scriptures unintelligible to the lower orders.⁶² The Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament, published at

Rheims in 1582, came under attack for similar reasons. William Fulke thought that the Roman Catholic Bible was:

obscured without any necessary or just cause, with a multitude of strange and unusual terms, as to the ignorant are no less difficult to understand than the Latin of Greek itself.⁶³

George Withers also believed that the obscurity was intentional: ‘for they have hunted for words on purpose which the people do not understand.’⁶⁴

During the Middle Ages the domains of the intellectual such as education, justice, charity, the production and dissemination of texts, and the administration of the state had been dominated by the clergy. By the sixteenth century their stranglehold had been weakened and lay intellectual were taking over. This did not lead to an immediate change in the perception of language. Just as ecclesiastical intellectuals had been criticised for hiding behind a linguistic barrier, lay experts were under fire for using language to protect their secrets. The humanist scholar, Thomas Elyot, wrote his *Castel of Health*, in 1534. In the second edition he justified his use of English, presumably in response to criticism from the medical establishment, referring to the ‘envy and covatise of those who professed and practised phisyke.’⁶⁵ Andrew Borde, himself a doctor as well as a travel writer, was critical of his colleagues who ‘write many obscure terms . . . the most being Greek words some few being Araby words’ and explained that he chose to write in English ‘that everyman might understand’.⁶⁶ Those members of the intellectual elite who saw language as an aspect of their power were fighting a losing battle as, by the middle of the sixteenth century, English was widely used for political, religious and cultural purposes. The role of printing was vital in breaking down barriers against publication in English. Printers could not have made their businesses viable without reaching customers who were literate but who did not have a classical education. In turn, print vernaculars could lay the basis for national consciousness by creating a unified field of exchange and communication below Latin and above the spoken dialects. But this does not mean that the intellectuals who were prepared to use English were conscious of language as a national force. In *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson made the comment that ‘nothing suggests that any deep-seated ideological, let alone proto-national impulse underlay this vernacularization when it occurred’.⁶⁷ Anderson was referring to Europe as a whole but I will argue in chapter three, which deals with the attitude of the intellectual elite to their mother tongue, and chapter four, which covers motives behind translation into English, that his generalization is appropriate to England. The impetus to use the English language came from the desire of intellectuals to inform, the desire of religious reformers to save souls, and the desire of the government to restrain the uneducated classes. The perception of language as a means of social control could, paradoxically, be a barrier to the establishment of wider hegemony. The continued use of classical languages by the clerical and lay elites is typical of one of the strategies identified by Gramsci as a barrier to ‘expansive hegemony’, which would always be limited if the language and culture of the

intellectual elite was different from that of the community as a whole.

I will suggest, in chapter five, that the policies of the Tudor governments towards minority languages such as Welsh, Irish and Cornish were designed to increase their power rather than to indulge in linguistic imperialism on behalf of the English state.

Various myths associated with Tudor patriotism have affected the reading of Elizabethan literature. The myth of Tudor 'Englishness' has developed in the centuries since their deaths. The legend may have originated with the propaganda of the 1530s and been developed in the age of Shakespeare, but it has been elaborated by Protestants of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and by the so-called 'Whig Historians' of the nineteenth. This point is made by Norman Davies who writes of the 'deification of the English Monarchy as a focus for the founding of English Protestantism and of modern English patriotism'.⁶⁸ Many early twentieth-century critics made two inter-related assumptions – that a feeling of national euphoria greeted the defeat of the Spanish Armada which produced a unified country and contributed to a 'Golden Age' of literature; and that the literature itself was patriotic or even nationalistic in content. This interpretation owes more to the success of sixteenth-century propaganda than to an understanding of the complexities of Elizabethan politics and society. An example is provided by Professor Hales, writing in 1904:

In no other century of English History was the national feeling more deeply roused and exalted than in the latter part of the sixteenth. In the earlier part of it there had been endless disquietude and uncertainty . . . a noble poetry could not flourish amidst such doubts and misgivings. Not until the accession of Elizabeth did a better state of things begin to be decided. The blessings of Elizabeth's reign were not immediately apparent: But slowly and with delight it (i.e. the country) at last recognised the happy transition that had taken place and then began the great Elizabethan period of literature.

Hales listed a 'high excitement of national feeling' alongside 'a suppression of religious quarrels' and 'a large increase of riches' as factors behind the 'golden age' of Elizabethan literature. When describing the climax of this mood of national achievement, Hales personified England:

The valour of England was just then over-brimming; it could not conceive itself defeated or shamed. It could only imagine itself coming and seeing and conquering. It felt its strength in every limb. It could not dream of failure and ruin.⁶⁹

Cumberland Clark shared Hales's views on the importance of national unity to Elizabethan drama. He wrote that 'in the stirring times of Elizabeth, exultant patriotism was an emotion which called for and received constant expression' and among the reasons given for this was a 'united national consciousness' which was 'represented in the monarch' and had 'replaced feudal loyalties'. He believed that 'one of the most prominent characteristics set forth in the plays, a characteristic which Shakespeare shared, is the patriotism of the

English.’ For ‘our’ one should of course read ‘English’. Clark was more open than most writers about his admiration of patriotism and his assumption that it was an English virtue:

Other characteristics of the Elizabethan English are still true of our nation. Loyalty to the sovereign, different but no less sincere loyalty still persists. Respect for authority, for birth and rank, though not so deep-rooted perhaps, has been able to withstand all disruptive forces. Readiness to serve the country, even die for England, distinguishes the best elements of our population.⁷⁰

Shakespeare has been reconstructed as a symbol of Englishness. Graham Holderness discussed the way in which the history plays and especially Henry V were used in 1944 to encourage a united response to the national crisis. G. Wilson Knight wrote a pamphlet entitled *The Olive and the Sword*. He believed that the voice of the nation was in its literature and that England’s destiny was to be sought in her ‘great heritage of letters’ with Shakespeare having place of honour as custodian of the country’s soul. He wrote:

We need expect no Messiah, but we might, at this hour turn to Shakespeare, a national prophet if ever there was one, concerned deeply with the royal soul of England. That royalty has direct Christian and chivalric affinities. Shakespeare’s life-work might be characterised as expanding, through a series of great plays, the one central legend of St George and the Dragon. Let us face and accept our destiny in the name both of Shakespeare and St George, the patron saint of literature and the nation.

In July 1941 he staged a production which involved an actor reading from Knight’s commentaries and Knight himself reciting Shakespeare speeches. The production was billed as ‘G. Wilson Knight’s dramatisation of Shakespeare’s call to Great Britain in Time of War.’⁷¹ The idea of Shakespeare and St George as some kind of double act come to rescue England in her hour of need is so blatantly intended as propaganda that no one would take the comparisons between the contemporary and Elizabethan situations at face value. Paradoxically, a serious academic discourse purporting to be independent of the contemporary scene may have been more influential in establishing the myth of Shakespeare’s England as a unified state. The dominant theme of E.M.W. Tillyard’s *Shakespeare’s History Plays*, first published in 1944, is that of order. He believed that the plays reflected the commonwealthmen’s fixation with the idea of the body politic as part of a chain of being controlled by divine providence with the king as head.⁷² He dismissed Machiavelli’s view that ‘disorder was the natural state of man’ as alien to Elizabethans:

Such a way of thinking was abhorrent to the Elizabethans . . . who preferred to think of order as the norm to which disorder, though lamentably common was yet the exception.

The comment in parentheses provides the clue to the ideological nature of Tillyard’s discourse. It implied that he favoured the old society of hierarchy and deference rather than the end of poverty, unemployment and injustice

which many of his contemporaries believed they were fighting for.⁷³

The gushing empathy with their version of sixteenth-century patriotism shown by Clark, Hales and Wilson was not emulated by post-war critics. However, many assumed that Elizabethan society was both unified and loyal to its monarch, especially in the 1580s when the danger from Philip II of Spain was at its height. David Bevington refers to a ‘united approach to the Armada threat by dramatists’⁷⁴ and A.L. Rowse, writing in 1972, made the statement:

These were years in which a small, highly tensed society braced itself for a tough struggle for its future with a more powerful opponent and won through, its integration much heightened by the struggle. After the strain was over and the heroic days departed – people were conscious of them as such – things seemed to fall apart. As with society so with drama.⁷⁵

Derek Traversi, in his introduction to *Renaissance Drama*, in 1980 took a similar line. He contrasted the closing years of Elizabeth’s reign and the opening of that of James I with the 1580s:

The unity between court and people, personified in the earlier years by the figure of Gloriana, the Virgin Queen, was giving way to a sense of separation which was not without its literary consequences. The war with Spain pursued in the past with immense patriotic fervour.⁷⁶

Walter Cohen, writing in 1985, also referred to a ‘unified national culture’ in Elizabethan England emanating from political unity after the defeat of the Northern Rebellion (1569) and the Ridolfi plot (1570):

Elizabeth’s victories marked the end of the internal Catholic threat, the defeat of feudal particularism in the north and thus the unification of the nation.⁷⁷

As late as 1992 Greenfeld still believed that:

It is commonplace in contemporary literary history to note the remarkable, indeed striking in its omnipresence and intensity, nationalism in Elizabethan literature.⁷⁸

By looking at a range of literature in chapters six and seven it will be possible to illustrate that the unity did not exist in literature any more than it did in politics and to challenge Greenfeld’s surprising comment that ‘Cultural creativity in this period (i.e. the first half of the sixteenth century) was almost invariably – and exclusively – motivated by patriotism’⁷⁹

Sixteenth-century portrayals of foreigners are a key aspect of patriotism in literature. Theorists of nationalism emphasise the importance of an ‘out-group’ in the formation of collective consciousness.⁸⁰ The transition to nationalism involves a belief in the superiority of one’s own countrymen and a desire to remain free, not only from foreign political control but also from alien cultural influences. Nationalism can also manifest itself in hostility to alien minorities within society. The patriot, however, can love his country to the extent of believing that foreign workers, cultural influences and even a foreign ruler can be beneficial to its welfare. I will be touching on attitudes to foreign states and rulers in chapter two and chapter eight consists of an analysis of

national stereotypes in literature, reactions to alien workers and travel abroad. The portrayals of foreigners in literature were not as hostile as one would expect had the cultural ethos been saturated with nationalism. Their role as the outsider meant the national stereotype could be used for moral or comic purposes, and in more realistic portrayals of foreigners' class, religion or individual characteristics continued to be more important than ethnic origin.

It is perhaps in the economic sphere that the beginnings of the hostility to foreigners, which is an inevitable component of nationalism, can be discerned. In his study of the ideas of the 'commonwealthmen' in the first half of the sixteenth century, W.R.D. Jones raised the possibility of their interest in economic welfare leading theorists to a more nationally based economic policy:

The traditional ideal envisaged the bridling of man's selfish acquisitive instincts in accordance with moral and religious criteria. . . . To what extent as this replaced, both in thought and actual policy, by desires to control and direct those instincts in the interest of national welfare, defined in terms of maximum wealth and economic efficiency.⁸¹

The transition to an awareness of England as unit whose interests should be given priority was a gradual one. A treatise written by a London merchant, Clement Armstrong, provides a typical example of the way concern for the national interest could be combined with paying lip-service to the idea of a unified Christendom. He called for protection for England against 'strange merchantise and artificial fantasies devised to make Englishmen fools to get riches out of the realm', yet he also suggested that a 'right ordinary Emperor' might obviate the need for international competition.⁸² Hatred of foreigners surfaced during economic difficulties and was based on fears that alien workers would take jobs or force up rents.⁸³ Towards the end of the sixteenth century dislike of Spaniards, based on trade rivalry cut across religious and political considerations and was beginning to provide a basis for a national outlook.

The themes of *Patriotism, Power and Print* have a myriad of contemporary resonances in early twenty first-century Britain. The Conservative Party's use of the 'patriotism' card in the 1982 Falklands War was so successful that politicians have since sought to portray themselves as defenders of the nation's integrity. Margaret Thatcher's tone in her famous Bruges speech of 1988, when she spoke of 'our pride in being English' and 'our Island fortress', has been emulated rather than demonised by subsequent governments. In the recent 2001 election campaign, Tony Blair depicted his pro-European Union stance as patriotic and it will be interesting to see both Euro-phile and Euro-sceptic politicians trying to re-invent themselves as patriots when the build up to the Euro referendum begins in earnest.

The devolution debate had pushed relations between England, Scotland and Wales to the forefront of public awareness and cultural and political relations with Ireland are as important as ever. The status of minority languages is still an issue at the beginning of the twenty-first century. In 1999 politicians in the Irish, Welsh and Scottish Assemblies used language to symbolise their move towards

greater autonomy. In the Scottish Parliament the veteran Nationalist, Winnie Ewing, was the first to take the oath and to make a brief declaration in Gaelic⁸⁴ and at its meeting, Gerry Adams addressed the Irish Assembly in Gaelic. Speakers in the Welsh Assembly are free to speak in either Welsh or English. The Cornish party, Mebyon Kernow, has been pressing for devolution for Cornwall for nearly half a century. The party chairman, Dick Cole is spearheading a campaign to have Cornish recognised by the government and to have it included in the charter of minority languages.⁸⁵

The dismantling of the Soviet Union into its constituent ethnicities and the disintegration of the Eastern Bloc has also resulted in much soul searching on the subject of nationalism. The end of the cold war contributed to the demonising of Islam and has produced hostilities similar to the situation in the sixteenth century when Christendom was supposedly united against the Turks. By the end of the sixteenth century the Protestant Reformation had shattered the unity of Christendom, but the Turks were still the focus for common enmities. Shakespeare had Henry V make the following suggestion as part of his attempt to cement relations with France:

King Henry

If ever thou be'st mine, Kate, as I have a saving faith within me tells thou shalt, I get thee with scrambling, and thou must therefore needs prove a good soldier-breeder: shall not thou and I, between St Denis and St George, compound a boy, half French half-English, that shall go to Constantinople and take the Turk by the beard? shall we not? what sayst thou my fair flower-de-luce?

Act 5 sc. 2 ll 196-208

Issues such as England's relations with the EU, the interactions of nations within the British Isles, the position of Islam in international affairs, the role of language in national consciousness look set to dominate the political agenda half a millennium later. It is gratifying to think that one is dealing with matters of such contemporary relevance. However, this is not without its teleological pitfalls. My aim is not to elucidate twenty-first century questions but to discuss those of the sixteenth century. Whatever their own agendas, I invite my readers to abandon them and attempt to see national consciousness through sixteenth-century eyes.

Notes

1. Sir James A.H. Murray, ed., *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, 1909.
2. L.R. Loomis, 'Nationality and the Council of Constance', *American History Review*, 44, 1938-9, pp 508-527, pp 524-5.
3. NED.
4. John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State*, Manchester, 1982; Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford, 1983 and *Encounters with Nationalism*, Oxford, 1994; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, 1991; Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, Cambridge, 1990.

5. Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*, 1998, p. 43.
6. *ibid* p. 9.
7. Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five roads to Modernity*, Cambridge, Mass., 1992, p. 30.
8. *ibid*. p. 3.
9. *ibid*, pp 3, 30.
10. This definition of patriotism differs from that of James Kellas who interprets nationalism as loyalty to a country and patriotism as loyalty to the state. This means that Welsh nationalists would have patriotic feelings towards Great Britain. James G. Kellas, *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 1991, p. 3.
11. Barnaby C. Keeney, 'Military Service and the Development of Nationalism in England, 1271-1327', *Speculum*, xxii, 1947, p. 534. His opinion was based on H.M. Chadwick, *The Nationalities of Europe*, Cambridge, 1945.
12. Graham Holderness, '“What ish my nation?”': Shakespeare and National Identities', *Textual Practice*, 1991 pp 74-93 p. 75.
13. John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State*, Manchester, 1982, p. 6.
14. E.D. Marcu, *Sixteenth-Century Nationalism*, New York, 1976, pp 3,73,83.
15. See chapter three.
16. E. Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 1961, p. 9.
17. K.R. Minogue, *Nationalism*, 1967, p. 12.
18. Breuilly, 1982, p. 3.
19. Anthony D. Smith, *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 2000.
20. Hastings *op. cit.* pp 31-32.
21. *A Conference about the next succession to the crown of England . . . whereunto is also added a new and perfect geneology of the discents of the Kings and Princes of England*. See below, chapter two p. 27.
22. Leonard W. Doob, *Patriotism and Nationalism – their Psychological Foundations*, Yale, 1964, p. 6.
23. John Edwards, *Language, Society and Identity*, 1985, p. 13.
24. Gerald Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History 1740-1830*, 1987, p. 60.
25. Esme Wingfield-Stratford, *The History of English Patriotism*, 2 vols 1913, 1 pp,xviii, 211.
26. Esme Wingfield-Stratford, *The Foundations of British Patriotism*, 1940, pp xiii-ix.
27. Garrett Mattingly, *The Defeat of the Spanish Armada*, 1959, Preface, p. 377.
28. A.L. Rowse, *The English Spirit*, 1946, p. 44.
29. J.E. Neale, *Essays in Elizabethan History*, 1958, pp 13,17.
30. Hastings *op. cit.* p. 5.
31. Geoffrey Parker and Colin Martin, *The Spanish Armada*, 1988, p. 253.
32. Felix Barker, 'If the Armada had Landed', *History Today*, 38, 1988, pp 34-41.
33. David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England*, 1989, pp 130, 140.
34. Wingfield Stratford, *op. cit.* 1940, pp 126,124, 141.
35. R.U. Lindabury, *A Study of Patriotism in Elizabethan Drama*, Oxford, 1931, chapter XIII.
36. Newman, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
37. Greenfeld, *op. cit.* p. 65.

38. A similar point is made by Hastings 'in England, the nation both precedes, and can see itself contrasted with, royal power'. op. cit. p. 48.
39. Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Writing of Elizabethan England*, Chicago, 1992, p9. Of the works which Helgerson has in mind, the most relevant here are: Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature*, Baltimore, 1983; Stephen Orgel, *Illusion and Power: Political Theatre in the English Renaissance*, Berkeley, 1975; Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, Chicago, 1980 and Leonard Tennenhouse, *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres*, New York, 1986.
40. Helgerson, op. cit., p. 122.
41. ibid p. 10.
42. ibid. p. 4. G.R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative changes in the Reign of Henry VIII*, Cambridge, 1953. Elton's views are challenged in C. Coleman and D.R. Starkey, eds, *Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration*, Oxford, 1986, and A.G. Fox and J.A. Guy, *Reassessing the Henrician Age: Humanism Politics and Reform 1500-1550*, Oxford, 1986.
43. See below chapter two, page 33.
44. Richard Hakluyt, *The principle navigation, voyages and discoveries of the English nation, made by sea or land*, 1589, Everyman, 1962, pp 2,3.
45. George Best, *A True Discourse of the late voyages of Discoverie*, 1577, printed in Hakluyt, op. cit..
46. John Dee, *General and Rare Memorials to the perfect Arte of Navigation*, 1577, Advertisement to the Reader.
47. Frances Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*, 1979, p. 85.
48. See chapter two, pages 45ff.
49. Roy Strong, *Portraits of Elizabeth*, Oxford, 1963, pp 114,73.
50. Frances Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*, 1975, p. 58. For a comparison between the Ditchley portrait and the frontispiece to Michael Drayton's *Poly-Olbion*, see page 120, below.
51. William Gaunt, *Court Painting in England from Tudor to Victorian Times*, 1980, p. 40
52. Martin Arthur Breslow, *A Mirror of England: English Puritan Views of Foreign Nations, 1618-1640*, Cambridge, Mass., 1970 argues convincingly that early seventeenth-century Puritans saw foreigners in religious terms and were disappointed that England did not lead the Protestant states in the Thirty Years War.
53. For a more detailed discussion of the ideas of Haller and his critics see below chapter two, pages 45-46.
54. See illustration below chapter two, page 46.
55. William Haller, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation*, 1963, p. 140.
56. see below chapter two, page 35.
57. Christopher Hill, 'God and the English Revolution' *History Workshop*, 17, 1984, pp 19-37.
58. Chantel Mouffe, 'Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci', Chantel Mouffe, ed, *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*, 1979, pp 130.
59. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, eds, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, 1971, p. 130
60. Smith, op. cit. 2000, p. 76.
61. Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, pp 130-131, 325.

62. James Goodwin, ed, *The Gospel according to St Matthew and part of the first chapter of the Gospel according to St Mark, Translated into English from the Greek with original notes by John Cheke, Knight, formerly Regius Professor of Greek and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge, afterward Tutor and privy Councillor and Secretary of State to Edward VI*, 1843, pp 11-12.
63. William Fulke, *A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the holie scriptures into the English tong, against the manifold cavils, frivolous quarrels and impudent slanders of Gregorie Martin, one of the readers of Popish divinitie in the trayterous seminarie of Remes*, 1583, dedication.
64. George Withers, *A View of the Marginal Notes of the Popish Testament, translated into the English by the English fugitive papists at Rheimes in France*, 1583, dedication.
65. Thomas Elyot, *The Castel of Health*, 1541, Preface.
66. F.J. Furnivall, ed, *The First Book of the Introduction of Knowledge made by Andrew Borde*, Early English Text Society, 1870, pp 119, 118, 120.
67. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, 1983, p. 44.
68. Norman Davies, *The Isles: A History*, 1999, p. 502.
69. Thomas Secombe and J.W. Allen, *The Age of Shakespeare*, 1904, 2 vols, I, pp x-xi. Hales was responsible for the introduction to this book.
70. Cumberland Clark, *Shakespeare and National Character*, 1934, pp 19, 20, 15.
71. Graham Holderness, 'Agincourt 1944: readings in the Shakespeare myth', in Peter Humm, Paul Stignant and Peter Widdowson, eds, *Popular Fictions: Essays in Literature and History*, 1986, pp 178, 192.
72. See chapter two, pages 30-31.
73. Holderness op. cit., 1986p. 189.
74. David Bevington, *Tudor Drama and Politics, A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning*, Cambridge, Mass., 1968, p. 187.
75. A.L. Rowse, *The Elizabethan Renaissance*, 1972, p. 5.
76. Derek Traversi, *Renaissance Drama*, 1980, p. 11.
77. Walter Cohen, *Drama of a Nation: Public Theatre in Renaissance England and Spain*, New York, 1985, pp 29, 137.
78. Greenfeld op. cit. p. 67.
79. *ibid* p. 43.
80. Newman, 1987, p. 55.
81. W.R.D. Jones, *The Tudor Commonwealth, 1529-1559*, 1973, p. 190.
82. 'A Treatise concerning the staple', R.H. Tawney and E. Power, eds, *Tudor Economic Documents*, 3 vols., University of London History Series, 14, 1924, III, pp 90-114.
83. See chapter eight, page 143.
84. Press Association, May 12 1999, www.newsunlimited.co.uk
85. Sarah Teasdale, 'Devolving England' BBC Online March 18 1999. <http://news2.thdo.bbc.co.uk/hi/eng/>