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ABSTRACT

This dissertation engages questions about the formation of empires and the relationship between imperial expansion and national consolidation. At the intersection of domestic British, British imperial, and Atlantic history in the early modern period, this study argues for the significance of the sixteenth century to the formation and development of Britain and the British Empire. It examines some of the earliest imperial designs undertaken by the crown and its subjects, in the sixteenth century, in settings within Europe, the British Isles, and the Americas. It traces this Tudor-era overseas experimentation in its diverse forms to show how territorial growth abroad and domestic consolidation and identity formation at home functioned together, intertwined and mutually-reinforcing in ideology and practice, from the accession of Henry VII in 1485 to the death of Elizabeth I in 1603.

In six substantive chapters, I reperiodize the sixteenth century, weaving together national, European, imperial, and Atlantic contexts, rather than focusing on the ebbs of the monarchy or religion alone. Using a wide array of interdisciplinary sources—including state papers, parliamentary, shipping, and court records, private correspondence, political philosophy, travel narratives, and material culture—and methods, this dissertation draws on material from six locations of imperial enterprise, chosen for their diversity in geography, chronology, type (from military occupation to settlement to trading company to commercial entrepôt), and limited scholarly treatment. It privileges these early, uneven, oft-overlooked enterprises in France
(Tournai), Scotland, Ireland, Newfoundland, Virginia (Roanoke), and Guiana to find a flurry of highly significant, related, extra-territorial efforts on the part of the British and Irish marked by a mix of continuity, borrowing, and change. As such, this project challenges the insularity of traditional domestic Tudor historiography as well as the chronological and geographical constraints of imperial and early modern histories and integrates an Atlantic approach—the first to link these scholarly endeavors. It seeks to create a dialogue among new British, imperial, and Atlantic fields and help reframe British history, integrating the processes of nation-, empire-, and identity-building and breaking down the divides and boundaries between subfields and analytical topics in early modern scholarship.
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INTRODUCTION
“This realme of England is an Impier”

The atmosphere around Westminster in the first week of April 1533 was nervous and tense, excited, acrimonious, and volatile, all at once. London was abuzz. The Habsburg ambassador Eustace Chapuys painted the scene for Emperor Charles V from the perspective of a languishing queen, his patron’s dear aunt: “all Englishmen, high and low, are in great alarm, and consider themselves as good as lost,” he wrote, “Great as their fears are, and not without reason, the general indignation is still greater, for excepting 10 or 12 persons who surround the Lady [Anne Boleyn], all the rest of the nation are terribly afraid.”

Chapuys begged Charles to destroy the “poisonous influence” of the new Protestant faith, an “irreparable evil.”

The diplomat’s alarm was palpable, and well-founded. That Monday, one of the most important, oft-cited acts in British History reached the statute books in England. Relying on years of research across Renaissance Europe and eight drafts, its preamble proclaimed: “this realme of England is an Impier and so hath bryn accepted in the world, gouerned by one supreme hedde having the dignitie and roiall estate of the Imperiall crowne.” With these words, parliament introduced the Act in Restraint of Appeals to Rome and originated the revolutionary process by which England rejected allegiance to the Pope and his Roman Catholic Church and made the monarch supreme throughout the land. In vigorous terms, the bill gave legal recognition to a Tudor imperial kingship, establishing in statute that England was an Empire,
imbued with honour and possessions by history and royal progenitors; governed by one supreme head with whole, unencumbered authority, prerogative, and jurisdiction; and encompassing all subjects (spiritual and lay), without interference from any foreign potentate. For many historians, the break from Rome and everything that went with it—divorce, remarriage, the births of a red-haired little princess and her institutional twin, the Anglican Church—are what make this statute, Henry VIII’s reign, even sixteenth-century Britain significant. We can see it in the scholarship, but we can also see it in popular culture, Robert Bolt’s A Man for All Seasons (1960), Hilary Mantel’s Wolf Hall (2009), Philippa Gregory’s The Other Boleyn Girl (2002), Showtime’s The Tudors (2007-10)—they all focus here, on 1530s Westminster. Meanwhile, when we think of the British Empire, these sources guide us away from the nation and toward the seventeenth century or beyond. Yet in this scheme, of separating the national from the imperial and favoring a single context alone, the Act of Appeals remains obscure, eliciting engaging problems and important queries: what did it mean to claim empire in sixteenth-century Britain? What did the term reflect, what did it entail, and what did it condone? Quite simply, if we look only to the 1530s and to England, how do we make sense of a domestic act that asserted empire?

---


6 As David Armitage has also noted, see Armitage, The Ideological Origins of the British Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 3.
In fact, the break from Rome was only one moment in a century of transition. A component of a wider discourse and an exercise in statecraft that went far beyond the halls of court and meaningfully invoked empire, parliament’s pronouncement in 1533 was endowed with international implications and applications.

* 

This dissertation argues for the significance of the Tudor century, a tumultuous period from the accession of Henry VII in 1485 through the death of Elizabeth I in 1603, to the growth and evolution of the British Empire. It finds that British imperial theory and practice at work abroad developed over time and space alongside a concurrent, deeply-intertwined, and mutually-reinforcing process of national consolidation and identity formation at home—different strands of a single dynamic. Examining some of the earliest imperial designs undertaken by the crown and its subjects, in the sixteenth century, in settings within the European continent, the British Isles, and the Americas, this project identifies, reconstructs, and integrates locations of experimentation crisscrossing the dynasty, the Atlantic Ocean, and current scholarship, elucidating their contributions to an emerging nation and empire. By privileging these early, frequently-overlooked ventures, a flurry of highly important, related, extra-national efforts on the part of the British and Irish emerge, marked by a mix of continuity, borrowing, and change—within and among each project and in connection to earlier and subsequent overseas activity. This project, then, challenges the insularity of domestic Tudor historiography, confronts the constraints of British imperial scholarship, and integrates an Atlantic approach.

Over the past three decades, historians have broadened and, indeed, transformed our understanding of imperialism. Scholarship on the British Empire, focusing on the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, has challenged the once unambiguous distinction between metropolitan
center and peripheral colony, the perception of the colonizer-colonized relationship as straightforward or one-way from superior to inferior, and the existence of unquestioned European hegemony.\(^7\) The perceived limits of nation-state and area studies approaches have combined with insights gained from Nationalist, Marxist, Subaltern, and cultural turns to yield a new kind of analysis, or “New Imperial History.”\(^8\) Censuring and countering Eurocentrism and essentialism, its practitioners have pursued a new definition of empire as contingent, complex, and in flux, an ill-defined entity of interrelated and porous analytic fields.\(^9\) New imperial histories show that, as Kathleen Wilson wrote using the subtitle to Linda Colley’s book *Britons*, “‘Forging the nation’ was thus inextricably bound to transnational and colonial developments.”\(^10\)

Yet in a way emblematic of a general preference for studying later periods in the British Empire (discussed further below), this approach has largely taken root among eighteenth- and nineteenth-century specialists. It is, however, more widely applicable, a means to explore nation and empire together in the early modern period and thereby improve our understanding of both.

Whereas the new imperial history has reoriented literature on empires in the modern period, Atlantic History has reconceptualized early modern expansion. Its British subset has

---

\(^7\) On this literature, see Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1931).


\(^10\) Wilson, ed., *New Imperial History*, 10.
directed our attention to patterns and movements of people overlooked in a nation-state or regional approach and revealed the extent to which Britain’s empire was shaped by entanglement with contemporary, rival empires of Spain, France, Portugal, and the Netherlands. British Atlantic scholarship, however, has had greater success in privileging the post-1604 era, Anglo-America, and Ireland than in examining earlier enterprise elsewhere. For a time when Spanish captains, conquistadors, and colonists dominated the Caribbean and Central America, when Portuguese merchants, mariners, migrants, and missionaries amassed navigational expertise and outposts in Africa and South America, British crossings were rarer, their presence impermanent, diffuse, and hard to measure. As a result, historians have relegated Britain to latecomer status

---


12 This is just one of the critiques leveled at the concept of an Atlantic World, a result of its immense size, variety, and origin the academic imagination. One result is that this historiography has fostered a global turn in the literature. On the possibilities and limits of an Atlantic approach, see “Beyond the Atlantic,” William and Mary Quarterly Forum, 63, no. 4 (2006): 675-742; Alison Games, “Atlantic History: Definitions, Challenges, and Opportunities,” American Historical Review 111, no. 3 (June, 2006): 741-757; Jack P. Greene and Philip D. Morgan, ed., Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). Alison Games, Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) demonstrated the truly global and even accidental nature of British imperial expansion as well as the limits of the metropolitan center, finding that the early empire was built on the ground, in the peripheries. An interesting pivot in the study of the British Atlantic is H.V. Bowen, Elizabeth Mancke, and J.G. Reid, eds., Britain’s Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), which examined space, law, diplomacy, and commerce in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, a framework that is neither global nor strictly Atlantic.

13 This comparative difference, which results in the 1500s being treated as a century of Iberian activity alone, is most appreciable in studies that take into account the British and Iberians. A useful example is J.H. Elliott’s Empires of the Atlantic World, which opens with a chapter on Hernán Cortes and Christopher Newport, thereby starting the Spanish Atlantic narrative in the sixteenth century but the British Atlantic narrative in the seventeenth, see Elliott, Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 3-28. On the sixteenth-century Iberian Atlantic, see J.H. Elliott, Imperial Spain, 1469-1716 (NY: Penguin Books, 1963); John H. Parry, The Spanish Seaborne Empire (NY: Knopf, 1966); Charles Ralph Boxer, The Portuguese Seaborne
in the Ocean and the New World, only beginning their narratives in earnest in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when English possessions and populations increased and permanent settlement-style colonization within the confines of the modern U.S. began.\textsuperscript{14} In these renderings, the sixteenth century does not come to the fore as a time of extensive English or British Atlantic activity, but rather as an era that was the purview of Iberian adventure, while significant British enterprise closer to home, in France and Scotland, is overlooked.\textsuperscript{15} Nevertheless, as a means by which to tell an interconnected, integrative story of empire-building across seemingly disconnected, disparate areas—the elementary characteristics of early British imperialism—an Atlantic unit of analysis functions as a useful tool.


\textsuperscript{14} This idea of delayed British interest is summarized and reasserted in Trevor Burnard, “The British Atlantic,” in \textit{Atlantic History}, ed. Greene and Morgan, 111-136, especially 111-2. Several broad surveys spanning multiple centuries of British activity include the sixteenth, but usually give the 1500s short shrift by comparison to what follows, see Anthony McFarlane, \textit{The British in the Americas, 1480-1815} (London: Longman, 1994); Armitage and Braddock, eds., \textit{The British Atlantic World}; Stephen J. Hornsby, \textit{British Atlantic, American Frontier: Spaces of Power in Early Modern British America} (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2005); Steven Sarson, \textit{British America, 1500-1800: Creating Colonies, Imagining an Empire} (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005).

My work engages a third important strand in the study of Britain: the “New British History” (NBH) that J.G.A. Pocock called for in 1975. Envisioned by Pocock as a plural history of the peoples, nations, and cultures situated along the Anglo-Celtic frontier and their global exchanges, the approach has successfully enriched a long-standing Anglocentric narrative and drawn closer to a four nations history—the history of the interactions of Scotland, England, Wales, and Ireland. Overwhelmingly in practice, however, the NBH has fixated on exploring religious pluralism within Britain and Ireland after the Reformation; the process of state-building from 1603 to the Anglo-Scottish union of 1707 (described as “the spinal cord” of British history by David Cannadine); and the emergence of Britishness versus older national or ethnic identities. The NBH has, then, essentially concerned itself with consolidation, failing to make vital, interesting connections with imperial projects and the transnational encounters and exchanges among Europeans and Amerindian societies that took place there. The field thus

remains circumscribed, Anglocentrism exchanged for an exclusionary focus on the Isles.\textsuperscript{19} Indeed, it is my intent to heed David Armitage’s call for a corrective, for the “reintegration of imperial and domestic history and the union of the new British history with Atlantic history,” in a period that has eluded three of these four categories.\textsuperscript{20}

The stubborn adherence to a national narrative is abundantly evident in scholarship on sixteenth-century England. Traditionally, larger-than-life personalities coupled with all-consuming debates over the English Reformations, Royal Supremacy, and Parliament have overwhelmed the specialty.\textsuperscript{21} Influenced by the NBH and against English exceptionalism, there is a recent, growing effort to explode the myth of insularity that was the mantle of Tudor Studies, which left British and European contexts as well as overseas endeavours understudied, their influence on the national dynamic poorly understood. Mapping the networks that bound England to its neighbors, this work has elevated the importance of political culture, highlighted the use of images and icons to express power, and situated the Tudor court as part of a Renaissance European milieu of mentalities, intellectual circles, and discourse.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{20} Armitage, “Greater Britain,” 438.
sixteenth-century Scotland, Wales, and Ireland have studied these realms in administrative calculus and noted the limits of English hegemony and governance, spiritual and secular.\textsuperscript{23} Still, most often, Tudor ideology or policy in the Isles or Europe remains at the margins of the literature, appearing as a coda to narratives otherwise centered on lowland England or as disconnected entities treated apart from England or one another.\textsuperscript{24} British historians rarely examine national developments in their broader international contexts.


Another, equally important effect of my research is to connect British imperialism with the medieval experience of Norman-Angevin conquest in Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and France—the activity that Rees Davies styled as the “First English Empire.” For Davies and others, the account of medieval consolidation and annexation simply could not be written separately, adding that the period lent later Britons essential imperial practice and precedent. Sociologist Michael Hechter made a related point, treating British national development as a process of “internal colonialism” of the Celtic periphery (Irish, Welsh, and Scottish) that began in the sixteenth century and resulted in persistent cultural and ethnic distinctiveness. Indeed, the relative stability of borders within Britain after the fourteenth century, the internal struggles of both the English and Scottish monarchies in the fifteenth century, the loss of the Angevin Empire in France, and the periodization of European history around the Renaissance and Reformation, have all excluded the relevance of the medieval era from the study of the British Empire and maintained the scholarly fault-line around 1500.

Thus, though Tudor historians have eschewed Anglocentrism in a variety of ways, their focus remains primarily on the British Isles and European religious, cultural, and political exchanges, limited in geographical reach to the archipelago and continent; conversely, though scholars have made crucial gains in understanding the nature of European imperialism as one of mutual borrowing, interconnectivity, and overlap, the Tudor period (along with earlier moments

---

27 Adopting this phrase from Russian populist and African American thought, Hechter also took note of the Norman Invasion and argued that in the late-medieval period, the correlation between land and power created a “natural tendency towards the acquisition of territories,” see Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), quotation from 62.
28 Significantly, John Watts has pointed to this problematic division, see Watts, ed., *The End of the Middle Ages? England in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (Gloucestershire: Sutton, 1998).
and experiences) has been largely left out of the chronology and the Atlantic framework applied only rarely to British activity in the sixteenth century, especially in the years before Elizabeth I.

*  

This project speaks most directly to a small group of scholars who have explored either the ideological or practical origins of the early modern British Empire in Ireland and the New World in the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—a modest but vital corrective to an imperial historiography that focuses chiefly on later periods. My work puts these two strains, the intellectual and the applied, together, and implements new temporal and spatial parameters to argue for the critical significance of the entirety of the Tudor era and of activity in continental Europe, the Isles, and the Americas to the development of Britain and its empire.

In the former category, Anthony Pagden, David Armitage, Andrew Fitzmaurice, and Ken MacMillan have all engaged the intellectual world of British imperialism, restoring the imperial dimension to early-modern British political thought. Their contributions locate what Pagden has called a “language of empire,” a corpus of law, assumptions, rhetoric, and literature that was squarely based in classical philosophy and the Renaissance invocation of antiquity, yet obscured in the scholarship. Brought to bear on other thought systems like Church teachings or common law by contemporary writers, this theory functioned to legally undergird “unquestionably new” European colonial acquisition in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century America. As Fitzmaurice and MacMillan have particularly shown, in the Tudor-Stuart context, humanist Roman law and

---


30 Pagden, Lords of All the World, 6

31 Pagden, Lords of All the World, 17. For Pagden, studying Britain, France, and Spain, the result was to uncover an imperial foundation that is at least somewhat common across Europe, though he also notes national differences.
scholastic natural law proved particularly dominant, providing the tools for expansion, the terms in which that colonization was understood, and the claims to imperium and dominium (absolute sovereignty and right to possession) used to justify colonies to the crown and European competitors.  

Moreover, these scholars offer three correctives to the scholarly narrative that are fundamental to my argument as well: first, British state-formation and expansion were inherently linked, rather than merely parallel or coincidentally-related; second, early British engagement overseas was about more than commerce; and third, the crown played an indispensable role in empire-building, retaining authority, expressing its legal right, and defending its subjects, rather than simply lending its name to private individuals.

This scholarship provides a starting point as well as also a counterpoint for this dissertation: although they look to antiquity and the Renaissance as critical impetuses, these historians begins their narrative in the second half of the sixteenth century. They evince a general reluctance to label Tudor efforts “imperial” (a reticence appreciable since J.A. Froude), which is linked to the limits of English colonial settlement in North America prior to 1607 and furthered by those who stressed the role of a Protestant religious consciousness in British imperialism.

---

32 Fitzmaurice, Humanism and America, especially introduction; MacMillan, Sovereignty and Possession, especially 7 and 13.
33 Fitzmaurice, “The Ideology of Early Modern Colonisation,” History Compass 2, no. 1 (2004): 1-14, especially 3-4. On the contrary, Elizabeth Mancke wrote that these were two distinct, even antithetical processes, parallel rather than interdependent or consequential, see Mancke, “Empire and State,” in British Atlantic World, ed. Armitage and Braddick, 175-195, especially 177.
35 MacMillan, Sovereignty and Possession, especially 6, 79-120. The idea of limited royal participation goes back to David Hume, who wrote in 1762 that Elizabeth “had done little more than give a name to the continent of Virginia,” see W.B. Todd, ed., Hume’s History of England, 6 vols. (Indianapolis: Liberty, 1983), quotation from 5:147.
Indeed, Armitage affirmed that “the emergence of the conception of the ‘British Empire’… was long drawn out, and only achieved by the late seventeenth century at the earliest”\textsuperscript{37}—a statement that, I find, follows from his definition of British Empire as “Protestant, commercial, maritime, and free.”\textsuperscript{38} Chronologically, MacMillan agreed, beginning his study with Martin Frobisher’s North Atlantic voyages between 1576-8 and charging that despite important exercises, “there was no ideological British Empire in late-Tudor and early-Stuart England.”\textsuperscript{39} Tellingly, Nicholas Canny’s introduction to the \textit{Origins of Empire} volume of the \textit{Oxford History of the British Empire} and the edition’s essays do not find an empire until after James I’s accession.\textsuperscript{40} Directing attention to national developments, specific cases of overseas experimentation within and beyond the New World (where Pagden, Fitzmaurice, and MacMillan focus), and pushing the timeline back, this project works to show where and why the terms “British” as well as “Empire” are appreciable, applicable, and, indeed, fitting across much of the sixteenth century.

Grounded firmly in the applied (rather than the theoretical) and overseas (rather than in Europe), a small group of historians have examined the complex of sixteenth-century British discoveries, interactions, and experiments. Their work illustrated the overlap between different types of activity, which were rarely disassociated and often indistinguishable in contemporary reality, and rejected the premise that only colonial settlement in the modern U.S. constituted early British imperialism.\textsuperscript{41} Positioning areas of limited, ephemeral, or futile adventuring for

\textsuperscript{37} Armitage, \textit{Ideological Origins}, 7
\textsuperscript{38} Armitage, \textit{Ideological Origins}, 8.
\textsuperscript{39} MacMillan, \textit{Sovereignty and Possession}, 7.
\textsuperscript{41} A point most clearly made by Andrews, \textit{Trade, Plunder, and Settlement}, 6.
study, these historians suggest the practicability, utility, and benefits of researching the uneven process of British empire-building in the sixteenth century.\(^{42}\)

The single-most significant source of scholarship on early modern British imperialism hinges on Elizabethan Ireland. In the 1970s and 1980s, David Beers Quinn and Nicholas Canny redirected the field to create a still-influential facet of British Atlantic History, which contends that England’s island neighbor was its oldest colony and, as such, the genesis of the British Empire. As an experiential model, training ground, and exportable colonial pattern, Ireland from 1565-1576 functioned, especially for Canny and others who followed in his wake, as the seedbed for subsequent activity there and in the New World.\(^{43}\) But though it accomplished an important, even necessary, feat in bringing Ireland into the wider context of European expansion, the thesis is both troublingly straightforward in its western, outward trajectory of wholesale transference and exclusionary in its late-sixteenth-century chronology and American comparisons, primarily restricted to Virginia. My work finds a more complicated process at work—a process that spanned the length of the Tudor period, involved other parts of the British archipelago and the Americas, and, accordingly, transforms Elizabethan Ireland from a point of origin into an intermediary moment on the arc of British imperialism.


Problematically, the intellectual history of the early British Empire has been largely divided from the study of exploration, discovery, commerce, and colonization on the ground, especially in the Americas. In effect, the ideological persists as divorced from the realized, though both were crucial. Moreover, different kinds of projects in a variety of locations remain disaggregated, making it difficult to spot and analyze their relationships to one another, while the second half of the sixteenth century remains dominant.

* *

Budding out of the connections and overlap that I find between the history of sixteenth-century Britain and the British Empire, this dissertation is an effort to flesh out their intersection, to bring together several important, largely separate on-going conversations among historians. Combining these related scholarly initiatives—New Imperial History, Atlantic History, the New British History, Tudor Studies, even Late-Medieval History—it offers a unique opportunity to see both the Isles and the activities of its people in a new light.

For the Tudor era, the possibilities of new imperial and Atlantic methods are great, though seldom applied to a period in which English insularity has proved remarkably difficult to penetrate. Drawing on the new imperial history and applying it to the sixteenth century, this dissertation recovers the imperial dimension of domestic culture, society, and politics and elucidates the close ties binding identity and empire. As in later periods, the early modern imperial project operated at home with many of the same attitudes, theories, mechanisms, and outcomes that it did abroad. My study employs an Atlantic framework to transcend the traditional national and regional division of Britain and Early Modern Europe and make hitherto

---


45 Andrews’s *Trade, Plunder, and Settlement*, which is very nearly global, endures as the most pertinent exception.
unlikely or untraditional links across time and space. Adopting a widened geographical lens to include engagement in Scotland and France, assess unrealized plots as well as realized ventures, and integrate a national narrative, it offers a focused treatment of a less-studied period and toys with the start date of the British Empire. Such an unusual perspective unearths truly *British* (English, Irish, Scottish, and Welsh) experiments prior to the seventeenth century, launched in concert and competition with European rivals. It helps us to better understand the ways in which crown, nation, and identity developed in the Tudor era, while linking the substance and concerns of medieval, early modern, and modern scholars of Britain. Eschewing a preference for the second half of the sixteenth century (at the earliest), situating contemporary enterprises together, adding sites that have not been discussed in a British imperial context, evaluating discourse with practice, and highlighting national influences, this project uncovers a Tudor Empire.

This study thus complements existing work, yet also builds on it, stretching the chronological and geographical limits of imperial, Atlantic, and domestic British history, and forging them into a single narrative, with insights gleaned from a century-long scope, multiple locations of enterprise, and interdisciplinary methods. Adopting a lengthy 120-year frame and an equally-expansive geographic space, it aims to comprehend the significance of a century that saw sustained British involvement overseas, in Europe, Britain, and the Americas, born alongside broader intellectual currents, like the development of a national identity and a vocabulary of *imperium*, all part and parcel of a consolidating state.

To do so, this dissertation highlights six locations of imperial experimentation, chosen for their diversity and limited scholarly treatment: across the Channel in Tournai (contemporary France, modern-day Belgium); across the northern broder and Irish Sea in Scotland and Ireland; and, in my largest maritime leaps, across the Atlantic Ocean to Newfoundland, Virginia, and
Guiana. Wide-ranging in location, date, and type, these six regions, as a unit, cross the traditional national and regional boundaries of continental Europe, the British Isles, North America, and South America. They also transcend the entrenched, divisive periodization within Tudor history, which is still written by reign (dates of accession and death providing our units of analysis) or by religion (the pre-Reformation church of Henry VII, the Henrician and Edwardian Reformations, the Marian Counter Reformation, and the Elizabethan Settlement). Four of these areas are treated as case studies—that is, one particular place at one particular moment—and two as century-long projects. Tournai was an imperial project of the 1510s, Scotland captured attentions in the 1540s, Virginia absorbed interest in the 1580s, and Guiana drew notice in the 1590s. Alternatively, Ireland and Newfoundland saw the wax and wane of British interest across the whole of the dynasty. Further, each of these locales witnessed a variety of experimental forms and models, often in collaboration or conflict with one another, from military occupations to garrisoning, settlement and plantation, commercial entrepôts for trade and raw material harvesting, to bases for defense, privateering, and offensive maneuvering.

My particular choices therefore afford opportunities to make connections and evince continuities and changes across time and space. Through them, we can recognize shifting interests towards the west and south as well as the evolution of specific schemes, the extent of crown and courtly involvement, the power of monarchical, doctrinal, and ecclesiastical upheaval, and the rise of private adventure and corporate bodies. Moreover, with the exceptions of Virginia and Ireland, which have not been explored in concert with these four contemporaneous projects, none are ubiquitous in the literature. Each, including the much-studied Ireland, benefits from analysis alongside five other, concurrent ventures, producing a much fuller picture of early British imperialism. Newfoundland’s fishery, Ireland, and Virginia were projects that endured;
others were dead-ends. However, our knowledge of what happened tends to mask a fundamental contemporary significance, even achievement, as building-blocks of nation and empire. Taken together, undertakings in Tournai, Scotland, Ireland, Newfoundland, Virginia, and Guiana constitute a burst of activity on the part of the British and Irish between 1485 and 1603.

Utilizing state papers, parliamentary, shipping, and court records, private correspondence, political philosophy, travel narratives, and material culture, I impose certain comparative criteria to tackle these six ventures: means of justification and legitimation, methods of promotion and finance, professed (and, as possible, actual) motivation, language and rhetoric, personnel, official participation, and European diplomacy. Methodologically, this dissertation strives to integrate and benefit from several interdisciplinary approaches. In textual analysis, it provides close readings of several key tracts and promotional materials, approaching imperial theory through the lens of its context, with special attention to diction, genre, and style, and exploring writing as a tool of statecraft, at home and abroad.46 For an age when one king went through six wives in search of a healthy male heir and when the accessions of a young boy and two unmarried women belied societal norms and patriarchal hierarchies, I especially trace the use of gendered language and renderings of empire.47 Finally, I use art, icons, maps, and architecture, piecing together these visual manifestations of British Empire in order to provide further insight into the nature and expression of Tudor imperialism and complement, supplement, or even revise interpretations.


47 This follows most closely the work of Frances Yates and Louis Montrose, see Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1975); Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).
of written sources.48 With methods from history, literary studies, and art history, this study asks what it meant to have an empire in the sixteenth century; how empire was expressed, challenged, and renegotiated; how that empire evolved over the course of the period; and how it fits with the narrative of domestic developments that we know so well.

Recognizing the challenges and potential pitfalls of certain terms in the sixteenth-century world, I strive to take great care in defining and applying vocabulary. Above all, rather than artificially-imposing modern terminology, my usages derive from my contemporary source base, where “empire,” “Britain,” “British,” and “nation” are all employed. I use “British” to refer to combinations of English, Welsh, and Scottish (depending on context) and as a modifier for the crown and empire, a reflection of a dynasty that conceived of itself as British—descendants of kings who presided over the entire archipelago. I deploy “English” when my sources do: to denote the kingdom of England alone or the set of cultural, political, and administrative norms ascribed to lowland England, like common law, the English vernacular, parliament, and shiring.

For “empire,” I employ two separate, related definitions I find at work in the century: first, the Latin imperium, which asserted absolute, supreme sovereign authority, spiritual and temporal; and second, the more modern notion of territorial expansion.49 This dissertation also adopts a broad idea of “nation,” drawing on Colin Kidd’s embrace of a complex early-modern

48 Developing the scholarship of Hoak, ed., Tudor Political Culture; Anglo, Spectacle, Pageantry, and Policy; King, Tudor Iconography; Margaret Aston, The King’s Bedpost: Reformation and Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
49 I have tired to avoid using a specific checklist for empire, favored by Richard Koebner, S.N. Eisenstadt, Max Weber, Michael Mann, Stephen Howe, and others. Still, such benchmarks overwhelmingly fit the empire examined herein: for example, Fredrick Cooper and Jane Burbank argued that “Empires are large political units, expansionist or with a memory of power extended over space, polities that maintain distinction and hierarchy as they incorporate new people,” see Cooper and Burbank, Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), quotation from 8. Similarly, Michael Hechter noted several precursors—autonomous political goals, effective sovereignty, and availability of resources—all present under Henry VIII, see Hechter, Internal Colonialism, 60-9. For other definitions, see Koebner, Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961); Eisenstadt, The Political Systems of Empires (London: Glencoe, 1963); Weber, Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978); Mann, Incoherent Empire (London: Verso, 2003); and Howe, Empire: A Very Short Introduction (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
sense of national identity, patriotism, kinship, religion, legal institutions, and history, which could be ill-defined and contradictory, and substantively different from nineteenth-century nationalism.\(^{50}\) Though some have traced the existence of Britishness to post-1707 or to the 1530s, I find that this sensibility of a British identity—based on specific forms of religion, language, law, monarchy, land use, agriculture, and other norms and customs—emerged at home and in the imperial context throughout the sixteenth century.\(^{51}\) In a process quickened by the end of the Wars of the Roses and renegotiated at several pivotal moments in the decades that followed, both the domestic and the imperial realms influenced the meaning of the British national ideal and rendered it worthy of export beyond England.

Overall, then, I stress the flexible, evolving nature of these concepts, preferring to note where and when they were invoked or forming, frequently referencing their processes (nation-, empire-, and identity-building) rather than their concrete existence. Though the actual extent of Tudor power may not have been quite so grand—unable to rule the vast empire that it claimed or foster the Britishness that it described—these terms aptly reflect what sixteenth-century Britons, by their own admission, sought to create. The exception is the term “Atlantic,” which this project uses to evoke the broader world of continental Europe, the British Isles, North America, and South America, and the maze of rivalries, historic claims, and warfare that Tudor subjects operated within. Unlike empire, nation, or Britain, “Atlantic” functions here as a descriptor, as a category of analysis and analytical tool, rather than a precise reflection of contemporary thought.

---

\(^{50}\) Kidd, *British Identities*, especially 1-33, which includes a useful review of the literature on modern nationalism from the perspective of an early modernist.

Beginning, then, with the advent of the monarchy in 1485 and concluding with the Stuart succession in 1603, this dissertation seeks to understand the nature, development, and function of a Tudor British Empire. Reperiodizing the century with an eye to national, imperial, and Atlantic contexts (rather than the monarch or his/her religion alone), I use six chronological chapters to trace the ideological and practical activity, at home and abroad, of the crown and its subjects. In chapter one, I show how the exigencies and interests of a new, unsecured dynastic house fueled the rediscovery of an imperial past and experimentation abroad that set powerful precedents and accrued valuable experience in empire-building in Newfoundland and Ireland. Under the auspices of Henry VII and a growing Renaissance court—both greatly influenced by the Wars of the Roses, Hundred Years War, and European-wide interest in travel—the first official British expeditions launched into the New World and boosted the prospects for further activity. Concurrently, civil war aftershocks prompted a new royal desire to tighten command over Ireland, solidify ties with Scotland, and buttress the still-tenuous monarchy with potent appeals to history, empire, and avant-garde intellectual currents.

In chapter two, this atmosphere merges with European circumstance and ego to set off the six-year Tudor occupation of Tournai. Here, I explore the imperial experiment waged between 1513-1519, studying the language and policies (part novel, part adapted), whereby Tudor officials sought to exercise sovereignty over the city and its inhabitants as well as the projects and posturing that Tournai engendered elsewhere, in Ireland and Newfoundland. The fundamental changes wrought by the break from Rome then merge powerfully with the lessons gleaned on the continent to create the contemporary concept of an “empire of Great Britain” and crystalize the meaning of Britishness in the Anglo-Scottish “Rough Wooings” wars of the 1540s,
the subject of chapter three.\textsuperscript{52} I analyze the campaign as a military and ideological exercise that straddled the Henrician-Edwardian divide, an endeavor which failed to unite all of Britain under Tudor rule, but produced a highly significant, enduring body of imperial propaganda.

The second half of the dissertation (and century) begins at war’s end, underscoring how changes at the top freed manpower, money, and energy and occasioned a turn west, to Ireland and Newfoundland, as France receded as Britain’s chief rival. Chronicling the “mid-Tudor crisis,” presided over by a sickly, young king and a Catholic, half-Spanish queen, I highlight essential continuity among three seemingly antithetical Tudor figures, identity construction against new alternatives, and a burgeoning imperial outlook, drawing attention to a group of essential yet overlooked ventures.\textsuperscript{53} I find that royal and spiritual change, evolving diplomacy, and the end of empire in France from 1550 to 1573 intensified American activity, leading to an experimental boom in the 1580s. Chapter five examines this densely-packed moment of adventure from Humphrey Gilbert’s royal patent through two Irish rebellions and the Roanoke voyages, ending with the arrival of the Spanish Armada in 1588. I argue that overlapping personnel and other similarities serve as points of continuity, but the relationship was neither a simple nor straightforward export west. Plots and activity remained uneven and inconsistent, the result of difference in time and space, the influence of other experiences, and the fact that there was no single pattern to export, while also underlining contemporary reckonings of these enterprises as successes. Building on recent work that looks to the 1590s as a critical “last decade” in British political history, the sixth chapter shows how protracted war with an Iberian, Catholic foe empowered Tudor subjects, bolstered resolve, spread knowledge, and produced a

\textsuperscript{52} For “the empire of Great Britain” and analysis of the phrase, see chapter four. For the phrase “Rough Wooings,” see Marcus Merriman, \textit{The Rough Wooings: Mary Queen of Scots, 1542-1551} (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2000).

\textsuperscript{53} On the phrase “mid-Tudor crisis,” see W.K. Jones, \textit{The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1539-1563} (London: MacMillan, 1973) and Stephen J. Lee, \textit{The Mid-Tudors: Edward VI and Mary, 1547-1558} (London: Routledge, 2007). For further analysis of this paradigm and my connection to it, see chapter four.
largely unrecognized sense of urgency to consolidate from within and grow from without that brought a full century of Tudor imperialism to bear on its more well-known, Stuart counterpart.54

This study of Britain and the British Empire in the sixteenth century reorients how we think about early expansion and consolidation, restoring northern Europeans to the Atlantic narrative along with crucial developments in the Isles and on the continent. It unearths an explicit, overt, self-conscious British imperialism of discovery, conquest, and rule, of maritime exploration, trade, and colonization that was part and parcel of nation-building in the sixteenth century—a course and trajectory of expansion quite unlike the still-popular conceit first aired by J.R. Seeley at the end of the nineteenth century that Britons “conquered and peopled half the world in a fit of absence of mind.”55 By examining Tudor imperialism, this dissertation creates a dialogue among domestic, imperial, and Atlantic fields and helps to reframe British history, integrating the processes of nation-, empire-, and identity-formation and breaking down the traditional chronological, geographical, and analytical divides in the scholarship. The gripping drama of Henry VIII’s divorce from Katherine of Aragon has ensured that the Tudor century is known in scholarship and popular culture as the century of religious reformation. This project shows that the Tudor period was also a century of imperialism. After all, as it enacted the break from Rome, the 1533 Act in Restraint of Appeals also asserted that England was an Empire.


CHAPTER ONE
“The whole earth will be subject to them”:
Forging and Legitimizing an Imperial Dynasty, 1485-1509

On the eve of the sixteenth century, a brief tale began to circulate in the pages of numerous tracts, chronicles, and anthologies. In its most widely disseminated form, the version printed by Elizabethan Richard Hakluyt in his *Principal Navigations* (1599-1600), the story retold how “Christopher Columbus fearing [that] the king of Castile in like maner (as the king of Portugall had done) should not condescend vnto his enterprise… sent into England a certaine brother of his [named] Bartholomew Columbus,” a man of experience and skillful in sea causes, to pitch his impending voyage.¹ But off the coast of Britain, Bartholomew encountered pirates, who left him robbed and delayed. At length, the sailor reached the court of Henry VII, presenting the king with a map of the world and details of his scheme on 13 February 1488. Wooed, the first Tudor joyfully accepted the offer, but by the time Bartholomew secured his patron, Christopher had already departed with Spanish support. There, in the margin of his account of these events, which appeared arranged with dozens of other inducements to overseas adventure, Hakluyt wrote: “The occasion why the West Indies were not discouere for England.”²

Ever-desirous to act a discerning, scrupulous editor, Hakluyt’s longing to inspire imperial journeying did know bounds: this revised edition of *Principal Navigations* omitted several appealing reports of questionable veracity, while Bartholomew remained.³ Yet despite this apparent commitment to the tale and the ubiquity of Christopher Columbus in modern cultural lore, the sailor’s brother and British audience are virtual unknowns.⁴

---
Though perhaps apocryphal, the myth passed Hakluyt’s skepticism, twice, because it fit with early Tudor interest, activity, and self-fashioning. The polymath was tapping into a useful backbone of Tudor dynastic promotion, the fantastical corpus of chronicle and folklore that regaled readers with the feats of Trojan demi-god Brutus and his Welsh progeny Arthur, Cadwallader, and Madoc—all kings who fulfilled an ambitious desire for vast territorial rule. In the sixteenth century, the leading source for these deeds was Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regnum Britannia (c. 1136), a Latin history that opened with the potent, canonical moment in which the oracle Diana foretold Britain’s future to its founder: “past the realms of Gaul, there lies an island in the sea, once occupied by giants... A race of kings will be born there from your stock and the round circle of the whole earth will be subject to them.”5 As the conqueror and namesake who rescued the land from barbarity at divine instigation, Brutus was the fount of Britain. His prophecy undergirded an alien, upstart House throughout its tumultuous century, legitimizing the first Welsh dynasty to claim Britain, Ireland, and France in some eight centuries, as well as its pretensions in the mysterious expanse beyond the Atlantic archipelago.

***

Bartholomew’s misadventures, their broader context, and the ensuing contemporary counterfactuals lamenting what might have been represent the work of this chapter, which analyzes a critical, overlooked juncture in the history of the British nation and empire.6 It argues

---


for the centrality of a twenty-five-year period that began on the Bosworth Battlefield, restoring the court culture, political backdrop, and possibilities manifest in the Columbus myth. It finds that amid perennial threat, the interests of a new, unsecured dynasty fueled the rediscovery of an imperial past and experimentation abroad that set powerful precedent and accrued valuable experience in state- and empire-building in Britain, Newfoundland, Ireland, and France.

In 1485, during the protracted civil conflict known as the Wars of the Roses, an obscure Welsh claimant by the name of Henry Tudor bested King Richard III. Ousting the Plantagenet House after some three-hundred-and-fifty-years, Henry VII’s prime concern was the security of his dominion, which stretched from the banks of the River Thames to the Scottish border, past the Welsh Marches, and (at least in theory) across the Irish Sea and English Channel. However, his posture was not merely defensive, but offensive and active. Both part and parcel of and well beyond his quest for stability, the king cultivated a court that rivaled the best of continental Europe, a hub that exerted a magnetic pull to draw in and create humanists. With their help, the monarchy used ancient and medieval sources alongside policy to assert, retain, and even expand beyond England.

---


The conventional units of analysis and stereotypical image of a tight-fisted, limited king have largely remained, overshadowing the beginnings of Tudor overseas engagement under Henry VII. The few who have reconstructed early Atlantic voyaging include J.A. Williamson, ed., *The Cabot Voyages and Bristol Discovery under Henry VII*
language, and imagery) mixed powerfully to produce a unique late-century climate. This milieu profoundly influenced the dynastic spare and ultimate heir lauded as the messiah of a new, British golden age: the future Henry VIII. Fusing domestic and imperial narratives, this chapter privileges a quarter-century that not only yielded Christopher Columbus’s famed 1492 voyage, but allegedly brought the mariner’s brother to London to entreat with a burgeoning nation and empire. Henry VII led Britain down the early modern imperial rabbit hole.

***

On 1 August 1485, a motley crew of four-hundred English exiles and fifteen-hundred Welsh, Scottish, and French mercenaries set sail from the River Seine. Six days later, they landed in Pembrokeshire, inaugurating an arduous march to the Midlands. The international complexion of Henry Tudor’s invasionary force and their circuitous route befit the challenger’s past, while fundamentally influencing his rule. These circumstances fostered in him a yearning for peace, illustrated the importance of monarchical authority and consolidation, lent his reign its British tenor, and privileged the Isles and France.

The Tudor accession is a lesson in contingency, in exigency and unlikelihood. Born in 1457 at Pembroke Castle—twenty kilometers from where he would land nearly thirty years later—Henry Tudor was a Welshman. His father died before his birth of the same Black plague that, together with incumbent civil war, had thrown England into disarray from 1455. The only child of Edmund Tudor (half-brother of Henry VI) and Margaret Beaufort (a direct descendant of Edward III), Henry had a double-dose of Lancastrian blood, entrenching him firmly on the losing

---


side when Yorkist Edward IV retook the throne in mid-1471. Henry took refuge across the Channel, where he became the Lancastrian figurehead, a pawn shuttled from castle to castle in English and French scheming.\textsuperscript{10} Like traditional Yorkist refuges Ireland and Calais, Wales and France became de facto hotbeds of Tudor support, rendering all three realms essential to the dynastic calculus of post-war England.

Henry Tudor’s opportunity came when, upon Edward IV’s death, the deceased king’s brother seized power, deposing the two princes (his nephews and the heirs apparent), overseeing their mysterious disappearance in the Tower, and crowing himself King Richard III. In so doing, Richard alienated much of the Yorkist elite and encouraged sedition. By the end of January 1483, an intermediary was in Rome, brokering a dispensation to allow Henry to marry Elizabeth of York and receive papal backing.\textsuperscript{11} The marriage, conditional upon Henry’s success, marked the first, crucial step in solidifying the emergent monarchy via dynastic diplomacy. Even before the invasion, the betrothal was a coup for the little-known Henry. On 3 November 1483, Cornwall rebels declared Henry king; by Christmas, he announced his impending nuptials to the English exiles who had arrived in Rennes, who, in turn, swore fealty to him.\textsuperscript{12}

The marriage was useful for two reasons: first, it united Lancaster and York, doubling Henry’s claim to the crown; second, it Anglicized Henry by bonding him to a native-born Englishwoman. As explored more fully in chapter two, the Hundred Years War had augmented English nationalism. Louise R. Loomis and, more recently, Steven G. Ellis have drawn attention to the Council of Constance (1414-8), perhaps the first public statement of English nationalism.

\textsuperscript{10} On Henry VII’s progress, see Cunningham, \textit{Henry VII}, 10-42; S.B. Chrimes, \textit{Henry VII} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 3-49. Though dated, Chrimes was Henry VII’s sole modern biography until 2007 and remains an invaluable source, taking a more administrative approach than either Cunningham or Penn.


\textsuperscript{12} On the marriage, see Arlene Naylor Okerlund, \textit{Elizabeth of York} (London: Palgrave, 2009), 36-7.
identity. England’s representatives asserted that “whether nation be understood as a people marked off from others by blood relationship and habit of unity or by peculiarities of language… or whether nation be understood, as it should be, as a territory equal to that of the French nation,” the realm of England met each requirement.\(^\text{13}\) After the Tudor accession, a Spanish ambassador explained that though Henry wanted to govern in the French fashion and employ foreigners, he could not, because English envy was diabolical and unparalleled. Herein lay the fundamental issue—why the king had to be careful—the Spaniard explained that the king, “not a pure Englishman, does not share this jealousy.”\(^\text{14}\) Similarly, a Venetian observed: “they think that there are no other men than themselves, and no other world but England; and whenever they see a handsome foreigner, they say that ‘he looks like an Englishman,’ and that, ‘it is a great pity that he should not be an Englishman;’ and when they partake of any delicacy with a foreigner, they ask him, ‘whether such a thing is made in their [sic] country?’”\(^\text{15}\) Another summarized what the Welshman was up against, commenting that Englishmen have an antipathy to foreigners.\(^\text{16}\) Ultimately, Henry would further the nationalist discourse with appeals to St. George and other English kings to legitimate his rule, a policy born of necessity: the tide of xenophobic nationalism was already high enough to force Henry to address his identity before he crossed.

Signing with a regal, flourishing “H.R.” for the first time, Henry wrote home to garner support for “the furtherance of my rightful claim due and lineal inheritance of the crown, and for


\(^{15}\) C.A. Sneyd, ed., Anon., *A Relation or Rather a True Account, of the Island of England...about the year 1500* (London: Camden Society, 1847), 20-1.

the just depriving of that homicide and unnatural tyrant which now unjustly bears dominion.”

The French-reared Welshman relied on an international gang of disenfranchised misfits and a rhetoric that posited Richard as the unnatural and unjust one, when, in fact, the current king was the native. It was a powerful discourse that initiated the vilification of the last Plantagenet and elevation of his successor as an even more legitimate inheritor to an even greater territory, with classical, medieval, even biblical imagery. According to chronicler Edward Hall, Henry and his entourage slipped out of France “like ramping lions… in the name of God and Saint George,” on to meet “Richard, who is both Tarquin and Nero!” As Edwardian historian Richard Grafton repeated, Henry delivered his “naturall Countrie men, from the bondage and thraldome (worse than the captiuitie of Egypt).”

Richard was well-aware of his challenger’s birth, backing, and bombast. In reply, he declared “Henry Tydder” a bastard-born usurper, who aligned with our ancient enemy and promised, in exchange, to “release in perpetuity all the right, title, and claim that the king of England have had, and ought to have to the crown and realm of France,” including Calais and use of the fleur-de-lis. Intended to galvanize “every true and natural Englishman born,” the proclamation not only justified resistance in 1485, but also substantiated over two decades of plots to depose Henry, while simultaneously cementing the alternative Tudor ideology. The shaky Tudor claim, compounded by the use of language on both sides, ensured that nationalistic and even imperial self-fashioning would be a hallmark of British policy at the dawn of the sixteenth century.

---

17 Henry VII to messengers, “Memorandum,” n.d. 1484, BL Harl. MS 787, fol. 2.
18 For “like ramping lions… in the name of God and Saint George,” see Edward Hall, The vnion of the two noble and illustre families of Lancastre and Yorke... (London: 1548), STC 12722, lvi; for “Richard, who is both Tarquin and Nerol,” see Hall, Vnion, lvi.
19 Grafton’s Chronicle; or History of England (1569, as reprinted under this title in London: Johnson Publishers, 1809), 125.
20 “Proclamation of Richard III,” 22 June 1585, BL Harl. MS 433, fol. 221.
21 “Proclamation of Richard III,” 22 June 1585, BL Harl. MS 433, fol. 221.
Over the course of a week, Henry snaked through Wales, a march as much about covering distance as it was about securing his native powerbase. His reign promised to usher in a new, British golden age—English and Welsh—as foretold in Galfridian Brut, mediated by Polydore Vergil: “797 years before, there came one night to Cadwallader, last king of the Britons, some sort of apparition with a heavenly appearance; this foretold how long afterwards it would come to pass that his descendants would recover the land. This prophecy came true in Henry, who traced his ancestry back to Cadwallader.”

Cutting a path with his new heraldry—white Richmond Greyhound (for his father) with the red Cadwallader Welsh Dragon—and perhaps propounding the anecdote that he had been christened Owain (after the last native Prince of Wales), Henry assured local magnates of a spot in the new regime and a modicum of equality with their English counterparts.

The two opposing ideologies and armies met on 22 August at Bosworth Field, where Richard’s impetuousness combined with bad luck in the defeat and death of the last Plantagenet. That day in Leicestershire, the Tudor dynasty began, though no one yet knew if the Wars of the Roses were over.

The Tudor machine sprang into action. Observers recorded that in the commotion, Richard’s coronet flew off into a bush, whereupon it found its way to the victor’s head, to shouts of God save King Henry. Coopted by the tenuous house, the image of a crown and thornbush became a subordinate Tudor symbol, as contemporaries latched onto providential imagery and purposefully glanced over potential problems, like the flight to France. Chronicles and poets

---

24 On this story, see Cunningham, *Henry VII*, 41; Penn, *Winter King*, 8.
began their story on the battlefield, where the Welshman was directed by Christ to defeat Richard III, memorializing Henry as “this rose was faire, ffresh to behold, Springing with many a royall lance; A crowned king, with a crowne of gold Ouer England, Ireland, and of Ffraunce.”

While Richard was interred at Greyfriars Church, Henry VII rode triumphanty to St. Paul’s Cathedral, presenting three standards: St. George’s cross, a fiery dragon set against green and white (his livery colors), and a dun cow on a yellow tartan (a nod to Beaufort and Warwick ancestors). As John King has noted, the relentless process of defining the Tudor image thus began before Bosworth, reached new heights in 1485, and continued to 1603. With, as Grafton described, “the Diademe and possession of the state royall and princely preheminence of this famous Empire and renowned kingdome,” Henry was proclaimed king of England and France, Prince of Wales, Lord of Ireland, in pomp and circumstance both necessary and pointed to encompass and inscribe British nationalism and Tudor British imperialism.

By late October 1485, the first Tudor was crowned at Westminster Abbey, a quick turnaround that evinces a palpable need for legitimacy by solemnization. And Henry arranged the coronation some four months before marrying, obliged to ascend alone on his own right if he wanted to retain the post and rule independently. London was sumptuously decorated, befitting a new Renaissance-era pageantry. Behind horses trapped in cloth of gold and the new royal arms

---


27 Grafton’s Chronicle, 158.


29 For “Diademe,” see Grafton’s Chronicle, 157-8; for the proclaimed title, see “Circular letter,” August 1485, printed in J.O. Halliwell, ed., Letters of the Kings of England (London: Colburn, 1848), vol. 1, p. 169 (hereafter, as throughout, all volume and page numbers are given as volume: page). As Sydney Anglo showed, such public spectacles were “instruments of prestige propaganda, and Henry Tudor was prepared to devote to them a portion of his wealth, because he was most diligent in pursuing every means, great and small, whereby his dynasty might sit more securely,” in Anglo, Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), quotation from 106.

30 Anglo, Spectacle, 10.
and a massive armed guard that served as a warning, Henry processed with a golden scepter and St. Edward’s chalice, powerful symbols of medieval English royalty. In response to the Archbishop of Canterbury’s recital, “Henry rightfull and indoubted enheritor by the Lawes of god and man to the Crown [and] royall dignitie of Englande” vowed to uphold the laws and customs of England. The lavish display matched the moment’s significance, taking advantage of a well-documented medieval ritual to bolster an evolving sense of national identity, while temporarily sidelining the show of Welshness present at the royal entry two months earlier.

Parliament amplified the vision, combining practical provisions, like predating of the reign to the day before Bosworth in order to attain Ricardians, reversing Lancastrian attainders, and negating Plantagenet statutes, with seminal statements on the king’s title and right. By appearing when called in November 1485, the legislature effectively acknowledged Henry’s rule. The session opened with a reference-filled soliloquy by Lord Chancellor John Alcock. The sermon explained England’s passage into golden age, presided over by a second Joshua, an invincible king who plucked Britain from an Ovidian cycle of greed, sedition, and violence. In its first statute, parliament vindicated the Tudor accession, declaring that Henry and future heirs of his body were the rightful, godly inheritors of the crowns of England, France, and “all other Seignaries to the King belonging beyond the See, with th’appartenaunces therto in any wise due or pertaineing.” Subsequent statutes defined the monarch’s landed reach and secured its financial future: they annexed Lancaster and Cornwall, resumed all areas held at any time by

31 “Little Device for the coronation of Henry VII,” n.d, BL Egerton MS 985, fol. 4r.
34 “Titulus Regis,” 7 November 1485, RotP 6:270.
Henry VI or Edward IV in England, Ireland, Calais, or the Marches, and granted new subsidies.\textsuperscript{35} Explicitly, then, Henry’s power was as ample as his predecessor’s, and then enlarged with the addition of his Welsh principality. Employing the legal body to assert its authority and nullify alternatives, in terms that were at once territorially-expansive, steeped in medieval vocabulary, and imbued with classical and biblical allusion, Henry created a dynasty.

Grafton averred that the king in parliament had “instantlye called of the English nacion his naturall countrimen,” esteeming it his chief duty to see the realm adorned and beautified with good and profitable laws and to flourish in virtue, good and civil manners, and prudent governance—upon “thys sure foundacion King Henry layde at the beginning of his raygne, entending theron continually to builde.”\textsuperscript{36} By this reckoning, Englishness and consolidation based on that identity and its specific, distinctive legal and political attributes were paramount, the basis of the new regime and its royal authority to be expounded over the course of the reign. Not trivially, for a king brought up speaking Latin, French, and Welsh, his parliamentary statutes were in English, even if the opening orations remained in Latin, conjuring up the classical scenes they related.\textsuperscript{37}

Subsequent parliaments furthered the association between Tudor England and antiquity. In 1494, the Archbishop of Canterbury described how the Roman Empire was harassed by Hannibal and would have been conquered without Scipio and others who put state and patria before personal safety.\textsuperscript{38} Praising Scipio’s acts as in accordance with divine, canon, and civil law, the church fathers, theologians, and miscellaneous histories, the correlation between

\textsuperscript{35} For Lancaster and Cornwall, see “Actus concernens annexatio ducatus Lanc, Cornub, et allis,” November 1485-December 1487 session, RotP 6:270; for the resumption of rights in England, Ireland, Wales, and Calais, see for example, “Item, quedam alia peticio…Hugonem Loterell,” November 1485-December 1487 session, RotP 6:297; for new subsidies, see those for Southampton and Exeter, November 1485-December 1487 session, RotP 6:299.

\textsuperscript{36} Grafton’s Chronicle, 160.

\textsuperscript{37} As appears out of the RotP for November 1485: for the Latin opening, see RotP 6:267; for laws in English, see RotP 6:269.

\textsuperscript{38} Entry entitled “16 January 1497,” RotP 6:509.
Hannibal and Richard, Scipio and Henry not only afforded a classical imperial comparison and legitimized the coup, but also normalized Henry’s national identity and completely ignored his foreign invasion. Such a king could not but be an Englishman, as much as Scipio was a Cives Romani.  

In this vein, the court readied for its next show: the long-promised marriage between Elizabeth of York and Henry or, as Hall described, the union of two noble, illustrious English families. Treading carefully, the court procured a fuller papal dispensation to satiate fears of consanguinity, which was circulated in 1486 with three reissues before 1498. Innocent VIII now sanctioned the match, willing that it end long and grievous conflicts that have blighted England and threatening to excommunicate any challengers. The moment occasioned humanist propaganda: poems by Bernard André and Giovanni de Giglis and a series of pageants coinciding with the couple’s first progress. From Waltham to Worcester, the pair met representations of their “Blood of great Antiquitie.” All six Henries and biblical kings David and Solomon appeared in York, before citizens donning green and white to greet Henry as Christendom’s most powerful prince, already nobler than Charlemagne. In Worcester, Henry VI welcomed his cousin and heir, promising that the merciful Tudor king will merit God’s guidance “both by See and Lande,” in all of his exploits—a comment that expected a future of

---

40 Hall’s chronicle, entitled The union of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre and Yorke, see title-page.
41 Our holyfadre the Pope Innocent the .viij. to the perpetuall memory of this here after (London: 27 March 1486), STC 14096, 1.
42 For André’s poem, De Vita Atque Gestis Henrici Septimi Historia, see its printed edition in James Gairdner, ed., Memorials of King Henry VII (London: Longman, 1858), 38; for Giglis, see his Epithalamium de nuptiis, BL Harl. MS 336.
44 Anglo, Spectacle, 24-5.
extra-national activity. The spectacle concluded with a list of comparisons, to Noah coming from the flood, Caesar from conquest, Jason with the Golden Fleece, and Arthur from Wales. The speaker asserted, “Cadwaladers Blodde lynyally descending, Longe hath bee towlde of such a Prince coming. Wherfor Frendes, if that I shal not lye, This same is the Fulfiller of the Profecye.”

Though the displays were self-serving, each town hoping to secure royal patronage, the scenes deployed medieval and renaissance comparisons to identify the monarchy with the English nation as well as a British imperial past and future. Notably, Bristol was among them, where merchants and artificers lamented their decay and begged for support of the navy and textile industry. Ultimately, the port’s appeal worked, as the Tudor king bought into their promise of crown honor, strength, and success in exchange for maritime and commercial investment.

Early Tudor self-fashioning continued with Elizabeth’s coronation in late-1487, officiated by the archbishop who had crowned Edward IV, Richard III, and Henry VII. Sailing past singers dressed as angels and virgins to signify the providential match, a grand flotilla crowded the river, anchored by the king’s “Barge… garnysshed and apparellede, pasing al other, wherin was ordeynede a great red Dragon spowting Flamys of Fyer into Temmys.”

The moment was promising, an essential consolidating measure that produced a new symbol pregnant with meaning: the two-toned Tudor Rose, created by the York white rose inscribed within the Lancastrian red, topped by a domed crown, “unto whome so being togedre

---

47 Anglo, Spectacle, 33.
48 Anon. eyewitness account, quoted in Anne Lancashire, London Civic Theater: City Drama and Pageantry from Roman Times to 1558 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 143.
all other floures shall lowte [stoop to make obeisance] and evidently yeve suffranti [sovereignty]...” Depicted and explained for the first time here, on the York city gates during the 1486 progress, the union rose quickly gained valence as the favorite characteristic Tudor badge. Imagined as the culmination of two rose trees rising upwards from a recumbent John of Gaunt and Edward of York on the title page of the 1550 edition of Hall’s history, the union rose emphasized the English descent of both Henry and Elizabeth, albeit with the Lancastrian red as the visually-superior partner. Moreover, the rose’s imperial diadem, domed to show the full power of its wearer, and its botanical hegemony (e.g. over the Scottish thistle or French lily) harbored expansionary pretensions, particularly when paired with the Galfridian founder of York, Ebrauke, who recalled how “Of right, I was regent and rewld this region, I subdewid Fraunce, and led in my legence.” Though securing the realm and raising the court’s profile, the full meaning and utility of marriage and flower waited in limbo, for “the vndubitate flower and very heire of both the sayd linages” to succeed, “which after their tyme should peaceably rule and enioye the whole monarchy,” as Hall described. The double rose incarnate and its first true possessor merged not only red and white, but English and Welsh, engendering the dynasty’s British tone.

A male heir, then, was the crucial second act, the dynasty’s most powerful asset. The occasion elucidates a chief legitimizing strategy. Upon news of the impending birth in the fall of 1486, Henry quickly shuttled his wife’s household to Winchester—a Roman town that was designated England’s capital by Anglo-Saxon King Alfred the Great, and, most importantly, the

49 Chronicle of the York Progress, 1486, in Johnston and Rogerson, eds., York, 139.
50 For the rose’s popularity, see Anglo, Spectacle, 36-7.
51 For this image, see Hall, Union, title-page.
52 Chronicle of the York Progress, 1486, in Johnston and Rogerson, eds., York, 140.
53 Hall, Union, quotations from title-page. Hall’s general sentiment here is repeated on 454 and 455.
legendary seat of Camelot.\textsuperscript{54} In the hallowed city, Elizabeth delivered a son, Arthur, on 19 September 1486, commemorated in verse by clergyman Thomas Philipps: “Joyed may we be, Our prince to see, and roses three.”\textsuperscript{55} André mused on the birth, commending authors who had predicted Arthur’s return and celebrating the famed King of Britain reincarnate, arisen from Mount Olympus. One line even described how Apollo would tame the western waters while the young prince rolled his starry orb, all notable imagery that emphasized the prince’s British identity and interest in the ocean to Britain’s west.\textsuperscript{56} De Giglis and Peter Carmeliano echoed André’s refrain, proclaiming that the first king of the world had returned to validate centuries of ancient British tradition and close Richard III’s murderous chapter.\textsuperscript{57} For both the French and Italian humanists, the event was laden with ancient symbolism. In André’s poem, Henry transformed into a Roman imperator crowned with a triumphali lauro like Caesar and Augustus, while his subjects became plebs shouting “Io Paean” to the sound of the tibia, an ancient Greek instrument.\textsuperscript{58} With Winchester awash in celebration following the christening and crown messengers riding through the realm to announce the dynasty’s perpetuation, Tudor antiquarian John Leland pronounced that the news induced “the Rejoysing of every true Englishsheman.”\textsuperscript{59} Albeit a lofty sentiment, the statement illustrates that reverence for the Welsh Tudors now constituted nationalist sentiment. Prince Arthur would soon have company: two sisters and a brother, Henry, all arrived before mid-1496.


\textsuperscript{56} André, “Dum Phoebum plectet ad undas, Dumque vices certas et volvet stellifer orbis,” as reprinted in Gairdner, ed., \textit{Memorials}, 42.

\textsuperscript{57} On De Giglis and Carmeliano’s poems, see Anglo, \textit{Spectacle}, 46-7.

\textsuperscript{58} André, “Verses in honor of his birth,” reprinted in Gairdner, ed., \textit{Memorials}, 41.

\textsuperscript{59} For the christening, see the chronicle of the event in BL Cotton MS, Julius B.XII., fols. 21v-24; for “the Rejoysing …,” see Thomas Hearne, ed., \textit{Joannis Lelandi Rebus Britannicis Collectanea}, 6 vols. (London: White, 1774), 4:204.
The crown feted Arthur with a pageant in Coventry in 1498, two years after he became Prince of Wales. There, he was greeted by a personified Fortune, who urged the prince to follow her and by extension, the great emperors who had succeeded by doing the same, like Caesar. Beside a tableau of St. George slaying the dragon (the chief motif of the patron saint’s hagiography and a staple of Coventry’s rich pageantry tradition), King Arthur appeared to counsel his “noble progeny”: the actor exclaimed, “favoreth your linage And all outward Enmyes laboreth to subdue, To make them to do to yewe as to me dyd homage.”60 The implication of the Coventry verses was clear, particularly powerful set against the cult of St. George, which served to validate Henry VII’s Englishness.61 The Tudors had fulfilled Merlin’s prophecy; the Britons had vanquished the Saxons, the red dragon ascendant and ready to conquer, at least in theory.62 It was left to the court to keep it that way, and to show the prince precisely what his imperial birthright entailed.

***

Complementing this public imagery and parliamentary policy, and in providing a basis for both after 1485, Henry VII carefully cultivated the first Tudor court as the manifestation of his rule. With his mother at the helm, the dynasty created a magnetic cultural epicenter, the mental world of early sixteenth-century Britain. Expending considerable money and effort, the court aimed to impress subjects with the king’s power and majesty and the ruling houses of Europe with the dynasty’s permanence and diplomatic weight—national and international support absolutely essential to the regime’s continuance.63 It also aimed to provide essential

61 For an example of the cult in art, see the crown commissioned family portrait, Henry VII and his Family with St. George and the Dragon (1503-1509), in the modern Royal Collection.
62 As Ayala wrote to the Spanish crown on 26 March 1499, “the people of England believe in prophecies. In Wales there are many who tell fortunes,” CSPS 1/139.
counsel to the current ruler and raise its most important assets, the heirs. The immediate object was precisely what the resident Milanese ambassador declared achieved in 1497: he wrote from London, “I could fancy myself at Rome.”

Crown efforts were aided by a variety of circumstances, some of their own making, others not. As David R. Carlson showed, by the late fifteenth century, “a very large and disproportionately influential English population had come to be convinced of the value of humanist training.” The apparently sizable, stable demand for Renaissance labors and perceptions of a now-calm and wealthy England collided with an over-production of scholars in Italy and political turmoil there following the 1494 French invasion. Together, these factors enticed significant numbers of foreigners to seek fame and fortune north after 1485.

The explanation for the Tudor humanist proclivity is threefold: first, the studia humanitatis was based on a reverence of the past and historical genealogy; second, it positioned England at the cusp of European intellectual culture; and third, it was thought to breed good kingship, for even the most inexperienced administrators could learn by ancient example. Thus, renaissance humanism and the Tudor house were a match made in dynastic heaven: scholars needed a ready, wealthy patron, just as the crown needed legitimacy, prestige, lessons for practical governance, and training for its next generation. The fruits of humanist learning, then, engendered early Tudor pageantry, political philosophy, and activity.

---

The tenor of the first Tudor court was largely determined by the king’s mother, Margaret Beaufort, England’s chief scholarly patron at the end of the fifteenth century. An shrewd political mind, Beaufort had remained in Britain throughout the wars, trying to ignite Lancastrian conspiracy. Rendered infertile by the birth of her only child at fourteen, contemporaries and modern historians alike have stressed the unusually close bond between mother and son as well as her enormous sway. Their relationship received physical expression in Henry’s use of the Beaufort badge, the portcullis, an iron gate that symbolized strength and security and aptly mirrored the monarchy’s prime concerns. Like the rose, the portcullis remained an essential icon through 1603, a fitting monument to Beaufort’s significance.

Uncommonly well-educated for her sex, Beaufort was a lifelong scholar in her own right, whose unfulfilled desire to study the ostensibly manly, esoteric Greek and Latin made the humanism appealing to her. Gifted considerable property and £1000 per annum to govern and supervise the heirs in 1486, “Margaret R” (as she signed her name, invoking a queen-like status) had the background, funds, and interest to attract a scholarly following. With an eye to avant-garde trends, utility, and feasibility, the court played host to a veritable laundry list of poet-orators, professional pedagogues, printer-chroniclers, and artists, many of them trained at Padua, Rome, and/or Oxbridge, all of them of documentable humanist leanings: André, Carmeliano, de Giglis, John Skelton, John Holt, John Rede, William Hone, and Giles Duwes. Ultimately, what

67 Penn, Winter King, 4.
68 For a contemporary note of the close relationship and its influence, see Ayala to Spanish crown, 25 July 1498, CSPS 1/210; in historiography, see Chrimes, Henry VII, especially 57, 109, and 240; Cunningham, Henry VII, especially 21-174; and Penn, Winter King, especially 100 and throughout 94-104.
70 On Margaret’s scholarly proclivities, see Jones and Underdown, The King’s Mother, 74; Linda Simon, Of Virtue Rare: Margaret Beaufort, matriarch of the House of Tudor (NY: Houghton Mifflin, 1982), 3-4.
71 On the signature, see Penn, Winter King, 97.
Henry and Beaufort created—a distinctive, unprecedented didactic establishment within the English household—served as the English template through the century and encouraged native British humanism, in figures like Thomas More, John Colet, John Leland, and Thomas Smith. Despite its varieties, the attachment to history (classical, ancient, and medieval), moral philosophy, rhetoric, oratory, and advice manuals is apparent in northern renaissance humanism under Henry VII.\(^73\)

Beginning in 1491, a carefully constructed intellectual milieu flourished at the Tudor court; the establishment suited Beaufort’s interests and the real needs of her embryotic dynasty. It was altogether telling that André’s poetic celebration of Arthur’s birth earned him the first Tudor tutorship. Just as his verses were laden with classical reference, André’s curriculum was peppered with antiquity’s staples: Homer, Virgil, Terence, Thucydides, Livy, Tacitus, Sallust and others,\(^74\) much like John Skelton’s for Prince Henry, Juan Luis Vives’s for Mary I, John Cheke’s for Edward VI, and Roger Ascham’s for Elizabeth I.\(^75\) And these credentials and sources explain why each was selected, by Beaufort, to acquaint “the honor of Eglond…. with the Musys nyne.”\(^76\) Tellingly, of the 2000 items catalogued in the future Henry VIII’s library, close to a quarter were histories, while another quarter were political philosophies. Illustrating the porous


\(^74\) André described his curriculum in the *Vita Henrici Septimi*, printed in Gairdner, ed., *Historia regis Henrici Septimi a Bernardo Andrea Tholosate conscripta* (London: Longmans, 1858), 43.


divide between medieval and renaissance thought, Carley’s inventory witnesses the placement of classical canon side-by-side with Anglo-Saxon and Brut chronicles. In fact, Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia and Thomas Malory’s Morte d’Arthur only became more popular at the dawn of the new century with the rise of the printing press and English vernacular, far outpacing Machiavelli or Melanchthon. The pairing made sense. For example, the renaissance rediscovery of Suetonius’s History of the twelve caesars reinforced continued usage of Jehan de Wavrin’s Anciennes and nouvelles chroniques d’Angleterre, both equally instructive for pupils studying statecraft and both, significantly, about empire. This merger of histories conditioned pageantry and rhetorical imagery. To use a Skeltonian coupling: early Tudor humanism, as practiced around Henry VII and Beaufort and to the princes, was as much about elevating Richard the Lionheart as Alexander the Great.

As Beaufort hired tutors and expanded Oxford and Cambridge, she also became a most important patron of printers William Caxton and his successor, Wynkyn de Worde. Both published and translated at her behest, thereby expanding the reach and function of the press and English language at the turn of the century. Most famous for his editions of Trojan history, English chronicle, and Arthurian romance, Caxton underscored the essential role played by his

---

79 For Suetonius, see Carley, Libraries of Henry VIII, 217; for Wavrin, see Carley, Libraries of Henry VIII, 8.
81 For Beaufort’s scholarly contributions, see Patrick Collinson, Richard Rex, and Graham Stanton, Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Professors of Divinity at Cambridge, 1502-1649 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
singular patron “to reduce and translate in our maternal and englyshe tongue [such] hystoryes of noble fayttes and valyaunt actes of armes and warre which have ben achyeved in olde tyme of many noble prynces…” 82 Caxton also praised other humanists on Tudor retainer like Skelton, admiring his translation of Virgil’s *Aeneid* (dedicated to Arthur) as part of the transformation of the vernacular from a “rude and old language but in polished and ornate terms.” 83 By patronizing the English language, at court and in parliament, the royal family demonstrated their Englishness while disseminating and hardening this essential characteristic of the British nation. Though in Latin, Vergil’s *Anglica Historia* (begun c. 1505, first version completed 1512-3) was part of the same trend and demonstrates Henry VII’s involvement in his own court culture. 84 The king’s apparent weakness for cultivated Italians led him to choose Vergil to pen the prequel to the official biography he had commissioned from André. A Suetonius devotee who relied on Livy, Pliny, and Tacitus with Bede, Ranulf Higden, and the *Brut* chronicle, Vergil carried British history from Brutus to Bosworth with an emphasis on the Cadwallader roots of the Tudor clan. 85

Together, this scholarly circle described an ancient empire founded by a Trojan practiced in Roman *imperium, dominium*, and *colonia* and perpetuated by Arthur, Edward I, Henry II, Edward III, and Henry V. 86 The group defined the geographical parameters of a Tudor British Empire, which reached from Scotland, Ireland, into France and into the fuzzy western distance. This literature provided an imperial scheme, not only via its content, but its form, function, and style, offering genres like the chronicle, dialogue, and *speculum principis* and circulating plot

---

84 For Vergil’s *Anglica Historia*, which was first printed in full in 1555, see the authoritative translation: Denys Hay, ed., *Anglica Historia*.
85 As Vergil explained in the dedication of his tract *De Inventoribus Rerum* (1512) to his nephew. For the text, see Thomas Langley and William Hammond, eds., *Polydori Virgili De rerum inventoribus* (NY: Agathynian Club, 1868).
86 The exception is Vergil, who questioned Arthurian legend. Still, he kept the remainder of the history intact and his skepticism backfired, encouraging John Leland’s steadfast assertion of Arthur’s veracity, see Carley, “Polydore Vergil and John Leland on King Arthur: The Battle of the Books,” *Interpretations* 15, no. 2 (Spring, 1984): 86-100.
devices like the doctor-patient metaphor, body politic, and the dream that became essential to British imperial ideology. However, the impact of this thought was blunted under Henry VII: the first Tudor was too preoccupied with the security of his crown to pay much heed, while his unlikely, meteoric rise meant that his outlook was largely well-established by the time he experienced any sustained contact with humanist theory, leaving little opportunity for redirection. As historian William Penn suggested, “although Henry VII had a healthy respect for the latest classical scholarship, recognizing the prestige it brought him and his family, he remained a distant admirer.”

This is not to say that this intellectual culture did not impact early Tudor policy. Indeed, the family’s patronage of the new learning and the ensuing esteem of his court demonstrated the vitality and strength of his monarchy, provoking the Italian, Spanish, French, and Scottish crowns to seek alliances with the dynasty. Expressly comparing London to Rome, a Milanese observer explained, “this kingdom is perfectly stable, by reason first of the king’s wisdom, whereof everyone stands in awe, and secondly on account of the king’s wealth.” Another Italian furthered this vision of a strong, important British king, comparing Henry VII to William the Conqueror, both universally feared by subjects and outsiders. The legitimacy lent by history and northern humanism bolstered the prestige of the new house and led the king to seek territorial expansion alongside interrelated efforts at consolidation and European diplomacy.

***

In 1498-9, the Milanese and Spanish ambassadors to England sought to introduce the Duke of Milan and Ferdinand and Isabella to the first Tudor king by proxy. Soncino explained that, “in his Highness’s opinion he has need of no one, while everyone needs him… [He

---

87 Penn, *Winter King*, 182.
88 Soncino to Duke, 8 September 1497, *CSPM* 1/540.
governs] like one at the top of a tower, looking on at what is passing in the plain.”

Ayala added that Henry handled every painstaking detail of his government, even tracking his accounts by hand.

Soncino’s and Ayala’s correspondence reveal Henry VII’s prevailing, paramount concern for security. Henry hoarded money, manpower, and power, limiting access and trusting few. At core, a childhood on the lam and inauspicious rise deeply influenced his person and policy. Early Tudor fears and suspicions were measured, as pretender threats and cyclical enmity with France and Scotland showed. However, as his first assertions of authority demonstrate, he toed a two-part monarchical line: national consolidation reinforced by a deeply intertwined process of expansion abroad. The dual policy was often unevenly applied; the former took precedence.

However, his experience, exigent circumstances, and carefully-constructed court culture induced him to dabble beyond England and Wales, domestic stability deeply tied to other Atlantic pursuits. As he did, Henry’s kingship isolated the defining features of Tudor British rule (wherever it existed), staked a claim to its historic empire in the early modern era, and increased nationalist sentiment.

Thus, the emergence of early Tudor imperialism was less about the king’s coronation claims, reading of history, or mercantile/political attraction (though all three patterned the particular crown response) and more about his shaky right. It was exigency, then, that made Ireland the first site of extranational activity after Bosworth. Though “sporadic” and marked by an uneven mix of conciliation, English involvement, and Anglicization, Henry VII’s intervention

---

90 Soncino to Duke, 29 January 1499, CSPM 1/364.
92 On this distrust, see Gunn, “Courtiers,” especially 26, 36-8.
inaugurated a century-long Tudor British imperial project in Ireland.\textsuperscript{93} Necessary rather than straightforwardly expansionary and more often implicitly than explicitly imperial, nonetheless, here were significant moments of experimentation that blurred the line between nation and empire.

Part and parcel of the rising tide of xenophobia and history stoked by Henry’s court was a rediscovery and resurgence of British rights over its island neighbor. Tellingly, as part of its effort to vindicate England’s nation-status, the representatives at the Council of Constance in 1414-18 had charged that “Great Britain—the kingdom of the Sea” encompassed Scotland, Wales, and Ireland.\textsuperscript{94} The speech implicated the Roman curia as the source of British superiority, a reference to the 1155 bull \textit{Laudabiliter}, which humanists plucked from the pages of Gerald of Wales’s chronicle and transformed into a standard Tudor source. Adrian IV’s \textit{Laudabiliter} authorized the twelfth-century Norman invasion of Ireland on spiritual and moral grounds, tantamount to a crusade, sanctioning Henry II’s bloody expedition against barbarous, “rude and unlettered [native] people, and to root out the weeds of vice from the field of the Lord.”\textsuperscript{95} As thanks, Adrian donated Ireland, permitting the king to take possession and requiring all Irishmen to accepted him as their liege lord and sovereign. The gift was nearly absolute, requiring only Catholic faith and tithes.\textsuperscript{96} Following the invasion, in 1172, Pope Alexander III indefinitely ratified the grant, clearing the way for Henry II’s soldiers to remain and settle, eventually

---

\textsuperscript{94} English representative’s speech, “Anglica nationis…,” BL Harl. MS 5, fol. 86.
becoming the Anglo-Irish or Old Irish community. Yet with the brief exception of Edward III in the mid-fourteenth century, intervention had been minimal since 1199 owing to plague and war. Critically, however, a cohort of Yorkists had made Ireland their home during Henry VI’s resurgence in 1470.

In 1485-1509, there was no problem that English right rested fully on the Roman Catholic Church; Tudor historians duly represented Ireland as a lordship of the English king, redoubled by Geoffrey of Monmouth, who described how Brutus, Belinus, Brennus, and Arthur had all conquered Ireland. As Edmund Campion recapitulated from the medieval Brut in 1571, “Thus had the Brittaines an elder right to the Realme of Ireland.”

Henry VII had also almost certainly read William Worceste’s Itinerary (c. 1480-5), a seminal relation of the Isles that evinced a late-fifteenth-century impulse for discovery at home concomitant with the urge evident in other British subjects to explore abroad, particularly in a westerly direction. The most recent, most important appraisal of Ireland at the Tudor ascent, Worceste described an island quite like the one conquered by the ancient Tudor ancestor Gombatruz, who had supposedly sailed through to a wild and empty place at some unspecified date. Writing after his 1477-8 journey, Worceste surmised that despite angry vengeful natives as Gerald of Wales described, the island was replete with compensatory good soil and fruitful crops not present elsewhere in the archipelago. The intelligence fit the well-known ninth-century “Prince Alfred’s Itinerary,” also in the courtly corpus, which described “flourishing pastures,

98 For the nature of Yorkist rule in Ireland, see the contemporary note in “Miscellaneous,” n.d., Lambeth Palace Library, Carew MS 608, fols. 53-66 (hereafter Carew MS series number, folio).
99 Campion, “Book on the State of Ireland,” The National Archives (TNA), Public Record Office (PRO), State Papers (SP), document reference number 63/31/32. All subsequent citations from TNA: PRO will follow this standard format of department code (e.g. SP) and document reference number. If a document contains any internal numbering, the internal reference (i.e. the folio number) is provided following the full document reference number.
valor, health, long-living worthies, commerce, wealth.”

The information garnered from Worcestre and Alfred, the strength of his claim there, and the potential of lurking loyalists encouraged a decisive break from recent history. Henry VII’s intervention provided the first model in the theory and practice of Tudor rule in Ireland.

When Henry doled out thanks after his coronation, most of his supporters received plush posts in England and Wales. The greatest preferment went to his uncle and Bosworth general Jasper Tudor, who was created lieutenant of Ireland in October 1486. It was a telling choice, indicative of how accurately the king judged the Irish situation, especially based on whom Jasper replaced: Richard Plantagenet, 3rd Duke of York and father to Richard III, appointed in 1447. Richard had earned enduring popularity there, promoting the aspirations of the Home Rule lords to govern with minimal English interference. At the Irish parliament, the Plantagenet rulership had seen to it that native magnate earl of Kildare received a virtual kingship, as the Drogheda legislature declared conspiracy or rebellion against him to be high treason and asserted the island’s political independence. The result was to wed the fate of Lieutenant Plantagenet to that of the Home Rule lords, and make Ireland a hotbed of Yorkist sedition in the half-century that followed.

---


Almost immediately upon Henry VII’s accession, rumors of Irish resistance dominated council deliberations, as the earl of Oxford expressed his surety that dynastic “rebellys and enemyes be in Irlande.”\(^{104}\) Jasper’s appointment only heightened tensions. When, in 1486, a young boy named Lambert Simnel appeared, announced as one of the princes in the Tower, the Home Rule lords in Ireland were more than receptive, eager for an opportunity to get out from under Tudor rule. With support from Margaret of York, it was only a matter of time, the court feared, before England would be invaded. On 24 May 1587, Kildare oversaw Simnel’s coronation as Edward VI and carried in spectacular fashion through Dublin. Soon, under their new king’s auspices, the Irish lords called parliament, struck coins with the royal image, and issued proclamations in his name.\(^{105}\) Quickly, Henry wrote sternly to the earl of Ormond, in what was the first expression of Tudor pretensions in Ireland—indeed the first at all since Edward III—that despite tidings of rebellion, the island remained “our land of Ireland.”\(^{106}\) The Irish earls had, as parliament later declared, “plotted and conspired the destruction and deposition of our said sovereign liege lord.”\(^{107}\) In response, the king readied his forces, which met a jumble of Englishmen, 1500 European mercenaries, and 4000 Irish kerne at Nottingham’s Stoke Field on 16 June 1587. Dubbed the last battle of the Wars of the Roses by modern historians, parliament emphasized that “contrarye to kind and naturall remembraunce, faith, toruth, and allegeaunce…false Englisshemen” and other traitors had sailed from “the parties beyond the see” for the

destruction of their sovereign liege-lord. The language and rhetoric was significant, emphasizing that the threat came from overseas, that it was unnatural, and that Henry was their rightful feudal overlord. Well-prepared, Tudor forces captured yet spared Simnel, reporting that he was merely an Oxford artisan’s son. The king ultimately restored Kildare in late 1495, cognizant of the crippling effect of Simnel’s defeat on the native lords. Indeed, when the pretender threat reappeared in the 1490s and sought to animate “our land of Ireland, in the wild Irisherie” (as Henry explained), the imposter received a cool reception there; his peril was realized instead by another perpetual foe: Scotland. Both conspiracies demonstrated that securing the crown in England was an archipelagic affair.

Vergil seized upon the episode as a pedagogical tool, highlighting the ease with which Irishmen turned against their king: the native earls were among the “most devoted follower[s] of King Edward’s family and, led astray by this sentiment,” they would continue to blight England until the crown uprooted “those seeds of the new faction which the year before had been sown among the barbarians there by Peter Warbeck.” The image stuck: a century later, observers recognized Simnel’s ascendancy as a seminal moment, drawing on the Anglica Historia’s vocabulary and commentary, adding flourishes and gravitas to cement this likely worst-case, a natural consequence of Irish barbarity. In his Chronicles (1577), Raphael Holinshed relayed the entire episode, when a “great multitude of beggerlie Irishmen, almost all naked and vnarmed,”

---

108 “Act of attainder,” November 1487, RotP 6:397. For Stoke as the last of the wars of the Roses, see Chrimes, Henry VII, 73.
109 Herald’s report of the battle of Stoke, BL Cotton MS, Julius B.XII, fols. 27v-29v, on fol. 29r.
110 “For the earl of Kildare, 18. Item, a petition presented,” 14 October-1 December 1495, RotP 6:481.
111 Henry to George Talbot, 12 September 1497, printed in Pollard, ed., Contemporary Sources, 1/113, p. 162-3.
112 Hay, ed., Vergil’s Anglica Historia, 75.
crowned Simnel with Tudor “titles imperial.” Henry VII thus offered an abject lesson in good Tudor imperial kingship for Vergil and Holinshed’s royal audiences: Henry VIII and Elizabeth I.

After ordering the execution of the insurgents, the king commissioned Richard Edgecombe, privy councilor, comptroller of the household, and the lord who had captured Simnel at Stoke, to reassert formal British authority over Ireland in 1488. Henry instructed Edgecombe to entreat “for the sound rule of peace, armed with pardons for those who would submit, and to administer oaths of fealty and allegiance, and to imprison rebels and traitors.”

Already, then, Henry VII’s policy marked a rupture from Plantagenet home rule: more interventionist, less conciliatory, and more English, requiring submission to the superior British crown via an English-born Tudor intermediary. The oathing was particularly important, an essential tactic of Tudor imperialism first laid here. The specific vow was set out by the crown, in English: “I become faithful and true ligeman unto kyng Henry the vijth kyng of England and of Fraunce and lord of Irland… as my soveraigne liege lord to lyve and dye agenst all maner creatours so god help me and his seyntes,” or forfeit all title and property. Though Edgecombe had secured some forty capitulations, rumors of James III’s murder on 11 June 1488 frightened Henry; he pulled his principal soldier home and reinstated Kildare.

Six years later, the king again gravitated towards a heavier hand under threat of a new pretender gathering overseas. His appointment was measured and prudent, and it established the

---

115 Edgecombe patent, 1488, Cal Patent Rolls, Henry VII, 1:225. An unknown author described the effort in a subsequent narrative of Edgecombe’s tenure, which is also undated, see BL Cotton MS, Titus B.XI., fols. 332-377.
116 James died in the civil uprising engineered by his disgruntled nobility at the Battle of Sauchieburn. Spies for the Tudor court and later chroniclers, among them Mary Stewart’s most ardent advocate, Scotsman and Catholic Bishop of Ross John Leslie, and her former tutor turned Protestant and foe, George Buchanan, propagated the tale that James was actually assassinated after the battle, at Milltown, by a group that sought to put James IV on the throne. Modern scholarship remains divided. For a recent study of James III’s reign and death, see Norman MacDougall, James III (St. Andrews: St. Andrews University Press, 2009).
reputation of its beneficiary, Sir Edward Poyning, as arguably the most important figure in early Tudor empire-building. A member of the victorious Bosworth army, Henry had made Poyning royal deputy of Calais in 1493, where he worked to stymie Yorkists and expand the area of English influence, the Pale. In the fall of 1494, the king promoted him to Irish deputy, under the nominal auspices of its lieutenant, the young Prince Henry who remained at home. In the *Annals of Ulster*, contemporaries described Poyning as the “Saxon knight… over the Foreigners of Ireland” or “the Saxon justiciary.”

Predicated on Statutes of Kilkenny (1367) as well as quite recent efforts to enforce common law as a means to better administration at home, Poyning consolidated and expanded English command, defined Englishness against Irishness, and reimagined the metropole-periphery relationship. As Historian S.B. Chrimes assessed, “by the time Poyning left Ireland fifteen months later in December 1495, the course of Anglo-Irish history had been changed.”

The experience served him well for future service in the Tudor imperial cause.

In the mid-fourteenth century, Edward III had advanced a set of articles that clearly defined and thereby sought to justify English superiority over their Irish neighbors. Passed at Kilkenny in an effort to curb Anglo-Irish lapse into native barbarity and Gaelic resurgence, the statutes served as powerful tool for sixteenth-century Ireland, beginning with Poyning—indeed, they made Edward III and Henry II the only medieval English kings deemed suitable by Tudor theorists as western imperial archetypes. Useful not only for their proto-nationalist statements on English superiority, the laws illustrated the legality and potential efficacy of (Irish)

118 For this recent effort in England, see “An act for justices of the peace to execu…,” 13 January 1489- 27 February 1490 session, in RotP 6:437.
parliamentary legislation to rule the island. For Tudor policymakers, Kilkenny justified British intervention and spurred the development of a British identity part and parcel with overseas rule.

In their preamble, the statues described the fall precipitated by lax overlordship following the Norman conquest, lamenting how so many English were overwhelmed by Irish wilderness to forsake their language, law, and customs in favor of enemy barbarity. To rectify this troubling phenomenon, they prohibited any alliance, marriage, or fornication between Anglo- and Gaelic Irish and mandated that every Anglo-Irishman return to his native ways on severe penalty.  

But with no English force to back up the measures, the laws fell into disuse; as Alfred’s Itinerary described, the Pale became the only “bulwark and security” of English Ireland. Kilkenny served as major inspiration for the new deputy; the first Englishman to hold the post, Poynings made the position what it was under the Tudors: an English architect and executor of British imperial policy in Ireland.

In tandem with 400 troops and two other new appointees, both experts in common law—Henry Deane (chancellor) and Hugh Conway (treasurer)—Poynings received command to reform and reduce the island to obedience, with carte blanche executive authority from Henry. Upon landing, Poynings marched into Ulster, capturing Kildare, quelling support for the new pretender, and accepting surrenders from local lords. Looking to Kilkenny, the deputy summoned parliament at Drogheda on 1 December 1494. Resting on an appeal to the prosperity wrought by monarchical rule, good counsel, and English legal superiority, “Poynings’ Law” put the Irish legislature firmly under crown control: first, by mandating that parliament sit only at royal will; and second, by declaring that “all laws made in England before that time should be

\[121\] The “Statutes of Kilkenny” survive in several undated manuscript copies. I have consulted Carew MS 603, fols. 165-172, and Carew MS 608, fols. 1-8. For a modern text and translation, see H.F. Berry, ed., Statutes and Ordinances, and Acts of the Parliament of Ireland (Dublin: Stationery Office, 1907), 430-69.

\[122\] “Alfred’s Itinerary,” in Hoagland, ed., Irish Poetry, 57.

current in Ireland, and that no laws should be made in Ireland till that Act or Acts were first
certified into England, and then returned under the Great Seal into Ireland.”¹²⁴ In conjunction,
parliament reaffirmed the Kilkenny Statutes, proscribing Gaelic practices in favor of English
ones, while also solidifying the king’s superiority by labeling all sedition high treason, limiting
all Irish appointments to terms not exceeding the king’s pleasure, reserving custody of chief
castles to native Englishmen alone, and instituting fresh subsidies, nearly doubling Irish revenues
for 1495.¹²⁵ This last element was essential: with it, Poynings originated the ever-illusory Tudor
quest for a self-financing subject realm.

Vergil described the watershed moment, commenting that the deputy had established a
dichotomy between two times of Irishmen: one who is tame, civilized, and can easily acquire
English manners and honor the English king with due obedience; the “other type of islander is
savage, rude and uncouth. From their indifference to all refinement and their primitive habits
they are known as ‘wild men of the woods.’”¹²⁶ Yet neither the king nor his faithful deputy had
gone far enough, Vergil lamented, the plague of sedition suppressed but not eradicated.¹²⁷

Born of Henry’s need for security and legitimacy, Poynings brought Ireland squarely into
the Tudor orbit, clarified its place as an unequal entity (legally and culturally), and established a
century-long overriding concern to civilize and rule there. His appointment and governance, at
the close of the fifteenth century, evoke the prevailing perspective at the end of the sixteenth,

¹²⁴ “Notes and Abstracts of Records,” n.d., Carew MS 617, fol. 48. For a modern edition, see Philomena Connolly,
Archives of Ireland, 2002), 10 Henry VII, caps. 9 and 39, which are both referred to as “Poynings’ Law.” On the
law, see D.B. Quinn, “The Early Interpretation of Poynings Law, 1494-1534,” Irish Historical Studies 2, no. 7
no. 8 (1941): 415-24; Brendan Bradshaw, The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century (Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press, 1979), especially 146-54; Steven G. Ellis, Reform and Revival: English Government in
Ireland, 1470-1534 (NY: St. Martin’s Press, 1986); and James Kelly, Poynings Law and the Making of Law in
Ireland, 1660-1800 (Dublin: Four Courts, 2007), 1-14.
¹²⁵ For these later statutes and Poynings’s success, see Steven G. Ellis, “Henry VII and Ireland, 1491-1496,” in
¹²⁶ Hay, ed., Vergil’s Anglica Historia, 79.
¹²⁷ Hay, ed., Vergil’s Anglica Historia, 79.
demonstrating an unrecognized continuity. Henry had initiated a new phase. Pre-Tudor, English lordship had been nominal; even the great bastion of civility around Dublin did not exist as “the Pale” in English vocabulary. The word’s first usage came in 1494 to describe Calais under Poynings, at which point he seems to have introduced it into the English lexicon for Ireland, in a Drogheda statute calling for “ditches to be made about the English Pale.”  

The applicability of the term to the Irish context, as well as its survival into modern usage to distinguish people and behaviors beyond what is normal, customary, or civil, serve as further examples of a shift and subsequent continuity across time and space that Poynings epitomizes.

***

When he set out to traverse the Isles and map them in prose as he did for Ireland, Worcestre was part of a broader project, and he saw himself that way. An early example of a new, late medieval/early modern humanist impulse for discovery, history, and ethnography, the scholar highlighted regions worthy of national interest and entailed to the crown, drawing on his own adventures and those of his countrymen. Encouraged by the Wars of the Roses and amplified by the succession of an obscure Welshman, the scope of British activity did not end at the Atlantic, and neither did Worcestre.

Among remembrances of Brutus and Arthur, Worcestre explained that “the British realm rises from North Africa and runs towards the west covering 800 miles in longitude by 200 in latitude.” As proof, he recorded the first transatlantic British voyage c. 1420-2, when a fisherman of English birth became the first to discover Iceland, by sheer accident. Then, in 1480,
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128 The statute and its original language are noted in the correspondence of Irish Lord Deputy William Skeffington to Henry VIII, 16 October 1535, Carew MS 607, fol. 9.
129 Harvey, ed., Worcestre’s Itineraries, 65. Kirsten Seaver combined archeology and archives to study the medieval Norse colony on Greenland, began c. 985 but gone by 1500. She unearthed an illicit trade between Greenland, Iceland, and Bristol that flourished in the fifteenth century, arguing that this contact lent important navigational information and made Bristol the natural point of departure for early American adventure, while it also caused the colony to peter out when their expertise was no longer necessary, see Seaver, The Frozen Echo.
fellow Bristolmen John Jay and John Lloyd travelled “to the western part of the island of Ireland as far as Brasylle.” Though forced home by storms before making landfall, the voyage’s clearly-stated destination, the description of Brazil as sixty days sailing from Ireland, and the men’s hometown all suggest that this might have been an unsuccessful venture to some Atlantic landmass. One year later, two ships owned by Bristol customs collector Thomas Croft, beneficiary of a three-year license to trade to any parts west from Edward IV, left “to serche & fynde a certain Isle called the Isle of Brasile.” Though there is no record that they reached their destination, one ship did return with forty bushels of salt, identifying its fishing intent.

Worcestre organized his entries chronologically by geography, but also thematically, finding resonances between these Atlantic tidbits and other trades and conquests in the Isles, Europe, and the Middle East. The Itineraries thereby transformed what might easily have been dismissed as insignificant failures into power memories for his audience. He also capitalized on a nascent maritime nationalism, evident as early as 1436 when an unknown poet penned the “Libel of Englyshe Polycye.” The verses cited the English, by virtue of their island geography and

---


132 This record appears in three places in the customs and memoranda rolls of Edward IV, each of which were printed in Carus-Wilson, ed., Overseas trade, 157-165, quotation from 157-158.

archipelagic hegemony, as God’s “keepers of the admiraltie and see enviroun.” By pairing actual voyages with the Libel’s sentiment, Worcestre further fueled the nationalist naval narrative in a critical embryonic period, when Henry ascended and began to patronize Bristol. As a 1495 Italian report explained, “the Islanders” (as he called the English) naturally “apply themselves to trade, or to fishing, or else they practise navigation.”

Worcestre’s Itineraries were in good company at court. Beside reverence for classical history, modes of governance, and methods of expansion, the humanist rediscovery also entailed antiquity’s science. Ptolemaic maps were recovered, copied, and circulated in manuscript from 1477, integrated with Platonic and Aristotelian cosmographies and medieval charts, like Pierre d’Ailly’s Imago Mundi (1410), Andrea Bianco’s world map (1436), and TO formulations, while the three-masted ship facilitated their use. About the same time, Marco Polo’s travel narratives reached England, enticing readers with spices, timber, and “immense quantities of gold” waiting in “pagan lands so rich that no one can tell their wealth,” and circulated widely alongside John Mandeville’s equally glowing Voyages (c. 1357). At court, Beaufort ensured that little new material went unnoticed or unappreciated. After all, according to Geoffrey of Monmouth, dynastic favorite Arthur had subdued Iceland, Greenland, and the New World. It was a moment of ferment that John Cabot – the first Tudor Atlantic adventurer – seized upon, smartly pitching his Newfoundland enterprise as a voyage to “Cipango,” after Polo who described “Chipangu, an
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136 On d’Ailly, Bianco, the TO map, and published versions of these cartographies, see James Robert Enterline, Erikson, Eskimos and Columbus: Medieval European knowledge of America (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 170-6 and Nicolás Wey Gómez, The tropics of empire: why Columbus sailed South to the Indies (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008), chapter 1.
island in the high seas, of idolators who know no lordship.” Renaissance culture, the dynasty’s rising status, and European competition soon forged a language of possession and overseas rule, as well as a corpus of precedent, which survived the sixteenth century quite intact.

Henry VII’s engagement in America actually began in the halls of parliament and the pages of late-1480s diplomatic correspondence, as Stoke occasioned new royal posture and policy. With safety seemingly assured, the November 1487 session looked past defense and towards strength and consolidation. Marked by a desire to regularize and regulate trade, new statute law restricted unlicensed merchants, limited commercial petitions by foreigners, and prohibited raw textile exports. In tandem with a royal proclamation on French rates of exchange made just two months earlier, parliament also passed a landmark act protecting subjects in France, as Henry declared the “conservacion and suertie of his towne and castell of Caleys, marches therof,” and its staple a crown priority. The first instance of Tudor attention to Calais and a harbinger of things to come, the regime’s second legislative season reflected a post-Simnel stability and legitimacy that radiated past Westminster, as Henry and Beaufort intended. Predicated on favorable ambassadorial intelligence, the court’s status was confirmed in 1488 when marriage negotiations between England and Spain began. Finalized in the Treaty of Medina del Campo (1489), Prince Arthur was betrothed to Princess Katherine, youngest daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella. The treaty was the highest form of praise and validation
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138 For Cabot’s venture as a trip to “Cipango,” see Soncino to Duke, 18 December 1497, CSPM 1/552; for Polo’s description of “Chipangu…,” see Ross and Power, eds., Broadway Travellers, 270.
139 9 November-18 December 1487 session, RotP 6:385-408, see especially “An Act for the staple of Calais,” (RotP 6:394-5); “An act that no foreigner or denizen shall carry any woolen cloths out of this realm,” (RotP 6:403); and “An act against merchants carrying goods from one port to another,” (RotP 6:403).
141 “Bill concerning the safe and secure custody of the town and castle of Calais and the continuation of the staple there,” 1487 session, RotP 6:396.
142 The best treatment of the future queen remains Garrett Mattingly, Catherine of Aragon (London: Cape, 1942), for the treaty see 14-30, especially 23.
for the new house, now united to Europe’s premier dynasty, and consistent with Henry’s belief in
the power of a wedding. But it was also much more. Part and parcel of the alliance and
concomitant Irish policy, Henry VII introduced the imperial crown into British iconography,
revived the Plantagenet dual monarchy over France, and took the first steps towards New World
enterprise.

On the very day that Ferdinand and Isabella ratified the treaty, 28 March, Henry VII
commissioned a new coinage, which he named the “sovereign.” The pieces were
unprecedented, bearing his image, arms (English and French), and an imperial crown over the
monarch’s head, distinctive for its enclosed shape symbolizing the complete, total nature of royal
sovereignty. Closely resembling the enriques of Isabella’s predecessor and the real d’or of
Maximilian I, the coins and their diplomatic twin implied consonance, even equivalence, among
the kingships of Britain, Spain, and the Holy Roman Empire—each decidedly imperial. And the
coins relayed that point everywhere that they circulated, at home and abroad.

The following year, construction began at Great Malvern Priory Church on a “large and stately window [which] set out in a [stained] glass, first, the lively image of the wise and devout King Henry the
Seaventh, prayeinge, all armed saveing his head, whereon he weareth his imperiall crowne, and
his Royal Taberd, France and England quartered.” Other royal commissions followed before
1500, each redoubling Henry’s imperial vision and combining the dynasty’s classical, ancient,
and medieval roots to represent Constantine, Arthur, William the Conqueror, Edward I, Henries

---

IV, V, and VI, all crowned with domed diadem, at St. Mary’s Hall (Coventry), St. Catherine’s Church (Ludham), Alton Church (Hampshire), and St. George’s Chapel (Windsor).  

Medina del Campo was not just a marriage alliance; it was an offensive pact with expansionary implications for England. Until 1489, Henry had honored his promise of French neutrality, a thank-you for the support he had received from across the Channel when mounting his invasion. As such, though implicated in his coronation and pageantry, the claim to France had remained dormant. This now changed dramatically, a consequence of Simnel’s defeat, the (transitory) end of English and Irish preoccupations, and the death of Francis II, the Duke of Brittany who had aided Henry VII during his exile. Pledging mutual assistance in defense of present or future dominions, the Anglo-Spanish treaty promised force unless the Valois voluntarily restored Normandy and Aquitaine to England. When France refused and invaded Brittany, Henry moved, sending in a total of four failed land and naval expeditions between 1489-92, with trademark personal oversight. As parliament granted unparalleled subsidies in 1491-2 so that the king might “cross the sea himself to his realm of France and to restore possession of it… whereby he trusts not only to restore this his realm to its ancient fame and honour, but also to enrich and bring profit, peace, and tranquility,” the king proclaimed his ambition in writing: the “recoveryng of his right within his seide realme of Fraunce” and “the crowne and regally of Fraunce... the duchies of Normandy, Guyan, Turayn, and the countie of Mayne.” Invoking St. George and preparing a special golden ryal engraven with the royal image complete with imperial crown, French fleur-de-lis, and Tudor rose, the offensive launched

147 “Treaty,” 27-28 March 1489, CSPS 1/34.
149 Council of Ordinance, 1492, TNA: PRO C 82/329/53.
from Calais that spring, but faltered and ultimately sued for peace. A powerful prophecy was left to circulate at court, which foretold that “the Son of Man, which is the kyng of Englande, shall demayne his right of the crowne of Floure de Lice, the which he shall have sone after.” With no immediate outlet, the legend gathered force.

It was in this context of bold French claims, imperial crowns, Spanish marriage, and Bristol voyaging that Bartholomew Columbus supposedly appeared before Henry VII—a context that explains the myth’s credibility, survival, and subsequent inclusion in Hakluyt’s volume. After 1485, Iberians carving up the Americas and Azoreans questing after islands on the westward passage to Asia stimulated British self-awareness of a specific role to play in these enterprises, a function of an imperial Atlantic gaze already well-underway.

But for now, none of it was to be—France, America, or sovereign empire. The pretender threat again reared its ugly head, stalling Tudor pursuits. Nevertheless, the new challenge drew royal attention squarely north to Scotland and concerned yet another site of past and future British imperialism, while the legacy of Columbus’s search for a backup patron and union with a New World power took root. Before long, another Italian-born mariner would be before Henry.

***

On 21 September 1496, an ambitious, adventurous twenty-two-year-old James IV marched across the Anglo-Scottish border into Berwick. Beside him were some 1400 troops and a young man, Perkin Warbeck, who claimed to be Richard Plantagenet, duke of York and the

---

150 For the coin, see C.E. Challis, The Tudor Coinage (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978), 52. Henry briefly considered another invasion to “reconquer what belongs to him by right,” but chose amity, ambassador Rodrigo Gonzalez de Puebla to Spanish crown, 17 July 1498, CSPS 1/203.


152 On Iberian activity and British awareness of it, see Wey-Gomez, Tropics of Empire, 141-142.
other tower prince. Just months earlier, James had overseen the pretender’s marriage into the Stewart family, a declaration of the groom’s authenticity and of war. It was a moment that Henry VII saw coming: back in October 1485, he had written apprehensively to his stepfather Thomas Stanley, sure that a Scottish invasion to protest his crown was imminent. Aware that the Stewarts harbored several key Yorkist exiles, Henry maligned the Scots, whose “malice and unnatural disposition entend the distruccioun of us and of our liege peaple… [throughout] this our reame and marchis.”153 The king asked that Stanley prepare the northern shires for war, as he carefully played with the precise contours of his realm and with Scottish inferiority, claiming an ill-defined portion of Britain beyond “our towne and castel of Berwik.”154 Two days later, Henry lambasted those who “confedered with oure auncient enemyes the Scottes ayenst their naturall dutees and allegaunces” to the detriment “of oure pour subgettes in the north parties of this our realme.”155

The crown couched its appeal in a language of feudalism (talk of liege and honour), natural kingship, and subjecthood. In this way, he subtly recalled a past of Anglo-Scottish enmity, amity, and right. According to Ranulf Higden’s fourteenth-century Polychronicon, the Scots had been conquered and induced to swear homage and fealty to the English numerous times since 910.156 With evidence Brutus and Arthur’s annexation of Scotland memorialized in the Brut as well as Edward I’s proclamation to that end before Pope Boniface VIII in 1301, it is highly unlikely that the potent Tudor claim to British sovereignty was unknown to its king.157

156 This reading of the Polychronicon is provided in Anon., “Book of Howth,” Carew MS 623, fol. 163.
After the immediate peril subsided in 1485, Anglo-Scottish relations stabilized through Simnel’s fall, as the king offered limited safe-conduct for Scottish merchants in an effort to benefit from its neighbor’s trade and industry.\textsuperscript{158} Predictably, the situation tensed up again in late 1491, when parliament passed a bill exiling all Scots dwelling in England or Wales who lacked express denizen-status.\textsuperscript{159} The statute reinforced the crown’s domestic consolidation and identity-building, as it clearly distinguished between subjects and these others. The act coincided with a surge by Warbeck’s, as the pretender gathered Yorkist and continental European support over the next two years.\textsuperscript{160} Pleased that “another feigned lad” had not succeeded in garnering Irish support, Henry prepared his army to repulse the inevitable Scottish offensive, which, the king argued, aimed at the destruction, subversion, and disinheriance of his crown and his realm.\textsuperscript{161} In this, he was successful, forcing James and Warbeck to retreat in 1496.\textsuperscript{162} However, when Henry levied taxes on an impoverished Cornwall to raise funds to maintain his border, his Stewart foe spotted an opportunity and offered Warbeck to the Cornish rebels as their figurehead in mid-1497. They readily accepted.\textsuperscript{163}

Thus encouraged, Warbeck proclaimed himself king of England and France, lord of Ireland, Prince of Wales and powerfully mimicked Richard III’s vocabulary and rhetoric, even his spelling, reminding his audience of Henry VII’s inherent, inferior otherness. He explained his

\textsuperscript{158} The change in policy is noted in Henry to the Sheriff of Kent, n.d. 1489, in Steele, ed., \textit{King’s Letters}, 2/14, p. 24.
\textsuperscript{159} An Act “Against the Scots,” 17 October 1491, \textit{RotP} 6:456.
\textsuperscript{160} Warbeck gained Maximilian’s aid, but not Spain’s, see the royal report dated 8 September 1493, BL Egerton MS 616, fol. 3.
\textsuperscript{161} Henry to Gilbert Talbot, 20 July 1493, in Steele, ed., \textit{Kings Letters}, 2/22, p. 37. The king was quite fearful that the Irish would support Warbeck, convinced that rebel activity was part of their barbaric nature. As such, the moment occasioned further conceptualizations of the Irish as seditious outsiders, furthering the narrative created earlier in the reign. For example, see Milanese Ambassador in Flanders to the Duke of Milan, 11 February 1495, which described that conspirators had “strong connections to the island” of Ireland (\textit{CSPM} 1/471); and Henry to Gilbert Talbot, n.d. 1497, which described royal displeasure that Warbeck “landed within our land of Ireland, in the wild Irishrie,” as printed in Steele, ed., \textit{King’s Letters}, 2/26, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{162} A Spaniard reporter was impressed with the Tudor defense, which this foreign observer cited in correspondence to his king as proof of Henry’s domestic support and Warbeck’s questionable bloodlines, 19 July 1495, \textit{CSPS} 1/98.
\textsuperscript{163} According to Soncino’s letter to Duke, 30 September 1497, \textit{CSPM} 1/545.
escape from the Tower into Europe, which had unfortunately permitted the “son to Owen Tydder of low birth in the country of Wales—to come from France and entered into our realm.” In righting this ungodly wrong, Warbeck continued, his dearest cousin James sought only to see the true king restored. Emphasizing the horrors wrought by the Tudor dynasty, from Irish war to Cornish rebellion, the pretender reminded his audience that only he descended from noble English royal progenitors. Though the speech stoked the crowd, the Tudor army was able to disperse the rallied group and capture Warbeck. That fall, the boy appeared before the king and confessed to the elaborate hoax that had drawn him away from his place of birth, the French city of Tournai.

Milanese reports announced that when Warbeck vanished, England reached new heights of calm, tranquility, and loyalty—never, they argued, had England been so obedient to a sovereign as it was to Henry VII. The pretender threat was over, the dynasty effectively bolstered by its British success, while Anglo-Scottish aggression now ceased until 1542. It was an altogether ironic end to Henry VII’s quest for peace and consolidation that its last greatest threat was born in the very city where the king’s son would mount the Tudor monarchy’s first, self-consciously imperial experiment overseas, on his father’s firm foundation.

Even more than in Ireland, Henry VII’s Scottish activities stemmed from exigency, rather than an expansionary impulse. Moreover, it was not augmented by the kind of concerted project undertaken by Poynings after Simnel, which was arguably imperial in all but name. There are, however, tantalizing snippets of Tudor posturing towards a British superiority that emerge out of

---

164 Warbeck’s proclamation, July 1497, BL Harl. MS 283, fol. 123v. The proclamation is also printed in Pollard, ed., Contemporary sources, 1/108, p. 150.
165 Warbeck’s proclamation, July 1497, BL Harl. MS 283, fol. 123v.
166 Warbeck’s confession, 18 November-4 December 1497, in Pollard, ed., Contemporary Sources, 1/124, p. 183.
167 “News received from England this morning,” 24 August 1497, CSPM 1/535. A report from the Milanese ambassador at Genoa to the Duke of Milan added that “it is believed that by this victory that country will remain long at peace,” 23 September 1497, CSPM 1/543.
non-English sources and, more concretely, various Rough Wooings writers who were certain that Henry VII’s engagements constituted British empire-building. The first appears just after the defeat, when Henry took the novel step of introducing permanent garrisons and royal constables along the northern border, which the Milanese Ambassador to England Raimondo de Raimondi de Soncino noted as “contrary to the custom of his predecessors, who garrisoned no place.”

Then, amid rumblings of a marriage alliance between James IV and one of the Spanish princesses, Spanish ambassador Pedro de Ayala reported that “the English wish for this marriage; but, on the other hand, they are jealous, and dislike the idea of the Scotch having the same honour as they have.” Though the ambassador added that because the king was not a “pure Englishman,” Henry was not among this dissenting cohort, the feeling of British superiority is interesting.

Moreover, Wooings propagandist Nicholas Bodrugan explained in retrospect (and in rather more poetic but dense prose) that by declaring war on the Scots near the end of his reign, Henry had effectively maintained this essential British title and so induced Edward VI’s continued claim to “the same superiority over them.” Truly, then, the history was already there in the 1490s to support such a broader, more offensive motive for war: the same history that implicated Ireland, France, and part of America as part of the Tudor inheritance too included Scotland, as the king certainly knew and, perhaps, benefited from.

Though he successfully blocked the Spanish match, Henry nonetheless realized that, as Soncino put it, the English were a “restless” people because they were blighted by a centuries-

---

168 Soncino to Duke, 8 September 1497, CSPM 1/540.
171 Bodrugan, An Epitome of the title that the Kynges Maiestie of Englande hath to the souereigntie of Scotlande... (London: 1548), STC 3196, 14.
old Scottish enmity and a young bellicose Stewart king sharing a single island. The solution, first thrown around in late 1498, was to match James IV with Princess Margaret, Henry’s eldest daughter, then about eight years old. Signed at Richmond Palace on 24 January 1502, the Treaty of Perpetual Peace wedded Margaret to James, and established an ostensibly eternal league between the two nations. The pretender subtext is apparent, as the Stewart king agreed not to harbor any men suspected or convicted of treason by Henry and pledged mutual military assistance. Ultimately, the peace proved anything but perpetual; but the strength and security that Henry VII had struggled to ensure opened the floodgates for his son to take a far more aggressive posture and push the British superiority his humanist tutors inculcated in him.

***

At the turn of the century, in January 1500, the Spanish ambassador wrote home to Ferdinand and Isabella. He explained that though there have always been pretenders to the crown of England, now that Warbeck and Simnel were gone, the only royal blood that remained in the land was the true blood of Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, and, above all, Prince Arthur. Persuaded, the monarchs sent their daughter to London and the children were promptly married the following fall, amidst lavish pageantry to “Welcum noble pyncesse Into Brytayan” and celebrate the realm of her wonderful spouse who “shall stand perpetually, Wyth the compasse of his noble progeny.” Processing through the city, much as Arthur’s parents had fifteen years earlier, they witnessed “on the highest of all the hole pagent a rede dredfull dragon, holdyng a

---

172 Soncino to Duke, 18 December 1497, CSPM 1/553. Ayala agreed, see Ayala to Spanish crown, 25 July 1498, CSPS 1/210. Other dispatches from England explained that the marriage would placate Britain by making Henry and James in-laws, e.g. Ayala to Spanish crown, 29 November 1497, CSPS 1/759.


175 De Puebla to Spanish crown, 11 January 1500, CSPS 1/249.

176 Contemporary account of the events by observer Rabanus Maurus, quoted in Anglo, Spectacle, 84.
staff of iron, and on the staf a great crown of gold.”\textsuperscript{177} In all likelihood, that precious crown on Gracechurch Street was domed. If the qualification was a territorially-expansive realm, then the Tudor diadem had every right to be imperial in 1501.

In more ways than one, a Spanish match occasioned British enterprise in the North Atlantic at the close of the fifteenth century, much as it would some fifty years later when Mary I wed Philip II. As Soncino described the origins of the first, royally-sponsored British Atlantic venture, “a Venetian, Messer Zoane Caboto by name… having observed that the sovereigns first of Portugal and then of Spain had occupied unknown islands, he decided to make similar acquisitions for his Majesty [Henry VII].”\textsuperscript{178} Though as yet engaged in Scotland, Henry had already dispatched Warbeck, sent Poynings to quell Ireland, and had his eldest male heir betrothed to a Spanish princess. Begun in 1496 and persisting through the end of his reign, royal policy confirmed a commitment to American adventure whenever possible.

On 5 March 1496, Henry VII deployed British monarchical authority to issue Cabot the first crown patent for transatlantic discovery. The king’s well-documented distrust of others, appreciable in dealings with nobility and parliament, indicate that in the absence of English precedent, the grant followed a face-to-face meeting and consultation of maps and arguments. In it, the king conferred unto Cabot, his heirs, and deputies, “full and free authority, faculty and power to sail to all parts, regions, and costs of the eastern, western, and northern sea… to find discover, and investigate whatsoever islands, countries, regions, or provinces of heathens and infidels, in whatsoever part of the world placed, which before this time were unknown to all

\textsuperscript{177} Anon., “The Voyage, &c. of the Princess Catherine of Arragon to England, on her Marriage with Prince Arthur, Son to King Henry VII. with a particular Account of her process to London, &c.,” printed in Francis Grose and Thomas Astle, eds., \textit{The Antiquarian Repertory} (London: Jeffery, 1808), 2:264.
\textsuperscript{178} Soncino to Duke, 18 December 1497, \textit{CSPM} 1/552.
Christians.” Specifically excluding the south in tacit recognition of Iberian right if not assent to the Treaty of Tordesillas, Cabot would “seeke out, discouer, and finde whatsoeuer isles, countreys, regions or prouinces of heathen and infidels hitherto vnknownen to all Christians… and subdue, occupy and possesse, as our vassals and lieutenants, getting vnto vs the rule, title, and jurisdiction” over them. Taking one-fifth of all profit, Henry standardized the royal cut, barred any other subjects from visiting the region without license, and mandated that all imported American goods pass through Bristol, exempt from most custom.

Couched in feudal liege-homage, devoid of imperial or nationalistic language and explicit historical appeal, the early character of the Cabot patent is clear. Yet, here was an adaptable model with staying power, which asserted dominium over territories surmised to be full of great “fruits, profits, gaines, and commodities” and inferior, non-British “heathens and infidels,” wholly on the authority of the Tudor crown and for the British realm. Even Arthurian skeptic Vergil declared priority over the region to England’s northwest via his diction: the “skillful mariner discovered lands lying in the British ocean.”

After storms forced his first expedition back to Ireland, a second made landfall in Maine or Nova Scotia in June 1497, where Cabot planted three banners, one of St. George, one of St. Mark (Venice’s patron saint), and one for the pope. The move was loaded with meaning: when he “hoisted the royal standard, Cabot took possession for the king” and asserted Tudor authority. In a letter to Christopher Columbus, sailor John Day represented the location of Cabot’s landfall by distance from Ireland (1800 miles west of Dursey), grouping Newfoundland

180 Letters patent to John Cabot (second grant), 3 February 1498, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:5.
181 Cabot patent in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:5.
183 Hay, ed., Vergil’s Anglica Historia, 117, emphasis added.
184 Milanese Ambassador to Duke, 18 December 1497, CSPM 1/552.
and Ireland as two western Atlantic islands under the British crown, the latter a midpoint point in space, familiarity, and civility from home. Further, Day was certain that this was the place found by Bristolmen long ago; if anyone supposed Iberian right, he averred, British enterprise certainly predated them.\textsuperscript{185} Cabot returned in August, relating the excellent, temperate isle, replenished with rich commodities, native Brazil wood and silk, copious fish, soil apt for agriculture and animal husbandry, and “tall trees of the kind masts are made.”\textsuperscript{186} To prove its wildness, Cabot presented certain tokens at court—nets filled with cod, “notched trees by which he judges inhabitants,” and wild animals.\textsuperscript{187} Before the king, he promised even great things on subsequent trips west to the island “where he believes that all the spices of the world have their origin, as well as the jewels.”\textsuperscript{188}

In effect, these reports crafted the first British commodity list for the New World, a blend of truth and hyperbole based on what suited Cabot and England’s economy. Moreover, its specificity – trees not only plentiful, but the size and type for masts – associated Newfoundland discovery with naval power.\textsuperscript{189} Much like descriptions by Gerald of Wales for Ireland or Worcestre for Scotland, the Cabot voyage’s list of wood, game, fur, spices, and ore functioned as the template for later promoters, comprehensive enough to fit agriculturalist, mercantile, colonial, and nationalist arguments for a century of empire-building with remarkable resilience.\textsuperscript{190} The captain was naturalized for his feat, his venture memorialized as fundamentally British, sailing under a Tudor flag and taking possession for England: as a fellow Venetian

\textsuperscript{185} Day to the Lord Grand Admiral Christopher Columbus, n.d., printed in Williamson, ed., \textit{Cabot Voyages}, 212-214.
\textsuperscript{186} Day to Columbus, n.d., in Williamson, ed., \textit{Cabot Voyages}, 212.
\textsuperscript{188} Milanese Ambassador to Duke, 18 December 1497, \textit{CSPM} 1/552.
\textsuperscript{189} Day to Columbus, in Williamson, ed., \textit{Cabot Voyages}, 212.
\textsuperscript{190} For the commodity list, see Day to Columbus, in Williamson, ed., \textit{Cabot Voyages}, 212-214.
remarked, “Talbot called the Great Admiral, vast honour paid to him, dressed in silk, English run after him like mad, he can enlist as many as he pleases.”\textsuperscript{191}

Rewarded with an annuity, Cabot also received support for a more ambitious plan: Soncino remarked that the sailor “makes everything so plain that his Majesty, wise and not prodigal, offered twenty armed ships” from his own fleet, complete with a priest and and various “malefactors of England to forme a colony in the new Ilande.”\textsuperscript{192} Though perhaps exaggerated or entirely apocryphal, the mention of an early Tudor penal colony with a spiritual dimension (either to minister crew, the native infidels, or both, as later European imperial projects sought) is quite provocative, and constitutes the earliest plot for British settlement in America. As it happened, Henry lent only a single ship before the expedition stalled. Afterwards, John Cabot disappeared from the records.\textsuperscript{193}

The difference between the projected 1498 venture and its reality illuminate how the domestic and American were intertwined, the former invariably paramount for Henry. Just as the pretender crisis dictated British policy, Newfoundland was similarly ancillary, but to the opposite end, delayed and sidelined while energies and resources went into defeating Warbeck and the Cornish rebels. Moreover, the less-than-enthusiastic crown contribution reflected a preoccupation with negotiations to finally wed Arthur and Katherine, as a critical proxy engagement came in 1497. Henry knew that no matter how far north or west of Hispaniola Cabot sailed, Spaniards would frown, and the king was unwilling to risk it.

\textsuperscript{191} Pasqualigo letter, 23 August 1497, in Biggar, ed., \textit{Precursors}, 14. 
\textsuperscript{192} Soncino to Duke, 18 December 1497, \textit{CSPM} 1/552. 
\textsuperscript{193} The plan is recorded in “Cronicon regum Anglie,” BL Cotton MS, Vitellius A.XVI, fol. 173. Cabot disappeared after Henry VII granted him two pensions, which are printed with translations in Biggar, ed., \textit{Precursors}, 25-27.
Henry repeatedly subordinated, even sacrificed, exploration or trade to pressing dynastic and strategic affairs.194 His proclivity for Atlantic discovery, however, remained. In 1501, the year of the marriage, conditions fit to support the American arena, when embargoes and Venetian-Florentine enmity limited British trade with the Low Countries and the Mediterranean, bottlenecking Merchant Adventurers at Calais, which upset the Stapler Company’s monopoly there and necessitated the opening of new markets to sell textiles and buy spices, wine, and fruit.195 Exigency thus combined with Cabot’s list of what England needed to load or unload, producing a new burst of American activity at the dawn of a new century. Fearful that the Tudor’s westward orientation had been more than a fleeting moment engineered by one persuasive mariner, Emmanuel I and Ferdinand and Isabella scrambled to “stop the exploration of the English in that direction.”196 Whatever its origins and limits, Tudor expansion threatened Iberian dominance, accrued experience, and hardened national lines in the Atlantic World.

Quite to the contrary, however, the perceived British threat to Iberian hegemony actually sent Azorean seamen João Fernandes, his brother Francisco, and João Gonsalves into welcoming British arms. To head Henry off, Emmanuel had granted Gaspar Corte Real a broad Atlantic monopoly, alienating Fernandes’s cohort, who joined with Bristolmen Richard Warde, Thomas Asselhurst, and John Thomas to receive the most specific Tudor patent to date.197 Authorized to “recover, discover, and search out” lands inhabited by heathens and infidels, Henry retained all

196 Spanish patent to Alonso de Ojeda, 8 June 1501, in Williamson, ed., Cabot Voyages, 110. For the Portuguese response, which came in the form of letters patent to John Fernandez and Gaspar Corte-Real, see Biggar, ed., Precursors, 39 and 41-43.
197 For Corte Real’s grant, 12 May 1500, see Biggar, ed., Precursors, 31-32; for Fernandes’s reaction, see his petition to Henry VII in conjunction with these Englishmen, n.d. 1501, in Biggar, ed., Precursors, 40.
property, title, suzerainty, and homage as before. But now the king specifically instructed his sailors to set up “our banners and ensigns… [anywhere not yet] discovered by subjects of any prince our friend and now in [their] possession”—all language of land vaguely “unknown” to Christians thus struck out, and the word “recover” added to assert a prior British right. Further, illustrating that the 1498 colonization scheme was not just a blip, the king declared his hope that “men and women of this our kingdom” might desire to visit these lands and “dwell in and inhabit the same,” with all of their servants, goods, and chattels, and thereby “acquire and keep the riches fruits and profits of the land” under royal obedience and governance. To do so, the patentees were instructed to establish good laws for peaceful rule and justice, and expel any non-Briton by force. Going forward, the Azoreans members of the crew were to be “treated, held, esteemed, and governed as our true faithful lieges born within our realm of England,” i.e. as if they were native subjects. A marked change from 1496 and demonstrating intensified royal involvement in America, the 1501 patent declared a recoverable Atlantic past, a colonial goal, and took first steps towards a theory of actual possession—which distinguished between abstract claims, discovery, and areas now possessed—and defining the status and administration of overseas colonists, all hallmarks of British imperial ideology. The project’s express purpose went unwritten, but a passage East, trade, and protection of national interests were all in play. Meanwhile, the enterprise originated the model of employing Iberian Atlantic navigational experience in the service of Tudor empire.

---

202 For these distinctions, see Fernandes, et al. Patent, 19 March 1501, in Biggar, ed., Precursors, 41.
The Anglo-Azorean syndicate reached Greenland twice in 1501, though they traveled without material crown support in shipping or otherwise. Though neither established a colony, Henry gave the Azoreans pensions for “true service which they have done unto us to our singular pleasure as Capitaignes into the new founde lande,” a significant valuation of their services. Perturbed by what he believed to be infringement on his father’s patent, John Cabot’s son Sebastian partnered with Robert Thorne, a Bristol merchant who claimed that his own father had preempted John’s discovery by three years. Together, the two sought to assert their patrilineal rights to Newfoundland at the same time as another Anglo-Azorean syndicate comprised of Asslehurst, Fernandes, João Gonsalves, and Hugh Elyot. The king was forthcoming. In December 1502, Henry incorporated all the men as the “Company adventurers to the new founde ilonds to discover the passage to Cataya,” the precursor to its Edwardian version of the same name (1553), the Muscovy Company (1555), and Newfoundland Company (1610), but on a Portuguese type that did not confer monopoly. Promoting intra-English competition to map and claim the region, the corporation demonstrates sustained royal interest in Newfoundland and an Atlantic impulse and organizational formation that ultimately outlasted the king.

Though the Company sent out only one expedition, in 1508, the venture fittingly memorialized the Henry VII-Cabot legacy as foundational to the Tudor Empire. With two caravels provisioned by the crown and three hundred men, all “by commandment of Kyng Henry the seaventh,” Sebastian Cabot “did first of all discover and finde out all that part of America,

205 The Thorne family exploits are recorded in Hakluyt, Divers Voyages (London: 1582), STC 12624, 258.
206 See the patent granted to Elyot, Asslehurst, Gonsalves, and Fernandes on 9 December 1502, in Biggar, ed., Precursors, 70-91.
207 The Company name is recorded twice in the crown financial records, see “List of Payments,” 1506, printed in Williamson, ed., Cabot Voyages, quotation from 262 and repeated on 263.
whiche nowe is called Baccalaos.” According to Hakluyt, who used Peter Martyr’s Decades to construct his rendering of the voyage, “Cabot himself named those lands Baccalaos, because that in the Seas thereabout hee found so great multitudes of certaine bigge fishes much like vnto Tunies, (which the inhabitants call Baccalaos).” This use of naming to claim possession in the Atlantic World was perhaps the earliest British example of this practice, which was later employed in Tudor Ireland, Virginia, and Guiana. On land, he found ore, men wearing beast skins, and eating raw flesh, all characteristics that would have been well-known to early Tudor audiences as evidence of savagery from accounts of Gaelic Irishmen. Ultimately, however, the frozen sea forced Cabot to turn back home, with resolve to return and seek out a Northwest Passage to the East that he had found evidence of. Though without contemporary corroboration, Hakluyt later recorded in Principal Navigations that according to Robert Fabian’s Chronicles of London, Cabot “brought the king manye thinges in token of possession,” including three men who were “in their demeanour like to bruite beastes, whom the King kept a time after”; two years later, they were “apparelled after the maner of Englishmen in Westminster pallace, which that time I could not discerne from Englishmen…” The story functioned as proof of how Newfoundland’s natives could be civilized by English clothing and society.

---

209 “Another testimonie of the voyage of Sebastian Cabot,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:8.
210 For example, these are precisely the kinds of renderings related in the popular writings by Gerald of Wales (Giradus Cambrensis) from the twelfth century, see the modern edition by John Joseph O’Meara, ed., Gerald of Wales’s The History and Topography of Ireland (NY: Penguin Books, 1982), especially 54, 79, 101, 111.
212 “Of three Sauages which Cabot brought home and presented vnto the King in the foureteenth yere of his raigne,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:9.
Sebastian Cabot’s 1508 enterprise was significant for contemporaries and later promoters alike. First, it confirmed Britain’s claim and reports of the region’s richness; second, it brought ethnographic information, perhaps even Newfoundlanders themselves, to England for the first time to prove their potential for civil reform; second, it showed that the land could sustain human life; third, it hardened the national character of American empire, for while foreign collaboration remained a necessity, Cabot’s project was unquestionably British. It launched in the name of and with support from the British crown, steered by a captain who was transformed by later Tudor propaganda from a “valiant Venetian, carried by his parents whilst a child to the island of Britain,” as recorded by continental European geographer Peter Martyr in 1516, into a native subject “with English valor,” as noted by Englishman George Best in 1578.214 For Best and fellow Elizabethans like Hakluyt, the Tudor dynasty marked not only the start of a new empire that included part of the New World, but also the recovery of an ancient entity.

According to Venetian Marcantonio Contarini’s 1534 report, when Cabot arrived home in 1509, “He found the king dead, and his son cared little for such enterprise.”215 His countryman Giovanni Battista Ramusio agreed, adding that the captain found England plagued by “great disturbances, of the people in rebellion and of a war with Scotland. There was no further thought of sailing to those parts, for which reason [Sebastian] came to Spain, and to the Catholic King and Queen…”216 Though his timeline is muddled (Cabot left English service in 1513, amid Tournai and Flodden, which did not coincide with civil unrest), Ramusio correctly identified two key points: the new king’s priorities were the Isles and France rather than America, yet with the fates of all three closely entwined; second, 1513 was indeed pivotal, illustrative of Henry VIII’s

214 For “valiant Venetian…,” see the excerpt from Martyr’s De Orbe Novo, printed in Williamson, ed., Cabot Voyages, 266; for “with English valor,” see Best, True Discourse, 16.
kingship and imperial vision. But he missed two essential corollaries: Cabot served the entangled Tudor *imperium*, wherever and whenever it existed; and once circumstance changed, Henry did care for Newfoundland.

Upon Henry VII’s death, poet clergyman Alexander Barclay printed his translation of Sebastian Brant’s *The Ship of Fools* (1509). The tract contained the very first allusion to the New World – “the newe fonde londe” – in English vernacular verse, heralding the ascent of the language that served as a vehicle for Tudor imperial promotion and a chief characteristic of national identity, yet it also signaled a prospective courtier’s desire to counsel the new monarch.217 Aware of Henry VII’s western overseas interests and unsure of what the king’s second son might bring, Barclay added his own verses to the tract, charging that it is “foly to tende vnto the lore and vnsure science of vayne geometry, syns none can knowe all the world perfytely.”218 Instead, he argued, “Ye people that labour the worlde to mesure… knowe firste your self, that knowledge most sure, for certaynly it is rebuke and shame for man to labor to knowe the compasse of all the worlde wyde, nat knwynge hym selfe, nor howe he sholde thym gyde.”219 Principally, Henry agreed, working to consolidate the current kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales, and France) before again looking across the Atlantic Ocean. Here, his policy rang true to Brant’s words, which asked England’s neighbors in the archipelago to “Submyt your selfe gladly to his empyre” and his “noble Diademe Imperyall” for “If the Englysshe Lyon his wysdome and ryches Conioyne with true love, peas, and fydylyte With the Scottis vnycornes

myght and hardynes Than is no dout but all hole christente Shall lyue in peas wealth and tranquylyte…”

***

Upon Henry VIII’s accession to the throne in 1509, Tudor gentleman William Blount, Lord Mountjoy, eagerly wrote to Erasmus, who was then studying in Italy, hoping to woo the premier northern humanist to London. Part of the early Tudor courtly intellectual circle, Mountjoy adoringly portrayed his new monarch, who had replaced Arthur as heir apparent in 1502, sure that this lover of justice, goodness, and the learned would stimulate Erasmus to grow wings and fly to England. He explained that the second Henry Tudor’s heart was not set on gold or jewels, but virtue and eternal renown; the young man had even exclaimed that his realm could scarcely exist without the help of scholars. Similarly aroused to describe his nation’s impending glory and prosperity, in honour of his former student’s accession, John Skelton penned a set of verses, amplifying Mountjoy’s assessment in humanist terms: “Our king, our emperour, Our Priamus of Troy, Our wealth, our worldly joy: Upon us he doth reign, That maketh our heartes glad, As king most sovereign That ever England had.” From the scholar whom Erasmus had once compared to the finest Roman poets, the message of an English prince who was equal to an ancient emperor was powerful. Smitten, the Dutchman rushed to greet this manifestation of renaissance kingship.

The Tudor mission in 1485 was not merely to breed the orderly peace achieved by Henry VII, but to successfully pass the crown onto a rightful, lineal, male heir, and this is precisely the

---

223 Erasmus to Henry, “Carmen Extemporale,” n.d. (c. 1499), BL Egerton MS 1651, fols. 6v-7r.
image flaunted at the second Tudor monarch’s coronation, where the king received with an enclosed crown alongside his new bride (also his brother’s widow), Katherine of Aragon. Portraying the new couple holding hands and enthroned, each below their respective badges (a Tudor rose and Spanish pomegranate), printer Stephen Hawes memorialized the 1509 ceremony visually, with a woodcut and accompanying verse. Lauding his king in the same way as poets extolled their emperors in antiquity, Hawes memorialized the new monarch as the great triumph of his nation and the joy and comfort of his realm, uniting not only Lancastrian red and York white, but Plantagenet and Tudor, English and Welsh, as the British manifestation of the two-toned rose. In the coming years, Hawes and his contemporaries would see what Henry VII’s legacy, at home and abroad, meant for the second Tudor monarch.

---

In the spring of 1523, the barrister son of a blacksmith from Putney and new member of the House of Commons stood before his king at Westminster to offer an appraisal of the domestic polity and foreign policy. Nearly fifteen years into the reign of the second Tudor, crowned king of England and France, lord of Ireland, it had become abundantly clear that for this renaissance prince, an aspiration for sovereignty in an expansive realm was more than mere pretension. The parliamentarian, a man by the name of Thomas Cromwell, discerned his monarch’s unflinching desire “to recouer agayne by the sworde the Realme of Fraunce, belonging to our most Redowbtid Souerayne by good and iust tytle…to the grete inryching and enprosperyng of vs and all suche as hereafter showld lyue vnder hys obeysaunce and subieccion”—to realize an empire that matched his title and inheritance.¹

A decade earlier, Henry VIII had set out to fulfill this end. As the speech described, he began where his ancestors had, concentrating across the Channel with secondary attention west, where his father had lay claim to Ireland and Newfoundland. Cromwell described the good experience gained thus far, but opined that these possessions—France most of all—failed to appreciate the honour and benefit of Tudor rule. At present, they were but costly, dangerous

1 “A speech delivered in Parliament,” n.d. 1523, The National Archives (TNA), Public Record Office (PRO), State Papers (SP), document reference number 1/27, fol. 192. Though Cromwell’s name is not attached to the speech, there is no doubt as to its provenance, according to R.B. Merriman, ed., *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1902), 1:30, n.1. All subsequent citations from TNA: PRO will follow this standard format of department code (e.g. SP) and document reference number. If a document contains any internal numbering, the internal reference (i.e. folio number) is provided following the full document reference number. This speech is also catalogued in J.S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, and R.H. Brodie, eds., *The Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, 22 vols. (London: Stationery Office, 1862-1932), vol. 3, entry 2958 (hereafter *LP* volume/entry). For sources that have two reference numbers (e.g. SP and LP or BL and LP), the second is supplied in brackets, as is customary; for sources that appear in one location only or were consulted in one location only, a single citation is provided. On the historic English right to France, see C.S.L. Davies, “Roy de France et roy d’Angleterre”: The English claims to France,” *Publications du Centre Europén d’Etudes Bourguignonnes (XIVe-XVIe siècle)*, 35 (1995): 123-132.
“vngracious Dogholes.” Accordingly, he advised British consolidation, then overseas expansion: “hit be a common sayng,” he charged, that “he who entendyth Fraunce to wyn with Skotland let hym begyn… than [sic] shall we therby have the experynce how to wyn and kepe other possessions of our most redowtyd souerayne of due ryght and enherytaunce belonging to his noble Crowne which we have in the parties of beyond the se.”

Though expensive and risky, the 1510s experiments had given a vital course in trial and error and shown the limits of Tudor power in the first quarter of the century, all while isolating a future route.

The oration encapsulated the nature, meaning, and importance of early Henrician empire. And, indeed, when Henry VIII ultimately choose to follow a decade of reform in England with an explicit effort to create a British Empire in Scotland and France in the 1540s, the offensive was inextricably linked to those “ungracious dogholes”—a set of incomparable, essential experiences in Tudor imperialism worthy of study.

***

This chapter argues for the significance of France and of the first two decades of Henry VIII’s reign—in particular the rule of Tournai (contemporary France, modern Belgium) between 1513 and 1519 and contemporary enterprise in Ireland and Newfoundland—to the growth and

---

2 “Speech,” n.d. 1523, TNA: PRO SP 1/27, fol. 192.
3 “Speech,” n.d. 1523, TNA: PRO SP 1/27, fol. 192. It appears that “dog” was a common descriptor for the French in Henry’s reign, particularly interesting because of contemporary comparisons of Amerindians and Irishmen to brute beasts. One year before the 1513 invasion, a royal ambassador reported that “the French are excommunicated and no better than dogs,” see “News from France,” 1 April 1512, British Library (BL) Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 327 [LP 1/1127]. During the occupation, Tudor officials noted that Tournaisiens “complain that they are treated like dogs,” see “A Paper of Intelligence,” April 1515, BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.II, fol. 155 [LP 2/399]. In 1536, witnesses recalled Englishmen shouting “Down with the French dogs!” see “Assault on Frenchmen in London,” 18 April 1536, LP 11/1334. The analogy increased during the 1540s, as England and France were pitted against one another again. Edmond Harvel wrote that “the French are now incredibly detestable here, being called dogs and predators of Christendom and monsters,” see Harvel to Henry VIII, August 1542, LP 17/693; statesman William Paget railed against “these false dogs” referring to the French, see “Paget to Sir William Petre from Guysnes,” 27 May 1546, LP 21/1/943. On the comparison, see Steven Gunn, “The French Wars of Henry VIII,” in The Origins of War in Early Modern Europe, ed. Jeremy Black (Edinburgh: Donald Publishers, 1987), 28-51, especially 33-34.
development of the early British Empire. A broader context of a more secure dynastic footing; an impulse for continued exploration, recovery, and annexation of new as well as old worlds and markets; military and missionary opportunism; chivalric and humanist airs all gave rise to conquest in France. There, the Henrician state undertook an experiment in the theory and practice of empire-building that was far more than a military occupation—a self-consciously imperial project built on Henry VII’s accomplishments. Like the whole of Tudor Empire, Tournai was not a clean break from medieval deeds or aspirations, but a pivotal and in many ways novel evolution, which in turn encouraged and influenced new, related plots elsewhere.

Though Henry ultimately returned the city to France, an economic failure, the venture accrued experience, intellectual and applied, in the practice of imperialism for court, parliament, and observers. Tournai, Ireland, and Newfoundland functioned as training grounds for ideology,

---


5 Indeed, I find that notions of medieval inheritance and chivalric honor peppered Tudor empire-building. As J.J. Scarisbrick argued, “It is damaging historical surgery that cuts [Henry VIII] off from his ancestry for they, surely, were his models,” see Scarisbrick, Henry VIII (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), quotation from 23. See also Gunn, “Chivalry and the Politics of the Early Tudor Court” in Chivalry in the Renaissance, ed. Syndey Anglo (Rochester: Boydell, 1990), 107-128.

6 Tournai has the unenviable distinction of slipping through the metaphorical cracks of multiple historiographies, a consequence of its early date in a tumultuous thirty-seven-year reign, its location, the transience of English rule, and the Plantagenet past. The episode is either dismissed as the immature, futile posturing, ignored as a meaningless tangent, or lumped into the medieval period as a renewal of the Hundred Years War. For dismissal, see the only full-
vocabulary, imagery, and administration over a foreign people and against a continental rival. Each forced Britons to confront the limits of the current Tudor imperium, determine the status of non-native subjects, define the tenets of a British nation, and govern abroad—after all, contemporaries conceived of France like the rest of these locations in the growing empire as “Turney yn the parties beyeond the see.”

***

The kingdom Henry VIII inherited in 1509 looked quite unlike the one his father claimed in 1485. Though it was the elder Henry Tudor who was crowned amid slaughter on the battlefield, war was the sport of the younger. Now, rather than staining his hands, York and Lancastrian blood pulsed through the monarch’s veins together, circulating with that of his Welsh ancestors, complementing the ghosts of kings and emperors past that swam in his mind as he read his princely pedagogy, and invigorating his kingship.

The renaissance impulse for discovery and rediscovery, for history and example, and budding nationalist sentiment, appreciable under Henry VII but trumped by insecurity, enjoyed promotion under the second Tudor, trained by the new learning’s greatest devotees. They portrayed an empire built on a mix of legend and past reality for the king to lust after: a

---


7 “Meryell v. Gybson,” Chancery case, 1 January 1518-31 December 1529. The National Archives, Public Records Office, Chancery Records (C), Early Chancery Proceedings Collection (1), bundle number 544, piece number 27 (hereafter given in the standard form of TNA: PRO C1/bundle/piece, e.g. this record is C1/544/27).
compendium of attractive, feasible locations with recourse to legal legitimacy and individual archetypes from Caesar to Brutus. And they were personally meaningful—Henry’s elder brother was Arthur, while his sons, Henry and Edward, echoed other conquering predecessors. He too heard tales of an Angevin Empire spanning the Isles and France from his aged courtiers. It was a culture he nurtured and pounced on, enjoying the chance to annoy England’s chief enemy since the Hundred Years War and its foil for burgeoning national consciousness. Well-primed, the Tudor crown and court defined its British nation and, increasingly, its empire against archenemy France throughout the first half of the new century.

With his house’s survival assured, the court would not let its new head forget his right, not that he was apt to. Henry’s interest in France was far more than a diplomatic ruse or misplaced juvenile aggression and aggrandizement. As antiquarian J.S. Brewer unwittingly remarked in 1867, “they [Henry VIII and his contemporaries] believed as fully in the right and title of their kings to France as we believe in our title to India or Ireland.” From 1509, the king sought only a justifiable opportunity—as the Milanese ambassador related, he was “so eager over the enterprise that no one can put it out of his head, unless it be God Almighty.”

---

8 Illustrating the substance and power of these memories, in 1515, Richard Wingfield regaled Maximilian I with England’s French claims, including Henry VI’s Paris coronation, see BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.XVIII., fol. 217 [LP 2/1265]. Further, Sydney Anglo noted that the Calais garrison celebrated Agincourt annually during Henry’s reign, see Anglo, “An Early Tudor program for Plays and Other Demonstrations against the Pope,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 20 (1957): 176-179.


10 As Gunn convincingly showed, see Gunn, “French Wars,” 37-8.


It was too Henry VII’s dynastic feat that sanctioned his heir’s marriage to Katherine of Aragon. The union brought Henry VIII into the formidable, knotty nexus of continental diplomacy and, in turn, presupposed intervention for Ferdinand and Isabella and their papal patron. Compounded by an all-important x-factor—the barely eighteen-year-old Henry’s egotistical nature, anxiety to prove himself, indefatigable love of war games, and envy of the far larger dominions that his contemporaries Francis I and Charles V were poised to inherit—it was an incendiary situation shrewdly manipulated against the Valois (though their pawn took little convincing).\(^{13}\) As Polydore Vergil described, Henry was in the flower of his youth, abounding in wealth and power, and eager to begin his military career in grand fashion.\(^{14}\) After Louis XII’s heroics in Italy earned him excommunication, a new 1513 holy league headed by Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I repackaged its need to stymie French conquest as Henry’s “unique opportunity to conquer a crown whose title he bears” and defeat his natural enemies.\(^{15}\) Moreover, English representatives explained, as “France was lost by the ayde of Spayne from yowr nobyl predecessoros, now the ayde of Spayne schal helpe your hyzghnys recouer your most nobyl ryzchte ynherytance.”\(^{16}\) Henry was convinced, duty-bound to fight “the savage tyranny of the king of the French, who is the common enemy of all Christians.”\(^{17}\) Circumstance and history had conspired to make France the first sought-after piece of his British Empire.

Calais was both the physical and intellectual entry point for Tournai, a town that had existed as a small piece of England in France since Edward III “re-peopled agayne the towne

\(^{13}\) Royal correspondence from Wingfield and Cuthbert Tunstal to the king noted the extent of these rival kingdoms, 18 July 1516, BL Cotton MS, Galba B.IV, fol. 113 [LP 2/2189].


\(^{15}\) Doge and Senate of Venice to the Tudor court, 21 December 1509, *LP* 1/278.

\(^{16}\) John Stile to Henry, 11 January 1510, BL Cotton MS, Vespasian C.I., fols. 45-46, quotation from fol. 46 [*LP* 1/329].

\(^{17}\) Henry to Archbishop Bainbridge, 12 April 1513, BL Harley (hereafter Harl.) MS, 3462, fol. 28 [*LP* 1/1769].
with pure Englyshemen.”

With a population of 12,000, half English by descent, and statute law made at Westminster, the city was of vital strategic and economic importance. The crown’s sole continental foothold, it served as a defensive bulwark, busy port market, European lifeline, and lonely reminder of a now-illusory Angevin empire. Its very existence facilitated the Henrician enterprise, making reconquest seem possible and providing a base for operations. Henry had only strengthened the city’s meaning and status within a changing realm: a 1512 proclamation termed mixed English-Calais progeny “mere English,” whereas children with two English-born parents were “good English,” ostensible colonists thereby distinguished from the remaining “strangers.”

Four times in his reign, Henry used Calais for a French offensive; it offered protection, supply chains, even an evacuation route and as his imperial vision sharpened, Calais policy followed suit.

The arrival of king and army in July 1513 had all the trappings of an emperor visiting his possession, as eyewitnesses described a fleet “as Neptune never saw before.” In full armor, Henry wore “a riche brooch with the image of sainct George [and] white cloth of gold with a redde crosse”—essential nationalistic icons. Crown carpenters built the camp where Henry and his ally and co-conspirator Maximilian I strategized on the ideal English model, with wide streets, a market center, timber cottages with Tudor chimneys, and tents decorated with lions,

---

21 “The Diary of Royal Chaplain and Clerk John Taylor,” October 1513, LP 1/2391.
22 Edward Hall, The vnion of the two noble and illustre families of Lancastre and Yorke... (London: 1548), STC 12722, “Henry VIII,” 25.
dragons, and greyhounds. The layout and imagery were entirely Tudor, readily coopted and appropriated in the future.

While there, the king heard mass, part of a palpable effort to demonstrate divine sanction and spiritual purpose. Never one for subtlety, he marched with a dozen new canons of “unusual magnitude,” each cast with an apostle’s image. Soon, he would turn them on Tournai’s Cathedral for espoused missionary ends.

Three weeks later and sworn to defend the king’s title, the mobile court waded out into the interior. The retinue captured expert native guides, each assigned to a master who was instructed to treat his charge well to avoid treachery. For Henry and his officers, many of whom saw imperial service in Ireland or Scotland, the use of indigenous informants could be translated into other, less-well-known territories. As they marched, the retinue departed from the past, from a medieval empire and city already inhabited by English. Where Edward III had faltered in 1340, Henry began his experiment.

Over late-summer 1513, Henry and Maximilian besieged Louis XII’s most prized northern cities, first sacking Thérouanne and sending the French cavalry into speedy retreat in the aptly-named Battle of the Spurs. Tournai ceded next, when, according to Tudor Clerk Brian Tuke, his “king of England and of Fraunce commanded them to yeeld him his Citie, and receaue him as their naturall Lorde” or be put to the sword. As Maximilian’s posturing hints, the enterprise was Henry’s show—the emperor’s prevailing concern was for a Valois loss, while a
majority British retinue and funding meant that Henry dictated their course. For him, Tournai was ideal, chosen for the very reasons his successors would choose their imperial outposts: mythic right, location, and economic viability, all to the detriment of England’s greatest rival.

History was among Henry’s prime concerns. Geography was equally essential and the crown recognized a need to expand piecemeal from Calais. Plenty of territories fit the bill, but only the Leie Valley (a River Scheldt tributary) was “the key of Picardy” and a vital Valois safeguard, according to contemporaries. The region’s other advantages—like minimal crown allegiance among inhabitants who watched their land vacillate between Hapsburg and Valois control, good fortifications, and agricultural fertility—all collided in one city northeast of Paris.

A complement to English markets, Tournai was renowned for its textiles, marble, timber, and wines, providing mercantile incentive. Simultaneously, the region’s isolation (with the key exception of a central waterway) was reminiscent of Britain. In this way, Tournai fit the mold of Tudor imperial holdings: it both mirrored and augmented the nation. Further, the city, which awed English observers as “large and beautiful, the most populous of any on that side of Paris… [and] without any commander-in-chief,” was the seat of an expansive diocese that included the wealthy Bruges and Ghent. As one courtier declared, the “magnificent city of Tournai, which Caesar mentions by the same name” was ideally suited for emulation of the great emperor.

Tudor governance of Tournai began on a grand scale, with a display that matched the moment’s consequence. Portrayed as rightful, imperial, and providential, material manifestations

---

29 According to one Tudor observer, “England alone carried a flag of triumph—and in the Cathedral the Emperor yielded to him the place of honour. He also put off his entry into Tournay, that he might not detract from the King of England’s glory,” see Taylor Diary, LP 1/2391.
30 Rumors in London promised that Paris was next, according to Venetian ambassador Antonio Bavarin to the Doge of Venice, 14 September 1513, LP 1/2265.
32 Tuke to Pace, 22 September 1513, CSPM 1/660.
33 Tuke to Pace, 22 September 1513, CSPV 2/316.
34 Taylor Diary, LP 1/2391.
of his kingship were appreciable at every turn (domed crowns, dragons, lions, roses, greyhounds, portcullises). Further, observers couched the success in terms that remained associated with empire through the century like plantation, possession, dominion, civility, and sexualized conquest. Upon arrival, as chronicler Edward Hall depicted, the king took possession by conquest and planted the city with his troops and armaments, while his entourage marched in, bearing “tharmes of England Fraunce Ireland & other the kynges dominions.” Meanwhile, the Tournaïsien co-produced a series of biblical and classical pageants, which were, fittingly, much like the Tudor coronations that had graced London, now celebrating the dynasty’s imperial coronation in France. In Caesar-like fashion, Henry received floral crowns and scepters, acts of spontaneous civility encouraged by their new king, according to Tuke. Duly heartened, the courtier celebrated, “We have now the city of Terouenne, which was called ‘the King’s bedchamber,’ and Tournai, on whose walls was inscribed, ‘La pucelle sans reproche,’ namely, ‘the unsullied maiden.’ The ‘King’s bedchamber’ is burnt, and this ‘Maiden’ hath lost her maidenhead.” His words are quite similar to the way in which Sir Walter Ralegh would describe his American conquest, when another territory lost its maidenhead to Tudor Empire; indeed, Tuke’s prose marks the first example that I have been able to find of such a gendered imperial discourse, which remained potent through the century.

As Tuke hoped, then, Tourne was more than a momentary advantage that would swing back to France with the rapid pendulum of early modern Chanel relations. To Maximilian’s

---

35 For a description of the display, see Giles Ap. (?) to the Earl of Devon, 2 September 1513, _LP_ 1/2227; for the official crown record of the materials, see “Revels,” 1519, _LP_ 3/unnumbered miscellaneous entry.
36 Hall, _Vnion_, 45.
37 Tuke to Pace, 22 September 1513, _CSPV_ 2/316.
38 Hall’s language is even closer to Ralegh’s _Discoverie of the Large, Rich, and Beatifull Empire of Guiana_ (1596) which asserted that Guiana “hath yet her maydenhead,” in Richard Hakluyt, _The Principal Navigations, Voyages, and Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation_, 3 vols. (London: 1599-1600), STC 12626a, vol. 3, 661 (hereafter _PN_ (1599-1600), volume: page number). Hall contended, “it be wryten on the gates grauen in stone lammes ton ne a perdue ton pucellage, that is to saye thou haste neuer lost thy maydenhed,” see Hall, _Vnion_, quotation from 44.
chagrin, his ally manipulated the holy league much as it had used him and brokered with Louis independently, offering his sister as a bride to the aging French king in exchange for Tournai. Strikingly, premier contemporary scholar of Spanish empire Peter Martyr took notice of the enterprise and its fruits as part of a pan-European narrative, remarking how Ferdinand “is afraid of the overgrowing power of England.” His assessment reminds us of the broader context.

British rule in France may have been “an ancient custom,” as Julius de Medici lauded, but Tournai was part of an Atlantic-wide imperial context, and it was against this background that the project took shape.

***

Henry knew the implication of declaring war on the senior member of the historic Franco-Scottish Auld Alliance, for, as one medieval continental chronicler put it, “whatever it pleases the king of France to command me, [the king of Scotland] shall do it.” Since Charlemagne, this anti-English pact had superseded any British truce, even 1502’s perpetual peace, which made James IV and Henry brothers-in-law. The prospect of a two-front war was daunting, but with astonishing speed, sophomoric recklessness, and trademark hubris, he perceived himself poised to reclaim not one but two rightful possessions. After all, King Arthur, Edward I, Henry II, and Edward III had all claimed Scotland. Discourse shifted accordingly, as Henry called the Stewart cause “dishonourable” and expressed his expectation that the Scots

39 Treaty of London, August 1514, in Thomas Rymer, Foedera, 16 vols. (London: Churchill, 1704-35), 13:413-21. Mary married Louis and was crowned that fall, however her husband died on 1 January 1515. According to historian Charles Giry-Deloison, contemporary French chroniclers quipped: “The King of England had sent a hackney [filly or prostitute] to the King of France, to carry him more swiftly and more sweetly to Hell or to Paradise,” see Giry-Deloison, “The French and Mary Tudor’s marriage to Louis XII in 1514,” in English Experience in France, ed. Grummitt, 132-159, quotation from 132. Henry sent friend Charles Brandon to accompany the dowager home, which he did, marrying her along the way. Tudor officials thought the elopement “a rumor of the French to dishonour England,” see Richard Sampson to Wolsey, 27 February 1515, BL Cotton MS, Galba B.V. 384, fol. 197.
40 Peter Martyr to Lud. (?) Furtado, 8 March 1514, LP 1/2707.
41 Julius de Medici to Henry, 22 June 1517, LP 2/3389.
42 Robert Macquéreau, Traicté et Recueil de la Maison de Bourgoigne en forme de chronique (c. 1530), as quoted in Gunn, “French Wars,” 48, n.5.
43 For a fuller description of Henrician views on the Tudor right to Scotland, see chapter three.
would take advantage of his departure.\textsuperscript{44} According to Hall, Henry charged in imperial terms: “I am the very owner of Scotland & he holdeth it of me by homage, & in so much as now contrary to his bounden duety he beinge my vassall, doth rebell against me, wt Gods help I shal at my returne expulse him his realme.”\textsuperscript{45} He patently refused to leave France.

As soon as Henry crossed into Tournai, James hastened south, occupying Flodden Field—no more judicious than his queen’s bellicose brother, Henry VIII.\textsuperscript{46} There, according to Peter Martyr, Katherine imitated her mother and made a “splendid oration to the English captains [that] they should remember that English courage excelled that of all other nations.”\textsuperscript{47} A major victory ensued; James and his men were slaughtered.\textsuperscript{48}

Through official correspondence in the fall of 1513, the two episodes were inextricably linked, despite the Channel separating them. Tuke’s letter from Tournai to Wolsey’s secretary underscores this fitting interconnectivity: after slaying James, Henry's lieutenants sought some proof to send their king. Amidst details of imperial policy, Tuke reported, “the rent surcoat of the King of Scots, stained with blood, has been sent to Tournai. The traitor Scots, who dare not face England when the king was there, and sought to destroy her in his absence, have paid a heavy penalty. Yesterday this opulent, strong, fair and extensive city of Tournai surrendered.”\textsuperscript{49} He closed by relaying an embarrassment of riches: “I am greatly fatigued, writing good and joyful news, thank God, in every direction.”\textsuperscript{50} For the duke of Milan, “the king was right in thinking that his intimation of the surrender of Tournay, was the more pleasant for the news of the victory

\textsuperscript{44} Henry to James IV, 12 August 1513, BL Harl. MS, 787, fol. 58.
\textsuperscript{45} Hall, \textit{Vnion}, 30. Hall interspersed the story of Flodden with that of Tournai, the two events inextricably linked for this chronicler.
\textsuperscript{47} Martyr to Furtado, 23 September 1513, \textit{LP} 1/2299.
\textsuperscript{48} Anon. report on the battle, 23 September 1513, BL Egerton MS 2014, fol. 2.
\textsuperscript{49} Tuke to Pace, 22 September 1513, \textit{CSPM} 1/660.
\textsuperscript{50} Tuke to Pace, 22 September 1513, \textit{CSPM} 1/660.
over the king of Scots about the same time.” Soon, the battered tartan emblazoned with Stewart arms lay in Henry’s hands as he mapped out his imperial administration in France.

Flodden destabilized Scotland overnight, plunging it into chaos. It was precisely the opening that Henry anticipated: he hastily asked to be appointed his infant nephew’s guardian and that the pope revoke Scottish independence, reduce St. Andrews to a bishopric under York (as it once had been), and condone James IV’s burial at St. Paul’s Cathedral. Though refused, the wheels of official propaganda immediately began to turn, as works from Richard Pynson’s press proclaimed Henry to be Scotland’s regent and sovereign lord.

Ultimately, then, such posturing towards a Britain-wide, imperial kingship encouraged by Flodden came to little in 1513, as Henry gave France priority. Still, it was neither insignificant nor coincidental that this first Tudor claim to Scotland came amid French adventure. The king was creating an empire, and the same history underwrote activity in both locations. The situation in 1542 would, however, look quite different, when the king would bring Tournai to bear on the 1530s and seek to build a truly British Empire on the foundation laid in 1513.

***

51 Duke to Henry, 27 November 1513, TNA: PRO SP 1/7, fol. 21 [LP 1/4579].
52 Taylor Diary, LP 1/2391. For corroboration of the object’s arrival, see Thomas Dacre to Henry, 22 October 1513, BL Cotton MS, Caligula B.VI., fol. 42.
From the outset, Henry embarked on a program to integrate Tournai into Tudor Britain with the status of an imperial possession. The first step was to replace extant French political structures with English ones and, of utmost importance within that, instill crown authority, thereby binding the territory to Henry’s imperium alone. In letters patent granted to residents, Henry emphasized the city’s fault, requiring payment of a massive war debt, renunciation of the soi-distant King Louis, and that all subjects receive him as their natural sovereign lord.\(^55\) Bowing before him, native provost John Le Sellier supplicated, “wee knowynge by reporte your honoure, your wysedome, your iustycye, and noble harte, are contente to become your subiectes and vassalles” and requested permission to surrender Tournai to monarchy in perpetuity.\(^56\) The contents of the command fit their highly significant title: reminiscent of the patents for Newfoundland that his father granted Cabot, this legal form had become, and would continue to be, the means by which Britain exercised overseas rule, Tournai an important step in the evolution of that executive instrument of empire.

Such an overwhelming concern for loyalty fit Henry’s measured disquiet. Despite fanfare and outward gratitude, a palpable undercurrent of anxiety, even outright rejection, marred the incoming rule, as Tudor officials voiced fear that the inhabitants would never give up their former master.\(^57\) Perhaps his newest subjects recognized something more than mere formality, of swapping official French for English overlordship. Indeed, this is precisely what they faced in the treaty of capitulation, which demanded that all residents, spiritual and temporal, take Henry

\(^{55}\) “Treaty of Capitulation,” n.d. 1513, TNA: PRO 31/8/144, fols. 286-7v. Not part of the SP, this source and several other documents on Tournai are catalogued in the subseries Records Commission Transcripts, Series II, as TNA: PRO 31/8/144.

\(^{56}\) Hall, *Union*, 45. Groveling and service made Le Sellier “the best Englishman that is born within Tournai” but “not a little hated among the Tournaisiens,” according to Richard Jerningham to Wolsey, 7 February 1516, *LP* 2/1499.

as their “natural and sovereign superior…[with] all rights and sovereignties, dignities, prerogatives, regal preeminences and jurisdiction,” any talk to the contrary declared treason.58

The treaty further commanded all subjects to swear to the new order, administered en masse by Wolsey. Designed to ensure obedience and ease governmental woes, the oath required Tournaisiens keep Henry as their “supremus rex,” defend against (French) attack, obey his laws, and report sedition.59 Subsequently, each subject had to appear before an English panel to sanctify the vow, accept excommunication in case of violation, and seek absolution from the Tudor crown alone. Refusal gave the subject twenty days to flee, permitted (in an act of clemency meant to convince most to stay) to take any moveable property and retain any incomes arising from within Tournai, so long as he did not relocate to “countries hostile to England.”60 On any given day in the 1510s, this excluded most of Europe, essentially creating a dichotomy between the current empire (technically England, Calais, Ireland, Wales, and Newfoundland) and everywhere else. They further agreed to a British garrison, of whatever size and duration Henry pleased, to reside within city walls.61 A significant use of oathing as a means of control, with its utterance, the preconditions were laid—British imperial rule in Tournai had begun and continental ears were appropriately perked.62

The capitulation’s sweeping claim to sovereignty was intentionally loosely defined, its elasticity a way for Henry to claim broad jurisdiction. It effectively made him supreme in Tournai, unlike contemporary England, where parliament and church circumscribed his power.

For the first time, a city beyond the Isles, was ruled according to a truly, self-consciously
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58 “Submission,” n.d. 1513, TNA: PRO 31/8/144, fol. 223, my translation from the original French.
59 “Oath,” n.d. 1513, TNA: PRO SP 1/230, fols. 65r-67v, quotation from fol. 65v. An additional provision allowed Henry to require repeated oathing, as he did in January 1517, according to “Obligation of its obedience,” TNA: PRO SP 1/14, fol. 244 [LP 2/2857].
60 “Oath,” n.d. 1513, TNA: PRO SP 1/230, fol. 66v.
61 “Oath,” n.d. 1513, TNA: PRO SP 1/230, fol. 67r.
imperial model, whereby the English crown oversaw law and justice, commerce and defense, even church—the very areas in which theorists and adventurers sought to spread Britishness and exercise rule elsewhere in the period. Albeit on different scales, geographically and culturally, the issues faced in Tournai matched those confronted in Ireland, Scotland, and the Americas, all believed to be markedly different and inferior to England.

Tudor objectives and stumbling blocks alike emerged almost immediately, in the selection of Tournai’s first governor, a job and a selection that were both squarely British and imperial. In October, the king appointed a head lieutenant with 5,000 English soldiers to remain permanently in Tournai. Alternatively styled governor, lord deputy, or lord lieutenant, the title and responsibilities mimicked those of the highest-level official in contemporary Ireland and, later, America, chosen by and subordinated to the king alone to act as royal agent at his pleasure. Without a French precedent, the governorship was a uniquely and decidedly British job, imbued with imperial status by Henry’s treaty. The man chosen was equally significant. Not only was he English—a qualification for the Irish version added by the Tudors—he was handpicked by the king for his loyalty and experience. In fact, he was the most practiced executor of Tudor rule overseas: Henry VII’s famed Irish lord lieutenant, Sir Edward Poynings.

Much like his title, then, Poynings was an English import via Ireland, brought in to reproduce the ostensible success vanquishing sedition, ordering new subjects, and spreading
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63 “Tournay,” 5 October 1513, LP 1/2336. According to Vergil, the number was 8,000 see Hay, ed., Vergil’s Anglica Historia, 165.
64 All three terms were used in conjunction with one another and often interchangeably, e.g.: for governor, see crown to Mountjoy, 20 January 1515, LP 2/41; for deputy, see Whetehyll to Wolsey, 13 March 1516, TNA: PRO SP 1/13, fol. 52; for lord lieutenant, see Jerningham to Wolsey, 11 February 1517, LP 2/2902; for use together, see Jerningham to Wolsey, 11 February 1517, LP 2/2902. On the Tudor origins of this position in Britain, its evolution through the seventeenth century, and its importance in early modern British imperialism, see Steven Saunders Webb, The Governors-General: The English Army and the Definition of the Empire, 1569-1681 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), especially preface and 1-6.
65 “Appointment,” 5 October 1513, LP 1/2336.
Anglican norms to the dominion for which Vergil and Hall memorialized him.\textsuperscript{66} Expressly asked to rule in accordance with royal design and keep the city in good order and justice, Poynings had served in Calais and the Low Countries, but his reputation was built on his Irish tenure.\textsuperscript{57} Already a knight of the garter, his preferment testifies both to an implicit comparison between 1490s Ireland and 1510s France and an explicit aspiration to replicate the tight oversight and reform Poynings had made famous thirty years earlier. Henry thus exported his father’s Irish project to France, though with a new authority and new discretion that, in many ways, epitomizes the differences between their kingship styles.

Ultimately, Poynings would prove too elderly for the task. In 1515, Henry replaced him with William Blount, fourth Lord Mountjoy, his friend and unofficial childhood tutor.\textsuperscript{68} This appointment reveals more of Henry’s vision, as the new governor’s reputation stemmed from his patronage of and own dabbling in the renaissance arts. With little knowledge of administration or war, Mountjoy’s experience was intellectual rather than practical, a student of classical empire.\textsuperscript{69}

Indeed, whether Henry’s intention or not, the new administration ushered early Tudor humanism from the halls of court into the empire: Desiderius Erasmus arrived in Tournai while editing his New Testament and \textit{Utopia} circulated among Tournai’s officer core after Thomas More’s visit less than a year before its 1516 publication in Latin.\textsuperscript{70} The pairing of \textit{Utopia} and Tournai was most fitting: the famous tract and city contemporary, mutually-informed experiments in overseas imperialism. Yet unrestrained in form or function like his prince and

\textsuperscript{66} For this contemporary legacy, see Hay, ed., Vergil’s \textit{Anglica Historia}, 79; Hall, \textit{Vnion}, 23-6 and 40-6.

\textsuperscript{57} Hall, \textit{Vnion}, 45.

\textsuperscript{68} Henry to Mountjoy, 20 January 1515, \textit{LP} 2/41.

\textsuperscript{69} Mountjoy had been lieutenant of Hammes Castle in Calais, a rather posh, cozy post that did not require residency. On Mountjoy, see Maria Dowling, \textit{Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII} (Dover, NH: Croom Helm, 1986), 13.

\textsuperscript{70} On 23 December 1515, Erasmus wrote to fellow humanist Andreas Ammonius that Wolsey had offered him a position in Tournai (\textit{LP} 2/1331). Soon after, More wrote to Erasmus on their common interest in the territory (17 January 1516, \textit{LP} 2/1552). In January 1517, Mountjoy wrote to Erasmus to thank him for sending \textit{Utopia} to him in Tournai and mused that “as he cannot have More’s presence, [he] will see it reflected in his work” (\textit{LP} 2/2747). Finally, in early March 1518, Erasmus described his visit to Tournai in a letter to Sampson (\textit{LP} 2/3981).
beneath a narrative cloak of abstraction, More mixed fiction and realism (a colony founded by a conquering prince in “that newe founde parte of the worlde”) to issue a stark critique of his kingdom and burgeoning empire.\textsuperscript{71} According to his rubric, colonial empire was only permissible to consolidate, improve, and extend the ideal commonweal; to rescue rude, wild people from tyranny; or to work unused land.\textsuperscript{72} Moreover, More expressly lambasted war against a near-neighbor, “vnder the coloure of some olde tytle of ryghte, such as kynges doo neuer lacke,” as he lamented princes who focus on war, chivalry, and how “to enlarge their dominions, [rather] than howe well and peaceablie to rule and gouerne what they haue all redie.”\textsuperscript{73} While certainly indicting improper expansion, More offered up an imperial model for his princely reader, emboldening Henry to emulate King Utopus, specifically in the New World.\textsuperscript{74}

Though Henry was already praised for his scholarly patronage, these men brought the intellectual and cultural currents central to Henrician imperial ideology to bear on its rule.\textsuperscript{75} Wolsey servant Richard Sampson, a constant presence in Tournai, even referred to the city as


\textsuperscript{72} For imperialism as a means to aid the commonwealth, see Robinson, ed., More’s \textit{Utopia}, sigs. C3r, D4r-5v, and J6r; for liberating from tyranny, see Robinson, ed., More’s \textit{Utopia}, sig. O2v; for planting wasted land, see Robinson, ed., More’s \textit{Utopia}, sigs. J5r-6v.

\textsuperscript{73} For “vnder…,” see Robinson, ed., More’s \textit{Utopia}, sig. P1v; for “to enlarge…,” see Robinson, ed., More’s \textit{Utopia}, sig. C1r.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Utopia} followed on the heels of two epigrams (numbers 243 and 244) commemorating the events of 1513 with daring ambivalence. In the first, More lamented that though few kings are satisfied to rule only one kingdom, there are even fewer, if any, who can rule a single kingdom well. The second extolled Henry as “Warlike Caesar,” while commenting that the king only felt (sensit) that he had accomplished something good. For the English translation of both poems as quoted herein and commentary, see Gerard Wegeman, \textit{Young Thomas More} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 110. Perhaps in response, the court engineered new English editions of the \textit{St. Albans Chronicle} (London: 1515), STC 10000.5, and \textit{Life of St. George} (London: 1516), STC 22992.1, both printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1515-6 and which solidified the French claim by memorializing past English conquests.

\textsuperscript{75} For an example of such praise, see Guillaume Budé to Pace, 20 April 1518, \textit{LP} 2/4128.
“Nervii,” a Belgian tribe in Caesar’s time. Despite furthering domestic intellectual networks and print culture and bringing pre-conquest ideology to bear on the exercise, the usefulness of an unprepared, court-bound governor quickly ran its course. Another Englishman, Richard Jerningham, replaced Mountjoy in 1517.

Each created by patent, the governors functioned as the crown’s eyes, ears, and fist on the ground; as commander-in-chief of a wholly English-created, manned, and run garrison; and as bailli, head of Tournai’s judicial system. Now rendered as “bailly by virtue of the King’s grant,” the post was fully Anglicized and under closer crown oversight than its French predecessor. Given leave to decide all civil and military cases in accordance with the king’s will and the common law that he sought to inculcate, the bailliage could punish, pardon, and impose martial law. But significantly, appeals went straight to London’s Court of Chancery. Natives recoiled against the alien system and tight centralization. Mountjoy agreed, deeming it cumbersome, impractical, and oppressive to Tournaisiens, and hoped to dissuade Henry against it.

Perhaps somewhat convinced but unwilling to surrender sovereignty or compromise a hallmark of English society for an inferior indigenous process, the crown did leave routine civic management to the four chiefs, a legislature comprised solely of elite Tournaisiens. Though the governor had standing orders to oversee their election and interfere as necessary to maintain Tudor will, the native council was perhaps Henry’s biggest blunder. The compromise empowered city elites to regard neither governor nor king as the perpetual ultimate authority and

---

76 Sampson to Erasmus, 2 March 1518, in R.A.B. Mynors, ed., Correspondence of Erasmus (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), 780.
78 Mountjoy to Wolsey, 12 July 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 299 [LP 2/701].
79 The system was confirmed in “Grants in January 1514,” LP 1/2617, item 22.
80 Mountjoy to Henry, 16 May 1517, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 77 [LP 2/1894].
81 Mountjoy to Wolsey, 11 September 1516, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 71.
laid the seeds of discontent by disrupting French home rule. Sampson reported to Wolsey that insubordination and disobedience were rampant, as Tournaisiens “have no wish to oblige either the King or any Englishman.” As Poynings put it in February 1514, the populace remained “good French.” Whether too controlling or not controlling enough, this instance of power-sharing was untenable. It was a tricky balance for the whole of Tudor imperialism, as subjects tackled the persistent, major question of how or whether to incorporate existing indigenous systems.

Aiding the governor was his council, an imperial version of this staple of Tudor national statecraft, the privy council. The theory of counsel was a foundational tenet of English humanism, percolating around a young Henry and penetrating his kingship wherever it extended. Indeed, the idea that good counsel bred good government, especially good monarchy, stemmed from the very classical philosophy that brought Greek and Roman Empire to bear on Henrician politics. There was little question, therefore, that Tournai’s governor would be advised by a council, just like his king, classical predecessors, and Irish counterpart. Formally the “King’s

---

82 I use the phrase “home rule” self-consciously here, to elicit comparisons to contemporary Ireland.
83 Sampson to Wolsey, 22 February 1516, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 293 [LP 2/1576]. For “obedience” as the most cited Tudor goal in Tournai, see, for example, Henry to Bainbridge, 12 April 1513, BL Harl. MS 3462, fol. 28; “Bond of the citizens,” n.d. September 1513, TNA: PRO SP 1/230, fol. 60; Henry to Tournaisiens, 18 November 1513, LP 1/2450; Henry to Bishop of Bath, 1514, TNA: PRO SP 1/14, fols. 247-50; Mountjoy to Henry, 12 February 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 45; Sampson to Wolsey, 20 May 1515 BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 288; Worcester to Henry, 2 September 1515, TNA: PRO SP 1/11, fol. 77; “Instructions given by Mountjoy,” n.d. 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 39; “Resolutions of the Provost,” n.d. 1516, TNA: PRO SP 1/13, fol. 27; and Sampson to Wolsey, 22 February 1516, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 293.
84 Poynings to Wolsey, 19 February 1514, TNA: PRO SP 1/7, fol. 94 [LP 1/2657].
council at Tournay,” the body included a deputy marshal, treasurer/comptroller, porter, and master of ordnance. Together, they both supplemented and sanctified the governor’s authority. Especially early on (c. 1513-4), British gentlemen might serve the royal council at home and in Tournai, yet even after 1515, no native Tournaisien ever served the organ. After all, as Charles Somerset, earl of Worcester, explained in 1515, the natives were only “true and faithful subjects to the King,” as far as the Tudors could perceive. Accordingly, he wrote, secrecy must be kept, assessing a fundamental inferiority and dubious loyalty among Tournaisiens.

***

All of Tournai’s governors and councilors were, then, noble English and Welshmen with courtly ties, which facilitated close correspondence with the king throughout their tenures. With varying experience, their most basic commonality, their prerequisite, was their heritage, and the crown imposed that condition on the rest of its administration, secular and ecclesiastical, military and civilian, with few exceptions. It was part of a broader program, essential to the Tournai project, to make the possession British, to transform it to fit this specific, superior ideal that was emerging concurrently and reinforced by the empire. From 1513 to 1519, Tudor subjects construed Britishness against two negative, alternative strangers: one native (the Tournaisien) and one European (the French), related yet distinguished by contemporaries. This made natural-born subjects not only better, but also exclusively trustworthy and capable of helping Britain retain and benefit from possession.

86 “Certain articles devised at Tournay,” 24 January 1517, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI, fol. 303 [LP 2/2819]. The particular posts are mapped out in June 1515, BL Harl. MS 5177, fol. 102 [LP 2/549].
88 Worcester to Henry, 27 August 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 194 [LP 2/856].
89 Worcester to Henry, 18 August 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 34 [LP 2/820].
90 Including Le Sellier and a single keeper of the seal. Both appointments were controversial, forcing the governor to take great pains to defend the picks and Henry to confirm them, see Mountjoy to Wolsey, 12 July 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 299.
With threats of treason from without and from within—Wolsey’s servants reported that “the French are resolved to recover” Tournai (along with their reputation) and that Tournaisiens were “glad to see English power diminishing”—the crown needed some way to secure the possession. Some, like John Yonge, suggested that Henry come tour the city, a method his father had employed to maintain far-flung realms. The scheme that took off, however, was plantation. From late-1513, the crown adopted a policy to send as many, natural-born English and Welsh subjects into Tournai, wooing them with public sale of Tournaisien plots and planting them in areas burnt by discontents. Others received letters patent for land or trade, just like in England. Though hard to measure in real numbers, news quickly spread to Brussels of the measure’s success, specifically reporting many Englishmen residing in Tournai. There, these and other Britons filled the void left by the unexpected hemorrhage of families who refused to dwell in the city so long as it remained under Tudor rule.

The most overwhelming presence, however, was certainly English soldiers. As the occupation wore on, Tournai forced Henry to increase his force in reply to the “refusal of the citizens to retain a competent number of Englishmen for watch and ward.” He enlisted his personal gunner, whom he proclaimed “one of the cunningest men in the world in the devising of artillery and fortresses,” for Tournai service in 1518. In addition, the king sent hundreds of his
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91 For “the French are resolved to recover,” see Thomas Spinelly’s Report, May 1515, BL Cotton MS, Galba B.III, fol. 234 [LP 2/536]; for “glad to see English power diminishing,” see Richard Whetehyll to Wolsey, 13 March 1516, TNA: PRO SP 1/13, fol. 52 [LP 2/1664].
92 Yonge to Wolsey, 18 August 1518, TNA: PRO SP 1/11, fol. 41 [LP 2/1/821].
93 For the scheme, see “License for the public sale of property in Tournai,” 25 September 1513, LP 1/2303; Mountjoy to Henry, 1 August 1516, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 44 [LP 2/2236].
94 For these grants, see Richard Whetehall to Wolsey, January 1516, TNA: PRO SP 1/12, fol. 117.
95 Andrieu de Zie Undonck to Maitre Des, 17 February 1516, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.I., fol. 11. The civilian British population must have been sizeable, however: one estimate noted 1,958 laborers and artificers from Britain, see “Tournay,” 13 September 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/16, fol. 23 [LP 2/3678]. Further, Henry owed over £250 “unto Englishmen not soldiers” for March 1519 alone, see “Accounts for Tournay,” 1519, LP 3/153, item 14.
96 Jerningham to Wolsey, 7 February 1516, LP 2/1498.
97 Wolsey to Jerningham, 29 January 1518, TNA: PRO SP 1/16, fol. 122 [LP 2/3907].
98 Gunner John Stile refused on 11 February 1518, BL Cotton MS, Vespasian C.I., fol. 125 [LP 2/3937].
own tools, weapons, and supplies from the Tower.\footnote{“Ordnance and Stores,” 17 April 1514, \textit{LP} 1/2812.} Fostering language on the “honour” of imperial subjecthood as well as English superiority in imperial governance and soldiering, Tudor officials proclaimed (albeit hyperbolically) how native Tournaisiens “desire to have an English garrison” and bow to Henry as they had Louis.\footnote{Mountjoy to Henry, 8 September 1515, \textit{LP} 2/891.}

The court expressly hoped that settlers—civilian and soldier—would function as a bulwark to sedition. These British colonists would function as a counterweight “unto divers strangers dwelling within Tournay”—a term applied throughout the century to inferior native inhabitants of the empire—and as a means to erode French influence, while offering a tangible model of well-ordered Tudor society.\footnote{For “unto divers . . .,” see “An Abstract of money due to Englishmen and strangers,” March 1519, \textit{LP} 3/153, emphasis added; for Britons as an example of good society, see Worcester to Wolsey, 27 September 1516, BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.III, fol. 76 [\textit{LP} 2/2394].}

Quite simply, Mountjoy noted, the city could not be kept without reinforcement from home, for “there are many strangers, much weapon, many cankered stomachs, some stark traitors in it.”\footnote{Mountjoy to Wolsey, 16 February 1515, TNA: PRO SP 1/10, fol. 59 [\textit{LP} 2/165].} To that end, in 1517, Jerningham applied for a team of laborers to “order” Tournai along English lines.\footnote{“Certain articles devised at Tournay,” February 1517, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI, fol. 303 [\textit{LP} 2/2819]. The articles included a list of the numbers required: “Masons, 506; servants and mortar makers, 1518; 30 carpenters, 8 sawyers, 22 smiths, 40 rokkyers and hewers of stone,” 200 unspecified laborers, 400 quarrymen, plus “12 pieren, lightermen, measurers of stone, and tailors of lime.”} The king obliged by sending in artisans, artificers, and a crown-chosen controller to oversee construction.\footnote{Mountjoy to Wolsey, 12 July 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI, fol. 299.} They, along with other civilians like the families of Tudor officials, saw that the city’s houses and gardens matched those of England and assuaged domestic burdens of population growth and unemployment.\footnote{Whetehall to Wolsey, 10 August 1516, \textit{LP} 2/2260. For example, various Wolsey relatives relocated in 1515, see “Wolsey’s Relatives,” December 1515, \textit{LP} 2/1368. For land usage as a tool of imperialism, see Patricia Seed, \textit{Ceremonies of Possession in Europe’s Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), chapter one.} Also culturally significant, the crown sought to instill some of the same pride for the monarchy he felt at home by spreading

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item \textit{Ordnance and Stores}, 17 April 1514, \textit{LP} 1/2812.
\item Mountjoy to Henry, 8 September 1515, \textit{LP} 2/891.
\item For “unto divers . . .,” see “An Abstract of money due to Englishmen and strangers,” March 1519, \textit{LP} 3/153, emphasis added; for Britons as an example of good society, see Worcester to Wolsey, 27 September 1516, BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.III, fol. 76 [\textit{LP} 2/2394].
\item “Certain articles devised at Tournay,” February 1517, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI, fol. 303 [\textit{LP} 2/2819]. The articles included a list of the numbers required: “Masons, 506; servants and mortar makers, 1518; 30 carpenters, 8 sawyers, 22 smiths, 40 rokkyers and hewers of stone,” 200 unspecified laborers, 400 quarrymen, plus “12 pieren, lightermen, measurers of stone, and tailors of lime.”
\item Mountjoy to Wolsey, 12 July 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI, fol. 299.
\item Whetehall to Wolsey, 10 August 1516, \textit{LP} 2/2260. For example, various Wolsey relatives relocated in 1515, see “Wolsey’s Relatives,” December 1515, \textit{LP} 2/1368. For land usage as a tool of imperialism, see Patricia Seed, \textit{Ceremonies of Possession in Europe’s Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), chapter one.
\end{thebibliography}
joyful news, like Katherine’s pregnancies, to Tournai, thereby creating a unified imperial system of sorts. However measures of success—defined by crown official Thomas Spinelly as ensuring that “if any enterprise be intended against Tournay, the people of the country will take part with England”—were minimal. At occupation’s end, Hall recalled, “many a young gentleman, and many a tall yoman wished that thei had not spent their tyme there.”

An imperial theory was burgeoning, one that, in many ways, formed a backbone of early British Atlantic Empire: plantation. As it played out here, on a small, mediated scale in Tournai, royal embrace of a policy of English rule and residence at once reflected and reinforced its broader application. Concurrently, in mid-1515, Henry summoned the foremost native chief of Ireland (also his lord deputy) the earl of Kildare to Greenwich, where minor complaints of insubordination widened to an inquest on the spread of unpalatable Gaelic culture into Old English strongholds, unchecked since Poynings. For the time being, Kildare’s groveling and assurances placated a king whose chief interest lay elsewhere, yet something had changed when Henry reasserted his historic empire in France, and observers took notice. Though stunted, arguably to 1536, Henrican imperial governance in Ireland began that summer.

Though Kildare gained leave to return home, call parliament, and select new officers, the inquest had raised the specter of Ireland for the first time since 1496 and encouraged intellectual hubbub amid Tournai experimentation. Baron of the Irish Exchequer Patrick Finglas not-so-subtly trotted out Henry II and Edward III, showing that though the current king was rightful heir
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106 The birth of Princess Mary came as if it were a press release directly from the Queen and addressing its native inhabitants rather than the Tudor bureaucracy, see Katherine to Tournai, 18 February 1516, LP 2/1556.
107 Spinelly to Henry, 1 April 1517, BL Cotton MS, Galba B.V., fol. 154.
108 Hall, Vnion, 67.
109 For record of the inquest, see the note by Venetian Peter Pasqualigo to (?), 3 May 1515, LP 2/411.
110 Royal licenses “for Gerald Earl of Kildare,” 7 October 1515, LP 2/996, 2/997, 2/998, 2/999, 2/1000, and 2/1001. The crown confirmed the license on 24 March 1516, LP 2/1704. Kildare’s restoration, even elevation, in 1515 has caused historians to dismiss this moment, even Henrician imperial policy altogether, as a cautious, unoriginal return to Anglo-Irish home rule. But in conjunction with Tournai and a few obscure political tracts, this image changes.
of Ireland, “there is at this day obedient to the King’s laws only the little English pale,” the remainder “over taken by Irishry.”

An anonymous tract supplied the manner of redress: with an army to “lyghtly conquyre,” augmented by a new crop of British inhabitants (specified as one man from every English and Welsh parish), Ireland would be glad to obey Tudor law and abandon native habit, language, and condition. To make his point, the author waxed hyperbolic on the wonders of the English vernacular, statue law, architecture, agriculture, and shiring, which made England unrivaled in justice, welfare, and prosperity. These defining features of Englishness, in turn, were meet to tame the “wylde Iryshe” and allow the Tudor crown to benefit from the isle’s port towns, timber, and ore. The author knew his audience well, asking rhetorically, what “better meane for the King of England to subdue the Kinges of Scottes, then torder his land of Ireland as aforesaid?” Then, “the same King shall subdue the realme of Fraunce… recover the grete cytee of Constantynoplle, vanquyshe the Turkes, and wynne the Holy Crosse. [He] shall dye Emperowre of Rome, and eternall blysse shall be his ende.” Caesar or Alexander, let alone Brutus or Arthur, would have nothing on this monarch, Irish colony his gateway to global British Empire. The author had mounted a British imperial argument for an Irish trial.

Others saw similar proclivities in their prince and deployed the same theory, but to further Henry VII’s other legacy: American venture. In this, they received a major boost from brothers-in-law Thomas More and John Rastell. Overshadowed by More’s scholarship and

---

113 Anon., “State of Ireland,” TNA: PRO SP 1/2, fol. 9.
114 Anon., “State of Ireland,” TNA: PRO SP 1/2, fol. 28.
115 Anon., “State of Ireland,” TNA: PRO SP 1/2, fol. 31.
martyrdom, their “Utopian Voyage” was the first New World project of Henry VIII’s reign, influential for promoters from Wolsey to Hakluyt despite never sailing past Ireland.\textsuperscript{116}

In 1516, as \textit{Utopia} reached print in Louvain, its author and his kinsman organized an expedition to Newfoundland. Galvanized by 1490s adventure, Tournai, and More’s fiction, Rastell set out in mid-1517 for a planned three-year stint with soldiers, textiles, tools, and a printer—an idealistic amalgam of Cabot and \textit{Utopia’s} Raphael Hythloday.\textsuperscript{117} Describing fish, skins, copper, naval stores, and eastern luxuries (a nod to the Northwest Passage), Rastell envisioned trade as well as colonization to propagate the foundational aspects of British civil society abroad: his soldiers would conquer, his artisans would build English-style fortification and homes, and his printer would instruct via the written word.\textsuperscript{118} But the crew anchored at Waterford and refused crossing, forcing Rastell to unload his wares there, in an ironic but fitting use of another site of Tudor ambition.\textsuperscript{119} The captain’s play, \textit{Interlude of the Four Elements}, distributed under his mermaid sign in 1519-20, memorialized his fate, purpose, and legitimacy: “what honorable thynge, Bothe to the realme and to the kynge, To have had his domynyon extendynge, There into so farre a grounde, Whiche the noble kynge of late memory, The most wyse prynces the vij. Henry causyd furst for to be founde.”\textsuperscript{120} He concluded: what great wealth would follow if “Englyshemen myght have ben the furst of all that there shulde have take possessyon and made furst buyldyng & habytacion, a memory perpetuall!”\textsuperscript{121} Rastell never wrote of “empire,” but his other vocabulary, descriptions, and familial connection to a scholar who

\textsuperscript{116}This fitting phrase is from E.J. Devereux’s article title, “John Rastell’s Utopian Voyage,” \textit{Moreana} 13, no. 5 (1976): 119-123.
\textsuperscript{117}Devereux, “Rastell’s Utopian Voyage,” 121.
\textsuperscript{118}J.O. Halliwell, ed., Rastell’s \textit{The Interlude of the Four Elements} (London: Richards, 1848), 30-31.
\textsuperscript{119}Halliwell, ed., Rastell’s \textit{Interlude}, 26-31.
\textsuperscript{120}Halliwell, ed., Rastell’s \textit{Interlude}, 29.
used imperialism as a major component of his political philosophy clarify this as perhaps the earliest British imperial, colonial scheme for the New World.

The same political and intellectual landscape that engendered Irish theory, *Utopia*, and Rastell’s voyage also assured their royal neglect due to the priority of Tournai. Still, 1515-6 had yielded three plantation schemes in the British Atlantic World, based on ancient and medieval archetypes. All significant Henrician products of the mid-1510s, Ireland and Newfoundland lay in wait for a fitting moment, the Tudor Empire otherwise engaged across the Channel.

***

In August 1515, the crown received a set of articles from Tournai’s inhabitants, which pled extreme poverty and distress under his rule.122 Henry firmly replied that their poor economy had arisen from years of local and French misgovernment alone, a predictable consequence of their laughable legislature and executive.123 To make amends, he committed to reforming all law inappropriate “for the conservation of the said sovereignty of the king, as for the weal and utility of the said town & the common weal of the same” and authorized his men to seize control of all finances and fiscal administration and travel door to door to catalogue and confiscate all armaments.124 With these acts, the king effectively extended sovereignty in Tournai, justified by an anti-French reading of history. This was not simply ordinary domestic rule over a city that happened to lie beyond Britain, nor a replica of Calais or Ireland. It was a distinct, new form of governance, an imperial form of governance that far exceeded the degree of control that the king could exercise at home.125

122 Described in Mountjoy to Henry, 16 August 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 37 [*LP* 2/812] and appearing in “Articles devised by the inhabitants of Tournai to be governed by the English king,” 27 August 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 194 [*LP* 2/856].
123 “Tournay,” January 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/14, fol. 244 [*LP* 2/2857].
124 Henry to the inhabitants of Tournai, n.d. (c. 1516), TNA: PRO SP 1/133, fols. 242r-44r, quotation from fol. 242r. The royal command reached Jerningham on 26 March 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/15, fol. 36r [*LP* 2/3055].
125 As Mayer also noted, see Mayer, “On the Road,” 16.
Indeed, because Tudor Tournai was experimental, policy could be contradictory and hard for the historian to interpret. A case and point comes when Henry called on the city to send representatives to Westminster. The first sign of this intent appears in November 1513, when, voicing concern that so many had taken up voluntary exile, Henry promised that he would not, as rumor had it, sacrifice his new subjects in some giant game of diplomatic chess. As proof, he noted his “will and intention for your committed and deputized [MPs] who should send your business to our next parliament, which will begin after Christmas”—the very next session, opening in January 1514.126

For the past half-century, the Plantagenets had halted the creation of new constituencies, reluctant to increase the size of the Commons. Though his father maintained the trend, Henry ushered in a windfall in the other direction, as parliament grew by a quarter between 1513 and 1558—more than half created by Henry, who drastically reduced the Lords (by removing abbots and priors) and simultaneously extended representation to his northern, southwestern, and eastern peripheries. As A.D.K. Hawkyard ascertained, it was “a means of unifying the kingdom, nurturing the commonwealth, and strengthening the Crown’s assertion of England’s imperial status.”127 Tournai inaugurated and fundamentally influenced that process, twenty-two years before Calais ever sent MPs across the Channel.


As Henry had promised, in early 1514, John Le Sellier and three other native subjects appeared before the English Parliament to represent Tournai. And, significantly, their presence appears to have resulted in legislation. On 26 February, the record shows that they drew attention to the problems of imperial governance precipitated by the substitution of British for French authority and testified to the Valois modus operandi, prompting passage of a solution: an act concerning the ministration of justice in Tournai. The momentous statute defined the commercial relationship between Tournai and Britain and, by extension, the status of imperial subjects vis-à-vis domestic ones: it declared contracts lawfully made in Tournai and marked with a new, special royal seal enforceable in England and empowered English authorities in Tournai to enforce contracts drawn at home. Most noteworthy, however, was the act’s preamble, which began by plainly asserting Henry’s great desire “to recover the Royalme of Fraunce his very true patrimony and inheritaunce and to reduce the same” in its entirety. The preface continued by describing the king’s unwavering commitment to “true and indifferent justice… mynistered in all matters and causes aswell to [those] dwellyng and inhabityng” abroad in the empire, as “his naturall Subjectes dwelling within this his Royalme of Englond.” Finally, the item delineated between national and imperial subjects, explaining that while the former was represented in Commons, residents of overseas holdings were not expressly guaranteed that right.

---


According to the docket, the justice act was the very first statute passed by the 1514 session, a statement on Tournai’s importance and meaning for the body.\textsuperscript{133} Regardless of the precise standing of Tournai’s attendees—whether they were full members or simply advisors—their appearance is striking and instructive, an example of the empire influencing the national agenda and of parliament enacting imperial policy. Just one year into the project, Henry had offered a part of his historic empire some stake at the highest level of national constitutional governance, conferring unto them a role or voice (though not necessarily power) wholly inconsistent with his other overseas possessions, like Ireland or Calais. The law strengthened the connection between Tournai and the crown, an attempt at solving the endemic imperial problems of distance and difference.\textsuperscript{134} According to chronicler Raphael Holinshed in 1587, Henry VIII believed that his parliament conjoined and knit together the body politic.\textsuperscript{135} If Holinshed was correct, then here was an effort at cohesive empire-building and consolidation, a concerted Tudor domestic goal apparent since 1485. Finally, like the rest of the enterprise, the move too illustrates true experimentation, a complicated mix of novelty, pragmatism, and fumbling about. Tournai was undoubtedly inferior, but reaped some perks of Tudor subjecthood.

As the official documents show, Tournai’s representation did not stem from local demand, but from the crown. The act, in turn, was a vehicle to further British administration, to clarify its judicial role and codify the exercise of English law, thereby strengthening the nation-

\textsuperscript{133} “Parliament,” 23 January 1514, \textit{LP} 1/2590.
\textsuperscript{134} Contrary to the findings of Hawkyard, Cruickshank, and Mayer, who all argued that the Tournaisiens were MPs, Davies questioned the representative’s status, suggesting that they may have been a delegation sent to discuss various points, rather than proper members of parliament. His best evidence is that Tournai does not appear on the dissolution constituency list, however they arrived late, were not subject to parliamentary tax (only crown tax), and, sent four men, rather than the usual two MPs, see Davies, “Tournai MPs,” 233-235. Based on my reading of the evidence, I think that they operated in a quite ambiguous role, reflecting a new and evolving empire, the record too vague for certainty. For Hawkyard, see Hawkyard, “Enfranchisement of Constituencies,” 1-6; for Cruickshank, see Cruickshank, “Parliamentary Representation of Tournai,” \textit{English Historical Review} 83, no. 329 (October 1968): 775-6; for Mayer, see Mayer, “On the Road,” 17-19.
empire bond and promulgating two tenets of Britishness—parliamentary administration and common law—both regarded as unique and superior and both bolstered by such an expansion of their jurisdiction. Further, by legislating the economic relationship between England and Tournai, parliament had marked off a Tudor Empire as a distinct, self-contained entity. There, subjects, regardless of location, functioned together as a single body. Ultimately, however, someone bristled at the authority and measure of equity conferred by the Tournaisien participation or the precedent that it set. The city’s parliamentary involvement ended there, in 1514, and with the exception of Calais, no other overseas possession enjoyed enfranchisement.\textsuperscript{136} Henrician imperial policy was new and fluid, developed by trial and error, with the Rough Wooings and later projects the apparent beneficiaries of the Tournai project.

The new law highlights another primary area in which the crown formed novel imperial policy at Tournai. With travel time between the city and London at least ten days (and involving both a Channel crossing and passage through Valois territories) as well as the complicating presence of a nexus of preexisting French legal systems, justice was a pervasive imperial issue that required and produced a new approach.

Due to its homegrown industries and location, the city’s courts were immensely consequential for Tournasiens, with litigation popular among merchants and manufacturers who could afford and demand proceedings.\textsuperscript{137} Previously, the bai\textit{lli} ran the system, appeals funneled through the \textit{Cour de parlement} at Paris. At first, Tudor officials retained the scheme, inserting its governor as bai\textit{lli}, while the king used his prerogative via letters patent to restart the stalled

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{136} Hawkyard presumed that Tournai returned members in 1515, but I have not found evidence of this, see Hawkyard, “Enfranchisement of Constituencies,” 7-9. Davies also did not find subsequent representation and argued that the parliamentary enfranchisement of Calais (1536) showed “the Anglicization of Calais, rather than being modeled on the supposed privilege granted to Tournai in 1514,” see Davies, “Tournai MPs,” quotation from 235.

\textsuperscript{137} Cruickshank, \textit{Occupation}, 190-192.
judiciary. He encouraged any subject with a decision in hand from Paris to come before the governor for review and, if approved, the ruling would proceed as if issued from Westminster by a British judge. If not, all parties would await such national adjudication. For new cases, however, the crown set up an original, imperial machine. Couched in terms of his historic right and desire to “return to our obedience our kingdom of France, our true patrimony and heritage,” Henry proclaimed “our supreme Cour de parlement at Paris” to be in open rebellion against its crown and therefore incapable of rendering decision. In its place, he selected five notable Englishmen trained in Common Law to hear all matters previously sent to Paris. Together, they would comprise an unimpeachable “court sovereign” that would sit in Tournai permanently, with jurisdiction over all of France (once fully recovered). Last but not least, the crown declared that all decisions would bear a new seal, which was modeled on the Great Chancery Seal to depict the king with domed crown, orb and scepter, fleur-de-lis, greyhound, dragon, and lion, enthroned on St. Edward’s chair. It was a powerful image that, together with the court’s creation, reveals the broader Tudor imperial vision at work at Tournai.

The court sovereign, however, was never created in Tournai. Despite nominal native approval, Henry vacillated, convinced the court needed close oversight to ensure good justice and that its location abroad would lower the prestige of London or that of his rule in the eyes of

---

138 For this procedure, see Henry to Maximilian, January 1513, LP 2/83, and Jerningham to Wolsey, 11 February 1517, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 85 [LP 2/2902].
139 Henry to the inhabitants of Tournai, February 1514, PRO 31/8/144, fol. 237 [LP 1/2684].
140 “Grants in February 1514,” LP 1/2684, item 107.
141 “Grants in February 1514,” LP 1/2684, item 107. Henry relinquished the power of appointment to the governor (who was also a de facto judge) under Mountjoy, but rescinded it under Jerningham. Mountjoy received the right expressly from Henry three times: in royal correspondence from May 1516, LP 2/1894; December 1516, LP 2/2737; January 1517, LP 2/2858. The crown took it back in a letter to Jerningham, 10 July 1517, LP 2/3458.
142 The “court sovereign” was created and laid out across three documents: “Tournay,” 26 February 1514, TNA: PRO SP 1/144, fol. 237 [LP 1/2676]; “Grants in February 1514,” LP 1/2684; and “Appointment,” 1 October 1515, LP 2/979.
143 “Administration of Justice,” 4 March 1514, LP 1/2699.
his subjects. He proved wholly uncomfortable devolving authority to the imperial periphery; instead, the king preferred a “court sovereign in your Chancery within your realm of England.” In practice, then, appeals went home, while a crown commission headed by the governor executed local justice under common law.

Just as the nation aided the imperial territory, supplying its administrative structures and law, settlers and soldiers, the imperial territory aided the nation. As project propaganda stressed, domestic benefit was a necessary requisite that justified the burdens of empire: “the great expences of the King [in Tournai are] for the common benefit of all.” Though Jerningham offered this analysis to rustle up funds, his comment reveals a presumption that empire served the commonweal. This was particularly true in the areas of trade and economy.

Much as his successors sustained empire in part to further Britain’s economic interests, so Henry was attracted to Tournai. There, he saw a center for timber and marble, textiles, and wine that would offer Britain a valuable new source for much-desired goods, new trading partners, markets, and surplus victuals, while cutting Francis off from his provisions. But the Tudor

---

144 For the native response and courtly debate on the matter, see Mountjoy to Wolsey, 16 May 1516, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 77 [LP 2/1894]; Jerningham to Wolsey, 24 May 1517, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 93 [LP 2/3279].
145 “Report by the townsman on certain Articles,” January 1517, LP 2/2858.
146 Mountjoy to Wolsey, 24 January 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/14, fol. 218. In the Court of Chancery records, I have found eight suits involving Englishmen at Tournai related to the occupation: TNA: PRO C 1/295/37; C1/313/13; C1/383/15; C 1/466/15; C1/544/27; C 1/562/78; C 1/624/44; and C1/697/1. I have also found consistent use of the English commissions and common law in Tournai cases. Some of the most interesting include the 1515 murder of “two of the King’s subjects of Tournay” by a French fugitive who was extradited home (see Mountjoy to Wolsey, 17 September 1515, LP 2/918) and the 1515 mutiny of several Englishmen from the Tournai garrison, who were either “justiced and banished at the city… to go in their shirts with halters about their necks” or “executed for seditiously exhorting the people,” under Henry’s name (see “Tournai,” 7 December 1515, LP 2/1255).
147 Jerningham to Wolsey, 26 March 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/15, fols. 36r-37 [LP 2/3055], quotation from fol. 36v.
148 For timber, marble, and wine, see Jerningham to Henry, 7 December 1518, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 96 and Thomas Boleyn to Wolsey, 14 August 1519, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VII., fol. 143. A chief expense for the crown by the end of the occupation was the shipment of tools and materials to work the stone, see “Accounts for Tournay,” March 1519, LP 3/153. For use of Tournai marble in England, see Elizabeth Schwartzbaum, “Three Tournai Tombstones in England,” Gesta, 2, no. 1 (1981): 89-97 and Paul Rolland, “Expansion Tournaissienne au Xle et XIe Siècle: Art et Commerce de la Pierre,” Annales de l’Académie Royale d’Archéologie de Belgique, 72 (1924): 175-219. Most of all, British officials eagerly gobbled up tapestries to decorate their English manors. For these textiles, see Le Sellier to Wolsey, 5 May 1517, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 310. Le Sellier even brought
A siege had sent the Tournaisien economy into a tailspin, trade suspended at Henry’s arrival and anything left syphoned off by a king eager to recoup his investment. When the occupation began, then, Tudor officials faced a tough road ahead to reinvigorate trade, but a necessary one—the city was of little use to anything other than the king’s ego if it could not line royal coffers and British purses. Moreover, without improvement, loyalty would be near impossible to secure, as the chiefs complained that “their city, hitherto a place of trade, was being converted into a city of war.” Equally significant, as the court justified Tournaisien occupation by a specific list of necessary commodities from 1513 on, they solidified a mercantile inducement for empire and armed successors with this important ideological argument applicable to Atlantic-wide expansion. Wherever they went in the sixteenth century, Britons described a ready export-import market, raw materials, and products that complemented and supplemented its own industries, like textiles, oil and wine (the most beloved Mediterranean goods), or naval stores.

Nevertheless, practical crown policy was flawed and rendered economic recovery difficult. The king’s first mistakes came early, when he blamed the city’s poverty on Tournai, imposed massive fees, and permitted inhabitants to leave with their wealth. As a remedy, while Le Sellier and his friends attended parliament, letters patent from Greenwich in March 1514 confirmed Tournaisien license to trade with England with identical rights, privileges, and taxes as natural-born Englishmen. After all, the preamble to the justice act exhibited the centrality of trade to early Henrician empire, positing that “great amytie famyliaritie and entercours [will ensue] in bying and selling of merchandises wares and oderwise bytwene the several pieces with him to parliament, expecting to make fast friends by passing them around, see Jerningham to Wolsey, 25 January 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/4, fol. 222.

Sampson to Wolsey, 14 June 1515, BL Cotton MS, Galba B.III., fol. 326.

Worchester to Henry, 18 August 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 34.

Henry to Inhabitants of Tournai, 18 November 1513, LP 1/2450.

Letters patent, 16 March 1514, TNA: PRO SP 1/230, fol. 103.
Citizens and inhabitauntes of the seid Cities Townes and percincte of the same And the Kynges naturall Subjectes inhabituntes in this his Royalme of England.”

In terms of trade, then, Henry willingly recognized his new subjects as partners in the hopes of fostering fidelity and anglophilia. By equalizing commercial status, the state clarified the importance of mercantile concerns in early overseas ambition and created a cohesive, functional economic body, a commercial empire of sorts, with tangible benefits for both sides. Significantly, however, fiscal administration lay squarely in British hands: the king appointed Englishmen to oversee all contracts while inter-realm disputes came before the Court of Chancery, with the Lord Chancellor authorized to send a sergeant-at-arms to require compliance. Britain too benefited from currency imbalance, as Wolsey learned that “the worst pence in England are good money at Tourney.” Despite clear disparity in power and authority, the commercial sector pragmatically afforded more rights and benefit to members of the empire than any other sphere. Even then, the effort was largely futile. By 1517, severe lack of capital had halted the king’s building works, as rumors swirled of exiles gaining in strength and mounting a Valois-aided attack. Though it never found that elusive balance of national advantage and native appeasement, the crown drew on and set powerful precedent in its attempt.

Coining money was considered an essential, useful royal prerogative, a practical instrument of governance and a canvas wholly in crown control. Quickly, Henry determined to

---

153 “Act concerning Ministracion of Justice… Tourney,” 1514, in Raithby, ed., Statutes of the Realm, 3:93. On 21 November 1518, the Bishop of Worcester requested that the Marshal of Tournai be granted authority to give free passage to “those who come from Tournay,” but talks to return the region to France had already begun and so the issue was never taken up, see BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., quotation from fol. 34.
154 As required by the “Act concerning Ministracion of Justice… Tourney,” in Raithby, ed., Statutes of the Realm, 3:93. The compliance measure is noted in a note from 26 February 1514, TNA: PRO SP 1/144, fol. 239 [LP 1/2676].
155 Robert Fouler to Wolsey, 9 June 1514, TNA: PRO SP 1/8, fol. 128.
156 For the progress of city works, see William Pawne’s report, 21 December 1515, TNA: PRO SP 1/12, fol. 25; for the Valois threat, see Jerningham to Wolsey, 7 February 1516, LP 2/1498.
create a mint in Tournai, operational c. 1514-5. Its infrastructure was the work of William Stafford, warden of the Tower mint, with Mountjoy and John Sharp—all English officials instructed by royal patent to strike groats to match the English standard, with gravers, finers, smiths, and other workmen from home. As 1540s comptroller of the Tudor mint Martin Pirry explained, “Kings of England heretofore when they have won any foreign country or town have shortly set up a mint there, that the coins there printed might be a perpetual memory of the winning thereof,” including Edward III in 1347 Calais. This was likely Henry’s example. However, the Tudor court manipulated the occasion in a new, fundamentally important way that distinguished Tournai from Calais.

The court supplied Stafford with several prints and forms as guides for the new coin. His work yielded two surviving versions, both declaring “Henric 8 di gra francie et anglie rex,” (transposed to stress the French claim) with fleur-de-lis and lions; the reverse showed St. George’s Cross, with Tudor rose and “h” or a profile of Henry VII, who appeared on all English currency to 1526; finally, both employed the arched imperial crown, atop the royal shield, gothic “T,” or crowning the late monarch.

Though deployed by Henry VII to legitimize his new dynasty, never had the imperial crown been used so often, in such a variety of forms, nor to symbolize a territorial expansive kingship and totality of power (via the enclosed shape) as well as descent from Brutus, Constantine, and Arthur. Through his reign, Henry VIII used it in cloth, tapestry, portraiture, and

---

157 The coins read 1513, but the old-style year ended on 25 March 1514 and they may have been backdated to commemorate the invasion. They are, however, the first English coins to bear a date, see Cruickshank, Occupation, 138-142.
158 For the mint’s creation, see the miscellaneous entry for 8 March 1514, LP 1/appendix 27. For English manpower, see “Mint at Tournay,” 7 April 1514, TNA: PRO SP 1/230, fol. 138-44 [LP 1/2788]; for the need to emulate “English groats,” see “Coinage at Tournay,” n.d. 1516, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II, fol. 33 [LP 2/1972].
159 Martin Pirry to (?), n.d. April 1545, LP 20/2, appendix 16.
160 Noted in “the King’s Book of Payments,” February 1515, LP 2/1466-9.
161 For images of the coins, see H. Casterman, ed., Annales de la Sociéte Historique et Archéologique de Tournai, new ser. 5 (Tournai, Belgium: Société Historique et Archéologique de Tournai, 1900), 467.
metal, and now, seminally, abroad in the empire at Tournai. Contemporaneously, an anonymous Flemish artist painted the Battle of the Spurs in a massive panel for Hampton Court, taking pains, as historian Dale Hoak showed, “graphically to register the fact that in his new-won French domain, Henry VIII’s standing was not inferior to that of the emperor: in size and prominence of place the device of the Tudor crown imperial on Henry’s white field pavilion challenges that of the Habsburg crown on Maximilian’s.”162 Meanwhile, royal shipwrights launched the Henry Imperial, arguably the most powerful warship of its time, and Mary Emperyall, named for the new heir.163 Built during the Tournai project, which had prompted study of “the state of the King’s ships” according to contemporaries, this flagship and secondary were intended as a means to defend and expand further abroad.164 Use of the imperial crown as a primary icon in the midst of Tournai reveals Henry’s understanding of the enterprise and of his kingship, while underscoring the experiment’s significance. As legal tender, the coins circulated across Europe, memorializing Henry’s accomplishment as decidedly imperial and popularizing the diadem icon.

Closely tied to Tournai’s economy was its defense, the single greatest Tudor cost, necessitated by its distance from home and volatile neighbors. Henry had won Tournai in battle, and accordingly, armed invasion, occupation, even permanent garrisoning were key imperial methods here, as they would be for sixteenth-century empire throughout the Atlantic World.

In theory, Tournai saw an unequivocal commitment to retain military command wholly in English hands and with native funds. Fear of a Tournaisien uprising—stoked by comments like those of King Ferdinand of Spain that “the nature of Frenchmen [is] that they will not let

164 “View taken at Portsmouth by Sir William Fitzwilliam,” 28 February 1514, LP 1/2680. Launched in 1513, the Henry (later dubbed Henry Grace à Dieu) cost £8,000 and weighed 1,500 tons. The Mary followed in April 1517.
Tournay be lost without doing their utmost to recovery it”—meant the Tudor crown never wavered from the first point; however, the second was impossible given the city’s bankruptcy and the crown’s unwillingness to test loyalty with further taxation. In practice, then, Henry subsidized defense continually, his officials perpetually in search of an abstract economic self-sufficiency. Their failure and the massive domestic spending that ensued was a striking lesson and, more immediately, a contributing factor in Henry’s search for land and cash at home. Self-sufficiency became a most ubiquitous watchword, goal, and promise of British imperial ideology and promotion to 1603.

According to Mountjoy, some crown officials hoped to reduce the garrison over time, but never end occupation altogether. Their plan would phase out high-paid yeoman, stop paying soldiers in advance, and make the city financially responsible for its own safekeeping, while retaining as many Englishmen as formerly, ordered exactly like those garrisons currently stationed in England. But British leadership on the ground pushed back, insistent “upon the difference of Tournay from the other garrisons, the dearness of provisions, the disadvantage of credit, the smallness of profits.” In other words, there were fundamental incongruities between defending nation and empire; prior models only went so far. Further, if we take him at his action rather than his word, Henry agreed: he played an unusually large, personal part in Tournai defense policy, to the torment of stymied officials, the detriment of functionality and his coffers, and quite unlike his English leadership. For example, the king footed the bill for a colossal

165 Ferdinand to Bernard de Mesa, December 1514, BL Egerton MS 544, fol. 153 [LP 1/3591].
166 Mountjoy to Wolsey, February 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 39.
167 For the plan, see Tournai Council to Henry, 31 May 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/15, fol. 143 [LP 2/3313] and Wolsey to Jerningham, 16 January 1518, TNA: PRO SP 1/16, fol. 109 [LP 2/3886].
168 “Memorial by J. Russell to Wolsey,” May 1517, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 61v [LP 2/3323]. Russell added that the Tournai garrison was the most important force in the expanding Tudor realm.
169 For crown participation, see the case of Henry Spurr, when the minor choice of a yeoman of the guard for Tournai required express royal sanction, see “For Henry Spurr,” December 1515 (LP 2/1375). In addition, the king frequently complained that his instructions had not been observed, e.g. William Pawne to PC, 7 November 1515,
citadel, surrounded by thatched cottages for British settlers.\textsuperscript{170} It stood as a less-than-subtle physical manifestation of his determination to keep the city, the superiority of Tudor craft and might, and the presence of British empire, a worthwhile expenditure, royal officials reasoned, to reduce the garrison, facilitate rule, aid expansion, and secure the Channel.\textsuperscript{171} Symbolic of Tournai’s meaning to the crown, as it happened, the citadel accounts for the project’s financial failure.\textsuperscript{172}

Much of the ideological and practical experimentation appreciable at Tournai, from the definition and spread of Britishness, to the status of a new dominion, to the exercise of profitable, supreme imperium came together in one space, and one episode in particular: the fight over the city’s bishopric. It was an essential moment not only “On the Road to 1534,” as historian Thomas Mayer argued, but on another, intersecting path that ran far beyond the break from Rome, to map the trajectory of early British Empire.\textsuperscript{173}

Tournai was attractive in part because of its sizable, influential, wealthy diocese. As Mountjoy remarked in 1515, it would be “no small pleasure for the King to have the best [see] in France… under the spiritual jurisdiction of an Englishman.”\textsuperscript{174} Moreover, religious invective had grounded conquest theory, lending Henry due cause, even missionary right, to turn one of his twelve apostolic armaments (Bartholomew) on Tournai’s Notre Dame Cathedral and monastery

\begin{flushright}
TNA: PRO SP 1/11, fol. 159 [LP 2/1118]. Henry gave his lengthiest instructions for Tournai in early 1517, see “Tourmay,” 7 February 1517, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 303 [LP 2/2972].
Tournai Council to Henry, 31 May 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/15, fol. 143 [LP 2/3313].
The monumental citadel was to have five new towers, among them the “King’s Tower,” the only part of the structure that survives today. For the citadel as a sign of Tudor intent, see Worcester to Wolsey, 27 August 1515, LP 2/857; for broader usages and meanings as listed here, see Worcester to Wolsey, 27 August 1515, LP 2/857; Whetehyll to Wolsey, 25 March 1516, LP 2/1708; Mountjoy to Wolsey, 31 May 1516, LP 2/1962; and Jerningham to Wolsey, 31 May 1518, LP 2/4201.
Cruckshank, Occupation, 104-27.
This phrase is the main title to this article, see Mayer, “On the Road,” 11.
Mountjoy to Henry, 19 August 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula E.II., fol. 32.
\end{flushright}
“to wake them up to be more inclined to serve God.” Now, Tudor official Robert Wingfield chalked native defiance up to heretical preachers and sought the “ruin or reduction of many [infi]delys to the right way of religion and life.” To that end, Mountjoy oversaw the construction of a new church, St. Peter’s. Untarnished by French schism, made with British hands along their architectural standards, a British clergy would proselytize godly faith and combat the immorality of the Tournaisien abbot. With so much to fix, it soon became abundantly clear that unless royal command extended over all Tournai, befitting an enclosed crown, then city obedience, wealth, even governance would always lay just beyond Tudor grasp, its kingship in the empire not truly *imperial*.

The ailing Tournai bishop had died shortly before Henry invaded. As the rest of the clergy took their requisite oath at surrender, the bishopric lay cold, but not vacant. In mid-1513, Leo X had selected Louis Guillard its administrator, bishop-elect until his majority. Unsurprisingly, the pick was political, an olive branch to the Valois, with an added perk of limiting the reach of any new regime, whether Tudor or Habsburg. Guillard had the pope, title, tax collectors, native clergy, and his own French birth behind him. His very existence stoked an undercurrent of anti-Tudor sentiment, making it impossible for Henry to fulfill his 1513 vision: as Wolsey learned, “a papal nominee claims the benefice, and, unless the King make proper provision, no Englishman shall have a quiet benefice in Tournay.” As other spiritual posts fell vacant and the economy collapsed, Guillard refused to submit to Henry and deepened native
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176 Wingfield to Wolsey, 10 December 1515, BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.XVIII., fol. 217 [LP 2/1265].
177 Mountjoy to Wolsey, December 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 302 [LP 2/1259].
178 Word of the appointment reached England in a fragmented report, 19 June 1513, TNA: PRO SP 1/230, fols. 24-35 [LP 1/2197].
179 Sampson to Wolsey, 8 September 1515, TNA: PRO SP 1/11, fol. 84 [LP 2/889].
resolve to combat British rule. Tournai needed a British bishop; its imperium—territorially-expansive and supreme over all subjects—depended upon it.

Henry’s pick for the bishopric was easy: a co-executor of Tournai, rising councilor, and cleric. Indeed according to Le Sellier, as early as February 1514, “Ponynges has spoke to Wolsey already of an office held by an unfit person… not an English subject.” Yet Wolsey’s potential appointment to the see was part of a broader program, overshadowed by his high-profile part. Surmising that “English canons would do good” throughout the wealthy dominion, the court worked to advance British stalwarts in the Church, but was blocked by Leo at every turn.

Guillard’s refusal to swear the Tudor oath was the crown’s loophole: Wolsey explained “do ye suppose that the said elect shall be admitted or suffered to dwell in Tournay without the King my master’s licence…? He could not be admitted unless he become the King’s subject, and renounce the French.” Without the vow, he could not reside in Tournai, a requirement of the see, as Leo agreed. But when Henry appealed to Francis to forbid Guillard to meddle in the city, Francis instead called on his followers to fight British authority. As it feared, the crown was losing control over the ecclesiastical realm, and the temporal was following suit. Sampson advised Wolsey “to use sharply the spiritual sword,” for all knowledgeable men fear it more “than the temporal, as they are not formidable who only have power over the body.” As the fight reached fever pitch, the court worked out the limits and meaning of Henrician imperium.

180 Le Sellier to Wolsey, February 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 309 [LP 2/150].
181 Sampson to Wolsey, 20 June 1516, TNA: PRO SP 1/13, fol. 224 [LP 2/2066]. Interestingly, on 19 August 1515, Worcester and Mountjoy suggested that “all the bayl[wick be] placed like Calais under the jurisdiction of the see of Canterbury,” in a letter to the crown, BL Cotton MS, Caligula. E.II., fol. 32 [LP 2/824]. In addition, whenever the crown tried to make lesser clerical appointments, Leo responded with lists of acceptable Frenchmen, e.g. Leo to Henry, June 1514, LP 1/2978.
182 Wolsey to Sampson, n.d. December 1514, TNA: PRO SP 1/9, fol. 216.
183 Wolsey to Worcester, 22 October 1514, TNA: PRO SP 1/9, fol. 116 [LP 1/3379].
184 For “to use…,” see Sampson to Wolsey, 20 May 1515, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 288 [LP 2/480]; for “than the temporal…,” see Sampson to Wolsey, 8 June 1515, BL Cotton MS, Galba B.III., fol. 324 [LP 2/566].
Here was the budding of imperial, not just Tournaissien, policy, as the logic that undergirded the debate penetrated the broader, developing empire. Since the 1490s, the Tudor crown had interfered little in Ireland, preferring home rule amid other distractions. Tellingly, that now changed, coinciding with and deeply informed by Guillard’s seat. As the king tested imperial waters in France, he too waded west. In mid-1514, he eschewed procedure and directly appointed Englishman John Kite as Archbishop of Armagh without papal sanction, a blatant rejection of Rome and unmistakable show of royal prerogative, imperial jurisdiction, and kingly authority—for Kite was not just any pick, but Wolsey’s closest servant. The very first royal ecclesiastical appointment there, Kite symbolized things to come in Tudor Ireland, a tightening temporal and spiritual control via English rule, as the clergymen ferried tithes into England and sought to teach civility and obedience. For now, though, it was a shot across the Vatican bow.

Not long after, the French “battle of the bishops” reached a crisis, devolving into a literary war. In reply to Sampson’s reasoning that “as in England, Calais and the Marches, the Pope meddleth with no gift of benefices, so he may be content to abstain in Tournay” and complaints of papal ambivalence, Francis pressured Leo into issuing a set of clandestine bulls that restated Guillard’s title. The documents expressly excluded Wolsey, empowered the
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185 Kite to Wolsey, 14 May 1514, TNA: PRO SP 60/1/4 [LP 1/2907]. To this date, English kings selected bishops for England, Ireland, and Wales in conjunction with the pope through a recommendation or nominating procedure that required formal approval from Rome for appointment. The king would give his choice to the cathedral chapter, which would then select a bishop-elect to be recommended to the pope, who usually accepted the candidate. Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer was the last appointed by this method, in 1533. The right to select bishops directly, without foreign interference, was central to the Henrician Reformation. For the procedure and the history of Henry’s bishops, see Kenneth Carleton, Bishops and Reform in the English Church: 1520-1539 (London: Boydell, 2001), especially 7-8; Andrew Chibi, Henry VIII’s Bishops: Diplomats, Administrators, Scholars and Shepherds (Cambridge: Clarke and Co., 2003). On the Kite-Wolsey relationship, see Peter Gwyn, The King’s Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1990) and Steven G. Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447-1603 (London: Longman, 1998), 115-6.

186 For Kite’s objectives, see his correspondence with Wolsey, 14 May 1514, TNA: PRO SP 60/1/4 [LP 1/2907].

187 Cruickshank’s apt descriptor, see Cruickshank, Occupation, 143.

188 For “as in England…,” see Sampson to Wolsey, 25 March 1516, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VI., fol. 285; for complaints against papal ambivalence, see Worcester to Wolsey, 27 September 1516, BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.III., fol. 76.
bishop-elect to obtain his rights by force, and threatened excommunication of all people, spiritual and temporal, who refuse to accept him. Henry was livid.\textsuperscript{189}

Wedding feudal to renaissance theory, the Tudor king rebuked this “derogacion of our right and prerogative royall within our Cittie of Tournay…our possession and domynion” in favor of Francis, “our disobedient and untrue vassall.”\textsuperscript{190} Contrary to the laws of god and man, justice and reason, and the honor of the papacy, Leo had discharged Tudor subjects of their fidelities and allegiances. The bull, he continued, had sought to take the king’s “superiority Regall preheminence Jurisdiction and Authority [in Tournai,] all causes bee determinable within the same, no appeale or resort either to the Court of paris or else where can have place there.”\textsuperscript{191} The brief thus unequivocally refused to recognize external authority, justifying the position by law and rhetoric of history, justice, honor, and dignity; it articulated, for the very first time, royal supremacy in all matters over all people within its realm, regardless of geographic location. The word “empire” was nowhere to be found, yet the discourse of Tudor British \textit{imperium} was everywhere. Henry’s assertion did foreshadow 1534’s Royal Supremacy, but it also did much more. It offered an ideology whereby future kings of Britain could claim complete sovereignty in their possessions. Addressed, significantly, to his agent in Rome (not Leo), as the brief progressed, its words grew stronger and more radical, until Henry had cast himself an imperial king.\textsuperscript{192}

For now, Leo was unwilling to press. He anxiously prostrated himself, promising that the bull “need not annoy the King”; he hadn’t known the extent of Guillard’s treason nor that the

\textsuperscript{189} As the king recounted to his papal ambassador, the Bishop of Worcester, January-February 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/14, fols. 247-50.
\textsuperscript{190} Henry to Worcester, January-February 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/14, fol. 248.
\textsuperscript{191} Henry to Worcester, January-February 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/14, fol. 249.
\textsuperscript{192} Henry to Worcester, January-February 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/14, fol. 250.
matter involved any ancient history. Within a month, Rome recognized Wolsey’s claim to the bishopric, but only on the basis of Guillard’s default. As such, though a victory on paper, Guillard remained bishop-elect, the job his if he capitulated to Henry. Sampson bemoaned the fact that the see remained “not yet well established, no man does occupy, from fear of being vexed by the opposite party.” By January 1518, however, the issue was moot; negotiations to return Tournai to France had begun.

***

Finalized in 1519, a treaty transferred the city to Francis as the key part of a wider nexus of Anglo-French peace: according to Spinelly, the Valois would only deal “if the king will part with Tournay.” Negotiations were long and knotty, with plenty of posturing to go around. Eventually Henry bowed to conciliar pressure, which stressed his debt, tired army, Valois muscle, and Tournaisien sedition. Yet outside his inner circle, many feared the Tudor king had been duped, reflecting surprise that the king would surrender a rightful dominion. The final treaty mandated that in exchange for £100,000, Henry ceded all claims to the city and its inhabitants for the good of all Christendom, while a side agreement promised Wolsey £1,3000
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193 Leo to Henry, 5 February 1517, TNA: PRO SP 1/14, fol. 261, which also begged the king to never circulate his brief. After relaying Henry’s message, Worchester reported Leo’s supplication: “insomuch that divers times I have seen him holding up his [hands] towards the heaven, saying those words, ‘O Almighty God, ut[inam] ille rex Angliæ war somewhat nerer to us for to have his [favor] and succor in our occurrents. Then the Holy Church would be in more ... and surety under the protection, umbre and chadow, of the said m[ost] virtuous King,” see Worcheser to Henry, 8 February 1517, BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.III., fol. 112.
194 Sampson to Wolsey, 11 September 1517, LP 2/3674. It helped that Wolsey reneged, claiming that his sole concern all along was “regiae majestatis et meum honoreum,” see Wolsey to Worcester, 24 March 1517, LP 2/3045.
195 In December 1517, Leo used the presence of French ambassadors in England to delay his ruling on the matter, see Leo to Henry, BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.III., fol. 190.
196 Spinelly to Wolsey, 16 August 1518, BL Cotton MS, Vespasian C.I., fol. 190 [LP 2/4385].
197 Consequently, a mass of documents tackles the negotiations. Most important among them are Knight to Wolsey, 22 September 1518, TNA: PRO SP 1/17, fol. 62; Bishop of Ely to Wolsey, 18 December 1518, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VII., fol. 57.
198 For the sense that trickery was afoot, see an Anon., “Letter of Intelligence,” July 1518, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VIII., fol. 22 [LP 2/4356]; Spinelly to Wolsey, 16 August 1518, BL Cotton MS, Vespasian C.I., fol. 190 [LP 2/4385]; and Maximilian to Henry, 25 October 1518, BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.XX., fol. 103.
per annum in perpetuity as compensation for the bishopric.\textsuperscript{200} The massive payouts were a nod to the success of the aggressive, dominant posture assumed by Henry and Wolsey.\textsuperscript{201}

Leo should have been pleased, and that is what the final leaf shows. However the Roman curia was uneasy, reasoning that if Henry gave up Tournai, surely he must be assured another piece of his imperial puzzle, a more desirable one at that.\textsuperscript{202} In fact, papal intelligence reported that Francis had given Scotland to Henry, at least until his nephew’s majority, pledging to release James from French clutches.\textsuperscript{203} The treaty included nothing of the sort, however the misconceptions provide insight into 1510s British Empire as something that went beyond France, beyond an isolated, failed Hundred Years’ redux. Tournai was certainly the most important, most fully formed experiment of the era, but far from the only one. As the early Henrician imperial vision implicated Scotland in 1519, so too did it entangle other dominions.

Tournai encouraged, even lent ideas and currency, to Ireland and Newfoundland. Though it had eclipsed other imperial activity by consuming crown attention and resources, Tournai’s return injected new energy into previously sidelined projects, reifying imperialism after 1519, which benefited from French experience. Unsurprisingly, two sites assumed pride of place—the only two historically legitimate avenues left open so long as the treaty endured. Now regarded as “the person who rules both the king and the entire kingdom” following his major role at Tournai, Cardinal Wolsey helped spearhead western activity based on its precepts.\textsuperscript{204}

In 1520 and 1522, Wolsey led the court in a major set piece of imperial propaganda, the Field of Cloth of Gold. For two weeks in mid-June, the Tudor and Valois courts met between

\textsuperscript{200} For the final treaty and its ratifications, see Rymer, \textit{Foedera}, 13:642, 659, 694-6; for the monetary figure in £, see Cruickshank, \textit{Occupation}, 240; for Wolsey’s payout, see “Bishopric of Tournay,” 31 July 1518, \textit{LP} 2/4354. The end of the occupation and the transfer of power are described in several documents, for most detail, see West to Wolsey, 12 February 1519, BL Cotton MS, Caligula D.VII., fol. 91.
\textsuperscript{201} As Gwyn noted, see Gwyn, \textit{King’s Cardinal}, 94.
\textsuperscript{202} Worcester to Wolsey, 10 December 1517, BL Cotton MS, Vitellius B.III., fol. 190 [\textit{LP} 2/3828].
\textsuperscript{203} Sebastian Giustinian to the Venetian Doge, 10 September 1518, \textit{LP} 2/4424.
\textsuperscript{204} Giustinian to Doge, 10 October 1519, \textit{CSPV}, 2/1287.
Guisnes and Ardres for a summit replete with pageantry, feasting, and games. Before his ally, Henry ostentatiously asserted the whole of France and the Isles constituted markedly British, Tudor territory, via tents and apparel adorned with “roses and pomegranates crowned, dragons, lions, greyhounds, unicorns” and the arms of “Arthur, Brute, Cadwallader… Ireland, Wales, Normandy, Guyon and Cornwall; the lion of England with crown imperial.”

There, beautifying the pavilion was John Rastell, who had been steadily preferred for such iconographic work that belies modern interpretations as empty, costly reveling. Meanwhile, more tangibly, the crown moved to take the bait held out in 1515-6 whereby Ireland was its imperial keystone and the New World its Utopia, revitalizing a fallow western enterprise with two projects that realized the opulent display made in rural France.

In 1518-9, the crown moved to strengthen ties between Westminster and key ports Waterford and Wexford, secure trade by force, and revive rights of English landholders to police their tenancies, all in the hopes that “Ireland may be reduced and restored to good order and obedience.” Meanwhile, Henry denied Kildare’s call for a parliament, reasserted Poynings’s principle of legislative supremacy to nullify all statutes of non-English origin, and, with his father’s governor as his inspiration, appointed Thomas Howard, earl of Surrey, as deputy. The connection between the war against France and post-Tournai Ireland was plain to
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205 For the crown record of these images, see “Revels,” LP 3/miscellaneous entry 1519.
207 “Memorandum concerning the Administration of the King’s Affairs,” December 1519, BL Cotton MS, Titus B.I., fol. 180 [LP 3/576]. The court instructed Wolsey to deal personally in Waterford, see Henry to Wolsey, 5 July 1519, LP 3/356, and Henry to Wolsey, 15 September 1520, LP 3/981. It too authorized the earl of Shrewsbury to send armed men into his Wexford territory to defend against Gaelic intrusion, see Henry to Shrewsbury, December 1517, LP 2/3852, and Henry to Shrewsbury, 18 August 1519, LP 3/430.
contemporaries: as a Kildare clansman spotted in May 1519, the king determined to regain “all the inheritance of his ancestors . . . in distant lands.”

With this first English-born deputy since Poynings, Henry ousted Kildare for a homegrown favorite and directed Surrey in lengthy, specific terms imprinted with mid-1510s imperial theory. Blaming the “misery and captivity… [of] this poor land” on the Irish clergy, Henry ordered that “no clerk be promoted to any bishopric there unless he be of English birth, or of the English nation and language” and appointed either by royal license or (to lessen the blow to Rome) by Wolsey as papal legate for England and Ireland. The king too reaffirmed his right to visitation and taxation, secular and ecclesiastical. As in Tournai and 1490s Ireland, Surrey would see that all Irish captains swore an oath to observe Tudor rule under penalty of treason. Further, Henry asserted that only express royal grant could convene parliament, while he simultaneously bolstered the Irish council with three additional English members and circumscribed its power by requiring crown sanction for it to act. The importation of new English bodies to fill out clergy and council epitomized a scheme of centralization and obedience through Anglicization that was at the very heart of post-1518 Ireland.

Well-aware of the enormity of Surrey’s task and its sea change from the post-1496 status quo, all three men—Henry, Wolsey, and the deputy—seemed prepared to dig in, with a force of English spear- and bowmen and a muster enforced throughout Ireland. The king even took the rare step of instructing Surrey to report directly to him, bypassing Wolsey for a distinctive

210 Surrey was uncle to two of Henry’s wives, Anne Boleyn and Catherine Howard.
211 For “misery…,” see “Articles to be showed unto the King’s most noble Grace Surrey,” January 1524 (likely 1520), LP 4/81, article 7; for “no clerk…,” see “Remembrances for Ireland,” January 1524 (likely 1520), LP 4/80, article 1.
212 “Remembrances,” n.d. (c. 1520), LP 4/80, article 7.
214 For the Irish parliament, see “Articles,” n.d. (c. 1520), LP 4/81, article 8; for the council, see “Articles,” n.d. (c. 1520), LP 4/81, articles 2 and 4.
215 As described in “Remembrances,” n.d. (c. 1520), LP 4/80, articles 9-10.
amount of direct crown rule.\textsuperscript{216} During a vigorous five-hundred-man campaign along the Pale, Surrey entreated the crown for more troops (rejected), more arms (rejected), common law (granted), and martial law (granted), but noted that an occupational force would be perpetually thwarted without a colonial commitment.\textsuperscript{217} He declared that “onles Your Grace [send] off your owne natural subjectes to enhabite such countrees as shalbe won, all your charges shuld be but wastefully spent”\textsuperscript{218}; only settlers could “contynew trew subjects… Irishe wold returne to their olde ill roted customes.”\textsuperscript{219} Henry refused and ordered Surrey to make peace with the Irish lords.\textsuperscript{220} Disapproving of what he saw as a policy reversal and sure that the land would not be brought to due obedience without compulsion, conquest, and planation, Surrey returned home under a deluge of disease, famine, and death.\textsuperscript{221} Now wholly overwhelmed by “countries as strong or stronger than Wales” and inhabitants who live “more hardily than any other people in Christendom or Turkey” as Surrey described in compelling comparative terms, Wolsey recommended the native Irish Piers Butler, the earl of Ormond, as the new deputy in 1522.\textsuperscript{222} Vowing to return to pursue his Irish claim in a few years time, the king grudgingly acquiesced, and only when Surrey promised the king that Ormond harbored “a true English hert.”\textsuperscript{223} Only superficially evincing a weak commitment to Irish imperialism in 1520-4, the experiment deepened the allure of a land that Surrey described as equal “in goodness unto your realm of

\textsuperscript{216} Surrey to Henry, c. March-September 1520, Carew MS 616, fol. 33.
\textsuperscript{217} For Surrey’s requests, see Surrey to Wolsey, 6 September 1520, Carew MS 602, fol. 63; for the crown’s reply, see Henry to Surrey, n.d. 1520, Carew MS 602, fol. 68v.
\textsuperscript{218} Surrey to Henry, 30 June 1521, Carew MS 616, fol. 33.
\textsuperscript{219} Surrey to Henry, 30 June 1521, Carew MS 616, fol. 33.
\textsuperscript{220} Henry to Surrey, n.d. 1520, Carew MS 602, fol. 68v.
\textsuperscript{221} Surrey to Wolsey, n.d. 1520, Carew MS 616, fol. 11.
\textsuperscript{222} Surrey to Henry, 30 June 1521, Carew MS 616, fol. 33.
England.”²²⁴ The brief foray had revealed Ireland’s current state, clarified its place under an evolving imperial crown, and illustrated the limits of minimal presence and militarism without colonization.

It was, then, a significant moment in the history of Tudor imperialism. Parallel to Tournai, the Surrey project sparked policy and ideology of imperial kingship: in late 1520, Henry railed against Irish insubordination, “like as We, being their Soveraigne Lorde and Prince, though of our absolute power We above the lawes… they be bounde boothe by lawe fidelitie and liegeaunce to restore unto us our oune.”²²⁵ Though neither the earliest nor the most extreme statement of this imperial theory, such a clear elaboration of the very royal philosophy propounded at Tournai illustrates the nearly concurrent development of an ideology of empire in France and Ireland.²²⁶ When political and financial fortune changed in 1534, Henry would resume his enterprise in Ireland, an Englishman again at the helm. Until then, no deputy served for more than two years.

Empire-wide, rather than Ireland-specific, the surge of activity too involved the New World, when opportunism and patronage collided to bring former architects of Newfoundland venture Sebastian Cabot and John Rastell back to Westminster in 1521. With Wolsey’s aid, Cabot tapped Rastell as a consultant to help exercise his father’s dormant patent. In concert with the Drapers’ Company, Cabot surmised that “the king & my lord Cardinall & the Counsell thynketh aswel for his honour as for the generall welth of this his Realme that there be appoynted a certayn noumbre of ships to be prepared for a viage into the newefound Iland.”²²⁷ With a sizable royal outlay of five ships at the king’s charge, the express objective of the enterprise

²²⁴ Surrey to Henry, 23 July 1520, Carew MS 602, fol. 52.
²²⁵ Henry to Surrey, n.d. 1520, Carew MS 602, fol. 71.
²²⁶ Quinn also remarked on this significant moment in the Irish context, see Quinn, “Henry VIII and Ireland,” 326.
mirrored that of Tournai: to end Tudor reliance on the “wyn & colles wood from Burdeux” and ensure that “no nacion shall have the trate but you.”

Its creators construed the 1521 project, then, as a national, commercial, and expansionary endeavor, worthy for a perpetually broke king (particularly after Tournai and Surrey’s Ireland) to adventure. But what inspired Henry to stick his neck out by investing in an enterprise for a place he had showed little interest in thus far and would never support so fully again after 1527? The answer lay in auspicious timing—out of Tournai, not yet wholly consumed by fear over a single female, sickly, half-Spanish heir that would, together with an infatuation with Anne Boleyn and interest in reformed religion, lead him to divorce—and the humanist rediscovery of history that emboldened him, dictating this and the other territorial outlets of his lofty monarchical vision.

Though the mercantile contingent had wooed Henry, the Company reneged, complaining that it was “sore aventour to joperd v shippes” under a turncoat captain like Cabot who had joined Spanish service and may have falsified stories of his own Atlantic crossings. Still, official interest and a glowing portrayal of American goods charged a merchant rumor mill, while a flurry of rival European activity popularized the fishery, spread knowledge, and incited competition. In 1521, the Portuguese king sent a contingent of nuclear families from the Azores and Iberian Peninsula to settle the cod-rich areas around Cape Breton. The enterprise lasted under a season, but reported native allies, fertile soil, and precious goods, including Mediterranean nuts, olives, and grapes. Most influential, however, were the ventures launched by Francis I, like that of John Verrazano who produced the most detailed survey of

---

228 Drapers’ Records, 1 March-9 April 1521, in Biggar, ed., Precursors, 135.
Newfoundland to date in 1525. With shaky continental alliances primed to breakdown with the divorce, Verrazano’s confirmation of naked natives eager for European goods, gold riches rivaling the Spanish Indies, “holsome ayre, traversable waterways… excellent wines as Lombardie, mightie woods and spicerie” quickened British interest and fear that they were losing ground in North America to European rivals.\textsuperscript{231}

These other projects and travels offered evidence of Newfoundland’s desirability as a site for expansion and as a commercial entrepôt, showing that its resources were not confined to fish, supported European life, harbored a passage east, and easily civilized natives. But equally, they pressed salt into Tudor wounds—since Henry VII, the British claimed \textit{dominium}, but could not even protect their own fishermen from being sacked, funding and resources in such short supply in Tournai’s aftermath.

The British response was neither consistent nor awe-inspiring, yet it did come, an evolution of past policy and dispatched on the heels of a letter sent by Englishman Robert Thorne, Jr., son of the American adventurer sponsored by Henry VII, to his king. The first of a new type of promotional tract for British American imperialism, the letter mounted a comprehensive case for expansion based on the foundations laid in the 1510s. Thorne charged that “experience prooueth that naturally all princes bee desirous to extend and enlarge their dominions and kingdomes,” only those who “lacketh noble courage content to liue quiet with their owne.”\textsuperscript{232} Because it was encompassed by the sea, Britain’s island was a providential invitation to growth, manifest in its ancient kings, who “passed the seas to conquer many rich and fayre dominions, and amplified this your Graces Realme with great victory and glory.”\textsuperscript{233}

\textsuperscript{233} Thorne, “Declaration,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:212.
Thorne harped on Henry’s now palpable proclivities, tying Tournai directly to Newfoundland as the next, equally legitimate, frontier for Tudor imperial energies: having like courage and desire as his English and Welsh ancestors “and not without iust cause, to enlarge this your kingdome, and demaund your limits and tribute of the French king… your Grace in person passed with a great power in to France… and victoriously conquered,” returning the territory out of clemency, not forced capitulation.\footnote{Thorne, “Declaration,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:213.} Upon that success, Henry had to look northwest, to the fourth part of the world—“the neerest and aptest” piece of his inheritance and the one area untouched by other Europeans.\footnote{Thorne, “Declaration,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:213.} With its passage east, here was the key by which “ye English shall compasse the whole worlde… [and] winne perpetuall glory and your subiectes infinite profite.”\footnote{Thorne, “Declaration,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:213.}

Thorne’s case was well-timed and well-executed, a calculated, plain appeal to ancient myth, medieval precedent, Henry’s lust for empire, and increased Newfoundland competition, all evident by 1527. And it worked, the crown lent Thorne “two ships wel manned & victualled… to seek strange regions” in mid-May.\footnote{“The voyage of the two ships… for the discouerie of the North partes,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:129.} With practice in 1520 and at Tournai, Wolsey enlisted the crew by encouraging gentlemanly participants to join “the expedition to Newfoundland to find their wives and children meat and drink,” much like the colonists of \textit{Utopia}, who had left home to lessen population pressures on the nation.\footnote{Lord Edmond Howard to Wolsey, December 1527, \textit{LP} 4/2/3731.} The first craft, which Spanish intelligence reported as sent to “discover the land of the Great Khan,” wrecked early, but the other reached “the countrey, putting men on land to search vunkownen regions.”\footnote{For “discover the land of the Great Khan” and fate of the ship, see “The Statement obtained from the English ship when at the Island of Mona,” 11 March 1528, in J.A. Williamson, ed., \textit{The Voyages of the Cabots and the English Discovery of North America under Henry VII and Henry VIII}, (London: Argonaut Press, 1929), 106; for “the countrey…” and the fate of the second bark, see “The voyage of two ships,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:129.} That very same season, Sebastian Cabot and mariner John Rut also benefited from Thorne’s tract. Furnished and sent out
for northern discovery by Henry, Cabot reached Brazil, but was forced home by the faint heart of his sailors and subsequently skulked back to Spain. Independently, Rut sailed without public backing, until icebergs sent him into dock at St. John’s, where—despite proclaimed Tudor right to the region—he found numerous Norman, French, and Portuguese vessels fishing the harbor. Exasperated by such insubordination, Rut hurriedly impressed upon Henry to reclaim the rich wilderness by force and fully annex the Northwest Passage and Newfoundland’s many good harbors, islands, and rivers to Britain’s empire. Yet despite a plea quite similar to that of Robert Thorne, Rut’s audience had changed—now 1528, his royal reception was cold.

***

When Thomas Cromwell stood before Commons in mid-1523, his speech held limited appeal for a king who still harbored bold ambitions in its “dogholes.” Tournai was gone, but alternatives still appeared feasible. Yet the address drew attention for its logic, style, and well-couched critique, capturing Henry’s notice and Wolsey’s attention. The MP enjoyed a meteoric rise to service, becoming the king’s “most trustie Counsailor” by 1531.

Neither Wolsey nor Henry could conceptualize Tournai, Ireland, or Newfoundland as “dogholes” in 1523; five years later, however, things had drastically changed. The crown continued to espouse an uncompromising vision, a belief in its inheritance, authority, and imperium, but circumstance fused with Cromwell’s deep-seated political outlook to privilege a new primary councilor and a new trajectory for Tudor Empire. When Wolsey failed to secure Henry’s divorce and the learned scholars of Renaissance Europe issued their appraisal of regal and ecclesiastical power, Cromwell could transform his parliamentary rhetoric into policy. Over

---

241 Rut’s plea, which included a statement of what he found in Newfoundland, ended up in the hands of Samuel Purchas, who printed it, see Purchas, *Hakluyts posthumus or Purchas his pilgrimes* (London: 1625), STC 20509, part IV, book 6, chapter 3, page 809.
242 “Instructions by the King to Cromwell,” n.d. October 1531, BL Cotton MS, Titus B.I., fol. 486.
the course of the late-1520s and 30s, England scaled back its activity overseas, focusing on consolidation, centralization, and dynastic security, until the nasty, fickle fortune of Franco-British-Irish relations turned once more and British imperial sovereignty took center stage.
CHAPTER THREE
“Scotland is ours by absolute right”:
The Rough Wooings and the Invention of the Empire of Great Britain, 1533-1549

With the forthright, incendiary statement that the independent “kingdom of Scotland is ours by absolute right,” royal polymath John Dee sought to stir up his monarch “to vndertake [a] Brytishe discovery and recovery enterprise... of your foreign lands, vndewlie and disloyallie alienated and wrested from the government of your Highnes ancestors theire Brytish Septer Royall.”1 Though offered in the 1570s, the author’s rousing diction and tone stemmed from the force of his substantial argument, a case about history, legend, and law deeply rooted in the political and ideological context in which Dee had come of age. Born in 1527 to a family that shared the dynasty’s Welsh heritage and to a father who served the second Henrician court, the burgeoning scholar had read Greek at Cambridge in the early and mid-1540s. There, his study in the New Learning stoked an interest in classical and medieval empire and introduced him to the mental world of contemporary Britain, a world much shaped, even defined, by the on-going protracted Anglo-Scottish war that followed the break from Rome. It was this atmosphere and discourse that Dee reflected when he wrote the seminal work excerpted here, The Limits of the British Empire (1578), and emphatically declared the Tudor claim to Scotland.

Carefully constructing his prose to be both persuasive and galvanizing, Dee’s use of one particular word is especially important and telling: “recovery.”2 From his perspective, the existence of sovereign royal right over an empire encompassing not only England, but Scotland, Ireland, Wales, France, and much of the New World was not novel. Quite to the contrary, the author staked this unit’s physical geography and its legal legitimacy on a rehearsal of the past that chronicled inheritors of the British throne down to Henry VIII and Edward VI, two reigns

---
1 For the “kingdom of Scotland is ours by absolute right,” see Ken MacMillan, ed., John Dee: The Limits of the British Empire (Westport: Praeger, 2004), 44; for “to vndertake...,” see MacMillan, ed., Dee’s Limits, 29.
that he had observed in his youth and two theories of imperial kingship that he aptly captured in the *Limits*. It was their British Empire that he exhorted the current monarch, Elizabeth I, to re-create, not any new political entity. To some extent, Dee framed his tract this way because it made his ideas appear less radical, more ironclad and defensible, more appealing, persuasive, and even safe to pursue. But in 1578, the crown was not considering the conquest of Scotland, nor was Dee really hoping that it would; instead, the Tudor court was debating experiments elsewhere in the Atlantic World. Yet to Dee, these projects were intimately related to the Scottish enterprise that he recalled. The present imperial impulse could, he purported, benefit from study of the Henrician-Edwardian example. The scholar’s knowledge and use of this earlier precedent, as well as his willingness to posit it before a royal audience, point towards the significance of Scotland and of the Empire of Great Britain pursued in the 1530s and 1540s to the history of the early modern British Empire.

***

This chapter argues for the centrality of Scotland generally, and the propaganda and military campaigns sparked by the Rough Wooings in the 1540s specifically, to the development and extension of Tudor imperialism. Studied in an imperial and domestic framework, the Wooings were far more than the proposed marriage of Edward VI, heir to the English throne, to Mary Stewart, heir to the Scottish one. In this context, Henrician and Edwardian theorists built

---

3 I adopt Marcus Merriman’s plural “Rough Wooings,” rather than the singular “Rough Wooing” coined in the nineteenth century, to more accurately reflect its stages, see Merriman, *The Rough Wooings: Mary Queen of Scots, 1542-1551* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2000).

4 Scotland is unlike Ireland in the dearth of attention it has received among historians of the early empire. However, just as D.B. Quinn and Nicholas Canny found continuity of personnel, methods, and ideology from Ireland to America, there too is continuity in each between Scotland and the rest of the British Atlantic World. Only David Armitage has pointed to these connections, but his interests are much broader than my own. On Ireland, see Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966); Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1556-76* (NY: Barnes and Noble Books, 1976); and Kenneth R. Andrews, Canny, and P.E.H. Hair, eds., *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America 1480-1650* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1979); Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*
upon the intellectual and practical experience of empire accrued since 1485, especially at Tournai, where crown and court had delineated English monarchical sovereignty vis-à-vis foreign potentates, defined the status of non-native subjects beneath the Tudor crown, and imagined what characteristics made Britishness distinct from an alternative identity. Indeed, Henry VIII planned the 1542 invasion of Scotland as part one of a two-part reconquest of Britain and France, which would continue the work begun at Tournai earlier in the century.

But much had transformed nationally since the end of the Tournaisien moment in 1519—the two projects, in Scotland and France, inextricably linked, but not identical. What accounts for their differences are the revolutionary changes of the intervening years, legal manifestations of an aspiration for territorial expansion and *imperium* harbored by the second Tudor king and evident at Tournai, but as yet underdeveloped and incomplete. These changes also epitomize the fundamental distinction between Henry VII and Henry VIII. Superficially, both tried to mollify the thistle with the rose by marriage, but the 1530s armed the crown with the law, authority, and vocabulary by which to lay claim to the Scottish throne. Consequently, this chapter argues that attempts to create a British Empire by bringing together England and Scotland were also greatly affected, indeed determined, by the changes wrought by English Reformation and ensuing projects of national consolidation and Irish reform. These developments fundamentally altered the ideological and practical reach of Tudor kingship, even providing the financial store from which the wars were waged. The crown was now depicted by the court, figuratively and visually,
with a domed top, supported above the king’s head by copious legal and cultural evidence culled from European archives. These changes meant that when Henry again indulged his deep-seated desire to become the next Arthur, Constantine, or Charlemagne, and set his sights to the north, the project of territorial expansion was both based on and distinct from the 1510s experience.

***

In April 1533, parliament passed the Act in Restraint of Appeals to Rome, which severed England from the papal see. Its preamble read,

WHERE by divers sundry old authentick Histories and Chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this Realm of England is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the World, governed by one supreme Head and King, having the Dignity and Royal Estate of the Imperial Crown of the same...

That the divorce, the break from Rome, and the ensuing revolutionary political, administrative, ecclesiastical, and spiritual reform were the products of a distinct intellectual milieu, cultivated at the court of Henry VII and his heir, is most apparent in these opening lines of statute. The law was not an original exercise in statecraft, nor was it meant to be. It was innovative in legislating the political philosophy of northern humanism. Its opening clause asserted Tudor imperium as the progeny of the king, Cromwell, and the scholarly team appointed to research the divorce, led by Edward Foxe and Thomas Cranmer. The fruit of their labors was the Collectanea satis copiosa (1532), a compendium of theology and history that validated the king’s power from scripture, doctrine, the Brut, Anglo-Saxon law, and antiquity. But the Collectanea did not

---

5 An act “For the restraint of appeals,” 24 Hen. VIII cap.12, in Owen Ruffhead, ed., The Statutes at Large, from the first year of King Edward the fourth to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, 3 vols. (London: Basket, 1786), 2:166.


7 Henry studied the Collectanea (literally “the sufficiently abundant collection”) extensively, annotating in forty-six places, as appear in the tract’s manuscript, British Library (hereafter BL) Cotton MS, Cleopatra E.VI., fol. 16-135. On the Collectanea and Henry’s reaction to it, more generally, see Guy, “Cromwell and Henrician Reformation”;
merely justify the divorce; it simultaneously announced doctrines of supremacy and empire, and
as the king read the evidence, he was emboldened to recover his long unrecognized rights.

As the statutory offspring of the Collectanea, the preamble was a comprehensive,
defended pronouncement that all subjects, ecclesiastical and secular, had but two superiors: God
and king. Within this scheme, the monarch devolved from divine donation without mediator. The
1533 act redefined crown, furnishing it with “plenty, whole, and entire Power, Preeminence,
Authority, Prerogative and jurisdiction” to adjudicate all matters. Further, its laws and customs
were made applicable to “any Person or Persons within this Realm, or within any of the King’s
said Dominions, or Marches.” Implying that England was insufficient, the language attests to a
conscious decision to accommodate new lands, and this is precisely how it would be employed.
When crown authority in matters of religion, finance, and property was questioned, officials
responded with recourse to the act’s “royal prerogative,” which extended intact into all Tudor
territories.

Henry and his scholars relied in part on a new corpus of precedent and vocabulary, one
which prior British and English kings lacked, and therefore constitutes an essential difference
between Tudor imperialism and the expansionary exploits of Edward III or Henry II: classical
theory. Though present in embryonic form at Tournai, the reformation parliaments were a major
watershed in deploying antiquity towards Tudor imperialism, as terms like “empire” and
“colony” supplemented and replaced “homage” and “fealty.” And the classics were as inspiring
as useful. Read by every English student in the elementary stages of his law career, Ulpian, Justinian, and Eusebius seemed tailor-made for the divorce, proscribing the church and validating the king as *supremum caput* and protector of the faith.\(^{11}\)

The chief significance of the act was the expansion of royal power it instituted, the maxim *Rex in regno suo est imperator.*\(^{12}\) As the Tournai bishopric debacle illustrated, without supremacy over all subjects, expansion abroad would be limited, command over any lands gained incomplete. So long as the ecclesiastical sphere—its people, lands, money, and authority—remained out of the king’s reach, true *imperium* was impossible. As latecomers to the imperial game and, in the case of Henry, lustful after unencumbered sovereignty, papal and imperial power were mutually exclusive. When the divorce threw into further relief the pesky problems of a foreign intermediary, Tournai became a harbinger of things to come. In this light, the 1539 “Act authorizing the King’s Highness to make Bishops by his Letters Patents” played like a jab at Leo X.\(^{13}\) Indeed, then, the Act of Appeals was a national document of consolidation, aimed at “the Conservation of the People of this Realm,” but with international application.\(^{14}\)

Following the 1533 statute, parliament passed a flurry of related law that further outlined the parameters of the supremacy and the Anglican Church, and dissolved the old ecclesiastical system. A concerted attack on everything “much prejudicial to the King’s Prerogative Royal, and


\(^{13}\) “Act authorizing the King’s Highness to make Bishops by his Letters Patents,” 31 Hen. VIII cap. 9, in Ruffhead, ed., *Statutes at Large*, 2:252.

\(^{14}\) “For restraint of appeals,” in Ruffhead, ed., *Statutes at Large*, 2:166.
repugnant to the Laws and Statutes of this Realm, but also overmuch onerous to his Highness and his Subjects,” each had domestic and imperial implications.\textsuperscript{15}

For example, the Act for the Submission of the Clergy (1534) exchanged ecclesiastical law codes and courts for secular ones. Foremost a product of expediency—Henry needed to circumvent papal dispensation—its consequences went beyond swapping Katherine of Aragon for Anne Boleyn; it elevated and clarified English justice as the only law in the realm.\textsuperscript{16} An exceptional amalgamation of common law, natural law, and commonwealth theory made England, alone in Western Christendom, legally and jurisdictionally self-sufficient. The act was part of a broader, decade-long program meant to solidify the nation after the break and prevent the kind of perilous uprising that would ultimately come in the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536).\textsuperscript{17} Yet the break’s expansionary implications made the legislation applicable externally. Consequently, the new legal standard became the standard for the ministration of justice by Tudor subjects outside England in the sixteenth century. Further, by defining domestic law and order, the act contributed to a growing nationalist conception of uniquely English justice, superior to that of its continental rivals, more worthy of propagation and implementation. Accordingly, the

reformation cemented the Tudor imperial commitment to bring specifically English forms of justice to its territories, first appreciable in 1490s Ireland and 1510s France.

Historians of the later British Empire have long pointed to Protestant religion as an elementary characteristic, foundational to self-definition and promotion under the Stuarts and Hanoverians. But looking back further in time shows that this confessional aspect was added to British imperial ideology in the 1530s and 40s. Supporters of the Wooings, English and Scottish, were all nominally Protestant, and envisioned the union as a means to a Protestant island immune from Catholic threats. Henry’s personal faith and religious policy were ambiguous at best, but his Reformation first identified England as a Protestant nation. The Act of Supremacy (1534) made the king supreme head of the Church of England and gave him full authority to visit, repress, and order that entity, desirous to “increase of Virtue in Christ’s Religion within this Realm of England, and to repress and extirp all Errours, Heresies, and other Enormities and Abuses.”

The effect was to create instruments of religious governance in any dominion under the imperial crown.

An important corollary is the crucial link among religious reform, vernacular standardization and diffusion, and the extension of crown administration to the local level. All part of the Henrician Reformation, each element had implications beyond England. Not only were legislative debate and statute carried out in English, the new Church mandated a vernacular standardization and diffusion, and the extension of crown administration to the local level. All part of the Henrician Reformation, each element had implications beyond England. Not only were legislative debate and statute carried out in English, the new Church mandated a vernacular

---


19 Perpetuating a debate begun by A.F. Pollard, George Bernard gave the most recent assessment arguing, controversially, that the break was motivated by the king’s own reformed theology. See Pollard, Henry VIII (London: Longmans, 1951) and Bernard, The King’s Reformation. Enigmatic and idiosyncratic to say the least, Henry’s personal leanings are not at issue here.

20 “The King’s Grace to be authorized Supreme Head,” 26 Hen. VIII, cap.1, in Ruffhead, ed., Statutes at Large, 2:193.
prayer book and service. It was a centralizing and nationalistic change: though doctrine would be reworked throughout the century, Henry made English the official language of church and state, and, by extension, empire. Politics may have been metropolitan and confessional change limited, but the church remained ubiquitous and engineered the proliferation of English to the parish level. Moreover, like the Bishop’s Book (1537), King’s Book (1543), and Book of Common Prayer (1549, 1552), the literature of discovery—travel narratives, poetry, guides, even administrative tracts—were vehicles for the vernacular.

The regulation of linguistic and religious change was, in turn, bolstered by the growth of administrative networks. Between 1535 and 1542, parliament authorized a series of expansions to the shire system and articulated its motivation: centralization by export (and enforcement) of social and economic programs, religious reform, and justice made at Westminster to northern England and Wales. Shirring would prove an essential technique of Tudor imperium. Its success strengthened convictions that the mere extension of English structures to outlying parts would automatically promote good rule.


The reformation parliaments, then, legislated five tools of national consolidation increasingly identified as essential components of Englishness with implications for empire: common law and justice, supreme monarchical power, the Anglican Church, vernacular, and shire. Their creation or institutionalization, elevation, and dissemination at home engendered their export abroad as hallmarks of British imperialism. The 1530s fundamentally altered the landscape, as England recovered its imperial status and established the theoretical and practical bases for the forays that followed, first in its backyards to the west and to the north.

***

Indeed, England and Wales were not alone in feeling the brunt of change, and the spread of these ideas to Ireland constituted a significant moment in the development of the Henrician Empire. Amid the whirlwind of 1533—the infamous year that Thomas Cranmer became Archbishop of Canterbury, Henry married and impregnated Anne (in reverse order), and the Act of Appeals reached statute books—an anonymous letter addressed to Cromwell contrived to bring Ireland into the national conversation. The author lamented the consequences of committing the realm of a native governor, the earl of Kildare. Ousting all vestiges of Tudor rule, Irish “incivilitie and brutenes” had, he argued, precipitated sore decay of “thEnglish ordre, habite, and maner,” and its civilized language. Championing an end to the hands-off approach inaugurated by Surrey’s departure, the author smartly cited the heroics preserved in “the King’s records”—i.e. those newly compiled in the Collectanea—as proof of Henry’s Irish inheritance. When parliament legislated England’s imperial status, then, it sparked a push to realize that entity.

Whether energized by such appeals or simply empowered by parliament, the crown looked to Ireland that September, calling Kildare to Westminster for dismissal. When the Irish earl delayed, Henry learned that his subject had been bargaining with Charles V to levy Ireland to pressure English realignment with Rome.\(^{26}\) Outraged and apprehensive, the king appointed William Skeffington deputy by letters patent to combat “Romish” intrigue and eliminate all native practice, via shiring and garrisoning.\(^{27}\) Though neither plot was new, there was a fundamental change at work. Skeffington was asked to extirpate “the usurped jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome… according to the statutes” recently passed in England.\(^{28}\) Armed with evidence, ideology, and authority from the divorce, the king in council had formulated imperial policy for Ireland, which Cromwell disseminated in printed form.\(^{29}\) Much to their chagrin, however, the court had not seen the end of the Kildares or the mayhem they could cause.

Fearing disenfranchisement and taking aim at Skeffington, when Kildare finally reached England in 1534, his son—the tenth earl of Kildare, a.k.a. Silken Thomas—raised the specter of rebellion. Though motivated by personal concerns, his uprising functioned as an outlet for those politically, culturally, and spiritually disaffected, strategically invoking religion to stimulate Irish and pan-European support. Thomas appealed to Pope Paul III, Charles V, James V, and Francis I, all of whom showed interest in thwarting and embarrassing Henry, on the basis that the

\(^{26}\) For Kildare’s alliances with the Emperor, see William Wise, Mayer of Waterford, to Cromwell, 12 July 1533, BL Cotton MS, Titus B.XI., fol. 409 and Thomas Batcock to William Prat, 13 July 1533, BL Cotton MS, Vespasian C.VII., fol. 42. This correspondence is also catalogued in J.S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, and R.H. Brodie, eds., The Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, 22 vols. (London: Stationery Office, 1862-1932). For Wise, see vol. 6, entry 815 (hereafter LP volume/entry); for Batcock, see LP 6/821. For sources that have two reference numbers (e.g. BL and LP), the second is supplied in brackets, as is customary; for sources that appear in one location only or were consulted in one location only, a single citation is provided.


\(^{28}\) Skeffington’s instructions from the crown, 31 May 1534, in StP 2:194-7, quotation from 2:194.

\(^{29}\) The instructions were circulated as a pamphlet, entitled Ordinances for the Government of Ireland. They survive in full as StP 2:207-16. For further comment, see D.B. Quinn, “Government Printing and the Publication of the Irish Statutes in the Sixteenth Century,” Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy 49 (1943/44): 45-129, especially 45-9.
English Reformation had nullified the 1213 oath of vassalage, by which King John received Ireland as a papal fief.\textsuperscript{30} In essence, Thomas had transfigured the plight of a scorned official into an attractive crusade. Flattering Charles as a modern-day Caesar, he implored the emperor to “oppose English intruders [and] take them as subjects… because their first progeny came from Spain.”\textsuperscript{31} It was a seminal moment: the earl’s rhetoric correlated Irish identity with Catholicism and Englishness with Protestantism and asserted Gaelic Iberian descent—both for the first time and effectively wooing some Anglo-Irish. Later in the century, Thomas’ argument served to underwrite theories of shared Irish-Iberian savagery, cruelty, and religion. For now, it only kept Kildare’s Rebellion afloat until Henry’s force—the largest sent into Ireland since 1399—crushed them. Subsequently, the crown could make good on extending its own revolution across the Sea. As historian Brendan Bradshaw argued, the Irish reformation parliament was the logical sequel to the victory, which “provided the opportunity to enact in the colony laws that gave the theoretical claims of the monarchy juridical express.”\textsuperscript{32}

Under new deputy Leonard Grey, Ireland’s parliament passed a set of acts nearly identical to those of England, with four additional provisos to apply and aid in the enforcement of the supremacy principle.\textsuperscript{33} Across 1536-7, all Irish authority and profit were “annexed and united to the imperial Crown of England,” with Henry and his heirs now recognized as the

\textsuperscript{30} On Silken Thomas’s appeals abroad, see Brendan Bradshaw, “The English Reformation and Identity Formation in Wales and Ireland,” in \textit{British Consciousness and Identity}, ed. Bradshaw and Roberts, 43-112, especially 60-64.

\textsuperscript{31} Report by Tudor official T. Batcock to (?), n.d. (c. 1534), BL Cotton MS, Vespasian C.IV., fol. 264 [\textit{LP} 4/4878].


\textsuperscript{33} For Grey’s instructions to this end, see Grey to Henry, 26 June 1536, \textit{LP} 10/1210; for the first parliamentary sessions called by Grey in Dublin in May 1536, see the modern printed legislative record of the “Irish Parliaments,” in \textit{StP} 2:316.
“Supreme Head of the Church of Ireland.” Immediately, prospective courtier Martin Pelles inundated Cromwell with promises that if inhabited and ordered, this Irish paradise “would be as profitable for the wealth of England as any land in the world to its prince.” Meanwhile, another crown correspondent, William Body, added that Limerick, “a wondrous proper city, environed with the river of Shenon, may be called Little London for the situation and plenty.”

The comparison to the domestic ideal was powerful and moving; it did not take long for the crown to tap the benefits of its new Irish imperium. On the heels of the legislation, Henry appointed a commission to tour the island’s church and religious houses, conveniently deploying language of an Anglicizing mission to root out rebels and fill his coffers. Under the cover of investigating incivility and superstition whereby “the whole Irish people may be speedily infected, to their total destruction,” the commissioners readily accepted all benefices and monies into crown hands. In the three phases from 1537, the Dissolution had spread to the empire.

Things were quiet until mid-1540, when word reached Westminster that natives were “intending to have over-ridden, banished and destroyed all your subjects and to have had all the whole land at their disposition.” The king sent in Anthony St. Leger to effect a middle option between post-Poynings Home Rule and Skeffington-Grey slash-and-burn. With experience in Calais and the Pilgrimage of Grace, St. Leger initiated a fierce campaign against the rebels. But

34 Deuty Grey and Council of Ireland to Cromwell, entitled “Statutes of the Irish Parliament of 28 Hen. VIII,” 1 June 1536, BL Cotton MS, Titus B.IX., fol. 90v [LP 10/1030], where the title and reference to the imperial crown appear under the sub-heading “Cap. 5.” On the five sessions that sat between May 1536 and December 1537, see Bradshaw, “Opposition to Ecclesiastical Legislation,” 285-303.
35 Pelles to Cromwell, 4 December 1536, Lambeth Palace Library, Carew MS 602, fol. 135 (hereafter Carew MS series number, folio).
36 Body to Cromwell, 9 August 1534, Carew MS 601, fol. 10r.
37 Royal letters patent for the Irish commission, April 1539, printed in James Morrin, ed., Calendar of the Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland, of the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth, Volume I (London: Stationery Office, 1861-2), 55. For the record of the commission and its accomplishments as reported to the crown, see “The Irish Commission,” 5 October 1537, LP 12/837.
38 On the dissolution, see Bradshaw, The Dissolution of the Religious Orders in Ireland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
the violence ended there, as he marched through Ireland accepting oaths of surrender to Tudor rule and then restoring the land under crown auspices. Justified because Henry held all Irish title and right, this policy of “surrender and regrant” sought to allure the most wild, remote parts in all “their former beastliness” to Anglican Church and “civility,” while at the same time, increasing royal profits.⁴⁰ Significantly, the crown dictated the specific form of surrender, requiring each lord to posit that, as the Chronicles show, he had been “brought up in a rude country, without order or good civility, not knowing your most excellent Majesty, hath of long time, by ignorance neglected our duty of allegiance.”⁴¹ When he finally got around to calling parliament in 1542, the body passed a groundbreaking statute that encapsulated Henry’s Irish vision since the 1510s. Concurrently enacted in England, the legislature promoted him and his heirs from lords of Ireland “to the state and majestie of a King imperiall… ever more Kings of Ireland.”⁴² Crown polemics explained that a history from Brutus to Edward III, rivaling England’s Collectanea, buttressed the statute. Indeed, this corpus even offered retort to Kildare, explaining that on the way from “the land they were dwelling in one side of Spain,” the very first Irish inhabitants had paused to submit to the “King of Britayne, now called England.”⁴³ Soon after the session, St. Leger honored another Henrician request, erecting a new mint and standard. Like Tournai’s, the coins were iconographic vehicles, proudly displaying a domed crown atop Irish harp.⁴⁴

Implicitly rejecting colonization, surrender and regrant was not the most interventionist policy—far from it—but the piecemeal approach remained couched in a discourse of civility and obedience and reflected a new contemporary reality. At the dawn of a new decade, the king was no longer content to focus on England, Wales, and Ireland alone; he looked to Scotland.

⁴² “Of the King’s title to the land of Ireland,” n.d. 1541, Carew MS 621, fol. 14.
⁴³ “Of the king’s title,” n.d. 1541, Carew MS 621, fol. 14.
⁴⁴ For the coinage, see Thomas Wriothesley to William Paget, 1 September 1545, LP 19/268.
When Thomas More cautioned Henry VIII in *Utopia* (1516) that the safety of the nation must trump external ambitions and Polydore Vergil declared in *Anglica Historia* (begun c. 1505, first version completed 1512-3) that domestic affairs should be a king’s “chief care,” the two humanists highlighted the interconnectivity of the British Atlantic World. Acts of aggression, even simple posturing, in one arena might set off tides in the Channel, North Sea, or Irish Sea, which would invariably come crashing back down upon England’s shores. The kingdom was somewhat insulated by its island situation, buffered by waterways, but with one major loophole: Scotland. Here lay the danger of Anglo-French-Scottish relations, and in late-1513—only months before More wrote—it had showed its full, deadly force at Flodden Field.

Back in the early fifteenth century, after the bloody slaughter of some fifteen hundred English soldiers at the hands of their northern neighbors at the Battle of Baugé in March 1421, Pope Martin V had proclaimed, “Truly the Scots are well-known as an antidote to the English.”

The hinge on which the Hundred Years War turned, Baugé underwrote the creation of the Auld Alliance between France and Scotland against an indispensible third party: the mutual enemy. Though a patchy union, from 1513 to 1547, the Alliance partners held one essential similarity which was part and parcel of a geography that made them England’s most troublesome neighbors (and vice-versa): a single crown claimed superiority over both realms and actively sought to

---

restore their subjection. Consequently, Henry’s aspirations bolstered the pact, and in 1542, he made them crystal clear.

Fittingly, the very first shots of the Rough Wooings—the campaign that first articulated and fought for the vision of a Protestant, British Empire—were fired from the pen of Henry VIII. Issued just before his invasion of James V’s kingdom, A Declaration, Conteynyng the Just Causes and Considerations, of this present warre with the Scottis (1542), initiated the Tudor claim to Scotland and, together with the military arm of the attack, began the British imperial experiment waged there.48 Here and in the elaboration of ideology that followed, Flodden and Tournai in the 1510s and the domestic and Irish developments of the 1530s were essential. These earlier moments lent the forces and ammunition necessary to carry out the 1540s enterprise. They armed the crown with the unencumbered authority of an enclosed crown, the vocabulary and history to back it up, and made the effort viable, though not necessarily successful. Moreover, they provided the immediate circumstance and impetus: when James refused to acknowledge the royal supremacy or accept the Anglican Church as a pan-British body, the pretext for the July invasion was set.

The Declaration was a personal appeal to the bonds of kinship and geography that tied the kings of England and Scotland together in a special nexus of familial honor and mutual security. Exasperated at the irreverence shown by his nephew, Henry manipulated the stinging betrayal and brought the entire weight of the Tudor legacy—Henry VII, Elizabeth of York,

James IV, and Margaret Tudor—down on James’s head, to show that his hand had been pushed
toward war. Both might be styled king, but they were equal neither in station nor authority.

Integrating ideas from antiquity, scholasticism, and medieval commonwealth theory, the
opening passage indicates that Henry sought to show himself a scholar of philosophy,
credentialed to wax on such matters. Employing the humanist trope of bad counsel, Henry
explained his initial reluctance to believe that James’s actions, contrary to God’s law, man’s law,
and all humanity, were his own; he must have been deceived, which “nowe compelleth and
forced vs for perseruation of oure honoure and right, to vse our puissance and power agaynst
hym.” A rebellious nephew metaphor redoubled the sin of insubordination. Not only was James
an insult to the bloodline, especially to Henry’s beloved sister (“a doughter of England”), their
current family feud resembled the story of Britain’s creation—Henry’s evidential trump card.
The Declaration put the dispute in precisely the same terms as the island’s first partition after the
death of its creator, and so easily resolved by primogeniture: Brutus had willed Scotland to his
second son Albanactus in governance alone and only so long as he was subordinate to his elder
brother Locrinus, who inherited England and overlordship of the entire archipelago. James was
no less, but also no more, than Albanactus’s heir. By privileging the nephew/uncle relationship,
Henry lent force to his allegation that the invasion was “not for reuengeaunce of our priuate
displeasure but for recouerye of our right, the perseruation of our subiectes from iniuries, and the
observation of such leagues as haue passed between vs.” Successive princes, down to Henry
VI, had upheld Brutus’s donation. Moreover, the Tudor king declared in reference to his direct
Welsh descent from Arthur, “there was neuer kynge of this realme [who] hath more iust title,

49 Henry, Declaration, 192.
50 Henry, Declaration, 193.
51 Henry, Declaration, 199.
52 Henry, Declaration, 197.
more euident title, more certayn title to any realme that he can clayme than we haue to Scotland,” not devised or contrived, but rather “lineally descended from the begynynge of that astate established by our progenitours, and recognised successiuely…” Like the Act of Appeals, the Declaration used history to argue that the empire also extended north to envelope Scotland.

Nearly a decade on from 1533, Henry delved into a detailed rehearsal of those authentic tales, specifically the Galfridian narrative of Brutus’s arrival, guided by the oracle Diana to an island replete with giants and lacking order and civility. Now, it was Henry’s turn and duty to restore civility via imperium, “for the better administration of iustyce amongst rude people, it was so ordred for auoydinge discention, that there shuld be one superiour in righte, of whom the syd astates shuld depend.” With these lines, Henry offered a cultural justification of conquest based on the right of the civilized to govern the uncivilized native inhabitants and established that Britain’s origins were inherently imperial. Though ancient and foundational, the king argued, Brutus’s legacy remained just and applicable: “How can there be a title diuised of a more playn begynninge, a more iuste begynninge, a more conuenient begynninge for the order of this Ilande, at that tyme specially when the people were rude, which can not without continual strife and variaunce conteine two or thre rulers in all poyntes equall without any maner of superioritie?”

Continuing to stake his claims on particular moments and monarchs, Henry moved from ancient to medieval, and again appealed to a specific group who had achieved the perfect conquest he desired, and in the same places: William the Conqueror, Edward I, Henry II, Edward

---

53 Henry, Declaration, 198.
54 Henry, Declaration, 199.
55 Henry, Declaration, 199.
III, and Henry V.\textsuperscript{56} Over the course of the century, theorists repeatedly named this set to demonstrate the historicity of Tudor imperial claim, not just over Scotland, but also over Ireland and the New World.

Henry VIII was most enamored with Henry V and Edward I. Their deeds lent continuity of purpose to his efforts in France and Scotland and laudable determination to their executor. He praised Henry V “for recoery of hys ryght in France, commaunded the kyng of Scottis to attende vpon hym.”\textsuperscript{57} He supplemented this by including the submission that Edward, “the noble and superior lorde of the kyngdome of Scotlande,” required from John Balliol, offering a plain model for James to emulate.\textsuperscript{58} In his choice, the king deftly recognized the usefulness and limitations of the pledge, writing it out in full, yet supplementing imperial language (i.e. imperial command, over spiritual and temporal subjects) alongside the feudal (i.e. “homage & fealtie”).\textsuperscript{59} Herein lay a crux of Tudor ideology, which sought to recreate a past entity, part real and part mythologized, and re-constituted in classical terms.

Constrained by feudalism, then, the medieval inheritance was not enough to support the Tudor vision, as evinced by the fact that Henry claimed two more historical legacies: the first ingredient, ancient British monarchy, came in the references to Brutus and Locrinus; the second, Greco-Roman history, came in the smattering of antiquarian and humanist references, like to fifteenth-century Venetian “Anthonius Sabellicus,” who, in his infinite wisdom, “calleth Scotlande part of Englande.”\textsuperscript{60} Coupled with the specific insistence that English sovereignty over Scotland would be truly imperial (territorially-vast, secular and ecclesiastical), the tract

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{56} Henry, Declaration, 201-2.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Henry, Declaration, 202.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Henry, Declaration, 203.
\item \textsuperscript{59} Henry, Declaration, 204.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Henry, Declaration, 199.
\end{itemize}
demonstrates that Henry’s models were at once classical, ancient, and medieval, and inextricably tied to the expansion of monarchical power achieved in the break from Rome.

Why did Henry VIII want to add Scotland, specifically, to his imperium? The Declaration demonstrates that the king’s motivations and, by extension, his justifications, fit into two general categories: Scotland’s lofty place in the ancient and medieval history of the empire and the benefits it would confer onto England. The first emerges clearly in the tract: the humanist reverence for history had fostered in Henry a desire to emulate the great imperial conquerors he read about, like Alexander, Constantine, Caesar, and Justinian. Like the exhortation by Dee that began this chapter, Henry imagined the Tudor empire as one of rediscovery, recovery, and recreation, and as such, focused his ambitions on the sites of this primordial entity: France and the archipelago. The king was also at least somewhat informed by pragmatism and appreciated what More and Vergil counseled from his father’s experience. England’s island geography only fortified the nation in so far as it thwarted attack; so long as half was a French satellite and a breeding ground for sedition, the kingdom lay prostrate and exposed.

Further, contemporaries suggested that Scotland offered economic and commercial advantages for England and its king, whose warmongering and material fancies came with a high price tag. Here, a brief foray into contemporary assessments of Scotland, from travel narratives and cosmographies of the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries is helpful. Just as promoters of the empire in Ireland and the New World recognized the power of these texts to encourage investment and adventuring, so too were they important for the venture north. Moreover, the popularity of these early texts, mimicked by Dee, Richard Hakluyt, and others, testifies to the general impulse for discovery that operated at home alongside the impulse for discovery abroad.
Among the earliest English humanists, William Worcestre composed arguably the first early modern travel account of Britain, the well-circulated *Itineraries*, which offered readers a geographically-organized account supplemented by anthropological data. His Scotland portion bears a striking resemblance to subsequent British accounts of Ireland and the Americas, paradoxically depicting the land as as Edenic, habitable, temperate, safe, and fertile; harsh, wild, uncivilized, and inferior; and with great mineral and raw material wealth, all at once.

By mixing geographical description with physical evidence of England’s claim there, Worcestre created an inducement to expansion unlike the more straightforwardly narrative monastic chronicles. He emphasized Scotland’s classical imperial past, conquered by Constantine, Augustus, and Claudius, and charged that because the Roman Brutus arrived in the archipelago when it was “uninhabited… wild and empty,” all English kings “shall judge Britain with her three isles” as a single political unit. Fluidly combining history and topography, Worcestre depicted Edinburgh as naturally well-endowed with waterways, fit for trade and agriculture, which had drawn in “Arthur the noble fighter… twelve times leader in battle and twelve times victor, triumphing over the Saxons, Picts, Scots, Irish, Iceland, Gothland, the Orkneys, Norway, Denmark, Gaul, Aquitaine, and Gascony.” He added that in the Orkneys, “fur trees grow, [used for] masts of ships,” plus all manner of vegetation. Finally, testifying to the veracity of legend, he witnessed where Arthur “King of the British people,” kept the round

---

62 For “uninhabited… wild and empty,” see Harvey, ed., Worcestre’s *Itineraries*, 97; for “shall judge Britain with her three isles,” see Harvey, ed., Worcestre’s *Itineraries*, 46.  
63 Harvey, ed., Worcestre’s *Itineraries*, 213.  
64 Harvey, ed., Worcestre’s *Itineraries*, 135.
table, at Stirling. Henry evidently believed the tale; in 1522, he dragged Charles V over one-hundred kilometers south from London to Winchester Castle to view the enormous table, which the king’s artists had adorned with a large Tudor rose and the figure of the robbed, imperially-crowned, and bearded Arthur bearing his orb at its center. In this sixteenth-century rendering, the medieval king bore a striking resemblance to Henry VIII.

***

Some three decades after Alexander Barclay wrote to the ascending Henry in 1509, imploring his prince to focus uniting the English lion with the Scottish unicorn rather than conquering abroad and beseeching all of Britain to “Submyt your selfe gladly to his empyre,” the scholar probably would have been pleased. The fall 1542 offensive was effective, led by Thomas Howard, the victor of Flodden and Duke of Norfolk. Less than one month after his crushing defeat at Solway Moss, a humiliated James V died. While his council scrambled to arrange a regency for the week-old Mary Stewart, Henry took the first steps towards turning his British Empire from theory into practice. The Solway treaty of capitulation was similar to the Tournaissien version, as soldiers were released only after they “swore to the Kinge to sett forth his Majesties tytle to the realme of Scoteland” and to the unequal dynastic union. Things looked good for Henry at the start of 1543; he thought he had won a British Empire for his son.

---

65 For “King of the British people,” see Harvey, ed., Worcestre’s Itineraries, 299; for the description of the table, see Harvey, ed., Worcestre’s Itineraries, 70.
66 On the still-extant table, its provenance, and use, see Martin Biddle, King Arthur’s Round Table (Winchester: Excavations Committee, 2000).
69 The victory appears to have encouraged British engagement in Newfoundland, particularly against the French. Iberian Alonso de Santa Cruz complained c.1542 that though discovered long ago, “by [John] Gaboto, father of Your Majesty’s pilot-major [Sebastian Cabot], now more than ever the land is frequented by English who go for fish and fur with merchandise suiting those people,” see Cruz, “Islario Genearl de todas las Islas del Mundo,” printed in
I have thus far described the imperial propaganda of the Rough Wooings as a campaign, meant to conjure up a figurative battle, carried out by theorists lobbing shots generated on paper across the border, alongside concurrent military engagements. Although the Declaration must be given pride of place for its early date and royal authorship, its mantle was taken up by writers on both sides of the Anglo-Scottish divide, and not necessarily in accordance with what their nationality might lead us to assume. Together, their work conspired to make this a promotional moment not dissimilar from that which coalesced around schemes for Ireland and the New World.

Sometime after the Declaration was composed, but before the end of 1542, John Elder, a Scottish Highland cartographer and St. Andrews-educated clergyman offered Henry “A Proposal for Uniting Scotland with England.” With it, he enclosed what was possibly the first accurate map of Scotland, locating all its notable towns, castles, and abbeys and attractive ports and waterways. The “Proposal” stands as an early Tudor example of the presentation of imperial literature with a chart detailing the implicated region. Three years later, Norfolk reported that he had examined Scotland’s coasts and offered instruction for the safe travel of the navy, both at

---

H.P. Biggar, ed., Precursors of Jacques Cartier (Ottawa: Government Printing, 1911), 183-94, quotation from 190. Similarly, at the same time, scholars rushed to show off Henry’s rightful claim to the northwest, including Frenchman Jean Rotz, who gifted him a world atlas adorned with domed crown and Tudor rose held aloft by Cadwallader dragon and Richmond greyhound to induce Henry to return to Atlantic navigation. Pleased, Henry gave him an annuity and added the book to his library (now BL Royal MS, 20.B.VII.), where it sat alongside Roger Barlow’s Briefe Summe of Geographie (1540, BL Royal MS 18.B.XXVIII.), the first vernacular description of America. On Rotz, see E.G.R. Taylor, “Jean Rotz: His Neglected Treatise of Nautical Science,” The Geographical Journal 73, no. 5 (1929): 455-59; on the developing royal library, see J.P. Carley, The Books of King Henry VIII and his Wives (London: BL, 2005). Most telling, French complaints of English piracy rose dramatically from 1542-9, illustrating a prolonged North Atlantic proxy war alongside the Wooings. The crown described this theater as a purposeful plot to “annoy enemies coming from Newfoundland” and avenge the treasons perpetrated against Edward VI (Privy Council to William Paget, 30 September 1544, LP 19/33). When Frenchmen petitioned for redress of “evil handling… brought by force into Bristol haven,” Henry refused (see “Complaints from Frenchmen,” 19 December 1542, LP 17/1220). Thirty years later, Humphrey Gilbert proposed a very similar plot to annoy the king of Spain, see chapter five.


71 On the map, see H.R.G. Inglis, Early Maps of Scotland (Edinburgh: Royal Scottish Geographical Society, 1973), 11.
royal behest.\textsuperscript{72} With their contributions, both Norfolk and Elder engaged in a program of
discovery of the Isles as part of the broader experiment. Their work links discovery—exploration
and cartography—in Britain to that same impulse abroad, as parts of a single, larger project.
Subsequent Tudors received similar offerings (treatise with map) for regions that peaked their
interest, like Newfoundland; but here, in 1542-45, scholarship highlighted Scotland as the
northern frontier worthy of attention.

Elder argued in favor of the union of Britain, under the supremacy of England, by both
conquest and marriage, and promised the aid of disaffected highland chiefs, “true hartis” devoted
to the Tudor cause.\textsuperscript{73} He urged the extension of the same Henrician policy instituted in Gaelic
Ireland to fix Scotland’s own similarly inferior inhabitants.\textsuperscript{74} There, the king could dispense of
incivility and plant the true, Protestant theology.\textsuperscript{75} In so doing, Elder tapped into an increased
hostility to Gaeldom that was a marked feature of Scottish literature since the 1510s, epitomized
by William Elphinstone and John Mair, who described regions “by arms of the sea and very high
mountains, in which dwell wild men rude and ignorant of letters, and almost barbarous.”\textsuperscript{76} But
Elder departed from his predecessors with something novel; in adding the confessional
component, he lumped all of Scotland, not just the Highlands, into the barbarian camp, and
appealed to the English imperial crown rather than the native Stewart one for redress. The
“Proposal” was a post-reformation tract, responsive to James’s obstinacy in maintaining ties to
Rome, which had been a pretense for the 1542 invasion. In fact, its very creation was occasioned

\textsuperscript{72} Norfolk to Henry, n.d. 1545, The Nation Archives (TNA), Public Record Office (PRO), State Papers (SP),
document reference number 1/201, fol. 24. All subsequent citations from TNA: PRO will follow this standard
format of department code (e.g. SP) and document reference number. If a document contains any internal
numbering, the internal reference (i.e. folio number) is provided following the full document reference number.
\textsuperscript{73} For the nature of the union, see Elder, “Proposal,” 7-8; for “true hartis,” see Elder, “Proposal,” 2.
\textsuperscript{74} For the Irish comparison, see Elder, “Proposal,” 9, 14.
\textsuperscript{75} Elder, “Proposal,” 8-9.
\textsuperscript{76} John Mair, \textit{The History of Greater Britain} (1521), printed in \textit{Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness,
Volume 16} (Stirling: Learmonth, 1891), 12. On Elphinstone, see L.J. Macfarlane, \textit{William Elphinstone and the
by the advent of the Anglican Church, as the Scotsman Elder wrote from England while in exile for his faith, offering the first instance in which civility and Protestant Christianity were associated as foundations of a British Empire.\textsuperscript{77} For the next decade, the scholar propounded the concept of a “whole body of thy noble empire of England and dominions of the same,” which, in turn, ensured the “perpetuall peace, love, and quietness of this most noble and hole yle of Britayne” and its incumbent Irish dominion.\textsuperscript{78}

Likening Henry VIII to Hercules and Achilles, Elder beseeched his king to take up poor Scotland, held hostage against its self-interest by “the advyse ... associatt with proud papisticall busheps [and] certane other wylde, fals, craftie bores, which haue drunkyne the French kynges wynes.”\textsuperscript{79} Employing commercial and financial inducements to empire, he made an important contribution to their place in the discourse, emphasizing what wealth and riches as well as peace would accrue if “boithe the realmes of England and of Scotland may be joynede in one; and so your noble Maiestie for to be superiour and kynge.”\textsuperscript{80} Elder depicted the recently-deceased James as on the one hand well-intentioned, and on the other, ultimately corrupted by French Catholic influences, which drew him away from his loving uncle and God. Now, “ther is no people in no region in Europe, so perturbed, so molestide, so vexide, and so vtterly oppreat withe bussheps, monckes, Rome-rykers, and priestis as they which inhabite the realme of Scotland.”\textsuperscript{81}

As this scathing denunciation exemplifies, Elder’s definition of the Henrician empire was as

\textsuperscript{77} As Armitage also noted, see Ideological Origins, 37-8. Armitage argued, however, that Elder’s correlation between civility and Protestantism was fleeting, disappearing upon the accession of Mary I and her marriage to Philip of Spain. I find Elder’s confessional about-face, in which he appeared to embrace Catholicism in the mid-1550s, to be altogether fitting for the often-contradictory development of Tudor imperialism. The Scottish scholar’s religious change constituted necessary, calculated pandering to changing winds at court. Meanwhile, in both cases, Elder clearly asserted the existence of a Tudor British Empire, see chapter four.

\textsuperscript{78} For “whole body...,” see “John Elder’s Letter describing the arrival and marriage of King Philip, his triumphal entry into London, the legation of Cardinal Pole, &c.,” (c. 1555) printed in The Bannatyne Miscellany (Edinburgh: Bannatyne and Co., 1827), 137-167, quotation from 163; for “perpetuall peace...,” see “Elder’s Letter,” in Bannatyne Miscellany, 165.

\textsuperscript{79} Elder, “Proposal,” 7.

\textsuperscript{80} Elder, “Proposal,” 8.

\textsuperscript{81} Elder, “Proposal,” 17.
much as a secular, temporal construct as a spiritual, ecclesiastical one. Offering a metaphor of illness, he explained that the plague sickening Scotland was the consequence both of its missing political head (an indictment of the minority), as its Francophilia and Catholicism;\(^2\) meanwhile he drew the “empyre of England” in direct opposition, for its strong king, Englishness, and Protestantism, adding that it should rightfully include Scotland.\(^3\) The “Proposal” illustrates the centrality of the break from Rome, the domestic consolidation that followed, and the evolving sense of a unique, superior English identity that it spawned to Tudor imperial ideology.

This is all most apparent in the comparison Elder offered between Ireland and Scotland; here, the scholar put forth Henry’s empire not only as the natural, legitimate superior over all Britain, but as the sole means by which Scotland could be rescued from its present barbarity. Relying like the Declaration upon Galfridian legend, he concluded that “as we reide in auncient stories,” Scotland had been inhabited “with gyauntes and wylde people, without ordour, ciuilitie, or maners, and spake none other language but Yrische.”\(^4\) Now, as in the age of Brutus, upon whose laurels the Tudor empire rested, the Scots had become even more savage than the Irish: thanks to “babilonicall busscheps and the great courtyours of Scotland…Yrishe Lordes passe theame a great deale in faithe, and honestie in policy and witt, in good ordour and ciuilitie.”\(^5\) The mode of redress was clear: if Mary wed Edward, heir of the Tudor Empire, then hypocrisy, superstition, and the French King would be plucked out of Scottish hearts, to the posterity of all Britain.\(^6\) Humphrey Llwyd may have coined the term “British Empire” in 1568 and Dee may have given it currency in English circles, but the concept and vocabulary of the “empyr of

\(^2\) Elder, “Proposal,” 16-17.
\(^3\) Elder, “Proposal,” 16.
\(^4\) Elder, “Proposal,” 11.
\(^6\) Elder, “Proposal,” 16.
England” that encompassed England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland under the Tudor crown was present here, in 1542. 87

The dynastic union was concluded with the Treaty of Greenwich on 1 July 1543, yet, as historian John Guy put it, the core had been “stripped out.” 88 Ignoring both complicating factors (the Auld Alliance and English suzerainty), the treaty kept Mary in Scotland until consummation and affirmed that if widowed and childless, she could return as independent Queen of Scots. 89

The concessions were necessary to get the speedy settlement Henry wanted, freeing him to concentrate on an invasion of Boulogne. The French de Guise faction, headed by the dowager Mary, was outwardly thrilled, never intending to honor the pledge—it wanted only time to build a new, more comprehensive anti-English coalition. By December, the Scottish Parliament negated the treaty on the pretense that the seizure of Scottish merchant ships by the English in late-August constituted an act of war. In its stead, the Auld Alliance was formally revived:

“Mary notifies that, her father having been dead a year and she still in her cradle, and Henry King of England, her great uncle, bent on subduing both her and her kingdom by war, Francis King of France, considering the love he bore to her father [reaffirms] the ancient leagues between their predecessors against the kings of England, their common enemies…” 90

87 Elder’s “Proposal” referred to the “empyr of England” three times, on 7, 11, 16. On the origins of the term “British Empire,” the older assumption was that Dee invented it in General and rare memorials pertaining to the perfect arte of navigation annexed to the paradoxal cumpas, in playne (London: 1577), STC 6459. However, historian Bruce Ward Henry found that Welshman Henry Llwyd used it eight years prior, in Commentarioli Britannicae Descriptionis Fraymentum (1568), an apology for the Brut translated by Thomas Twyne as The brevity of Britayne (London: 1573), STC 16636, to include the phrase “British Empyre,” on 92. As for the phrase’s source, Ward Henry credited the intellectual milieu of Dee and Abraham Ortelius, see Bruce Ward Henry, “John Dee, Humphrey Llwyd, and the Name ‘British Empire,’” Huntington Library Quarterly, 35, no. 2 (1972): 189-190. I find this use in the 1540s, however, to be absolutely essential to the development of British Imperialism and of the phrases used to describe it.

88 Guy, Queen of Scots, 24.

89 “Treaty of peace with Scotland and Treaty of Marriage with Scotland,” 1 July 1543, BL Cotton MS, Caligula B.VII., fols. 255-267 [LP 18/804].

90 “Treaty between Mary Queen of Scots and Francis I,” 15 December 1543, LP 18/499.
The privy council had warned Henry that the treaty “cannot well come to pass, while the present Governor [Arran] and the Cardinal [Beaton] rule, without using force, to the destruction of his proneptes lands and subjects.” In hindsight, their findings were prescient: the earl of Arran fully recognized the gravity and determination of Henry’s project and scrambled for European aid. Here, the inclusion of a missionary objective in the English propaganda, even if only rhetoric, was advantageous. Equating British imperialism with Protestantism, the earl of Arran made a plea to Rome possible: “the King of England has determined to make war on us with all of his forces, not only to destroy our liberty… but also to overthrow our religion and the obedience paid for so many centuries to the Holy See. To meet this... the commonwealth looks to His Holiness.” Moreover, in de Guise thought, it heightened the Tudor threat, which brought slaughter and sin, drawing them to “their faith and opinion of Ingland... and purposing, with these [traitorous] Scottishmen, to make plain conquest of the realm.”

Simultaneously, back in England, consolidation continued. Tracts urging that reformation was as yet incomplete emphasized the diligence required to maintain the supremacy as a bulwark against a flock that had wandered may years behind the Bishop of Rome circulated alongside the Scottish material. Examples from 1544-5 demonstrate that the association between *imperium* in Scotland and the European confessional war was not isolated to the regency. Stewart insubordination was put forth as a reminder of the challenges to godly religion and supremacy, as an impetus to vigilance in its defense, inside the realm and out: “the present miserable state of Christendom, everywhere plagued with wars” resolved Cranmer to set forth “certain godly
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91 Norfolk to Henry, 8 December 1543, BL Additional (hereafter Add.) MS 32653, fol. 155 [*LP 18/468*].
92 Arran to Pope Paul III, 8 December 1453, BL Royal MS 18.B.VI., fol. 157v [*LP 18/471*].
93 Mary de Guise to Sheriff of Roxburgh, 19 November 1544, BL Add. MS. 32656, fol. 45 [*LP 19/636*].
prayers and suffrages in our native English tongue.”

English observers added that triumphs on the ground signaled providence and lauded the Anglican Church. As Norfolk himself concluded, the Wooings had “a noble and godly purpose… to the universal benefite of their countrey and ours.”

The importance of the cause, its religious invective, and the need for an uncompromising show of force in response to “the crafty and devilish means” of Arran and the Scots appear in a flurry of official Tudor correspondence from the same months, particularly as penned by Edward Seymour, Prince Edward’s uncle and earl of Hertford. Interestingly, the crown prioritized military conquest as well as material gain, indicating a growing commercial objective.

Statesman William Eure recommended the heavy use of garrisons along the border and interior raids coupled with a blockade and royal naval offensive to “stop all passage of Scottish ships. Thus in one year, for want of corn, and the garrisons keeping the Borders from sowing, and burning the hay and corn that is won, Scotland shall be glad to give over and yield.” He explained that then Scotland would be reliant on English agriculture, under high tariffs. The privy council directed the specific seizure of goods attractive to English textile manufacture: “amongst the spoil of Edinburgh and Lyth [we] have gotten great quantity of canvas, olromes, polldavies, and other linen clothes.” Indeed, the first major 1543 offensive did target Leith, for its accessibility and incomparable richness. Scottish shipping and havens remained a major

---

95 Cranmer to Bishop of London, 18 June 1544, LP 19/732.
96 Anon., “The Late Expedition into Scotland, made by the King’s highness’s army, under the conduct of the Right honorable the Earl of Hertford, the year of our Lord God 1544,” printed in A.F. Pollard, ed., Tudor Tracts, 1532-1588 (Westminster: Constable, 1903), 42-4.
97 Norfolk to Henry, 28 February 1544, BL Add. MS 32653, fol. 290 [LP 19/136].
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focus, and correspondents reported success alongside vital navigational information: “our own
[ships] being almost pestered with spoil and booty.” In particular, the advantageous situation
of the Scottish fisheries and their plenty pop up as a motivating factor for the Tudor enterprise, as
it was for Newfoundland.

Though success against a Franco-Scottish league that (according to Tudor officials),
determined to invade northern England and “his Highness’ pieces beyond the sea” was uneven,
there was enough good news by spring 1545 to warrant the design of a plan for the future. Structured as a list of things that the king required of his “governors” in Scotland, the plot
specified first and foremost that the Tudor empire must extend the state and ecclesiastical
apparatuses at work in England: extirpating the Bishop of Rome and enforcing the supremacy,
“They shall cause the Word of God to be taught and preached in their countries, as the only
foundation of truth and means of judging who proceeds justly and who abuses them for private

glory.” The king’s death mid-war on 28 January 1547 makes this the clearest statement we
have of what Scotland would have looked like under Henrician imperial rule in the mid-1540s.

Additional clauses supplied to the governors addressed the problem of obedience and
integration of a new dominion and its people into an expanded empire, which had plagued Henry
in Tournai and would remain a ubiquitous quandary in early and modern empire. The Greenwich
nullification had convinced some councilors that “the Scots are strange men to meddle with and
little to trust to.” Therefore, the instructions reaffirmed the requirement that all new subjects
swear their inferiority to both “the King and to England” and then “renounce aswel the leages
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made in commun betwene Fraunce and Scotland... prejudiciall unto us our Royalmes and domynions.”

Further, the scheme required the Scots serve the King, “for lyke wages as other our subjects do, bothe against Fraunce, and all other nations and personnes” as commanded and aid the king in protecting the realm, fortifying its cities and ports. Similar to the Tourmaisien provisions, the clauses show crown efforts to integrate the Scots into an imperial system, which included a standing English army, and its special concern to hold Scotland’s urban and maritime centers, which were, as several sources above attested, central to the attraction. For day-to-day governance, the king appointed as deputy an English “Governor of Scotland” (Lord Wharton), charged with administration of justice via common law and with updating the crown. Henry would thereby remain somewhat involved, but surrender direct rule to the legal structures perfected at home and to the governor, the same executive post used throughout the Tudor imperial system.

When Henry died three years later, he left his experiments unceremoniously incomplete, yet his proclivities and perspectives were well-known around courtly circles. Just prior to the king’s death, in late-1547, English antiquarian John Leland presented the crown with a gift that appealed to this very vision, a gift that showed that Henry’s empire could, like the body politic, outlive his mortal body natural. Leland’s *Laboriouse Journey* (pub. 1549) bridged the general impulse towards discovery at home with that of related, concurrent efforts at territorial expansion abroad. Its commission and Leland’s generous reward also demonstrate that the king actively
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112 Leland, *The Laboryouse Journey [and] Serche of Johan Leylande for Englandes antiquitees gueuen of hym as a newe yeares gyfte to Kyng Henry the viij. In the xxxvij. yeare of his regne, with declaracyons enlarged by Johan Bale* (presented in 1547, pub. in London: 1549), STC 15445. Ernst Hartwig Kantorovich convincingly showed that the theory of the king’s two bodies developed consistently in England after the eleventh century and was employed in the sixteenth, including under Henry VIII in the break from Rome, see Kantorovich, *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), especially 228-30.
patronized humanist scholarship, even in his final months; it had served him well so far.

Scouring libraries across the Isles for “all the olde monumentes of the Brytaynyes” like those in
the Collectanea, Leland responded with more evidence of the Bishop of Rome’s usurped
authority, in defense of the king’s “supreme dygnyte.”

Leland found “olde Chronicles autorisid, remayning in diverse Monasteries booth in
England as yn Scotland, by the which it is openly knowen and shewid, that the Kinges of
England have had, and now owt to have, the upper Domination and Subjection of the Reaulme of
Scotland, and Homage and Feaultie of the Kings of the sayde Reaulme.” Specifically, he
traced this power from Brutus, by right of Trojan primogeniture, to 1292 when Edward I created
John Balliol, who swore, in return, “yn writing, to kepe trew Faith, and Obedience, to the sayd
King Edwarde, and to his Heires, Kinges of England, for ever more, as their chief Lord.” That
oath had been violated.

His journeys throughout the archipelago made Leland a pioneer in local history,
geography, and archeology, yet he was equally an imperial promoter—he aimed to supply Henry
with a detailed description of his imperial history, people, and territorial holdings. On the models
of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, and classical definitions of sovereignty, dominion,
and imperium, the resultant manuscript, though incomplete, was explicitly a guide to the current
bounds of Henrician Empire and a tool for future expansion by the Tudor Charlemagne.

***

113 For “all the olde monumentes…,” see Leland, Laboryouse Journey, sig. A6v; for “supreme dygnyte,” see Leland, Laboryouse Journey, sig. C5v.
The Protectorate of Edward Seymour, now Duke of Somerset, for the minority of Edward VI, installed at the head of the English body politic a veteran of Henrician imperial enterprise in Scotland and France.\textsuperscript{116} Created earl of Hertford in celebration of the birth of his nephew, Henry’s first and only legitimate, male heir, Seymour had enjoyed great preferment as a soldier and courtier in the years that followed, particularly after his landmark September 1547 victory at Pinkie Cleugh. When the Scots vacated the Treaty of Greenwich, he was appointed to lead the December 1543 offensive that lay siege to Edinburgh and plundered Scottish shipping, after which he crossed the Channel to join the king at the capture of Boulogne (14 September 1544). Reassigned to Scotland in late-spring 1545, Hertford struck strongholds Kelso and Jedburgh and, meeting little opposition, promulgated a campaign of systematic devastation, fulfilling council’s directive to “repulse the Scots and requite their malice... overrun, waste, and burn a great part of the country.”\textsuperscript{117} In two letters sent after Kelso, Hertford affirmed the objectives and legitimacy of the enterprise and demonstrated the nature and extent of his involvement in planning the practical side of the king’s empire across England’s northern border. They are the earliest insights into what became his British imperial venture in 1547 and the mix of continuity and rupture from the Henrician to the Edwardian projects.

In the first, dated 25 August 1545, Hertford avowed his commitment “taccomplishe the said enterpyse of your Majesties honor” and set out a practical plan to do so with least danger


\textsuperscript{117} Hertford to Henry, 11 August 1545, TNA: PRO SP 49/8, fol. 121. For Hertford’s feats, see the following crown correspondence: Hertford to Henry 12 April 1544, BL Add. MS 32654, fol. 88 [LP 19/319]; PC to the earl of Shrewsbury, 1 February 1545, \textit{LP} 20/129; Hertford to Paget, 31 May 1545, \textit{LP} 20/837; Hertford, Cuthbert Tunstal, and Ralph Sadler to Henry, 4 June 1545, \textit{LP} 20/867; William Damesell to Paget, 3 September 1545, \textit{LP} 20/285.
and difficulty. He devised a proclamation, whereby the many noblemen and other Scottish subjects who already favored the Tudor cause would be emboldened to reject the French and, in exchange for protection, to swear allegiance to England. In vocabulary and purpose, Hertford’s language resembled that of the Tournaisien oath and Henry’s 1544 instructions, “to bryng that countrey [to] obedynce, subjection and service to Your Majestie.”^{119}

Indicative of his long-term vision for the region, one that would find Scotland easily and permanently governed by England, without undue financial, military, or demographic burden, a second letter elucidates Hertford’s appraisal of the benefits of expansion here, that is, Scotland’s attractiveness as an imperial dominion. His judgment is far more detailed and far more practical than the more ideological ruminating of the Declaration, highlighting Scotland’s rich soil and agriculture, raw materials, and pliability of its inhabitants, who could be made to serve England without much trouble: “the countrey is very fayre, and so good a corne countrey, and suche plentie of the same, as we have not seen the more plenteous in England... I fynd great honestie in the straungiers whiche serve Your Highnes here.”^{120} With “trayning” in English ways and promises of obedience, they might “be aswell ruled, as men of as good order in the feald, as ever we sawe” and, over time, replace a portion of the English garrison.^{121} Hertford’s vocabulary is particularly important: though England’s fellow islanders, from the same bloodline, and a part of the same European political web, the Scots were termed “straungiers,” the same label applied in Tournai and to the Irish and Amerindians earlier and later in the century.^{122}

This experience in Scotland in the years before his rule influenced Hertford’s imperial ideology and policy. It exposed him to the Henrician program—its aims, motivations, rhetoric,
and justification—and put him on the ground there. Similarly, Thomas Smith and William Cecil (later Lord Burghley) too fought in the Wooings, under Somerset at Pinkie, and subsequently gained prominence as Tudor statesmen and theorists. That all three were involved in this experiment in the first half of the century and later promoted or took part in further imperial adventure is not coincidental. Historian David Armitage asserted that Cecil’s Scottish experience, cartographic interest, and awareness of the threat posed by a pro-French British neighbor fostered in him a “wide-ranging vision of England as the center of a Protestant British monarchy encompassing both Scotland and Ireland.”123 The same was true for Somerset and Smith.

Edward’s Rough Wooings—again, broadly defined to include military and ideological campaigns—were deeply rooted in and profoundly shaped by Henrician precedent. Like his father, he was “superior and sovereign lord” over his English, Irish, Welsh, French, and Scottish subjects, and resolved towards “fulfilling his father’s intentions, with the advice of the Lord Protector and others of his counsaill.”124 Historian Stephen Alford found that Edward, and, by extension, his regency, inherited three principles of kingship with major, profound repercussions for governance: first, the king of England exercised secular imperium, second, he was the vicar of Christ in his own realm, and third, the Church in England could separate itself from Rome. As Alford put it, “Edward was an emperor. Printers used every opportunity to emphasize the power of imperial kingship in their editions of sermons, homilies and injunctions, and bibles, inheriting from the reign of Henry VIII the presentation of the king by artists like Holbein and the

iconography of the Great Bible.”125 The boy king internalized this powerful monarchical model, shaping the regime even as a child.126

There are, therefore, multiple points of continuity across the Henrician-Edwardian divide of 1547: both elaborated a classical humanist theory of sovereignty and empire and buttressed their interventions with tracts of British imperial theory. Both sought a long-term settlement whereby the Tudor monarchy would rule over a single, Anglicized island and reap its benefits. Both cited the failure of Stewart Scotland to uphold its historical and familial obligations and were indebted to the developments, foreign and domestic, of the 1510s and 1530s. Both too fed off of the contemporary process of national consolidation at work in the 1530s and 1540s that bore a nationalist belief in the superiority of Englishness (law, justice, custom, religion) over the Scottish stranger.

As translator Nicholas Udall explained, Henry’s death left Edward with an “Emperiall croune and sceptre” to “consummate & finishe such regall enterpryses as he [his father] had begonne” in religion, government, and diplomacy.127 Yet the two enterprises were not identical—Edwardian imperialism was an elaboration and hardening of the Henrician version. Injecting new energy, troops, schemes, and money, all under the auspices of a more evangelical Protestant establishment personified by the godly boy-king Josiah, Somerset transformed what had been a five-year-long, uneven show of force into a decade-long endeavor, single-minded to the point of recklessness, as major economic and social problems went unabated at home. As M.L. Bush explained, Scotland was “the government’s main concern and the hub around which

---

127 For “Emperiall croune…,” see Udall, *The First Tome or Volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the Newe Testamente* (London: 1548), STC 2854.5, iii; for “consummate…,” see Udall, *Paraphrase of Erasmus*, vi.
the rest of the policy revolved.” Symptomatic of and stimulated by this change, a reactionary, anti-imperialist backlash emerged and the Somerset regime fell, in a perfect storm of conciliar power-grabbing and domestic rebellion, provoked by reform and financial crisis part and parcel with the imperial project. Though the protectorate languished and the Wooings failed, the escalation of Henrician imperialism in 1547-9 advanced earlier ideology and policy, allowing both to crystalize into a more clearly defined, comprehensive theory of British imperialism, at once more broadly applicable beyond Scotland, and more recognizable to historians of later empire.

Just under a year into the minority, theologian John Hooper presented Somerset with what was primarily a religious tract, filled with scriptural musings gleaned from the Swiss reform movement. The first piece of Edwardian Wooings promotion, *A declaration of Christe and his office* (1547) set the tone for much of what followed: it imagined the growth of Henry’s
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130 Continuity and elaboration are both also apparent in Irish policy; the protector did (occasionally) look west. Initially, Somerset retained Henrician deputy Anthony St. Leger, directing him to stop canoodling with the Anglo-Irish and arm the Pale. The deputy obliged, erecting two huge forts—named Governor and Protector—along the Pale’s western border. But quickly, the protector preferred Edward Bellingham, a veteran of Henry VIII’s French wars. Elevated in early 1548, Bellingham immediately seized Leix and Offaly for the throne, charging that their lords had failed to honor the terms of their regrant. As advised by Cranmer, Somerset also commissioned a new liturgy from Archbishop of Dublin George Browne and directed Bellingham to introduce the first *Book of Common Prayer*. Meanwhile, the deputy launched into military mode, snuffing out rebellion and placing new English proprietors on land in Offaly, as he reported to the Council in late-1548, see Bellingham to PC, n.d. 1548, TNA: PRO SP 61/1/85, fol. 130. Overall, however, these developments were minimal, as Britain took priority through 1549. On Somerset-era Edwardian Ireland, see D.G. White, “The reign of Edward VI in Ireland,” *Irish Historical Studies* 14, no. 55 (1965): 197-211; Bradshaw, “The Edwardian Reformation in Ireland, 1547-1553,” *Archivium Hibernicum* 34 (1976): 83-99; Brady, *Chief Governors*, 45-65; Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 166-169; James A. Murray, *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: Clerical Resistance and Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 159-203.
experiment as a providential obligation to expand the bounds of Tudor monarchy, territory, and faith.131

Hooper found that from its start, the war had unwavering, unequivocal occasion and purpose: God’s singular favor had asked the Tudors “to annex and add an external testimonie of his good will,” i.e. Scotland, to its realm.132 His diction here—“annex” and “external”—clarify his pro-imperialist agenda and conception of the enterprise as one of conquest and rule over foreign people.133 Further, he offered an argument of environmental determinism and cultural imperialism, charging that by creating an “Ilond deuydyded from all the worold by imparkyng of the sea by naturall descent of parentayge and blud, one in langayge and speche, in form and proporcioon of personayge,” he intended it to be a single realm, a united Protestant “Empyre.”134 Scottish disobedience against its natural and lawful prince and superior power and especially their fall from civilized English norms of manner and living, the “worke of the deuill by his wyckid membres.”135 A diatribe against the “blaspemus [sic] pryde of the Bishope of Rome” and his church followed, as Hooper charged all Catholic clergy with maliciously divorcing Scotland from English moorings, the true teachings of Christ, and their rightful overlords, the Tudors.136 Like Adam, Moses, and Peter, God had elected Edward to continue the work of his father, confirm his right, and rid the isle of “exteriour ceremony and pompe.”137 Merging scripture with Brut and solidifying the characteristics of Englishness, Hooper articulated a clear evangelical, civilizing mission drawn against a degenerate Franco-Catholic alternative. His offering pleased

131 Hooper, A declaration of Chríste and of his offyce compylyd (Zurich: 8 December 1547), STC 13745.
132 Hooper, A declaration, sig. A2v.
133 Hooper, A declaration, sig. A2v.
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its recipient: Hooper joined Somerset’s household and eventually accepted Gloucester’s bishopric.\(^{138}\)

In 1548, following his departed monarch’s model, the protector contributed his own piece to the literary campaign, the *Epistle or exhortacion, to unite and peace*, which began by reciting the monarch’s titles. Not atypical for a royal tract, the novelty of the protectorate evidently necessitated compensation; Somerset styled himself guardian of the treasury, “Gouernor of his moste royall persone, and Protector of all his Realmes, dominions, and Subjectes, Lieutenaunt generall of all his Maiesties Armies, bothe by lande and sea,” for Edward, “of Englannde, Fraunce and Ireland, kynge, defender of the Faithe, and supreme hedde of the Churche of Englannde and Irelande.”\(^{139}\) It was a thinly veiled flex of muscle, a clarification of the author’s right to “exhort” the Scots.\(^{140}\) By reaffirming the supremacy and the elasticity of its territorial bounds (implicit in the words realms and dominions), the protector made abundantly clear, to a British audience, that he lawfully possessed Tudor imperial authority and the practical tools (money and military manpower) of its execution.\(^{141}\)

Mirroring Henry VIII’s *Declaration*, Somerset highlighted the familial bloodlines and geography that tied Britons together, charging that the existence of two separate, independent kingdoms on the isle was unnatural, ungodly, and illegal. Yet to this, he added another

---


\(^{139}\) Edward Seymour Duke of Somerset, *An epistle or exhortacion, to vnitie [and] peace, sent from the Lorde Protector, and others the kynges most honorable counsaill of England: to the nobilitie, gentlemen, and commons, and al others the inhabitauntes of the realme of Scotlande* (London: Richard Grafton, 1548), STC 22268, sig. A2r.

\(^{140}\) As the author presumed in his title, see Somerset, *An epistle or exhortacion*, title-page.

\(^{141}\) Edward’s royal style was the same as his father’s after 1542, when Henry assumed the Irish kingship. Somerset’s title was far more elaborate here than in government documents. For example, compare to his privy council appointment, which only specified his duty to “tende to thonour and suretie of our Souveraigne Lorde for thadvancement of his affayres,” see “Nomination of the Protector,” 1 February 1547, in John Roche Dasent, ed., *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, 46 vols. (London: Stationery Office, 1890), 2:4-7, quotation from 2:5.
metaphorical relationship, the physician and patient, arguing that just as a learned doctor advises what is right, necessary, and healthy, which the patient would be a dunce not to follow for his own good, so too did the English seek to cure the Scots of those who, “for their awne priuate wealth & comoditie, not regardyng though you bee still in miserie... abuse you, with feyned and forged tales” into serving a foreign nation.\textsuperscript{142} The metaphors accomplished the same point: if the Scots persisted in rejecting England’s brotherly love, then, “as the louying Phisicion, would do to the mistrustfull and ignorant pacient, we are content to call and crye vpon you [as] enemies and Conquerors.”\textsuperscript{143}

The evolution to a more aggressive stance, born out in this line, is palpable throughout the treatise. Unlike Henry’s chronological rehashing of Galfridian legend, the \textit{Epistle} relied on the same source, but presented it differently, and more succinctly, prodding the Scots with the number of times an English king defeated them in battle in a single year (five) and the number of kings captured or slain by the English (countless). Though interspersed with promises that the Tudors sought friendship, these references are far outnumbered by statements that warned “if you refuse, [you] drive vs to conquere.”\textsuperscript{144} Somerset made clear that even if the marriage alliance were achieved, it would not be a union of equals, but a “godly enterprise” of expansion, by right of the Tudor “Imperial Croune” to its ancient British Empire.\textsuperscript{145} Indeed, this is why God provided a prince to one and a princess to the other and proscribed the subservience of all wives. Further, Somerset justified his hostility on the basis that Scotland had already floundered ample opportunities to submit, “as heretofore hath been experimented [by] the moste wise and

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{142} Somerset, \textit{Epistle}, sig. A3v.
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\textsuperscript{144} Somerset, \textit{Epistle}, sig. A8r.
\textsuperscript{145} For “godly enterprise,” see Somerset, \textit{Epistle}, sig. C3v; for “Imperial Croune,” see Somerset, \textit{Epistle}, sig. A6r.
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victorious Prince, late our Kyng and Master, kyng Henry theight.” 146 Stubbornly, he disparaged, the Scots had refused. 147

The Epistle also speaks to the progress of national consolidation since 1542. There is far more here than any other piece about natural unity based on common language, manners, geography, and (soon) religion. Echoing Utopía, Somerset asserted that Britain’s island situation was providential, but only a defensive advantage if it housed a single commonweal, “If we twoo beyng made one... and hauying the sea for wall, the mutuall loue for garrison, and God for defence, should make so noble and wel agreying Monarchie that neither in peace wee maie bee ashamed, nor in warre affraied.” 148 Stressing a shared linguistic heritage above all others, he posited that once the Scots embraced the English vernacular, it would be the vehicle for the true word of God, to abolish the Bishop of Rome in “both realms under the name of Britons,” and confirming their global advantage. 149 Scotland had but two options, British union or French enslavement: if “you marry [Mary] out of greate Britayne, you [will] be subiectes to a forein Prince of other Countrey, another language...how shall thei oppresse you, fill your house, wast your groundes, spende, and consume your vitaill, holde you in subieccion, and regarde you as slaues.” 150 He concluded, “we shal be of one Islande of greate Britayn.” 151

Somerset’s optimism that either by concord or conquest his British imperial vision would be achieved, and bear the standard of superior Englishness was informed by reports he received from his men in the north. After all, as Andrew Dudley reported in late-1547, most of the

---

146 Somerset, Epistle, sig. B1r.
147 Somerset, Epistle, sigs. B1v-B3r.
148 Somerset, Epistle, sig. C1r.
150 Somerset, Epistle, sigs. B4r-v.
151 Somerset, Epistle, sig. A4v.
honorable, leading men of Scotland favor the word of God and desire Protestant preachers and translated scripture, all “glad to become English.”

Beyond imagining the new empire, the Epistle too offered a practical scheme for governance under Edward’s imperial crown. Somerset demonstrated his particular concern for trade and law, two issues central to British imperial experimentation in the sixteenth century. Assuming a defensive posture, he professed his interest not to deprive Scots of their custom, but rather to exchange them for a better kind, common law, superior for its reliance on “the auncient vsage.” He added that a single Great Britain would breed mercantile exchange: he promised that every Scotsman who recorded his name with Edward’s government would receive leave to enter any port or market in England, buy and sell there, and then bring the imports back home to Scotland under the same duties as Englishmen. Significantly, then, the Protector envisioned a Protestant, British commercial empire, couched in mutual benefit, but in which England was superior and sovereign—its king ruled and its officers regulated trade and taxation, and could do so on the basis of merchant nationality.

Much like his master’s Epistle, William Patten’s account of the first military campaign of the Edwardian Wooings stressed continuity of Henry’s “prosperous successes” and selflessly offered to instruct the protector, as Ovid to Somerset’s Caesar, on the means by which the earlier model might be advanced and improved. Arguably the chief, definitive feature of the Protector’s Scottish policy (and its fatal flaw) was the commitment to garrisoning. Somerset and Patten believed that the Henrician experiment had failed because periodic shows of force could never achieve permanent subjection. As historian M.L. Bush postulated, “Garrisoning for

152 Andrew Dudley to Somerset, 1 November 1547, CSPScot 1/74.
153 Somerset, Epistle, sig. B3r.
154 Somerset, Epistle, sig. C3r.
155 Patten, The Expedition into Scotland (1547, pub. 1548), printed in Pollard, ed., Tudor Tracts, 53-158, quotation from 57.
Somerset was the practical alternative for maintaining some control and influence, the Scots having proved treacherous and invading armies having failed to provide a remedy.” It is possible that as a pupil of early Tudor military history, he drew his admiration for the technique from Ireland or France, but regardless of its source, Somerset regarded garrisoning as the necessary instrument of imperial rule. Patten took this lead and couched this militaristic vision in the rhetoric of a common British good: “which thing, taking once effect, what can be more for your universal commodities, profits, and weals? whereby even at once, of foreign foes, ye shall be accepted as familiar friends! of weak, ye shall be made strong! of poor, rich! and of bonds, free!” What had changed is the clarity and firmness with which English promotion put forth its case, even though what it advocated (the marriage), censured (the Greenwich treaty), and staked its claim on (the Tudor imperial crown inherited from Locrinus) remained unchanged. It was a shift away from rehearsing the specific history of the Anglo-Scottish relationship and towards a more comprehensive ideological argument in favor of imperialism, easily translatable to another space and time.

This project, whereby the British Empire was conceived of and justified as a specific commercial, political, and cultural entity, received a major push from Edinburgh merchant James Henrisoun, who, like Elder, crossed national lines to promote the English side. Addressed to Somerset and composed in English, not Scots or Latin, Henrisoun’s *An exhortation to the Scottes* (1547) took as its point of departure the politics of identity. Looking to the hallmarks of English self-definition as they had developed over the two decades prior in English domestic consolidation—geography, ancient British heritage, vernacular language, and reformed religion—he “marueill[ed] how betwene so nere neighbors, dwellyng with in one land,

---

compassed within one sea, alied in bloude, and knitte in Christes faithe, suche vnnaturall
discorde should so long continue."\(^{159}\) The wicked, lawless Scots, addicted to popery, France, and
an inferior civility misconstrued as ancient and national rather than new and alien, had bred an
unnatural civil war. He extolled the Tudors, justly entitled to the whole isle, and called on God to
“graunte to the Kynges Maiestie of England his righteous possession of the whole monarchie of
Britayn, to thaduancement of Gods glory, comfort to his lieges, and confusion of his enemies.”\(^{160}\)

A Protestant humanist, Henrisoun offered copious scriptural, classical, ancient, and
medieval examples, drawn, he explained, from Herodotus, Tacitus, Boethius, Gildas, Geoffrey of
Monmouth, and others, to demonstrate that the experience of all realms in all times in history
shows that “\textit{Omne regnum in se diuism desolabitur}: that is to saie: euery kyngdome diuided in it
self, shal be brought to desolacion.”\(^{161}\) The author was judicious in his diction here—he
employed the Latin \textit{regnum} in the original maxim, the English kingdom in his translation, but his
comparisons were imperial, his Britain expansionary. This empire was only a kingdom in the
sense that it was governed by a single king, the Tudor monarch, and from this point forward in
the text, Henrisoun described a “supreme empire,” based in the island’s most fruitful region,
London.\(^{162}\) He explained that this empire had, indeed, been observed in England by all kings
since Constantine, who all “weare a close crowne Emperiall, in token that the lande is an empire
free in it self & subiett to no superior but God."\(^{163}\) It would begin in the isle of Britain, with this
war, but come to encompass far more, as Edward followed in the footsteps of his Roman
ancestors, men desirous to enlarge their realms and never content until they had the whole of

\(^{159}\) Henrisoun (alternatively Anglicized as Harrison), \textit{An exhortacion to the Scottes to conforme them selfes to the
honorable, expedient, and godly vnion, betwene the twoo realmes of Englande and Scotlande} (London: Richard
Grafton, 1547), STC 12857, sigs. A2r-v.
\(^{162}\) Henrisoun, \textit{Exhortacion}, sig. C1r.
\(^{163}\) Henrisoun, \textit{Exhortacion}, sig. D2v.
what they sought; this is what made each of them the “very Emperor of al Britayn.”

Here, Henrisoun went beyond previous propaganda and advanced a significant thesis: he explicitly connected national consolidation (the elimination of division in the realm) with imperial growth and expressly likened the Tudor state not just to the ancient British Empire, but to classical versions, from which Brutus was descendant.

Henrisoun extolled example after example of emperors who had eradicated division and discord and so reduced territories and, especially, “sauage and barbarous” inhabitants, to one monarchy, king, and governor. By these means, “the Pictes and Irishe Scottes… strong nacions who so often infest and vexe bothe Brytains & Romaines” were subdued and conquered. In this construction, the ancient imperial legacy now descended upon Edward, evident in his right title over the Scots, Irish, French, and beyond—each group equivalent to sixteenth-century Picts, similarly backward, immoral, and ungodly. Stressing consolidation, particularly religious, as part one of the imperial process, Henry had begun the task for his son, who “we[e]ded out of his realm, those wicked plantes, not onely unprofitable to his commonwealth, but also enemies to all veritie and true Religion.”

The previous king had also confirmed in the Declaration—a named source for Henrisoun—that the supreme British kingship persisted historically in the English crown. The author’s word choice here mimicked both the Declaration and the language of the Henrician Reformation, and set up two folio pages that described the course of the Wooings so far. The Scots, he explained, had been given ample chance to realize their rightful, godly station in the empire. It fell now to Edward to implement a
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164 Henrisoun, Exhortacion, sig. D2r.
165 Henrisoun, Exhortacion, sigs. B7r-B8v.
166 Henrisoun, Exhortacion, sig. C4r.
167 Henrisoun, Exhortacion, sig. B4r.
168 Henrisoun, Exhortacion, sig. D7v.
169 Henrisoun, Exhortacion, sig. E8v.
program whereby two realms will grow into one and eliminate corrupt superstition and other
“deuilries brought by the bishop of Rome.” Though censuring the pope as a usurper and
minion of the Anti-Christ, Henrisoun reminded his Scottish audience that the pope himself had
confirmed England’s ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the whole of Britain in the Council of
Windsor and the Treaty of Falaise, in 1170 and 1174. The Exhortacion’s Tudor imperium was
thus temporal and spiritual, Britain “not onely vnited in one Empire, but also in one Religion.”
The planting metaphor here is equally significant; it was an essential element of imperial rhetoric
in Ireland and the Americas, where English ways, people, and religion were similarly to be
planted in place of uprooted incivility. Henrisoun’s use of it for the Scottish context speaks to the
parallel among Tudor enterprise in these three areas.

Henrisoun argued that brought to fruition, the Tudor empire would rival its forerunners.
As it grew larger, beyond Britain, it would grow in prestige: “For beeyng then bothe vnder one
kyng, the more large and ample Empire, the more honorable and glorious: the king of greater
dominion, gouernance power, and fame: and the subiectes more renouned happy and more quiet:
the realme more sure, and formidable to enemies.” Befitting his emphasis on the gains made in

170 Henrisoun, Exhortacion, sig. H4v.
171 Under Henry II, the Council of Windsor had declared that the archbishopric of York encompassed all of
Scotland, in addition to northern England, and the papacy had agreed. Henrisoun conveniently omitted the fact that
in 1192, after heavy Scottish lobbying, Pope Celestine III issued the bull Cum Universi, which recognized the
Church in Scotland as filia specialis or “special daughter” of the papacy. Further ecclesiastical dominion was given
over to the Scottish crown in 1472 and 1487, when the papacy elevated St. Andrews to archiepiscopal status and
then surrendered to James III the right of appointment to his kingdom’s richer ecclesiastical benefices. In 1174’s
Treaty of Falaise, Scottish king William I surrendered Scotland as a subordinate to the crown of England, though the
agreement was nullified in 1189. For the Windsor compact text, see A.W. Haddan and William Stubbs, eds.,
Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869-78),
vol. 2, part I, p. 159. For the text of the Treaty of Falaise, see James Gairdner, ed., The Historical Collections of a
Citizen of London in the fifteenth century (London: Camden Society, 1876), 258-62. On Windsor and Falaise and
where they fit into medieval British claims of suzerainty, see Michael Lynch, Scotland: A New History (London:
Pimlico, 1992), 86; Alan MacQuarrie, Medieval Scotland: Kingship and Nation (Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2004),
especially chapters 5 and 6; Colin Kidd, “The Matter of Britain and the Contours of British Political Thought,” in
British Political Thought in History, Literature, and Theory, 1500-1800, ed. David Armitage (NY: Cambridge
172 Henrisoun, Exhortacion, sig. D6v.
in the 1530s and early 1540s, Henrisoun specifically portrayed the empire as an organ of the
Tudor state, beneficial to all of Britain yet governed by English religion, defense, law, language,
and commercial economy. Just as the ocean would be a natural buffer to repel hostility, so too
would English officials (one chief justice in Aberdeen to oversee the north, another in Edinburgh
to oversee the south and Ireland) and common law (printed in multiple languages to avoid
disobedience) end crime and sin.\footnote{Henrisoun, \textit{Exhortacion}, sig. F5r-F6r.} With the worst people and influences repelled and the best
retained, the laboring man could till his ground in peace, enjoying Scotland’s natural fertility,
while the merchant travelled abroad and brought luxuries into the island.\footnote{Henrisoun,
\textit{Exhortacion}, sig. B4.} The final point is
indicative of the author’s own concerns as a trader, but also illustrative of increasing chatter
reaching England in these weeks from the frontlines of the Scottish campaign highlighting the
region’s rich raw material stores: copious “herring, white fish, and salmon, along the coast of
Scotland” and mineral wealth.\footnote{Ormistoun and Longniddry to the earl of Warwick, 9 November 1547, \textit{CSPScot} 1/81. Though noted under Henry
VIII, the correspondence from 1547-8 explicitly prioritizes these two markets, as the Ormistoun letter exemplifies.}

Henrisoun’s 1548 \textit{The Godly and Golden Book}, gifted to Cecil, clarified these points,
promoting imperial expansion in Scotland on the basis that Tudor Britain would, accordingly,
win rich fisheries, great mineral wealth (gold, copper, iron, and lead), and provide place and
opportunity for the idle to labor.\footnote{Henrisoun to William Cecil, \textit{The Godly and Golden Book}, 9 July 1548, \textit{CSPScot} 1/285.} Further, in a 1549 memo to the protector, Henrisoun adopted
the term “straungiers” as a stand-in for the Scots, mirroring Somerset’s use, and enumerated
precisely how much revenue the king might expect yearly out of Scotland (a whopping
£20,000).\footnote{Henrisoun to Somerset, “Questions worthy to be consulted on for the common wealth and union of the two
realms,” n.d. 1549, \textit{CSPS} 1/357.} The courtier’s texts thus offered an absolutely essential argument, reflective of past
schemes for Ireland and Newfoundland and, equally, signs of burgeoning commercial and
agricultural arguments that found great expression under Cecil’s auspices in mid- and late-Tudor Empire.

In the style of the *Epistle*, Henrisoun closed with a warning: “the Englishemen, haue these many yeres, kepte foote and possession of ground in Fraunce” and, in recent memory, “we lost the feld and our kyng & kyng Henry, at the very same time wonne the battaill in Fraunce… [capturing] by plain conquest, Turwayn and Turney.” Here was an effective reminder that Tournai was not forcibly surrendered in a grand display of French retribution, but it and Flodden were unconditional successes towards recreating the ancient empire. With this prompt, he pressed his audience—likely Somerset and the Scots both—to recall the strength and zeal of Henry’s imperial crown and “conquerors handes.” Failure to recognize the superiority of the proposed empire, he explained, would be tantamount to choosing brutishness over civility and cursing God and the isle. Personified as a woman, Henrisoun’s Britain asked, “Hath not the almighty prouidence seuered me from the reste of the worlde, with a large sea, to make me one Islande? hath not natures ordinaunce furnisshed me with asmany thinges necessary, as any one ground bringeth furth? hath not mans pollicie at the beginninge subdued me to one gouernoure? and illumined me with one faith?” Britannia concluded with one more, potent rhetorical probe: why do these “beastes so slauage, or cruel” determine “to rend their mothers wombe?”

Also in the last two years of the Wooings, another Scotsman, Nicholas Bodrugan, produced *An Epitome of the title that the Kynges Majestie of Englande, hath to the souereignitie of Scotland.* The piece was not an in-depth portrait of the Edwardian Empire—the author’s
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179 For “the Englishemen…,” see Henrisoun, *Exhortacion*, sig. F7v; for “we lost…,” see Henrisoun, *Exhortacion*, sigs. F8v-G1r.
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183 Bodrugan, *An Epitome of the title that the Kynges Majestie of Englande, hath to the souereignitie of Scotland* (London: Richard Grafton, 1548), STC 3196.
concern was far more with justifying the Tudor right to supremacy and sovereignty there, on the Declaration model—but its evidence and rhetoric are an important elaboration of Tudor imperial theory, and several elements were entirely novel.

Keenly aware of the ever-increasing weakness of the protectorate, (a consequence of Henry VIII’s ambiguous last will and testament, conciliar division, and increasing civil unrest), Bodrugan created for Somerset his own personal, lineal connection to the British Empire and so imbued the regency with new legitimacy. He proclaimed that Edulph de Samour, an ancient member of the Seymour house under King Ambrose, had slain “the capittall enemy of the Briton nacion: which noble seruice like as this Realme was deliuered from the tyranny of Saxons, and restored to the whole Empire & name of greate Britigne.” Bodrugan reminded the protector to work not only for his nephew, but too in the service of his kinsman, “for the like restitucion of the name and Empire of greate Briteigne.” It fit with the objective of his treatise: to prove that the Scots were due subjects of England, “the only supreme seat of thempire of greate Briteigne,” and thereby justify realization of that entity.

Here, in this last clause was Bodrugan’s next novel contribution: he was the first to term England’s territorial holdings, ancient and contemporary, the “Empire of greate Briteigne” as well as the “Empire of Briteigne,” another absolutely essential stop (after Elder) on the way to the phrase British Empire. His usage underscored three, central component parts, all based on Henrician imperial ideology and related to the earlier Rough Wooings promotion, but far more well-defined and, by extension, justifiable: the empire was an offshoot of classical Roman

184 Bodrugan, Epitome, sig. A3v.
185 Bodrugan, Epitome, sig. A3v.
186 Bodrugan, Epitome, sig. A5v.
187 For the “Empire of greate Briteigne,” see Bodrugan, Epitome, sig. A3v; for the “Empire of Briteigne,” see A8r.
imperialism, territorial expansive (beyond England’s national borders, in the locations conquered by past kings), and in which the exercise of royal authority was sovereign and supreme.

Evincing the extent to which the humanist reverence for antiquity continued to influence sixteenth-century imperial theory, Bodrugan repeated (no less than six times) that Brutus and every British king since was of Trojan blood, and “lyke as the dignities of the Roman Empire folowed the state of Rome,” Scotland’s subordination to England fit this imperial mold.188 As for the extent of its reach, he offered the tale of Locrinus’ heir Maximian, someone not present in earlier Wooings theory, who travelled west to subdue distant countries.189 In this effort, Bodrugan continued, Arthur, Malgo, and Edward I all followed and similarly conquered, and perfecting their inheritance making Ireland, Iceland, the Orkneys, France, and unknown American lands “tributory to hym.”190 Accordingly, Bodrugan contended that each piece entailed to the Tudor line; it was Edward’s job to again “perfect” the empire.191

The specificity of the empire mapped in the *Epitome* was essential to Dee and other subsequent, related theorists—in it, they found legal claim to a huge area sought by mid-Tudor adventurers. Interestingly, Bodrugan was the first Wooings promoter to use the word “charter” to describe the donation of monarchical authority to local officials, the same word preferred by the crown in grants of land, trade, and administration throughout North and South America.192

Finally, though Bodrugan did not follow Henrisoun or Elder in explicitly conceiving of British imperialism as an evangelical mission, he did understand imperial kingship as spiritual and secular sovereignty, and, by extension, Edward as Supreme Head would replace the Catholic Church and doctrine with Anglicanism. This point emerges when, alongside his chronicle of the

kings of Scotland who willingly submitted to the superiority of the kings of England—drawn from Geoffrey of Monmouth and Boethius—Bodrugan highlighted Henry II’s *Laudabiliter* to prove how the “generall iurisdiction ecclesiastical” of Scotland had been rightfully subjected to the diocese and rule of “tharchbishoppe of Yorke in Englantde, whereby also appeareth the same to be then vnder this dominion,” precisely as Ireland.\footnote{For “generall…,” see Bodrugan, *Epitome*, sig. F3r; for “tharchbshoppe…,” see Bodrugan, *Epitome*, sig. G5v.} In closing, he aligned with the intimidating posture of the Edwardian campaign and furthered the familial metaphor: “And Scottisshemen, how long shall I beare you vnnaturall cruelties, howe long will ye remaine rebellious children, when shal there be the end of your malice?”\footnote{Bodrugan, *Epitome*, sig. H3v.} Perhaps only, he answered, when the English force the “surrender to ye crowne of Britaigne.”\footnote{Bodrugan, *Epitome*, sig. C7r.}

Until 1549, the last year of the campaign, all of Woolings propaganda was pro-imperial. Only two additions were made in the final months, but both were reactionary, anti-English, and pro-Catholic, written by Scottish clergymen with strong ties to the de Guise faction. Though the Stewart crown made no formal, official response, Mary’s betrothal to the French dauphin and the imprisonment and subsequent exile of reformer John Knox in England was answer enough, and William Lamb and Robert Wedderburn served as its mouthpieces.\footnote{Lamb, *Ane Resonyng of Ane Scottis and Inglis Merchande Betuix Rowand and Lionis* (1549), BL Cotton M*Caligula B.VII.*, fols. 354r-381v; Wedderburn, *The Complaynt of Scotland, wyth ane exhortatione to the thre estaits to be vigilante in the defens of their public veil* (1549), printed in *The Complaynt of Scotland*, Early English Text Society 17 (London: Trubner & Co., 1872), 1-186. On the betrothal and Knox’s time in England, see Guy, *Queen of Scots*, 27-53; Rosalind Kay Marshall, *John Knox* (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2000), chapter three.}

Lamb’s was a self-styled reply to “the declaration of this instant war by King Henry the Aucht,” delivered as a dialogue between two merchants, an Englishman and a Scot, traveling from Rouen to Lyon.\footnote{Lamb, *Ane Resonyng*, fol. 356r. A comment on fol. 375v suggests that Lamb planned a retort to the *Exhortacion* as well, but the text breaks off at the end, leaving eight empty leaves. Either Lamb never finished or his purpose was overtaken by the end of the war, both of which would explain why *Ane Resonyng* never appeared in print.} The dialogue was an effective literary device, popularized by humanists
who revered the classical original and, more recently, by a cluster of Protestant polemics. For Lamb, it allowed him to restate the British imperial argument from the English side, without lending it credence, and then demolish it, item by item, in the Scottish merchant’s reasoned rebuttal. His best, most powerful weapon was “your Polydore” (Vergil), who had rejected a portion of the *Brut* as apocryphal. Even the contracted royal historian concurred with Scotland’s “Boece our true historian… that the Brutus monarcho and his three sons is also uncertain as the origin of all other nation!” Combatting medieval admissions of English superiority, he charged that the first homage, to Edward I, was general, recording neither the Scottish king’s name nor the place or date of its occurrence, thereby tainting all subsequent submission. Consequently, “Scotland is not nor never was any part of England.” At this moment in the story, further English embarrassment arrived in the shape of three mysterious horsemen—Thomas More, John Fisher, and Richard Reynolds—who described their martyrdom among the countless victims of Anglican heresy, a faith disguised as superior, peaceful, and just reformation by supporters of Tudor imperialism. Lamb made Reynolds the biggest dupe, still enamored with his murderer as a puissant and noble prince, yet critical of Somerset, one of the many councilors who did often misled the late king.
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With the groundwork laid, Lamb attributed the Wooings wholly to Tudor bloodlust on pretended claims. Significantly, he found their origins in 1513, as the moment at which the English eschewed the positive, productive policies of Henry VII and began posturing. His Scottish merchant exclaimed, “what sap come from the root” when the second Tudor cared more “for winning Tournai in Haino” than for his sister in Scotland and suddenly believed it was a convenient, providential time to challenge his French title, “for all English kings await always a convenient time and opportunity to recover their claimed right to the crown of France.”

Moreover, Lamb charged, here too was the start of “the innovations then made lately in England of heresy.” For Lamb, then, Tournai, the break from Rome, and Scotland were all inextricably linked, explained by an unconscionable lust for war and expansion. But most incendiary of all, he claimed that the last kings of England departed when Richard III was killed. Invoking Henry’s unlawful divorces and marriages, Lamb wrote, “you [English] do transform your estate royal as often as Protheus did change forms”; as such, only the Stewarts stood as “apparent heir to England.”

Wedderburn took a different approach. Rather than delegitimizing English claims, his Complaynt of Scotland (1549), dedicated to the now five-year-old Mary Queen of Scots, readily conceded that Britain was, indeed, an empire, and then turned that positive association on its head. His was also the first vernacular use (in Scots) of the Latin word _colonia_ to mean a settlement of people from England in the empire. Its application here, to the 1540s landscape, and subsequent uses in Ireland and the New World help tie these contexts together.
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203 For “what sap come from the root,” see Lamb, _Ane Resonynge_, fol. 357r; for “for winning Tournai in Haino,” see Lamb, _Ane Resonynge_, fol. 357v; for “for all English kings…,” see Lamb, _Ane Resonynge_, fol. 358v. Haino refers to the province where Tournai was and remains located, Hainault.
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207 Wedderburn, _Complaynt_, 1-5. Because of the challenges of Wedderburn’s spelling and diction, I have chosen to paraphrase rather than quote directly from his tract in most instances.
Wedderburn, a scholastic humanist, repeated the same comparisons to classical, biblical, and medieval empire ubiquitous in Tudor promotion since the Act of Appeals. However, he did so to charge that Britain’s imperial status proved not its greatness, but its transience: the Tudor empire, like all empires before, would crumble and fall by God’s will. Poignantly, he asked his readership where is the tower of Babel, the rich and triumphant Troy, the powerful Sparta, Athens, or Carthage? The kicker was the fate of Rome: what shall be said, he asked, of the rich monarchy of Rome, which did dominate and subdue the entire world? Is its superiority not now divided and torn asunder? Thus far, he explained, the Englishmen have been allowed to build their kingdom, wage bloody war, and scourge the Scots in their expansion, yet by the lessons of scripture and history, Wedderburn asserted, divine justice will take care of “their straynge natione” and render their “false seid” extinct. Here he added further religious subtext: in this construction, the Scots were modern-day Israelites, a chosen people fighting against disobedient men who, in their Protestantism, lived contrary to God’s command. They would be rescued, he promised, so long as they held fast to Catholicism.

In the same vein as Henrisoun’s personification of Britain, Wedderburn punctuated his lesson with an apparition of “lady dame Scotia.” Both metaphors were early reckonings related to a broader literary trend in sixteenth-century imperial discourse whereby the land was imagined as a woman, often a virgin, beckoning the English to discover or conquer her. Wedderburn’s anti-imperial objective, however, inverted the trope: dame Scotia was not a mysterious, attractive, maiden eagerly awaiting plantation by England’s seed, but an old mother ravaged, violated, and literally torn apart by imperialism. Bearing a mantle split in three to
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signify how her sons, the three estates, have fractured as the Tudors carve her up, Scotia lamented a degenerate nobility, an absentee clergy, and an exploited, molested commons. The trope was useful for Wedderburn to berate his countrymen for neglecting their motherland: those Scots who will not expose their bodies to peril and danger for the just defense of their honour, friends, commonwealth, and native country, but rather think only of themselves, “ye ar mair disnaturellit than brutal beystis.”

It is here, in describing Edwardian objectives, that Wedderburn used the word colony. Back in his own narrative voice, he argued that though realms were conquered with blood, not books, “The oratours of Ingland, at there protectors instance, hes set furtht ane buik, quhair be thai intende to preue that scotland vas ane colone of ingland quhen it vas fyrst inhabit.” Likely referring not just to Somerset but to the corpus of 1540s propaganda, he continued to explain that upon the prophecies of Merlin, Tudor Englishmen claim that the realm was conjoined together, under the governance of one prince, and called “the ile of bertan.” He charged, in reply, that Merlin’s tale was ungodly and actually foretold that the last British conquest, which will be achieved by the Scots. The irony of 1603 aside, Wedderburn bolstered his point by reminding his audience of the escapades of Henry VIII and his medieval predecessors: like Edward I’s subjugation of Scotland, “the onfaithful cruel act that kyng henry the aucht vsit con trar yrland and valis quhen he becam their superiors suld be mirrour and ane exemplil til al scotland” for the English are tyrannical and cruel above all other nations. Censuring the Scots for subjecting themselves to the vile servitude of the English, who call you barbarous and slander the true faith,

---

212 Wedderburn, Complaynt, 73.
213 Wedderburn, Complaynt, 82.
214 Wedderburn, Complaynt, 82.
215 Wedderburn, Complaynt, 85.
216 Wedderburn, Complaynt, 94.
he mounted both a nationalist and confessional argument and appreciated the Rough Wooings as an imperial, Anglicizing, even colonial mission.\textsuperscript{217}

Wedderburn’s piece, the final literary shot of the 1540s campaign, serves as a fitting conclusion to this chapter. The \textit{Complaynt} speaks both to the broad contours of Tudor imperialism in Scotland in this period as well as to the continuity of rhetoric and purpose perceived from the Henrician to the Edwardian enterprise, but his heightened anxiety is also a testament to what had changed, to its intensification during the protectorate. Mary’s betrothal to the future King Francis II strengthened the Auld Alliance, while military and financial assistance from the continent buoyed Scottish resistance.\textsuperscript{218} The Treaty of Boulogne ended hostilities in March of 1550, and it did so as an explicit retooling of what “the heads of the treaty of perpetual peace” had created in 1502, though without dynastic union.\textsuperscript{219} But by then, Somerset had fallen.

Somerset’s demise demonstrates just how inextricably linked his imperial and domestic politics were, as Henry’s had been. In theory and practice, the evolution of Henrician policy in the international sphere came part and parcel with closely related developments in the national that similarly radicalized what had come before: between 1547 and 1549, while the protectorate fostered an ideological campaign that increasingly advanced the vision of a Protestant, Anglicizing, commercial British Empire, bolstered with an influx of troops and money into the Scottish sinkhole, it sought to consolidate in the south with a program of religious and social reform and draw to out resources for war. All of this colluded in the protector’s fall.

\textsuperscript{217} Wedderburn, \textit{Complaynt}, 165-7.
\textsuperscript{218} Guy, \textit{Queen of Scots}, 27-41.
\textsuperscript{219} For the Treaty of Boulogne, see its “Acceptance by Mary Queen of Scots,” 18 April 1550, \textit{CSPScot} 1/360. The war formally ended with the Treaty of Norham, between French king Henry II and Edward VI, after which the English military presence was withdrawn. This peace, forged in May and June 1551, is recorded in \textit{CSPScot} 1/374 and 1/375. The final Treaty of Norham is provided in full in in Thomas Rymer, \textit{Foedera}, 16 vols. (London: Churchill, 1704-35), 15:265.
From its start, throughout its dominions, the Somerset regime had promoted rigorous doctrinal and theological reform in the name of the young king, whose Protestantism, even bigotry, has been well-documented.\textsuperscript{220} Henry VIII and his last queen, Catherine Parr, had appointed tutors John Cheke, Richard Cox, and Roger Ascham, all Cambridge humanists who were committed to evangelical reform and helped lay the foundations of Edwardian and Elizabethan faith.\textsuperscript{221} Hailing Edward as a second Josiah, Cranmer crowned Edward in a ceremony brimming with anti-papal invective, claims to royal supremacy, and imperial symbolism. The nine-year-old wore both the diadem of Edward the Confessor and the domed imperial crown and held the orb and scepter (albeit with a great deal of help), while seated in Edward I’s coronation chair.\textsuperscript{222}

With a unique style of governance—which historian Diarmaid MacCulloch memorably described as personal and autocratic, with a compulsive urge to win popular approval, combined with the reforming zeal of Cromwell and the chutzpah of Wolsey—Somerset called parliament nearly immediately upon his accession as regent.\textsuperscript{223} Galvanized by evangelical enthusiasm, a belief in the superiority of English vernacular, law, and administration, and the need to provision the northern war, the protector pushed comprehensive reform through in 1547. Among the most


\textsuperscript{223} MacCulloch, \textit{Boy King}, 51.
important, a bill for Chester and Wales advanced the 1536-40 Acts of Union by curtailing the
marcher lords in favor of English officials via three new, royally-appointed lordships and an
injunction barring non-English speakers from holding administrative posts. The law furthered the
imposition of common law, shirring, and reformed religion, and gave the crown, its courts, and
parliament jurisdiction over all Welsh affairs.\footnote{224}

The most dramatic, wide-reaching changes began in July 1547, when the Council banned
candles and shrines in all dominions. At the end of February 1548, processions, mystery plays,
holy day pageants, and images in stained glass, wood, and stone went too, walls lime washed and
repainted with lines of scripture in the vernacular. At least officially, gone were the physical and
material manifestations of popular Catholicism, which, despite the advent of the national Church
some fifteen years earlier, had thus far remained intact.\footnote{225} Arguably most important for the
spread and standardization of Anglicanism and the English language was Cranmer’s First Book
of Common Prayer (1549), which created a uniform, vernacular worship service implemented
via “An Act for Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments,” while two
miserably unsuccessful enclosure commissions came in tandem with the religious reform.\footnote{226}

Significantly, Preacher John Hales aligned the highly controversial enclosure movement with
Protestant evangelism, the two inextricably linked policies: “If there be any way or policy of man
to make the people receive, embrace, and love God’s word, it is only this – when they shall see

\footnote{225} On the Edwardian Reformation under Somerset, see especially Duffy, Stripping the Altars, chapter thirteen; MacCulloch, The Tudor Church militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation (London: Allan Lane, 1999), especially 20-41; Catharine Davies, A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), chapter three.
\footnote{226} For the parliamentary statute, see “Act of Uniformity,” 2 & 3 Edward VI, cap. 1, in Raithby, ed., Statutes of the Realm, 4:37. On its enforcement and the Book of Common Prayer, see MacCulloch, Cranmer, 408, 512, 621. On the enclosure commissions and their impact on the brewing rebellion, see Loach, Edward VI, 63-89.
that it bringeth forth so goodly fruit, that men seek not private commodity, but, as good members, the universal wealth of the whole body.” His rhetoric mirrored the imperial argument, bridging spiritual, political, and domestic concerns.

But dismantling the Roman Catholic Church and propagating the First Book of Common Prayer were uneasy and uneven. Popular dismay over spiritual matters combined powerfully with the unpopular enclosures, currency debasement, and siphoning off of troops for permanent garrisoning in Scotland to spark riots that began in Cornwall and rippled through more than half the counties of England over the next six months. The Prayer Book and Kett’s Rebellions were the most extensive uprisings of the century. In a coup d’état engineered by the Council, Somerset was deposed by Parliament on 14 January 1550, imprisoned, and executed two years later for high treason.

***

The Edwardian kingship was a major source of inspiration for Elizabethan government, and, as Alford showed, the two “bear more than a passing resemblance” to one another. Both monarchies faced similar problems of legitimacy and adopted similar tactics in response, like biblical self-representation and imperial iconography. Moreover, they ascended with related ideological baggage in tow, and both, with sister Mary, engaged in interconnected processes of empire- and nation-building, contributing to the development, practical and ideological, of the British Empire and English identity.

---

227 Hales to Somerset, 24 July 1548, TNA: PRO SP 10/8/56, fol. 103r.
229 Alford, *Kingship and Politics*, 64.
Some thirty-five years ago, A.H. Williamson argued that the vision of a Protestant and imperial British kingdom, built on the “Constantinian model” survived the Edwardian Moment to be reinvigorated in the early years of Elizabeth’s reign.230 Elizabethan imperial promoters Dee, Cecil, and Smith and others, demonstrate that the Edwardian Empire of Great Britain was seminal to their formulations. The same was true for her chroniclers, William Camden and Raphael Holinshed, evident in their efforts to map Britain, its history, and its place in the late-Tudor order—to understand what opportunity and advantages might exist for an Elizabethan Tudor British Empire. Camden’s Britannia (pub. 1607, 1637) built on Wooings ideology to purport that Scotland remained split between those who “being more civill, use the English language and apparell: the other, which are rude and unruly, speak Irish, and goe apparelleled Irishlike…”231 These Scots needed to imitate their southern counterparts along the “Borders… ranged & reckoned in the very heart and midst of the British Empire, as who begin to be weary of Wars, and to acquaint themselves with the delightful benefits of Peace.”232 Similarly, Holinshed’s Description of Britain (pub. 1587) looked to Leland, who “prooveth” that Scotland had once been under King Arthur’s obedience and further found that, by extension, “the whole empire of all Britaine” created by the famed Welsh kings belonged to the Tudors.233 Their words illuminate a powerful legacy in Elizabethan imperial thought.

In 1558, John Knox breathed new life into the imperial rhetoric of the Rough Wooings, praising Henry VIII and Edward VI, in agriculturalist terms, with rooting the “Romish Antichrist” out of England and laboring to spread the “faire vineyard [that] the Lord hym selfe

---

230 For the phrase “Constantinian model,” which is repeated three times in the text, see Williamson, Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1979), 5, 44, 142. Other scholars have agreed with his point, see Mason, “Scotland, Elizabethan England, and the idea of Britain,” 285; Armitage, Ideological Origins, 24-61.
231 Camden, Britannia (London: 1607, as reprinted in 1637), STC 4510, “The Division of Scotland,” 5.
hath planted” in the south to their northern brethren. The polemicist lamented that by the “craft and malice” of the French Papists, “the knot of friendship, that might haue ensued betwixte England and Scotland by that godlie coniunction” was left untied. Elizabeth may not have cared for extreme reformation, proselytizing, or Scottish suzerainty—a calculated rejection of the British policies which had brought financial and political ruin on the protectorship and of the trajectories, religious and dynastic, of the isle, as we will soon see—yet, by the urging of Wooings veteran Cecil, she did intervene decisively (if reluctantly) on behalf of Knox’s Lords of the Congregation in 1559-60. Mary Queen of Scots’ flight to England afforded her the opportunity to further the cause of a united Protestant isle simply by extinguishing Mary as the main focus of Catholic opposition to it.

But just three years later, in 1563, now twenty years on from the Treaty of Greenwich, English diplomat Ralph Sadler appeared before a parliament at Westminster fractured by the Succession Crisis, by “the tytle of the Quene of Scotts to thimperiall crowne of this realme.” His fiery speech censured supporters of James VI, “a prynce of a strange nacion,” and did so with direct reference to the Rough Wooings, recalling a conversation he had had with Adam Otterburn, a Scottish official from the de Guise court. Despite assurances of common benefit and perpetual peace from the English in 1543, Otterburn had recognized the reality of the sixteenth-century Tudor British imperium that the Rough Wooings endeavored to create, and Sadler now asked parliament to do the same: “if these proude beggerly Scotts did so moche disdayn to yelde to the superioryte of England,” that they chose English invasion and bloodshed
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234 For “Romish Antichrist,” see Knox, *The appellation of Iohn Knoxe from the cruell and most iniust sentence pronounced against him by the false bishoppes and clergie of Scotland* (Geneva: 1558), STC 15063, 68; for “faire vineyard....,” see Knox, *Appellation*, 72.
over peace, then “whie should we, for any respect, yelde to their Scottishe superiority... and thereby to do so grate an injurye as to disinherite the next heire of our owne nacyon? Surely, for my part, I cannot consent unto it.”238 The entailment of the realm to the Stewarts, he submitted, was an abomination to its imperial crown and to every “naturall and good Englishman.”239

The words of Sadler, Knox, Camden, and Holinshed demonstrate the extent to which the Rough Wooings were an essential part of Elizabethan memory, even shaping debate, if not the actual (and perhaps unavoidable outcome) of the queen’s virginal state. There was, indeed, as modern historians have noted, immensely important carryover from 1542 to 1563, but it was not accomplished in a vacuum nor by rejecting the tenures of Somerset’s successors, Northumberland and the Catholic Mary. Rather, the mid-Tudors, Elizabeth included, presided over another, equally essential juncture in the history of the British Empire.

CHAPTER FOUR
“Recouer thyne aunciente bewtie”:
Mid-Tudor Empire over Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1550-1573

In the weeks and months following the accession of Mary I, one Edwardian humanist
toiled in desperation to recommend his talents and services to the new regime. A former servant
to Edward VI’s second regent, the Duke of Northumberland, Richard Eden’s connections
implicated him deeply in the duke’s coup, enveloping him in an unenviable shroud of heresy and
treason when claimant Lady Jane Grey met a swift defeat. As he turned to pen and paper, the
tools of his trade, in 1553–4, the scholar wrote for his life. The product was The decades of the
newe worlde or west India, printed in 1555 with a laudatory address to the new queen and king
consort, Philip II of Spain, who had replaced Eden’s patron at the apex of English power.¹

Striking, however, are the similarities between the Decades and Eden’s first literary
accomplishment, A treatyse of the newe India, composed two years prior for the still-ascendant
duke and his prince.² Eden may have written for new royals, but his skill set, sources, aim, and
broader audience remained unchanged across the 1553 divide. Both treatises were new English
translations of popular European travel narratives; both sought to use recent non-British overseas
activity alongside ancient and medieval exemplars to shame and cajole his dormant countrymen
into similar pursuits. Here, Philip’s consortship played into Eden’s hands, due cause for elevating
Herculean Habsburg feats to reveal Tudor inadequacies. Celebrating the new Anglo-Spanish
kingdom as endowed with “antipodes beyond termination” and “ample imperial authority,” he
teetered carefully between praise of the match and exposition of its threat to British national
sovereignty and empire-building.³

¹ Eden, The decades of the newe worlde or west India (London: 1555), STC 647.
² Eden, A treatyse of the newe India with other newe founde landes (London: 1553), STC 18244.
³ Eden, Decades, epistle dedicatory, third unnumbered page, my translation from the Latin, which Eden used here
for Philip (the body text was English): “Antipodes et plvs ultra terminatis” and “vestrorum amplissimis imperijs.”
Amid apparent sea change (minority exchanged for female kingship, reformed faith for Catholicism, native for foreign rule), Eden’s parallel works highlight a fundamental continuity, a common singular concern that linked Edward, Mary, and ultimately Elizabeth to one another and to their shared past—imperialism. Reflecting an essential mid-Tudor era and ethos that pulsed through the 1550s and 1560s the author implored, “O Englande, whyle tyme is gyuen thee… recouer thyne aunciente bewtie whiche hath so longe byn defaced.”

Recover a British Empire.

***

This chapter argues for the significance of the mid-sixteenth century to the history of the British Empire and for the importance of an imperial Atlantic context to the history of mid-century Britain. Building on recent studies that question the existence of a “mid-Tudor crisis” in a domestic, monarchical frame, it demonstrates that the period between Northumberland’s rise in 1550 and the end of the first Desmond Rebellion in 1573 constituted a critical moment for nation and empire and that upheaval and uncertainty barred neither significance nor continuity. Only

---


superficially unwieldy and disparate, here was a moment marked by a distinct set of overlapping, mutually-contingent processes integral to the development of British imperialism: the use and amplification of imperial theory and polemical literature; a reorientation away from expansion in France and Scotland and towards the west; the rise of Catholic Spain as Britain’s chief rival and the formation of a Protestant, British nation and empire in contrast to Catholic, Iberian versions; the growth and standardization of public-private co-adventure and corporate trade monopolies; a renewed focus on Ireland with recycled ideas for its rule, including plantation; a new interest in America south of Newfoundland; and the use of religious dissidents to settle the empire.

Somerset’s fall and the turn from Scotland after 1549 encouraged a group of scholar-statemen practiced in early Tudor empire to apply discourse and experience gained in Tournai, the break from Rome, and the Rough Wooings to already-extant enterprise in Ireland and Newfoundland. Four years later, Mary I’s tenure did not affect a clean rupture, spiritual or otherwise. Her gender and faith necessitated an emphasis on security whereby the court followed a trail blazed by Henry VII to use marriage diplomacy, history, consolidation, and overseas experimentation to secure the throne and propagate an imperium in keeping with that of her predecessors. For the developing Tudor empire, the Spanish union was particularly salient, bringing in a deluge of Habsburg personnel, goods, and texts, which lent new models (positive and negative) and quickened xenophobic sentiment. Upon Mary’s death, Elizabeth I’s accession fused with the loss of Calais, anti-Spanish nationalism, and the gathering storm of European
sectarian upheaval to raise the queen’s profile as the Atlantic World’s Protestant protector, make Ireland and America into silver bullets to stem British decline and global Iberian hegemony, and draw Tudor subjects, Catholic and Protestant, overseas. In just over a decade, from 1547 to 1558, five monarchs and six rulers claimed Britain, Ireland, France, and part of the New World, yet as Eden reminds us, these years also show that empire was a common mid-Tudor thrust.

***

After eight hard-fought years dominated by Britain since 1542, war ended with the decade, freeing money, manpower, and attention for a neglected empire overseas. Shaken up and reshuffled, yet with essential stability in personnel (Cecil and his circle at court, Cranmer in the church, the king on the throne), the regime was an organic second act to the protectorate, steeped in its imperium. Northumberland certainly turned away from Scotland—and faced due west. As the king assumed greater command, his new regent solidified the nation in the wake of rebellion, and the Church settled into its most reformed rhythm yet, new imperial activity took shape abroad, profoundly influenced, ideologically and practically, by the Rough Wooings.

While revolt ballooned and protector fell, Ireland had waited in limbo. Now, however, valid royal fears that the Irish would follow the Scots and throw off the “yoke of England” with French help animated Westminster. In a specific nod to past policy, Northumberland reappointed Henrician deputy Anthony St. Leger to fortify and introduce the Book of Common Prayer, with help from Wooings veteran James Croft. Lacking support from Dublin’s clergy and former deputy Bellingham’s cronies, St. Leger was recalled in under a year, accused of

---

6 Alford, Kingship and Politics, 138.
obstructing religious reform and treason. The crown promoted Croft, who built on his 1540s experience to throw a jumble of Henrician surrender and regrant, Bellingham coercive occupation, and plantation at the problem. As the king reasoned, “if we win them not by their wills but by our power, then shall they obey because they cannot choose.” Some of it stuck. Submissions produced settlement plans for Newry-Lecale and Baltimore, a key Munster port, but as per Edward’s express command, Leix and Offaly were paramount. There, the Tudor state planned what would be the dynasty’s very first realized colony in Ireland and began to define the settlement’s place in the British Empire.

Comprised of English and Palesmen, the colony drew on past schemes from Tournai and Scotland, requiring residency and armed service. This continuity appears to have come from Edward, who took active part in what he and the privy council framed as an explicit experiment that would eventually encompass the entire isle. The comprehensive policy advocated wholesale transference of certain norms—Common law, Anglicanism, and shiring, all perceived as superior, unique tenets of Britishness—to make the country answerable to Edward’s imperial crown. On royal orders to finish what “our gracious father” began, the deputy created a new

9 Crown to St. Leger, 4 August 1550, The National Archives (TNA), Public Record Office (PRO), State Papers (SP), document reference number 61/63/2, fol. 14. All subsequent citations from TNA: PRO will follow this standard format of department code (e.g. SP) and document reference number. If a document contains any internal numbering, the internal reference (i.e. the folio number) is provided following the full document reference number.
10 PC to Croft, 24 February 1551, Lambeth Palace Library, Carew MS 611, fol. 135 (hereafter Carew MS series, folio number).
12 For the confiscations and planning in Leix-Offaly, see Croft to PC, n.d. 1550, TNA: PRO SP 61/2/57; surveyor-general Walter Crowley to PC, “Survey of Offaly in 1550,” n.d. 1550, TNA: PRO SP 61/2/65; “The petition of thos parsonnes whose names hereafter ensue to the kinges deputie and Counsaill,” n.d. 1550, TNA: PRO SP 61/2/69.
13 Plantation began following express royal command, see Edward to Croft, n.d. 1551, TNA: PRO SP 61/2/57.
14 The leases and terms are all recorded in “Calendar of Fiants,” in Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records and Keeper of the State Papers in Ireland (Dublin: Thom, 1869-1920), Edward VI, entry numbers 599, 661, and 724, all dated 1551 (hereafter Cal Fiants reign, entry).
15 As noted in the lease to Francis Cosby of Kildare, 15 March 1551, Cal Fiants, Edward VI, 724.
16 For the policy, see its descriptions in PC to Croft, 17 August 1551, TNA: PRO SP 61/3/48; “Instructions,” 29 September 1551, TNA: PRO SP 61/3/54; and Edward to Croft, n.d. November 1551, TNA: PRO SP 61/3/73.
press in Dublin, oversaw the circulation of “prayers of the Church translated into our mother tongue of England,” and expelled “blind and obstinate bishops [with their] popish mass.”\footnote{Edward VI, “The translation of the copy of the order, for the liturgy of the Church of England to be read in Ireland,” 6 February 1552, printed in \textit{The Harleian Miscellany, Vol. V} (London: Government Printing Office, 1745), 540-541, quotation from 540. The manuscript is no longer extant.}

A year later, the governor had made only superficial gains, while laying the seeds for native rebellion based on doctrinal disaffection, among other things.\footnote{On the limits of reform, see James A. Murray, \textit{Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: clerical resistence and political conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), especially 202-3; Bradshaw, “The Edwardian Reformation in Ireland,” \textit{Archivium Hibernicum} 34 (1977): 83-99, especially 96; Ciaran Brady, \textit{The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of the Reform Government in Tudor Ireland} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), especially 45-71.} Yet reality did not stop hyperbolic reports of “ploughing [that] increaseth daily” and a savage “country universally inhabited and so brought to quiet,” from flooding home and igniting ruminations.\footnote{“Book sent from Thomas Cusake, Lord Chancellor of Ireland,” 8 May 1553, Carew MS 611, fol. 112.} Among them was the first proposal for British imperial governance by private syndicate. Sponsored by twenty-three English officials, soldiers, and gentleman, Anglo-Irishman Edward Walshe detailed how the company would, at its own charge and rent, “wynne obedience, reformacion, rich profit, streignth, dischardge of conscience to the kinges maiestie in yrland.”\footnote{Walshe, “The coniectures of Edwarde Walshe to chinge the state of yrlande,” n.d. 1552, TNA: PRO SP 61/4/44.} Courting royal permission, he asserted that king and syndicate harbored identical approaches and ends, all that differed was what would lead to Croft’s recall: finance and manpower. Walshe clarified a transition underway as he used commercial advantage and his king’s supreme authority to justify rule on a Roman model, “wherby great nombres shalbe planted thicke together and so the lande stronge and well manured without enny chardge but aduantage.”\footnote{Walshe, “Coniectures,” n.d. 1552, TNA: PRO SP 61/4/44.}

As for its \textit{colonia}, the company was brief but clear, inspired by antiquity and the crystallization of what it meant to be a British subject, regardless of location, that had come amid 1540s consolidation, reform, and war. English law and its defense by royal officials was central
to preserve crown right and revenue, “for without Justice evin englishe bloode wax wylde yrishe.” The plan never made it to Edward, let alone fruition, but the stunted Croft projects were important and relevant among contemporaries, stoking this deputy’s legacy and transforming him into a colonial standard-bearer.

Just as the events of 1550 renewed Irish interest, they too privileged Newfoundland, as much a part of the king’s inheritance as the British Isles, and engendered a reversion to past policy. Northumberland called in Sebastian Cabot, who chose a modest £100 over his Spanish post and brought along his *mappa mundi*, which incorporated British and Iberian knowledge to 1544, earning him a title (“grand Pilot of England,” according to Richard Hakluyt) and an annuity. The crown resurrected the family’s 1496 patent and authorized a “companie for discoverie of regions, dominions, islands and places vnknowen” for Cabot to explore Newfoundland and the “Cathay” Passage in 1553. Two hundred and forty shares were sold at £25 each, a mobilization of capital and broad base unprecedented for America, while King Edward defined its purpose: the “preservation of his most excellent Maiestie, & his crown Imperiall of his realmes of England and Ireland,” requiring every sailor swear to that crown and record navigation and observations for future travel. He also mandated that English law and the Protestant liturgy be read aboard daily by a crown-appointed minister.

---

22 Walshe, “Coniectures,” n.d. 1552, TNA: PRO SP 61/4/44.
23 As in William Herbert’s famous tract, c. 1591, see Arthur Keaveney and John A. Madden, eds., William Herbert, *Croftus sive de Hibernia Liber* (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 1992).
The project was part new, part familiar, and strikingly like the Leix-Offaly plantation.
The precursor to later syndicates for other locales, the model required no royal capital and rallied personnel quickly and easily. Authority, however, still emanated from the crown, the company’s express intent to preserve and expand Tudor Empire. Resting on Henry VII’s donation, Edward emphasized the “examples of our fathers [which] doe inuite vs to search both land and sea, to carry goods, aswell that the people to whom they goe may not be destitute of commodities their countries bring not foorth and to bring from the same, things commodious for our owne.”

Further, the Company and any claimed territory were made part of British realm, under the dominion of the king. Tellingly, council selected Wooings veteran Hugh Willoughby to lead the inaugural voyage. Permitted a northwest or northeast route, he ultimately chose the latter, never even approaching Newfoundland. By the time the wounded fleet limped home, Willoughby and Edward were dead, but the persistence of empire and dynastic marriage made Cabot’s duplicitous allegiances fortuitous and kept the Company idea alive, as Mary and Elizabeth renewed Cabot’s charter as the Muscovy Company, sights set on Russia.

Close royal involvement in the Newfoundland Company stemmed from interest and personal connections, among Cabot, Northumberland, Cecil, Thomas Smith, and Eden, Smith’s student and Cecil’s secretary after 1551. With courtly oversight, Eden produced his first work, a translation of Sebastian Münster’s Cosmographia that he asserted was the “duetie I beare to my natyue countrey & countreymen,” urging them to follow ancient emperors, Henry VII, and

28 “The copie of the letters missiue, which the right noble Prince Edward the sixt sent to the Kings, Princes, and other Potentates, inhabiting the Northeast partes of the worlde, toward the mighty Empire of Cathay, at such time as Sir Hugh Willoughby, knight, and Richard Chancelor, with their company attempted the voyage thither in the yeere of Christ 1553,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:231-2, quotation from 3:231. Knighted by Somerset at Leith, Willoughby negotiated the 1549 ceasefire.
29 “Copie of the letters missiue,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:232.
Henry VIII, who had all sent voyages of expansion. A watershed for the English vernacular and imperial ideology, Eden’s _Treatyse_ (1553) gave voice to an entire courtly circle, espousing a tripartite inducement to empire: “settynge forthe Christes true Relygion”; reap the “great abundaunce” of gold and spices that the Iberians brought from the south and which stretches north to “the newe founde landes” discovered under Henry VII; and spread navigational knowledge to English audiences. Fusing Protestant British nationalism, Tudor precedent, and humanist history, all hinged on “the newe fonde landes,” Eden produced a compendium of Edwardian Empire, just as Mary ascended the throne.

***

Northumberland’s defeat in just nine days plunged Cecil’s circle into uncertainty, yet this essential cohort of men – trained in the failed conquests of France and Scotland – survived the new regime, because when it came to empire, the queen did not cleanly break from the past. Rather, she propounded and extended an Edwardian-Henrician imperial vision, as marriage to her cousin redefined Tudor Empire for the second half of the century. The intellectual backbone of British imperialism remained intact.

As England’s first queen regnant, the Marian government articulates what Alice Hunt described as “an anxious struggle for meaning, truth and legitimacy,” satiated by appeals to history and empire. Mary’s Catholicism was certainly on display—bells rang for the first time since the 1530s, holy oils were imported from Rome for her consecration, and cheers extolled
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31 Eden, _Treatyse_, sig. AA3r.
33 The “the newe founde landes” was a common refrain, repeated in Eden, _Treatyse_, sigs. AA2r, AA4v, AA5v, M6r.
34 Alice Hunt, _The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England_ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 111.
this “most Christian” monarch. Yet Mary was proclaimed “qwene of England, France, Yrland, and alle domy(ni)ons, [as the] syster to the late Edward, doythur unto the nobull Henry,” two excommunicated heretics, their imperium her chief motif. On 3 August, she entered London in violet velvet imperial robes and “took possession of her kingdom” escorted by over a thousand men-at-arms, a show of soldering, even conquering strength that would have made her father proud. Declaring herself “Moste rightfu enheritoure of the crowne imperial,” Mary refused to hide her faith and lambasted “evil-disposed persons, which take upon them, without sufficient authority, to preach and interpret the word of God.” However, by these clauses, she had but reaffirmed her supreme title, wide territorial reach, and command over the state and its national religion—three central tenets of Tudor Empire. Her language belies the simplistic Protestant dichotomy between Roman Catholicism and imperialism.

Mary’s coronation was laden with historical and imperial symbolism. After processing past triumphal arches lauding “Mary of famous constant piety with the crown of the British Empire,” she sat on Edward’s throne (a symbol of medieval English empire) and received three crowns, St. Edward’s diadem, the domed imperial crown, and another made for the occasion—one each, the Spanish ambassador surmised, for the realms of England, France, and Ireland.

35 For bells, see J.G. Nichols, ed., The Diary of Henry Machyn: Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, from 1550 to 1563 (London: Camden Society 1848), 37; for oils, which Mary requested from the Bishop of Arras via Simon Renard, Charles V’s ambassador in England, see Renard to the Emperor, 9 September 1553, in Royall Tyler, ed., Calendar of State Papers Spain (London: Stationery Office, 1862-1954), vol. 11, entry number 8 (hereafter CSPS volume/entry number). Renard obliged, see Arras to Renard, 13 September 1553, CSPS 11/12; for “most Christian,” see Nichols, ed., Machyn Diary, 37.
34 Nichols, ed., Machyn Diary, 37.
33 Renard to Charles, 6 August 1553, CSPS 11/6.
31 As Alexander Samson argued, “Mary’s power over the church of England was as complete as her predecessors and even after reunification, legislation ensured that her authority was not abrogated by Rome,” see Samson, “Marriage,” quotation from 53.
30 For “Mary of famous…” see the description of Genoese arch at Fenchurch Street quoted in Samson, “Marriage,” 56, my translation from the Latin provided by Samson: “Mariae Reginae inclytae constanter piae coronam britanici
Carefully examining the diction by which she swore “to kepe, to the people of England and others your realms and dominions, the lawes and liberties of this realme,” Mary actively chose to portray a wide lawmaking power, retaining the supremacy’s dual headship over church and state and its commitment to superior English law in all territories.\(^\text{41}\) Thus, on “the stone chair… carried off from Scotland in a sign of victory,” with arched crown on her head, “in her hande a scepter of golde, and in hir other hande a ball imperiall, which she twirled and tourned,” Mary deliberately propounded Tudor imperial iconography.\(^\text{42}\)

Though her reign evinces an imperial element from the first, Mary’s marriage to the King of Spain hastened watershed in the history of the early British Empire, a fundamentally significant evolution. Even before it was concluded and well past 1558, the match charged the process by which nation and empire were defined as anti-Spanish, anti-Catholic entities; oversaw a reinvigorated Irish program; bred interest in the New World; and initiated the gradual turn away from empire in France.

The previous reign commanded the origins of the shift. Seeking to exclude Mary from succession, Edward gave voice to and legitimized British xenophobia, explaining that if Mary should “enjoy the imperial crowne, then happen to marry any stranger,” her spouse would invariably prefer “the lawes and customes of his or their own native countrey,” thereby

---


\(^{42}\) For “stone chair…carried off from Scotland in a sign of victory,” see Renard to Philip, 3 October 1553, *CSPS* 11/261; for “in her hande…,” see the contemporary report of the coronation in J.G. Nichols, ed., *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary* (London: Camden Society, 1850), 31.
destroying the commonwealth—the extra pronoun “their” illustrative of Mary’s own otherness. According to Spanish intelligence, explicit royal claims to the contrary only imbued fears that she would “alter religion to the hurt of their consciences, marry a foreigner, change the government and ancient laws” with official sanction.

According to foreign observers, a general, natural hatred of foreigners persisted among “Britons, set apart from the rest of the world” by godly geography. Part of why a Welsh Henry VII worked tirelessly to legitimize his dynasty, earlier chapters have shown that to 1549, such anxiety was directed at France and Scotland, a consequence of the Hundred Years War and continual aggression. But now counter-reformation, a half-Habsburg queen, and her marriage moved Spain into that spot, as war against the Auld Alliance fell away and each partner moved towards reformation. In the summer of 1553, Charles V wrote that union would be hard, “loathed as all foreigners are by Englishmen.” Yet by autumn, his diplomat admitted specific prejudice: “the English did not at all want his Majesty… because they dreaded the rule of the Spaniards and partly for religious reasons.” Lest the point was opaque, he continued, “The Spaniards [are] hated.”

As historian Alexander Samson persuasively argued, anti-Habsburg sentiment had a key imperial strand: “Spain was the colonial power par excellence in Europe itself in the sixteenth

---

44 Spanish ambassadors in England to Mary, 24 July 1553, CSPS 11/118. This sentiment was restated twice, in Spanish ambassadors in England to the Emperor, 16 August 1553, CSPS 11/169, and Emperor to his Ambassadors in England, 23 August 1553, CSPS 11/179.
45 Habsburg ambassador Perrenot Granvelle to Charles V, as quoted in Sampson, “Marriage,” 76, my translation from the Spanish provided by Samson: “los britanos apartados son de todo el mundo.”
46 Charles’s instructions to Renard, 23 June 1553, CSPS 11/64.
47 Renard to Arras, 9 September 1553, CSPS 11/228.
48 Renard to Arras, 9 September 1553, CSPS 11/228.
For a certain segment of society, noted one papal legate, Britain was next for perpetual servitude by foreigners. Protestant exile John Ponet warned: “the bayte is pleaantaunt till the hooke hath taken holde,” when under a “clooke of amitie,” Spaniards will purge the hallmarks of Britishness: wealth, freedom, justice, and liberties. Even Chancellor Stephen Gardiner, a Catholic, preferred a native pick because his “rough, fickle and proud people” would never tolerate the Spanish. Arguments in favor of the match, including Mary’s that she married a Spanish prince to defend against a French king who had already seized Scotland, only hurt, as did the image of the queen being conquered by her Spanish husband in the bedroom. Nation and empire re-formed around the fear noted by Charles’s ambassador that “England is to be governed by Spaniards.”

The marriage negotiations were an essential opportunity for both sides to assert their case, but hypersensitivity fed trepidation as threats to Britishness were specifically aired (and tacitly conceded). An open treaty proclaimed Philip’s willingness to subjugate himself to Mary and install “naturalle bourne” Brits in his household, while additional provisions required parliamentary consent for any progeny to be raised abroad and protected Tudor laws and customs against Habsburg efforts to “innovate.” The contract thus cemented English law and culture as
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49 Samson, “Marriage,” 73.
50 For the legate’s comment, see C.V. Malfatti, ed., The Accession, Coronation, and Marriage of Mary Tudor as Related in Four Manuscripts of the Escorial (Barcelona: Sociedad Alianza de Artes Graficas, 1956), 37-8. Looking at other contemporary source material, G.R. Elton agreed: he argued that Charles had at last extended Habsburg power across the Channel, a long-sought desire, see Elton, Reform and Reformation (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), 381. Glyn Redworth however, disagreed, asserting that Philip harbored no such desire, see Redworth, “‘Matters Impertinent to Women’: Male and Female Monarchy under Philip II,” English Historical Review 112, no. 447 (1997): 597-613.
51 For “the bayte…,” see Ponet, A Warnyng for Englande conteynyng the horrible practises of the Kyng of Spayne (Emden: 1555), STC 10024, sig. A2v; for “clooke of amitie,” see Ponet, Warnyng, sig. A3r.
52 According to Renard to Charles, 6 November 1553, CSPS, 11/339.
53 For Mary’s defense against France argument, a reference to Mary Queen of Scot’s betrothal to the dauphin, see Malfatti, ed., Accession, 41.
54 Renard to Charles, 11 December 1553, CSPS 11/412.
55 For “naturalle bourne,” see the formal Marriage Treaty, written sometime in 1553 and printed on 14 January 1554, TNA: PRO SP 11/1/20, fol. 1; for “innovate,” see Marriage Treaty, 1553, TNA: PRO SP 11/1/20, fol. 7.
foundational principles of British identity and asserted the tenets of Tudor imperial sovereignty. As Gardiner noted, “nothing generates greater hate for the prince than defying the ancient laws.”56

The treaty failed to blunt popular apprehension. Within days, Tudor gentleman Thomas Wyatt and his conspirators rebelled, “overwhelmed by a Spanish whore” and their Protestantism in peril, as Marian Catholic Robert Wingfield explained.57 With “we are all Englishmen” as their rally cry and appeals to “Inglish harts,” Wyatt united men in defense of London, “the town which Brutus sought by dreams… my king, my country, alone for whom I live.”58 Purporting that the insurgent’s real motive was religion, Charles V and his supporters decried these “subverters of the state.”59 Rebels and court alike thus endorsed the revolt as both xenophobic and confessional, solidifying its Tudor legacy. A touchstone for British Protestant nationalism and empire-building against Habsburg alternatives, Wyatt’s uprising gives both ideologies a Marian seed.60

While Wyatt’s execution created a martyr for many, Mary struggled to prove his rhetoric incorrect, casting herself as “a good Englishwoman, wholly bent on kingdom’s welfare.”61 If dynastic union was inevitable, then it had better display Britain’s national greatness,

58 For “we are all Englishmen,” see Wyatt’s speech, as reproduced in the Chronicle of Queen Jane, 38; for “Inglish harts,” see Wyatt’s speech as recorded in the Chronicle of Queen Jane, 39; for “the town…,” see R.A. Rebholtz, ed., Thomas Wyatt, The Complete Writings (London: Penguin, 1978), Epigram LX, 98.
59 For Wyatt’s motivation, see Charles to Philip, 16 February 1554, CSPS 12/100; for “subverters of the state,” see John Proctor’s Historie of Wyat’s Rebellion (1554), reprinted in Edward Arber, ed., An English Garner, Volume 8 (Westminster: Constable and Co., 1846), 48.
60 This is precisely how the event was represented in John Foxe’s popular Acts and Monuments (first pub. 1563), see Josiah Pratt, ed., Acts and Monuments, 7 vols. (London: Religious Tract Soc., 1877) 4:413-4. The literature on the rising is diverse: Loades argued that the real cause was anticlericalism rather than Protestantism, motivated by secular politics rather than religion, see Loades, Tudor Conspiracies, especially 17, 88; whereas Samson stressed participants from Kent, where the Edwardian Reformation had taken firm root, see Samson, “Marriage,” 116-9.
independence, and empire, equal to Philip’s, a point Mary fundamentally understood. Born and raised amidst Tudor humanism and pomp, Mary brought Henrician and Edwardian *imperium* to bear on the rite, perhaps the single greatest show of British imperial diction and imagery to date.

Beginning with a February 1554 speech at Guildhall, Mary declared that though about to take a husband, she “was wedded to the realm and laws of the same”—words that lent precedent to her sister and elevated Common Law as an essential national characteristic. Soon after, a decidedly anti-foreign royal proclamation deported all “seditious aliens [who] plant and sow the seeds of their malicious doctrine.” Then, in April, parliament issued a clear response to Wyatt, by recourse to empire and history. With like authority as her noble progenitors, the act affirmed Mary’s status as “supreme governess possessor and inheritour to the Imperial Crown of this realm,” its dominions, and subjects. Behind the provision was Gardiner, a member of Cromwell’s team when parliament first legislated the supremacy and quite familiar with the authority of the queen’s predecessors. An essential moment of continuity, the meaning was clear: regardless of theology, sex, or Habsburg husband, Mary was a Tudor, cut from the same cloth as both Henrys and Edward. The statute reasserted the Tudor British Empire because it accurately reflected her power and assuaged a climate of religious tumult, conspiracy, and patriarchy.

In subsequent weeks, parliament would reestablish papal authority only insofar as not prejudicial to the imperial authority of the realm or its laws. Evincing her commitment to those
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65 “An Act Repealing all Article and Provision made against the See Apostolick fo Rome, since the twentieth year of King Henry the Eighth,” 1554, 1 & 2 Philip & Mary, cap. 8, in Ruffhead, ed., *Statutes at Large*, 2:469-78.
precepts, Mary rejected Philip’s less-than-subtle overtures for coronation and refused to return secularized church land to Rome even if it meant maintaining schism. Spanish union and Catholic faith neither rejected Henrician reform nor subverted British Empire, both preserved for Elizabethan Britain. The Marian restoration was for a reformed, Tridentine Church, orchestrated by an imperial princess, bolstered by a well-educated, humanist clergy and propaganda run out of Edward’s presses.

At Winchester Cathedral, beneath the Arthurian round table (complete with Henry’s visage as Arthur at center) that their fathers had visited together in 1522, Mary wed Philip in unusually public fashion on 25 July 1554. The crown seized the chance to reaffirm its imperium as equal to Philip’s—as Wooings theorist John Elder described the following year: with “their armes joined in one, under one crown emperial,” each promised “to lyve, rule and reygne over their most noble empyre”—and illustrate Mary’s superiority in Britain, positioning her to the right of her prince, in the place of preeminence.66 They repeated marriage vows from the reformed 1549 Book of Common Prayer in Latin and English.67 For six days, the Cathedral doors bore verses that naturalized Philip and heralded a Catholic, Habsburg British imperialism in humanist, missionary terms, just like Protestant imperial ideology: “The Devil… did not wish that the English Queen Mary marry English Philip… but God, the provident hope of the English did wish it. The fierce Gallic lands and inhospitable Scotland would not want it, but Caesar [the personification of empire] did.”68

66 “John Elder’s Letter Describing the Arrival and Marriage of King Philip, his triumphal entry into London, the legation of Cardinal Pole” (c. 1555) in The Bannatyne Miscellany (Edinburgh: Bannatyne and Co., 1827), 137-167, quotation from 151.
68 “Verses by the Winchester Scholars on the Queen’s Marriage,” reprinted in Nichols, ed., Chronicle of Queen Jane, Appendix 12, p. 173. The verses were then presented to Mary in manuscript form, now British Library (BL) Royal MS 12 A.XX.
Their London entry too coopted the union for a nationalist, imperial agenda. The convoy passed beneath a drawbridge flanked by two great giants (“Corineus Britannus [and] Gogmagog Albionus,” the archipelago’s barbarous natives defeated by Brutus) who declared Philip the “sole hope of Caesar’s side” to whom “Britayne yelded hir hand And noble England openeth her bosome.”

In another scene, an old man, outfitted as Edward III with a closed crown and “ball imperial,” claimed that both monarchs lineally descended from him. A Gracechurch tableau depicted Edward VI and Henry VIII with a sword and bible, inscribed with the words *Verbum Dei* to mimic the donation of God’s word to the king on the title-page of Holbein’s 1535 Coverdale Bible. Enraged, Gardiner chastised its designer, the Protestant royal printer-historian Richard Grafton, for such treason against the Queen’s Catholicism. Nevertheless, the visual remained, marred with confused religious meaning but unequivocal British imperial significance: the tableau stressed the monarch’s command over the entire isle, spiritual and temporal.

Protestants still found foreboding in the displays. John Foxe read a Cheapside stage as “English people resembled to brute and savage beasts, dancing after Philip’s pipe,” while Elder noted Spaniards outnumbering Britons four to one. Images of the queen alongside Greek pillars (Charles’s imperial emblem) replaced those of Mary alone in royal robes, arched crown, rob, and roses. Since Tournai, the Tudors had deployed coinage to claim extra-national territorial

---


70 “Elder’s Letter,” in *Bannatyne Miscellany*, 150.

71 For the scene and its censure, see the contemporary description in Nichols, ed., *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, 78-9.

72 For “English people resembled…,” see Pratt, ed., Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, 4:558; for the crowd’s composition, see “Elder’s Letter,” in *Bannatyne Miscellany*, 137.

73 For this new representation, see Antonis Mor’s portrait of Mary (c. 1554-5) and the analysis of its meaning by Joanna Woodall, “An Exemplary Consort: Antonis Mor’s Portrait of Mary Tudor,” *Art History* 14, no. 2 (1991): 192-224; for examples of the queen alone surrounded by these emblems, see the Court of the King’s Bench (KB), Coram Rege Roll from the first year of her reign, PRO KB 27/1169.
authority. But now, from 1556, Philip appeared on Mary’s right, both under her imperial (enclosed) diadem. In a letter to Swiss reformer Heinrich Bullinger, Anne Hooper lamented these “effigies of Ahab and Jezebel” with the domed British crown “made over both ther heds yet upon nether of them, geving to the prince of Spayne as much auctoritie as if he were king of England in dead.” Other Wyatt supporters bemoaned, “the Queen is a Spanish woman at heart and thinks nothing of Englishmen.” Meanwhile, Philip tried to repair the damage by taking British courtiers and promising to “favour them as if I were an Englishman born.”

Iconographical practice mirrored transition in the practice of Tudor imperium. Though legally curtailed, Philip exerted essential influence (direct and indirect) on post-1553 nation- and empire-building. He deliberated with the privy council, set up his own Castilian sub-council to exclude unsuitable Britons from policy-making, attended parliament, and persuaded Mary to oblige her men to “obey his comandment in all thynges,” perturbing critics who saw English vernacular and sovereignty erode.
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74 Edwardian councilor and imperial promoter Thomas Smith explained in 1583 that currency was “alwayes stamped with the princes image and title” to affirm its weight and goodness, see Frederic W. Maitland, ed., Smith’s De Republica Anglorum (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906), quotation from 60.
75 As in the Coram Rege Roll from 1558, PRO KB 27/1185.
77 As Renard relayed in correspondence to Charles, 18 September 1554, CSPS 13/60.
78 Philip to Renard, 16 February 1553, CSPS 12/104.
79 Scholarship on Philip is quite good, e.g. Henry Kamen’s authoritative Philip of Spain (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), but the push to revise Mary has sidelined efforts to reassess Philip as British king. The only full-length study, by Harry Kelsey, is brief and provides little evidence to support the author’s that Mary “was never allowed to participate in government or to learn the intricacies of court politics,” see Kelsey, Philip of Spain, King of England: the forgotten sovereign (London: Tauris, 2011), quotation from 27. The most successful treatment remains David Loades, “Philip II and the government of England,” in Law and Government Under the Tudors, ed. Claire Cross, David Loades, and J.J. Scarisbrick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 177-194.
80 For “obey his comandment in all thynges,” see Mary to Lord Privy Seal, n.d. (c. 1555), BL Cotton MS, Vespasian F.III., fol. 23. For the privy council act requiring that henceforth, all business be conducted in a language that Philip could understand (Latin or Spanish) and with his participation, see “The King Consort,” 27 July 1554, APC, 5:53. The Duke of Alba wrote (and likely exaggerated) that due to Philip’s presence, Castilian was used exclusively in the Marian council, see Alba’s collected letters, in Jacobo Stuart Fitz-James, ed., Epistolario [del III Duque de Albal, 4 vols. (Madrid: Real Academia, 1952), 1:64. For the sub-council, see Philip’s untitled memorandum creating the unit in August 1555, BL Cotton MS Titus B.II., fol. 160. According to this scheme, the council would remain at court, report to Philip thrice-weekly, and determine what bills went to parliament. Though
Even when Philip’s presence in England dwindled and Mary proved infertile, Habsburg influence functioned not only as raw material for anti-Spanish sentiment and propagation of a Black Legend of Iberian cruelty and deviousness, but as stimuli for and determinants of imperial policy in Ireland, the Americas, and France.  

In these locations, the king consort’s sway merged powerfully with the queen’s own aspirations overseas and inherited experiences.

Philip’s agency is most apparent in the ecclesiastical sphere, where he worked to mend his father-in-law’s breach; this move would, in turn, fundamentally affect rule in Ireland in the second half of the century. Resolutely pursuing Anglo-papal reconciliation, Philip assured Rome of Britain’s loyalty by virtue of their marriage, despite his wife’s stubborn adherence to supremacy. He not only convinced the pope to allow ecclesiastical lands to remain secularized—the key sticking point in negotiations—but mediated a key June 1555 bull that reestablished papal right to donate Ireland, reinvested those rights in English hands, and substantiated Henry’s 1541 claim to Irish kingship.  

Granting them the “title King and Queen of Ireland… by the authority which the Pope hath over all kingdoms, to supplant those that are contumacious and build new,” Paul IV lent his power to the Tudor imperium, showed that the English had not forfeited Ireland when they embarked on religious reform, and implicitly accepted the utility of the kingly title. The bull was both meaningful and useful, a specific example of Marian imperial transition, wherein the queen endeavored to have it all (Catholic doctrine, apostolic law, and imperial kingship) in an island she could not be “induced to quit,” according to one
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81 On the connection between the marriage and the Black Legend, see Loades, “Philip II,” 180.
82 Mary admitted to Charles that her “return to obedience of the Holy Church… was largely obtained thanks to the wise guidance of my Lord,” 7 December 1554, CSPS 13/125. For a modern printed edition of the bull, see J. Hogan, “Miscellanea Vaticano-Hibernica, 1420-1631,” Archivium Hibernicum 4 (1915): 217.
83 Anon., “Out of the History of the Council of Trent, that the Pope gave to Philip and Mary,” Carew MS 616, fol. 169.
contemporary observer. The bull substantiated the Tudor claim to Ireland with its first and only external boost since the Angevins.

When English church bells chimed in 1553 for the first time in decades, they too echoed across the Irish Sea, albeit less resoundingly in the Pale. According to Protestant bishop of Ossory John Bale, word of Mary’s accession as Queen of England, France, and Ireland – as she insisted to be called, long before Paul’s bull – spurred “wicked” Kilkenny clergy to “blasphemously resume agayne the whole Papisme, or heape of supersticions of the bishop of Rome.” Renard reported that, spontaneously, the “wild Irish are submitting, they wish to obey the Queen.”

To explain the sudden loyalty of such an incorrigible bunch, a new imperial theory developed, propagated by Marian supporters but soon appropriated and construed negatively by English Protestants: years ago, “King Brigo of Spain settled dwellers on a large island, in these days named Ireland,” and to this day, its people “confess that they proceed from a Spanish lineage.” Now, the story justified Tudor rule; later, it explained Spanish-Irish incivility and alliance, thereby justifying Elizabethan conquest to rid the world of both.

Watching from London was George Dowdall, ex-archbishop of Armagh, who had endured self-inflicted exile at a Dutch monastery rather than suffer no mass. In him, Mary saw a Catholic, but a Henrician Catholic—unmarried and comfortable with royal supremacy—and
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85 When Adrian IV’s bull Laudabiliter granted the title to Henry II in 1155.
86 For “wicked,” see “The Vocation of John Bale to the Bishopric of Ossory in London; his persecutions in the same, and his final deliverance” (1553), reprinted in The Harleian Miscellany, Volume VI (London: White, 1810), 437-465, quotation from 456; for “blasphemously…” see “Vocation of Bale,” in Harleian Miscellany, Volume VI, 452.
87 Renard to Charles, 3 December 1553, CSPS 11/425.
88 Floridan de Ocampo, Los Cinco Libros primeros de la Cronica (1553), as quoted in Samson, “Marriage,” 82, my translation from the Spanish provided by Samson: “Certifican otrosi, que tanbien este rey Brigo de España puso moradores en vna gran Isla, que nombran estos dia Yrlanda… diciendo nos decender ellos de linage Español.”
promptly restored him to the archdiocese.\textsuperscript{89} The selection was telling, an imperial exercise. Though the post-reformation norm, the crown only made ecclesiastical appointments outside of England twice (Henry VIII at Tournai and Ireland) before excising papal jurisdiction and officially taking over this papal duty; as at home, Mary revived Catholicism largely without Rome’s aid. The spiritual pick fit with secular change: Dowdall landed in November 1553 with one Anthony St. Leger. Though a Northumberland ally, the deputy’s rumored Catholicism and mutable fidelity in the Eden mold gained him a third tenure. Mary’s instructions laid out an active administration to restore Catholic faith among “our loving subjects,” reduce the garrison, install an English council in Munster, plant Leix-Offaly, and end native coign and livery.\textsuperscript{90} She rejected the association among Irish barbarity, disobedience, and Catholicism promoted since the mid-1530s, however her personnel, policy, and discourse were quite familiar.

The reinstatement of Dowdall and St. Leger confirmed Tudor Irish \textit{imperium}, spiritual and temporal, using the men to export statute nearly wholesale from nation to empire and further Anglicization. Under tight royal oversight, Dowdall and his crown commissions strove to imbed Catholic doctrine, liturgy, and pomp (described by Dowdall as the “externals of the old religion”), root out “heretical” alternatives (especially married or non-English-speaking clergy), and extinguish Gaelic custom.\textsuperscript{91} Perpetrated by the same authority and methods—the unrepealed 1536 supremacy, visitation, printing press, oaths, and local hierarchy—mid-1550s religious


\textsuperscript{90} Mary’s instructions to St. Leger, 1 September 1553, Carew MS 603, fol. 10r. Another order asked him to “be favourable and assistant to all the Queen’s tenants,” Mary to St. Leger, 6 December 1553 Carew MS 603, fol. 201.

\textsuperscript{91} For “externals of the old religion,” see Dowdall’s written scheme for Irish reformation, the “Reformada in concilio provinciali Reverendissimi in Christo Patris ac Domini Domini Georgii Dowdall Archiepiscopi Armachani totius Hibernie Primatis celebrato in Ecclesia Sancti Petri de Drogheda Anno Domini 1553,” as quoted in Murray, \textit{Enforcing the Reformation}, 219. Though legally binding only in Armagh, as Murray has shown, their relevance extended to the church in English Ireland as a whole, including Dublin. For “heretical,” see the queen’s appointment of her clerical commission for Ireland, n.d. April 1554, in Morrin, ed., \textit{Patent Rolls Ireland}, 1:302.
reform closely resembled 1540s reform, despite its opposite confessional end. Moreover, high-profile Protestant casualties, like the ousting of married Archbishop of Dublin George Browne in favor of Englishman Hugh Curwen, occurred alongside a March 1555 royal dispatch directing St. Leger to donate all vacant lesser benefices to a vetted group of Henrician Anglicans and forgave a plethora of transgressions against the Church of Rome in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. Emboldened in Ireland in a way that she was not in England, Mary woke Dublin from its supposed Protestant stupor, gifting various lands back to Rome only where she saw fit. The move signified good faith to the Pope. However it was also an unmistakable show of imperial kingship. Catholic reform, then, was more complicated than medieval reversion or counterreformation; at times, the exigencies of empire trumped faith.

In Marian theory, Catholic revival and plantation were two sides of the same imperial coin, both propagated a (redefined) superior culture. As Dowdall argued with reference to the British chronicles, the Irish were so imprinted with pride and avarice that no good preaching, example, or counsel, could effect change. The godliest solution was to subdue and banish them, a right bestowed unto the king of England by the Pope at the time of the first conquest. Yet St. Leger’s reticence to return lands to the pope, his poor health, and accused corruption meant he would not be at the helm. Armed with papal sanction of her right, which she had just seen

---

92 “An Act for the English Order,” n.d. 1554, described both this authority and technique, as printed in J.G. Butler, ed., The Statutes at Large, passed in the parliaments held in Ireland, 20 vols. (Dublin: Grierson 1786), 1:119-27.
94 For the royal reallocation of church lands, see Mary to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, “Restoration of the Cathedral,” 10 September 1555, printed in William Monck Mason, ed., The History and Antiquities of the Collegiate and Cathedral Church of of St. Patrick’s near Dublin, 1190 to 1819 (Dublin: Mason, 1820), 155-160.
95 Significantly, a parcel invested in English (rather than Anglo-Irish) hands after dissolution remained there. The queen explained to her Irish lord deputy and lord chancellor that it was because this man, an English clerk who had come to Ireland in the 1530s named Matthew King, “had served us and our dearest father and brother right honestly,” Mary to St. Leger and Thomas Cusake, 31 December 1553, in Morrin, ed., Patent Rolls Ireland, 1:317.
96 “The Archbishop of Armagh’s opinion touching Ireland delivered in 1558,” n.d. 1558, BL Harley MS 35, fols. 195r-204v. Armagh’s report came in explicit response to a crown’s request and on the heels of two other reports by Dowdall to the crown: “Articles submitted by Dowdall to the Privy Council,” 17 November 1557, TNA: PRO SP 62/1/61; and “Dowdall’s Articles,” 30 May 1558, TNA: PRO SP 62/2/44.
published and circulated in Ireland, Mary elevated Thomas Radcliffe, earl of Sussex, in April 1556, promising him military and monetary might to extend her rule beyond the Pale via new English officials, institutions, and plantation. This sole original Marian Irish appointment was considered and telling: knighted in 1544 Boulogne and dispatched with Somerset, Cecil, and Smith in 1547 Scotland, this veteran of Tudor empire-building and former envoy to the Habsburg court befitted a queen whose self-espoused watchword, employed in correspondence with her new governor, was “experience” and who may have sought a new style of administration for Ireland influenced by Spanish methods of governance in Europe and the Americas.

Alongside directives to repress heretics in favor of “the true Catholic faith recovered in our realms England and Ireland,” Sussex’s instructions harkened back. Like Walshe in 1552, Mary declared English law to be the sole way to retain her possessions, rights, and obedience. To this end, she stated a “special desire” to shire Ireland into “reasonable counties as our realm of England.” Recycling justification for intervention in France and Scotland, she charged that only common law and justice ministered by Englishmen could yield quiet and great profit from various and sundry native commodities, specifying the very same goods in the very same terms as successive promoters from Henry VII’s time to Elizabeth I’s, in the new world and old:

---

97 For the bull’s publication, see Philip and Mary to Cusake, 13 September 1554, in Morrin, ed., Patent Rolls Ireland 1:339; for Sussex’s appointment, see “Notes for Remembrance,” n.d. April 1556, TNA: PRO SP 62/1/13, fol. 11.
99 Crown instructions to Sussex, 28 April 1556, Carew MS 628, fol. 53. Here, as in subsequent reports, the official instructions came from Philip and Mary as a single unit, even though Philip may not have been involved.
100 Crown instructions to Sussex, 28 April 1556, Carew MS 628, fol. 53.
timber, textiles, foodstuffs, and precious metals. Once he secured Ireland’s many well-situated ports, the crown asked Sussex to oversee a new Exchequer, mint, and plantation of Leix-Offaly in stages: first, horses would manure in the English style to repair the land; then, officials would order the wards; and finally, British subjects would “occupy” and “dwell” permanently on crown leases. In tandem with Curwen’s reintroduction of the mass, altars, and other accouterments in the spiritual sphere, Sussex’s directions promoted English governance, plantation, and profit.

Experience tempered expectation. Soon, the crown allowed Sussex to permit Anglo-Irish to live on the land so long as they accepted Tudor sovereignty and owned no more than two ploughlands; Gaels on up to two-thirds of a ploughland so long as they were deputy-vetted and kept at a strict quota of no more than one non-Englishman for every ploughland. All had to pay yearly rent, dwell in English-style homes, bear arms of the English sort only and for personal protection alone, and settle permanently. Put simply, the new rules distinguished between Old English and Gael, but found both in need of reform via Anglicization and English-born neighbors. By these rules, the Marian regime defined its version of Britishness, contributing to an existing dialogue with each salient point. And, notably, the crown imaged this as a scheme that would envelop all of Ireland.

The plan remained a theory, with few exceptions: Sussex did expel the Gaels in Antrim (targeted due to an unrelenting fear of Irish-Auld Alliance partnership) and defeated the native

102 Crown to Sussex, 28 April 1556, Carew MS 628, fol. 53.
103 Crown to Sussex, n.d. late-May 1556, BL Cotton MS Titus B.XI., fol. 465. In 1557, Philip and Mary opened mining in “Waxfforthe,” operated by royal laborers “after the manner of the bollars in Derbyshire” to crown profit, thereby pushing the point of superior Britishness, see “An Abstract for the setting forth of the King and Queen’s Majesties’ mines,” n.d. 1557, Carew MS 603, fol. 1.
104 For Curwen’s objectives, see Mary to Curwen, n.d. 1556, printed in R. Gillespie, ed., First Chapter Act Book of Christ Church (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997), 23-5. On his successes, see Murray, Enforcing the Reformation, 248-251.
O’More and O’Connor clans, while erecting forts and shiring. In 1558, Sussex finally called parliament to do away with the Edwardian innovations in religion, but because a strict reversion to 1533 statute law would overturn its imperium, the crown chose its words carefully, rescinding only provision not contrary or prejudicial to the authority, dignity, and preeminence of “the Queene being supreem governesse, possessour, and inheritrix to the imperiall crowne of this realme” and expressly declaring that Mary’s right in Ireland was as broad and full as any of her predecessors.

Governor Sussex served for eight years, in absentia for three, which left his brother-in-law, Henry Sidney, in charge—meaning that this famed Elizabethan deputy’s practice came under Mary. Dowdall’s complaints that “this poor realm was never in my remembrance in worse case than it is now” and Foxe-ian polemic obscure essential novelties for British Empire and an enduring experiment. In 1557, the Irish parliament shired Leix-Offaly, renaming them Queen’s and King’s County with capitals at Maryborough and Philipstown, and reaffirmed the Tudor crown’s complete command there, spiritual and temporal. These measures enforced English order on the landscape via imperial right—the new names symbolized possession, a technique not present in earlier British experiences abroad but later exported to America, in Virginia and elsewhere. In the not-so-distant-future, the move gave cause for Irish rebels to appeal to Philip (based on kingship, common faith, and fatherland), for help in shucking Elizabeth.
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107 For these accomplishments, see Sussex to Philip and Mary, n.d. 1558, in Constantia Maxwell, ed., Irish History from Contemporary Sources, 1509-1610 (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1923), 49.
108 “An Act declarynge that the Regall Power of this Realme is in the Queene’s Majestie, as fullie and absolutlie as ever it was in any of her moost noble Progenitours, Kynges of this Realme,” 1558, in Butler, ed., Statutes at large, Ireland, 1:274.
110 “An Act whereby the King and Queen’s Majesties, and the Heires and Successors of the Queen be entituled to the Countries of Leix and Offayl, and for making the same Countries Shire Grounds,” 1557, in Butler, ed., Statutes at Large, Ireland 1:273.
Ireland, however, was not Mary’s only inheritance; her queenship, vision, and marriage encouraged imperial transition in the New World, bolstering interest, exposing new sources, models, and motives, and privileging Spain as Britain’s competitor in the construction of a Tudor America.

On display from the moment Philip arrived in England was the opulent wealth of his American kingdom: American ore flooded in alongside oil, wine, and other Mediterranean products, sparking a fruitful mix of envy and impetus. Back in 1549, Tudor Staplers had extolled Philip as “Emperor Caesar Augustus,” longing for his perpetual friendship. Yet in late 1553, Habsburg ambassador Simon Renard aptly reflected mercantile concern over whether the match “intended to enrich foreigners by opening the gates of the country to them and impoverish its unfortunate inhabitants” or “would mean riches and advantages for them rather than poverty, because navigation would be safer and trade freer.” This ambivalence provided just enough intellectual space for Northumberland’s clients to operate again. By reminding subjects of a tantalizing New World, the marriage put Tudor inadequacies front and center and provoked an entangled process of borrowing, emulation, and rivalry with imperial Spain.

That Northumberland allies could salvage their reputations testifies to Mary’s imperial gaze, even if priorities at home (Catholic reform) and abroad (Ireland, France) eclipsed their specific focus (America). While Cecil renounced Lady Grey early enough to appease Mary yet chose to lie low for his conscience’s sake, Eden unabashedly preferred patronage, forging narratives of past discovery, British and Iberian, to stroke the royal ego and arm British readers


\[112\] Renard to Charles, 8 November 1553, CSPS 11/347.
with arguments and information for western adventure. In this, Newfoundland held particular sway, the sole site where Britain could claim presence longer than any European and a source of fish, vital for a Catholic kingdom. A Marian Leland, Eden eulogized exploration, glorifying personal, national, and economic value, as the divine renaissance fulfillment of Abrahamic, Greek and Roman models.

Eden’s was an artful balancing act: he capitalized on rhetoric of cooperation used to smooth over a worrisome union as well as nationalist sentiment to at once extol Habsburg imperialism and incite competition. He described, “Englande is in fewe yeares decayed and impoueryshed, and howe on the contrary parte, Spayne is inryched.” These Habsburg riches, primarily from metal ore, were, then, “iust deserties and good fortune [for] goddes made of men (whom the antiquitie cauled Heroes)” or Emperors. Endearing himself to king and queen, his patriotic, religious call to enlarge a carefully nondescript faith reasoned that if anything pleased god it was doubtless what his home nation had attempted in the northwest, but since let lapse. Luckily, beside Iberian America, lay fair, fruitful regions, uninhabited by Christians. The Decades stirred interest, contributing to a broader climate that pushed the crown to spend £120,000 to resume shipbuilding on Philip’s suggestion and his Habsburg models. Lead by its two new flagships, the Philip & Mary and Mary Rose, the Tudor navy was “ready for action,” as

---

113 On Cecil’s life during Mary’s reign and the influence of this queenship on his policy, see Alford, Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 4-32.
114 Eden, Decades, sig. A3v.
115 Eden, Decades, sig. B3v.
116 Eden, Decades, sig. A1r.
117 Eden, Decades, 104.
118 For the region’s plenty, see Eden, Decades, especially 126-127; for lack of inhabitants, see Eden, Decades, 104.
the Venetian Ambassador put it, and won a rare, notable Atlantic victory against pirates in 1556.\textsuperscript{120}

Part of the \textit{Decades’} success rested on its calculated appeal to popular anxiety that Mary had not only destroyed the Church, but brought the Isles irrevocably into Spanish orbit. The text compounded fears that (as refracted through Renard) Philip had begun to “draw money out of the kingdom, spend it elsewhere, change the government, promulgate new laws, give office to foreigners, draw England to war, set the land in confusion.”\textsuperscript{121} Eden had charted the geographical and ideological course Elizabethans would take in the New World, drawing on legend and precedent, building the empire with an eye to nation, Isles, and Europe, all with a changed, more mature sense of self.

***

A variety of factors – from the brevity and limits of Mary’s tenure, to continuity in policy, resolve to reverse course, and close study of Spain – meant that when Elizabeth I ascended and exiles returned, the individuals and ideas were in place to foster growth. They gave rise to a narrative whereby empire was fundamental to recovery from a half-decade of heresy, alien influence, debt, famine, war, and dishonor. Comonarchy had brought all of these horrors, but for contemporaries, one event symbolized rock bottom: the 1558 loss of Calais.

Encouraged by Britain’s obliged partnership and utility as a base for his endless feud with France, Philip manipulated Tudor pretensions across the Chanel to cajole his gravely ill wife into a catastrophic invasion of France, despite her councilors’ protest against war where defense did

---

\textsuperscript{120} Venetian Ambassador to Doge and Senate of Venice, 30 July 1556, in Rawdon Brown, ed., \textit{Calendar of State Papers relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice} (London: Stationery Office, 1886-1947), vol. 6, entry 564 (hereafter \textit{CSPV} volume/entry).

\textsuperscript{121} Renard to Philip, 3 October 1553, \textit{CSPS} 11/263.
not require it. With its new fleet, 7000 men, and 200 officers, the invasion seemingly united
England’s nobility in goodwill behind their foreign king. Indeed, it notably brought in
Wooings and Irish veterans Carew, Nicholas Throckmorton, and three of Northumberland’s
sons—all reform-minded exiles pardoned for service. When the mission failed spectacularly,
the English were routed from their possession in January, and the queen died within the year, the
post-defeat recriminations began. When they did, a core of Protestant thinkers brought their
study of Europe’s premier empire in action to bear on mid-Tudor imperialism.

Still raw at Elizabeth’s coronation and loaded with baggage, the loss of England’s sole
surviving French holding assumed inordinate significance beyond any practical value. Early
Elizabethan chroniclers like Richard Grafton told that Mary languished with grief over the loss
of “her possession on that side of the sea,” two hundred years under English jurisdiction.
“[Se]eing no lykelyhood nor hauing any hope of the restitution of Calice, and considering also
that most of her affayres had but hard successe, [Mary] conceaued an inwarde sorrowe of
minde,” contracted a fever, and quickly died. Crowned Queen of England, Ireland, and
France, Mary’s sister fostered hopes of recovery. Calais faded slowly, but if the loss truly was
permanent, European empire gone with it, then Newfoundland and Ireland assumed new weight,

---

122 Council memo, n.d. 1557, BL Cotton MS Titus C.VII., fol. 199.
123 For the size of the offensive, see the formal declaration of war, n.d. 1558, BL Stowe MS 571, fols. 77-132, which
(interestingly enough) reaffirmed the 1513 alliance that had yielded the invasion and occupation of Tournai; for the
sense of unity, see Venetian Ambassador in England to Doge, 27 June 1557, CSPV 6/948. On the military mission
124 All granted in 1558, for Carew’s pardon, see Morrin, ed., Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary, 2:43; for
Throckmorton’s, see Morrin, ed., Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary, 2:71; for the Dudley brothers, sons of the earl of
was killed but Robert returned home, poised to become Elizabeth’s favorite.
125 Grafton, A Chronicle at large and meere history of the affayres of Englane (London: 1569), STC 12147,
126 Grafton’s Chronicle, 2:566. For similar comments on the loss of Calais and the town’s importance, see William
Camden, Annales, the true and royall history of the famous empress Elizabeth… (London: 1625), STC 4497, sig.
A2v and 18-25. Ironically, Philip yearned to launch an immediate counterattack to recapture Calais, but Mary could
not convince her council to raise an army so deep into a severe winter, see the conciliar discussion of the matter on 1
February 1558, BL Cotton MS Titus B.II., fols. 59r-v.
Britain’s only remaining overseas holdings. This was the precise effect: the 1560s and 1570s were about envisioning and creating a new post-France, anti-Iberian empire, based on history and experience and focused west.

Much as Jacobean enshrined a posthumous myth of the virgin queen, a group of humanist scholars recast history to engender twin ends of imperial growth and evangelical reform.\textsuperscript{127} Relying on Leland, Vergil, and More, Elizabethan chronicler Grafton drew a direct line of kingship over “one entire Isle” from its founder and namesake Brutus to Henry VII, harbinger of civil law, manner, and peace endowed with “the Crown and Diadem of this noble Empyre.”\textsuperscript{128} The realm secure, Henry VIII began the recovery of France, where the Tournaisiens were glad to return to their English ways.\textsuperscript{129} Then, he proceeded to Ireland and Scotland, seeking to tame these rightful Tudor subjects, “altogether noseled in supersticion and popery… ignorant & rude” and easily the “most brute and bestly of the whole realme.”\textsuperscript{130} This success was, in turn, seamlessly continued by “king, yea saint, Edward the sixth” and Somerset, whose Rough Wooings \textit{Exhortacion} was reproduced in full.\textsuperscript{131}

Their legacy, swollen by Mary’s loss of her vital cross-Channel buffer, fell to Elizabeth: Grafton pled, “If you loue god, your linage, or natie countrie, you must take vpon you the diademe of this noble empyre.”\textsuperscript{132} When the author produced Elizabeth’s coronation pageants, his vision spread, forging a normative model for later apologists.\textsuperscript{133} Well-acquainted with this

\textsuperscript{128} For “one entire Isle,” see \textit{Grafton’s Chronicle}, 1:xi (dedication “To the Gentle Reader”); for “the Crowne and Diadem of this noble Empyre,” see \textit{Grafton’s Chronicle}, 2:125.
\textsuperscript{129} For his history of Tournai, see \textit{Grafton’s Chronicle}, 2:263-78.
\textsuperscript{130} For “altogether noseled…,” see \textit{Grafton’s Chronicle}, 2:457; for “most brute…,” see \textit{Grafton’s Chronicle}, 2:458.
\textsuperscript{131} For “king, yea saint…” see \textit{Grafton’s Chronicle}, 1:xv; for the \textit{Exhortacion}, see \textit{Grafton’s Chronicle}, 2:508-513.
\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Grafton’s Chronicle}, 2:125.
\textsuperscript{133} As John King argued, see King, \textit{Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 226.
propaganda and faced with her own legitimacy issues, the new queen noted the collection of classical, biblical, and historical comparisons bestowed on her sister and near-canonized brother—deliberately adopting and cultivating some while rejecting others.  

Grafton embodied the Somerset Circle court culture of Cecil, Smith, Eden, Foxe, John Daye, Robert Beale, and John Aylmer. Many veterans of Scottish or Irish war, all Cranmer-men dedicated to the vernacular (over the Latin language associated with Roman Catholicism) and superior Britishness, they drew on the 1530s, 40s, and 50s to propagate a Protestant Tudor British Empire in the 1560s. Merging religion and empire, consolidation and expansion, the circle exaggerated Mary’s “blody tyme” and her predecessors’ success to jolt a queen who, as Francis Bacon recalled, declined to “make windows into men’s souls” and heard mass in her private chapel into promulgating Protestantism abroad. The same context bore Welsh cartographer-antiquarian Humphrey Llwyd’s 1559 chronicle, an adaptation of the Brut that reintroduced audiences to a remarkable Tudor ancestor: the Trojan-Welsh Prince Madoc, who

---


136 For “blody tyme,” see Pratt, ed., Foxe, Acts and Monuments, 1:307; for “make windows into men’s souls,” see W. Warhaft, ed., Francis Bacon, A Selection of his Works (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), Aphorism 129, p. 455. Art was equally prolific and pushed the same agenda. Among the most illustrative and enduring are woodcuts from Foxe’s Acts and Monuments (first pub. 1563, republished 1570, 1576, 1583) and the Bishop’s Bible (1569). Portraiture continued along Henrician and Edwardian lines, Old Testament prophets combined with classical kings, depicted with the sword of justice, closed crown, orb, and scepter (four symbols of imperium) and the book to demonstrate the unification of ecclesiastical and secular authority, divine revelation, sacred kingship, personal piety, and royal right to circulate vernacular scripture. Moreover, as Margaret Aston demonstrated in The King’s Bedpost: Reformation and Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), here was more than a simple celebration of the queen and her religious settlement, but an effort to spur Elizabeth into emulating her brother and realizing that a lackadaisical policy threatened all of Britain with relapse into idolatry, superstition, and failed empire. Elizabeth’s commissioned family portrait, the Allegory of the Tudor Succession (c. 1572-1590, likely by Lucas de Heere), then, becomes a defense of her queenship. The portrait depicts Henry VIII enthroned in the center, handing the sword to his kneeling son. Next to Edward is an oversized Elizabeth, accompanied by personifications of Plenty and Peace. At far left are Mary and Philip, isolated from the group with Mars, set against a scene of war and destruction. The inscription suggests the painting was an admonition to her courtier, Walsingham, who advocated armed support for continental coreligionists, a promise of peace and cautious Protestantism rather than intervention. On the portrait and for reproductions of it, see Roy C. Strong, The English Icon, Elizabethan & Jacobean Portraiture (London: Mellon Foundation, 1969), 140; Aston, King’s Bedpost, 114.
sailed past Ireland to inhabit “some part of Noua Hispania or Florida. Wherevpon it is manifest, that the countrie was by Brytaines discouered, afore either Columbus or Vesputius,” and so entailed to Elizabethan by Justinian law. Representative of a turn southwest from England to the heart of Habsburg Empire in the Americas occasioned by Mary’s marriage, Llwyd merged myth and contemporary knowledge to justify continued British engagement below the St. Lawrence. As he served Elizabeth’s first parliament, his work was picked up and expounded by John Dee, David Powell, and others, fulfilling its desired end of new enterprise.

For those carrying the torch for the Oxford martyrs, the 1559 church settlement was limited but swift, England, Wales, and Ireland again Protestant. With acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, parliament reinstated Henrician-Edwardian “laws for utter extinguishment of usurped powers, restoring and uniting to the imperial crown [in] any your majesty’s dominions that now be or hereafter shall be.” For nation and empire, the legislation re-confirmed monarchical sovereignty, expansionist pretensions, and the Protestant complexion of Tudor imperium.

The settlement reflected and reinforced Cecil’s faction, which sought to make England’s newly reasserted religion into British and, eventually, Atlantic policy. In Ireland, Elizabeth

---


138 “An Act to restore to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction,” 1559, 1 Eliz. 1, cap. 1, in Ruffhead, ed., *Statutes at Large*, 2:501. The same parliament also revived 1536’s Ten Articles, the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, and required all subjects swear to the new order (as Henry had), though hedged on transubstantiation and punishing Catholics, see 1 Eliz. I, caps. 1-4 in Ruffhead, ed., *Statutes at Large*, 2:501-14. In Ireland, pre-1553 form was restored by May 1559, under the auspices of Sussex and the Irish parliament, as described in Elizabeth’s instructions to Sussex, 16 July 1559, Carew MS 628, fol. 61 and “Instructions given by us to our cousin Thomas Earl of Sussex,” n.d. May 1559, Carew MS 628, fol. 28. For a useful summary the 1559 settlement more generally, see Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion, 1558-1603* (NY: Routledge, 1994), 10-22.

139 The return of personnel (like Cecil) might have been enough to pick up from 1553, and this explains Armitage’s finding that Elizabethans continued and adapted Edwardian British imperialism. I agree, however this misses Mary’s
sustained and adjusted Marian models—an unstudied imperial sphere of a domestic phenomenon espied by Judith Richards.140 Indeed, Elizabeth’s instructions were purposely steeped in the past to justify continuity in policy and discourse. Beyond the Church, Elizabeth’s first seven years stayed the course. Sussex remained at the helm, charged with maintaining Leix-Offaly plantation, where “wild Irish [are] far more beastlike and barbarous than other countries.”141 Heightening xenophobic nationalism, their correspondence stressed the threat of aid from (Spanish) foreigners and native Brehon Law, concluding that only by granting land and office to Englishmen exclusively.142 Then, by instituting “our common law [in] remoter parts” and crushing all “Irish blood not reduced to the English,” could Ireland reach obedience and civility.143 It was all decidedly familiar, though Elizabeth refused to use her predecessor’s colonial nomenclature, King and Queen’s County.144

At least in part, continuity in Ireland stemmed from preoccupation elsewhere. The court’s Edwardian experience coupled with immediate crisis north made Scotland Elizabeth’s principal concern. Cecil’s powerful British Protestant imperial language, which proclaimed the “auncient rights of England over one Ile devided from the rest free from Pape,” swayed a reluctant queen to

aid the Lords of the Congregation.\textsuperscript{145} Their success in reforming the kirk was a coup for Cecil and the empire he imagined.\textsuperscript{146}

Fittingly, the next site of intervention in defense of reformed faith was France. In 1562, Elizabeth put the restoration of Calais at the fore of her agenda and occupied Le Havre for the Huguenots in France’s Wars of Religion.\textsuperscript{147} For the queen and Cecil, the intervention was a win-win-win: they gained a suitable temporary French foothold until it could be exchanged for Calais or a larger Pale; fought against de Guise and Habsburgs forces, keeping them out of the Isles; and pleased hardline Anglicans, even if domestic reform had fallen short.\textsuperscript{148} But the occupation was an abysmal failure, as the Huguenots turned on the British for their thinly-veiled imperial ambition. Yet paradoxically, Le Havre did not induce isolationism, rather, it further crystalized Spain as Protestant Britain’s enemy (a process begun under Mary) and profoundly affected Cecil.\textsuperscript{149} Humiliated and convinced religion proved a weak bond, he rejected armed cooperation with continental brethren. Going forward, Walsingham led the bloc for European action based on confession.\textsuperscript{150} Cecil had given up on Calais and by extension, the medieval empire. With his circle, he began to look west, to Ireland, Newfoundland, and, slowly, Virginia.

Participation in the French and Scottish wars—pursued, in part, because Tudor claims there remained influential—drove the crown west. With the entirety of Britain now Protestant (following the 1559 settlement and 1560 Scottish Reformation), Cecil had turned towards

\textsuperscript{145} Cecil’s memorandum to the crown, 31 August 1559, BL Lansdowne MS 4, fols. 26r-27v, quotation from 26r.
\textsuperscript{147} Camden, \textit{Annales}, 97.
\textsuperscript{148} For the idea of swapping Le Havre for Calais or some other piece of France, see Thomas Smith to William Cecil, 6 December 1562, in Joseph Stevenson, ed., \textit{Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth} (London: Longman, 1863-1950), vol. 5, entry no. 1198 (hereafter \textit{CSPF} volume/entry).
\textsuperscript{149} On the enterprise more broadly and its failure, see Wallace MacCaffrey, “The Newhaven Expedition,” \textit{The Historical Journal} 40, no. 1 (March, 1997): 1-21. My argument here amends Patrick Collinson’s, which found that the process of crystalizing Spain as the Tudor enemy began at Le Havre, see Collinson, \textit{The Elizabethan Puritan Movement} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), especially 52, 214.
\textsuperscript{150} On this shift, see Alford, \textit{Early Elizabethan Polity}, 60-70.
France, where intelligence from Le Havre stressed the port’s western access, wealth from the Newfoundland fish trade, and launch of the mid-Atlantic Charlesfort colony. Concurrently, he was flooded with (largely spurious) reports that the Spanish had founded a new trade to Newfoundland that bypassed any English fishermen and the Portuguese had gained obedience, dominion, and tribute from newly-conquered northern territories. The evidence showed that rivals were profiting off what Eden proved was a Tudor territory, not an unclaimed, ungovernable fishery, British presence necessary to see these “Papists” deprived of their livelihood. Le Havre was important for another reason: when the queen authorized the mission, she tasked junior soldier Humphrey Gilbert with raising one-hundred of its footmen. His first-ever exercise abroad, the post may have occasioned his subsequent friendships with famed geographer André Thevet and knowledge of the Charlesfort Huguenot settlement. Back home, the soldier took up cartography with Muscovy Company captain-general Anthony Jenkinson, convinced of the presence of a northern passage to “Cathaye and orientall regions.”

Engineered against Britain’s enemies in religion and empire in Europe, the Isles, and America, intervention in Scotland and France in the 1560s was central to the development of Tudor imperium: it lent her subjects military and naval experience, strengthened the association of Britishness with reformed faith against Catholic Iberians, confirmed the loss of Calais, and oued what continentals were doing in their northwestern backyard. France and Scotland also determined how Elizabethans approached Newfoundland: they drew on theory, evidence, and projects test-driven there in the 1510s and 40s, alongside northern experience, while mindful that

---

151 Henry Killigrew to Cecil, 10 August 1562, CSPF 5/459.
152 For the Spanish activity, see English diplomat Thomas Chamberlain to Elizabeth, 27 September 1561, TNA: PRO SP 70/30, fol. 111; for the extent of Portuguese accomplishments, which Elizabeth believed enough to send an irate letter to their king, see “Elizabeth’s answer to the Portuguese,” 15 June 1562, TNA: PRO SP 70/38, fol. 110.
153 “The Answer of M. Beauvoir concerning the Ships [at Brazil, Guinea, Newfoundland, Barbary, and Spain],” 4 November 1562, CSPF 5/983.
154 Jenkinson and Gilbert testimony before the court, n.d. 1562, BL Cotton MS Galba D.IX., fol. 4.
the invasion had depleted royal coffers, necessitating private funds, just as Edwardian and Marian theorists had experimented.

Cecil’s concrete turn to Newfoundland is appreciable from 1562-3, when the secretary pushed a new fish day through parliament. Contending that “merchandise into the Levant and Spain is decayed, the trades into I[ce]land impeached, the building of ships is costly and difficult for lack of timber,” his initiative promised to increase fish consumption and provide access to new materials, thereby swelling the mariner core, bolstering the navy, and strengthening the island kingdom. Against popular accusations that “Cecil’s fast” constituted “popish practice,” Elizabeth required her clergy to preach its “true cause”: that mariners and shipping were the “choicest fortresses for the defense of the realm.” The bill constituted concerted, official policy to make Newfoundland cod a linchpin of national and imperial growth by maritime activity.

Meanwhile, another project took shape under Cecil’s auspices, also focused on a locale brought squarely into sights by Mary’s match and Le Havre. When the English departed France,

---

156 Cecil, “Arguments to prove that it is necessary for the restoring of the navy of England to have more fish eaten and therefore one day more in the week ordained to be a fish day,” 1 February 1563, in Robert Lemon, ed., Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth (London: Longman, 1856-72), vol. 27, entry number 71 (hereafter CSPD volume/entry). In drafting the bill, Cecil likely had help from one Edward Jenynges, who had dedicated a treatise to Cecil “On the utility to the realm by observing days for eating fish only” in early 1563 (the document is now BL Lansdowne MS 101, fol. 22). In addition, the formal motion presenting the bill to parliament was given by William Wynter, a Portsmouth MP and Woosings veteran. Later a rival to Hawkins, Wynter descended from generations of Bristol merchants who fished in Iceland and Newfoundland and his father was treasurer of the newly reorganized Henrician navy from 1545. Elizabeth selected William as her master of naval ordinance in July 1577 and administrator of all outgoing expeditions in 1557-8, before enlisting him for the Dutch Revolt. On Wynter, see the entry for “William Wynter,” in P.W. Hasler, The House of Commons, 1558-1603 (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1981), 673.
157 PC to the Sherrif and Justices of the Peace of Surrey, 4 February 1578, from the transcript in J.C. Jeffreson, ed., Historical Manuscripts Commission: Appendix to the 7th Report: Molyneux Family of Losely Park Historical Correspondence (London: Historical Manuscripts Commission, 1879), 630a.
John Ribault, the famed pilot who had led the Huguenot contingent under Gaspard de Coligny and René Goulaine de Laudonnière to settle Charlesfort the previous year, covertly followed them home.\(^{159}\) Sorely in need of aid for the colony, Ribault’s nation was embroiled in civil war, his coreligionists routed by a Catholic majority. Elizabeth’s reputation and his own decade-long sojourn in Edwardian Britain brought Ribault straight to Westminster, where he and the queen concocted a joint Anglo-French venture to salvage and rebuild the colony as a reformed imperial outpost in supposedly British territory within striking distance of the Spanish Indies and Central America – the very first mid-Atlantic Tudor enterprise.

As captain, Elizabeth selected Briton Thomas Stuckeley, an experienced Atlantic privateer and imperial wrangler: indeed, he had previously entertained Irish nobleman Shane O’Neill on a visit to England, an altogether fitting dress-rehearsal because, as Camden later noted, with regards to his “troupe of Gallosglassorum… the English admired them no lesse, than they should doe at this day to see those of China or America.”\(^{160}\) With one royal ship and British-only funding and supplies, the venture set sail on 26 June 1563 following an opulent Thames pageant that announced Elizabeth’s American intentions to Europe. The size of the spectacle, the ease with which Ribault raised support, the extent of courtly contribution, and the plan’s avowed Protestantism all illustrate its significance. Despite colossal disaster—Stuckeley went rogue, rechristened the ships the *Anne Stucley*, *Thomas Stucley*, *William Stucley*, *Trentine Stucley*, and *Fortune Stucley*, and diverted them to privateer off Spain, never even crossing the Atlantic—the venture accrued valuable knowledge from Ribault and fellow French mariner Laudonnière (found, ironically, with his colonists aboard one of the plundered ships), essential practice in

\(^{159}\) Camden, *Annales*, 95.

mounting Elizabethan adventure, and compounded Tudor American interest. Paying little heed to horrid reports from the Charlesfort survivors that they had lived only by drinking their own urine and eating one another (surmising that “it was better that one should dye, then that so many men should perish, his flesh was devided equally among his fellowes”), Elizabethans were enthralled by the prospect of an anti-Spanish, anti-Catholic America. Meanwhile Ribault remained at court as an American consultant and Laudonnière planted a new, French-only colony. In 1564, John Hawkins conferred with Robert Dudley, Cecil, and Lord Admiral Howard—all three privy councilors, all three behind the Stuckeley fiasco—and, with essential crown support, set sail for Africa, the Spanish Main, Jamaica, and Cuba, visiting the new French settlers at Carolina along the way. In tow, most likely, was his young cousin, Francis Drake.

Perceiving the new Fort Caroline for precisely what it was, adelantado Pedro Menéndez de Avilés moved to reclaim the territory, planting his own St Augustine colony fifty miles south. Twelve days later, he attacked, slaughtering the Huguenots and earning his king’s commendation. Tudor interest only grew as a result of this fitting example of Iberian global takeover and Marian Black Legend of Habsburg cruelty, in contrast to benign, godly, civil British Empire, inciting the rapid translation of Ribault’s report for a vernacular audience—the

161 The events of the voyage are recalled throughout Hakluyt, *A notable hisotrie containing foure voyages made by certaine French captaines unto Florida* (London: 1587), STC 15316, 1-64.
162 “The state and condition of those which were left behind in Charles-fort,” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:318. The anti-Habsburg element of the Stuckeley venture is apparent in Elizabeth’s refusal to believe Philip’s (legitimate) protests that “Stukeley is bent rather on committing some great robbery than discovering new lands,” see Bishop Quadra to Philip II, 19 June 1563, in Martin A.S. Hume, ed., *Calendar of State Papers Spain (Simancas)* (London: Longman, 1892), vol. 1, entry number 233 (hereafter *CSPS Simancas*, volume/entry number).
165 Menéndez to Philip, 12 December 1565, as quoted in Woodbury Lowery, *The Spanish Settlements within the Present Limits of the United States, 1513-1561* (NY: Putnam, 1911), 206.
very first detailed report of North America to appear in England.\textsuperscript{166} Translator Thomas Hackett’s quick work resonated, portraying the savage murder of the Anglican’s brethren set against a fertile, commercially-fit land, replete with wood, spices, and goodly people willing to trade gold for British trinkets, terms that would become a mainstay of Roanoke propaganda.\textsuperscript{167}

Redoubling Hackett’s effort, the day Hawkins returned home—coincidentally, the same day as the massacre, 20 September 1565—the sailor began to circulate news of his accomplishments, stressing his American progress over the rest of this expedition, during which, beneath the royal standard, he purported to have discovered wealthy southern coasts, beyond European control.\textsuperscript{168} When he reached Florida, the Huguenots had greeted him as a Protestant brother sent by God and graciously accepted English supplies. Then, low on victuals himself, Hawkins had sailed to port at Cornwall via Newfoundland, where he fished for cod and traded, redoubling British northern rights and further illustrating the region’s plenty.\textsuperscript{169} As he propounded his tale, Hawkins also passed Floridian gold as well as oil and olives around court, lauding the two much-beloved Mediterranean items increasingly rare as Spanish relations deteriorated.\textsuperscript{170} His detailed, encouraging report of goodness of the country served as proof positive in favor of British American Empire—especially in Newfoundland, as a mid-way refueling station between the mid-Atlantic and Britain.\textsuperscript{171} As Elizabeth showered Hawkins with gifts, Philip’s ambassador duly identified the effect: “the vast profits made by the voyage has

\textsuperscript{166} Thomas Hackett’s translation of Jean Ribault, \textit{The whole and true discoverye of Terra Florida (englished the florishing lande.)} (London: 1563), STC 20970, sigs. Aii r- Cvii v.
\textsuperscript{167} For example, Hackett described “temperature, fertilitie, ports, havens, ryuers, and generally all the commodities that be seen and found in that land,” see Hackett, \textit{Whole and true discoverye}, quotation from sig. Aii r.
\textsuperscript{168} “The voyage made by M. Iohn Hawkins to the West Indies, made in the yeere 1564,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:501-521.
\textsuperscript{169} “Voyage made by Hawkins…1564,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:521.
\textsuperscript{170} “Voyage made by Hawkins…1564,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:521.
\textsuperscript{171} “Voyage made by Hawkins…1564,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:520-521.
excited other merchants to undertake similar expeditions.” According to Hakluyt, Laudonnière similarly surmised that “the Queéne of England shoulde be encouraged to set footing there, as before shée had desired.”

Though Stuckeley’s debacle provoked a transient turn away from America, here was fodder for Tudor imperial ferment in Newfoundland. Aware of his allies at court, state debt, and material from Eden, Jenkinson, Thevet, and Hackett, Humphrey Gilbert petitioned for a decade of exclusive “tyrall at myne owne cost for vndisouered passage” in 1565. Stressing his English birth, the soldier promised success, honor, and power for queen and realm without injury to any other Christian prince. Drawing on ancient, medieval, and early Tudor precedent, Gilbert’s lobby formally originated the Elizabethan Newfoundland project and its propaganda, yet demonstrates firm roots in the past, an explicit experiment that developed Protestant nationalism to justify empire.

Gilbert’s 1566 discourse argued that the study of conquest from classical and contemporary authors and the experiences of Saxon travelers, Columbus, and Cabot all verified the existence of a Northwest Passage, located in land entailed to Elizabeth and closer to her dominions than any other prince’s. However, as was Eden’s intent, it too showed that above all else, the kings of Spain and Portugal and the entire Iberian Peninsula seek “to cut them [the English] off and enioy the whole traffique to [them] selfe.”

Bolstered by providential

---

174 Gilbert to Elizabeth, June 1565, BL Additional MS 4159, fol. 392.
175 Gilbert to Elizabeth, 24 January 1567, TNA: PRO SP 12/45, fol. 5.
geography, right by first discovery, and competition, Gilbert described an enterprise already well-underway, which he would only advance.\textsuperscript{178}

Gilbert charged that America would not only enrich the commonwealth with infinite luxury goods, but free Britain from dependence on continental Europe for import or export; increase shipping, naval experience, and the national economy without burdening the state; and employ idle Englishmen.\textsuperscript{179} Soon echoed in Dee’s edition of Euclid (a product of the same courtly intellectual milieu), Gilbert reinforced the rhetoric of Vergil and More, supposing that as an island nation, the British were chosen by god to be the most skillful pilots and to claim famous, rich places overseas.\textsuperscript{180} Pouncing on the defense of Cecil’s fast, Gilbert added that though already preeminent, Elizabeth’s navy “should be greatly increased by the traffike insuing vpon this discoverie, for it is the long voyage that increase and maintaine great shipping.”\textsuperscript{181} To reap these benefits and reduce poverty and landlessness at home, he offered to “inhabite some part of those countryes” in Newfoundland, which he described as a physical island, combining permanent garrisoning with trade and colonization.\textsuperscript{182} From assumptions that Britons were predisposed, even preordained, to go overseas to their list of advantages and geography, Gilbert and Dee both described an empire inextricably linked to the home nation, both mirroring and complementing this domestic ideal. Nevertheless, a cash-strapped and preoccupied Elizabeth refused.

Made prior to his Irish service, which began in 1567, Gilbert’s initial royal petition and discourse disrupts the thesis that Gilbert’s American engagement stemmed directly or only from

---

\textsuperscript{178} Gilbert, “Discourse of discoverie,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:16.
\textsuperscript{180} Gilbert, “Discourse of discoverie,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:13 and 22. For Dee’s similar sentiment see the preface to his tract \textit{The elements of geometrie of the most auncient philosopher Euclide of Megara} (London: 1570), STC 10560, sig A1.
his Irish experience in a microcosm of early empire, though certainly these two projects were mutually-informing. Instead, the source privileges the 1550s, 1560s, and earlier northern enterprise. Ultimately, his ties to Cecil brought Gilbert to Ireland as an undertaker, which preoccupied him for a decade, but this interlude exemplifies how Ireland and Newfoundland were related, rather than sites of straightforward, linear progress, one to the next.

Amid the Le Havre expedition, Elizabeth had commissioned a primer on Gaelic, packaged as a tool whereby her Gaelic subjects will receive justice, civil plantation, and increase their love of the queen. She also summoned what was only her second Irish parliament. Following the Poynings principle of legal uniformity, the legislature enacted specific, unchanged Tudor laws, including the queen’s right to fortify, to punish for treason and common law infractions, and to rule “as absolutely as ever it was in any of her progenitors Kings of Ireland,” a provision identical to its Marian original. With means to help her understand her troubled, inferior charges and codified imperial right, the crown reaffirmed its Irish status and laid the groundwork for a reinvigorated colonial plan. Two years later, in 1563–4, Elizabeth made a bevy of land grants to various English soldiers, including Gilbert. Using recycled prose and theory, the fiants allowed Anglo-Irish and Gaels to remain (as Mary had), but required a standing militia and

---

183 On this broader thesis regarding Ireland’s place in the early British Empire, in which Gilbert forms an integral part, see D.B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966) and Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1556-76* (NY: Barnes and Noble, 1976). Both historians emphasize the fact that Gilbert did not venture to North America until after his adventure in Ireland and do not examine the petition and discourse in their mid-Tudor context.

184 Gilbert’s Irish involvement during this period emerges from correspondence, where he is mentioned in several documents: see Elizabeth to Sidney, 11 June 1567, TNA: PRO SP 63/21/10; Elizabeth to Sidney, 6 July 1567, TNA: PRO SP 63/21/49; Francis Knollys, “Mr. Vicechamberlens opinion in certen causes of Irland,” 7 July 1567, TNA: PRO SP 63/21/56; “Request of Warham St. Leger, Edward Saintloo, Richard Grenville, Thomas Leton, Humphrey Gilbert, Jacques Wingfield, and Gilbert Talbot for Corporate Privileges in Munster,” n.d. (c. 1568-9), TNA: PRO SP 63/26/81. Gilbert also wrote a “Discourse of Ireland,” n.d. 1572, Carew MS 614, fol. 239.


186 For “as absolutely…,” see “Acts not extant in the Printed Book,” n.d. 1562, Carew MS 608, fol. 106. For the remainder of the statutes passed, see “A note of certain Acts of Parliament,” 1 June 1562, Carew MS 603, fol. 151.
English norms of law, language, dress, and manner. In 1565, Elizabeth made her first Irish appointment, promoting Sussex’s second-in-command and former Edwardian councilor Henry Sidney to mend a “world overrun with brambles and replenished with ravening beasts” as deputy, replete with authority to declare martial law, root out arch-rebel Shane O’Neill, and erect a Star Chamber upon his 1566 arrival—all evidence of tightening grip and Anglicization that ultimately provoked the Desmond Rebellion. By mid-1567, Sidney reported success, commenting that “considering the infancy of any good order in that country,” he was encouraged by “the great increase of tillage,” quiet, and obedience.

The appointment of this subordinate member of the Somerset circle—epitomized by Cecil and Smith—brought its tenets to bear on 1560s and 70s Ireland, as its participants steadily advocated and brought to fruition a series of historically-rooted, joint public-private colonial plots. By prioritizing a mid-Tudor era, these schemes emerge as a sinew in the history of the early British Empire, connecting Atlantic projects in the first half of the century to those in its second half and illustrating the interconnectivity, mutual reinforcement, and contingency of Tudor imperium.

Most immediately, these experiments originated in the writings of Palesman Rowland White, who drew heavily on More’s Utopia, Wooings propaganda, and the tumultuous atmosphere of the 1550s to offer a treatise on the situation of Ireland c. 1569. Styling himself

---

187 The plot is described in detail in Richard Dunlop, “The Plantation of Leix and Offaly,” English Historical Review 6, no. 21 (January, 1891): 61-96, on 71-3.
188 For “world overrun...,” see Elizabeth to Sidney, 8 March 1566, TNA: PRO SP 63/16/69; for the details of his appointment, see “A particular instruction by Queen Eliz. To Sidney,” 9 July 1565, TNA: PRO SP 63/14/6. On the new deputy, see Brady, Chief Governors, 113-58.
190 Canny first appreciated White and his significance, arguing that the writer first revived More’s agriculturalist argument and specifically applied it to Ireland in “the most comprehensive analysis of the social and political condition of sixteenth-century Ireland made by an Irish-born contemporary,” see Canny, “Rowland White’s Discourse Touching Ireland,” Irish Historical Studies 20 (1977): 439-63, quotation from 439. However, Canny did
as a mediator between his Anglo-Irish brethren and new English administrators elevated by Mary, White responded explicitly to the xenophobic, nationalistic theory of English superiority present since Poynings and sharpened in the 1540s-50s, reasoning that despite unequivocally barbarous Gaels, all Irish were inclined towards civility; they need only be introduced to it via British plantation, conversion, and education, which together would function as a “counterpoise” to incivility and maintain “Englyshlike” society.\textsuperscript{191} White too hit all of the inducements now standard throughout the mid-Tudor Atlantic, describing a well-endowed island of staples and luxury goods that would render the empire self-sufficient and profitable, while reaffirming “her Majesties Ymperiall power and authoritie.”\textsuperscript{192}

So when funding and the threat of O’Neill’s uprising made a passage search untenable in 1566, Ireland appealed to Gilbert. There, with Cecil’s help and a cohort of Richard Grenville, Warham St. Leger, and Peter Carew, he found much of what had attracted him to the north Atlantic, and applied much the same plan—Ireland too was a western island, closer to England than the rest of Europe, entailed to the Tudors by history, with plenty of minerals, victuals, fish, and other commodities necessary at home, peopled by “savadge barbarous infidels” in need of monarchy.\textsuperscript{193} In both, Britons must occupy, settlement, and implement their law, “for nacion and preservacion of thempire from conquest of spaniardes, frenche, and other nacions, nowe more

\textsuperscript{191} For “counterpoise,” see White, “Discours,” TNA: PRO SP 61/31/32, fol. 90v; for “Englyshlike,” see White, “Discours,” TNA: PRO SP 61/31/23, fol. 96r.

\textsuperscript{192} For Ireland’s commodities, see White, “Discours,” TNA: PRO SP 61/31/32, fol. 75v; for “her Majesties Ymperiall power and authoritie,” see White, “Discours,” TNA: PRO SP 61/31/32, fol. 79r.

\textsuperscript{193} Gilbert, “The Discourse of Ireland,” n.d. 1572, Carew MS 614, fol. 239.

not find a connection between Henrician and Elizabethan imperialism nor the influence of interim Marian and Edwardian activities. There is sufficient evidence of the White-Cecil-Smith connection. Four years before White forwarded the “Discours Touching Ireland,” n.d. (written c. 1569), to Cecil in March 1571 (now TNA: PRO SP 63/21/32, fols. 73-113), White sent him three other treatises. Though no longer extant, they intrigued Cecil, who invited the author to London. Though the two missed each other, Smith sent his brother to consult with White and Smith later became ward to White’s son (see Rowland’s son Nicholas White to Cecil, 10 May 1573, TNA: PRO SP 63/40/31).
perilous for England then when Callis was Englishe.” Sidney’s 1567 defeat of O’Neill had accomplished the military prerequisite, clearing the way for husbandmen, smiths, and fishermen to colonized, and thereby “stablishe those conttres with Englishe birth and government.”

By the time Sidney approved the colony, the First Desmond Rebellion was underway. Instead of planting, the deputy sent Gilbert to beat the Irish into bloody submission; the captain obliged, for “no Conquered nation will ever yelde willinglie their obedience.” The deed won Gilbert a knighthood, a wealthy wife, and a parliamentary seat. His decision to use all three sources of income and sway towards America suggests that for practical considerations (the uprising lasted to 1573, its sequel soon underway) or preference, Gilbert favored Newfoundland over Ireland, though contemporaries spotted reinforcing “martiall affayres… both in this Realme and in forreigne Nations,” to ensure the home nation is not “naked and altogether unfurnished” in the two projects.

Similarly and concurrently, the inability to mount a project in one part of the historic imperium precipitated parallel experimentation in another part, a testament to the interconnectivity of early British Empire. A key member of the Somerset circle and Wooings
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194 Gilbert, “Discourse of Ireland,” n.d. 1572, Carew MS 614, fol. 239. Warham was former-deputy St. Leger’s son. I find that when historians Hiram Morgan and George Hill dub these 1565-75 projects a prelude to the enterprise of Ulster, they overemphasize what follows and overlook an essential prehistory. Closely tied to previous experience, these plans were an explicit alternative to extensive, perpetual royal garrisoning and crown-financed settlement, both cited as “intolerable for her Majestie” by the deputy, see Sidney to Elizabeth, 12 November 1568, TNA: PRO SP 63/26/18. Launched by private syndicate, these plots were not novel in their advocacy of large-scale colonization or their private approach; these were, however, the first carried out, though only after considerable vacillation between 1565 and 1570. See George Hill, An historical Account of the MacDonnells of Antrim (London: Archer: 1873) and Hiram Morgan, “The Colonial Venture of Sir Thomas Smith in Ulster, 1571-1575,” The Historical Journal 28, no. 2 (1985): 261-278.

195 Elizabeth to Sidney, 11 June 1567, TNA: PRO SP 63/21/10. Elizabethan official Francis Knollys provided further detail for the scheme in his short tract, “Mr. Vicehamberlens opinion in certen causes of Irland,” 7 July 1567, TNA: PRO SP 63/21/56.


197 On Gilbert’s rapid advance in these years, see William Gilbert Gosling, The Life of Sir Humphrey Gilbert (London: Constable, 1911), 74-76.

198 For “martiall affayres… both in…,” see George Gascoigne’s epistle to the reader in his edition Gilbert’s A discourse of a discouerie for a new passage to Cataia. Written by Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Knight (London: 1576), STC 11881, sig. ¶iii v; for “naked and altogether unfurnished,” see Gascoigne, Discourse of discouerie, sig. ¶ii v.
veteran, Smith lagged behind Cecil in appreciating Le Havre’s failure as a deathblow to his queen’s “ancient title,” still demanding surrender of Calais in mid-1567.\textsuperscript{199} Groping for an alternative, Smith found it in Ireland, receiving his grant just months after his November 1567 return—the doom of his embassy and Tudor empire in France ultimately advanced another, more westerly plot.

Smith conceptualized his nation as a godly commonweal compassed by an empire comparable to and inherited from Britain’s Greek and Roman ancestors.\textsuperscript{200} After requisite national consolidation, Smith justified the creation of an “empire” on five points: precedent; superiority (charging that the “pollitique and civill doe maister the rest...[endowed with] soueraygntie ouer the rude and vnlearned”); environment (all islands requires items from beyond the sea); economy (isolation breeds impoverishment); and demography (a release valve for excess population).\textsuperscript{201} First conceived in the 1540s, Smith’s theory convinced the mid-1560s court to reassert its Irish rule, contending that the island needed “nothing more than to have colonies [to] augment our tongue, our laws, and our religion, which three be the true bonds of the commonweal whereby the Romans conquered the world.”\textsuperscript{202} At his death, Smith would leave

\textsuperscript{199} Smith to Cecil, 22 September 1562, TNA: PRO SP 70/44/770.
\textsuperscript{200} Smith, \textit{A Discourse of the Common Weal}, as transcribed and printed from the original manuscript at Cambridge University with the MS pagination in Elizabeth Lamond, ed., \textit{A Discourse of the Common Weal of This Realm of England} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893). Published in London in 1581, references to the Enclosure Commission suggest that the writer was describing Somerset’s England c. 1549. The text adopted a dialogue between a doctor and a knight, mimicking classical philosophy and 1540s theory.
\textsuperscript{201} For the the importance of consolidation before empire-building, see Lamond, ed., Smith’s \textit{Discourse}, fol. 78v; for “empire,” see Lamond, ed., Smith’s \textit{Discourse}, fol. 10r; for antiquity as Britain’s precedent, see Lamond, ed., Smith’s \textit{Discourse}, fol. 10v; for “pollitique and civill...,” see Lamond, ed., Smith’s \textit{Discourse}, fol. 10r; for the importance of island geography, see Lamond, ed., Smith’s \textit{Discourse}, fols. 27v and 36r-37v; for the economic rationale, see Lamond, ed., Smith’s \textit{Discourse}, fols. 27r and 46v; for the demographic impetus, see Lamond, ed., Smith’s \textit{Discourse}, fol. 28r.
behind a large map of Britain and Ireland painted under a single, domed Tudor crown. It was precisely the image he had spent a career trying to turn into a political reality.

On the heels of a domestic treatise lauding common law as the ideal backbone for Roman-style imperial commonweal, it all came together in Ulster’s Ards Peninsula, where Smith argued that conquest by ancient Britons, entailments to Plantagenet heir Elizabeth of York (the queen’s namesake), Henrician dissolution, and native incivility and revolt had prepared the land, just as providential prosperity overpopulated the home nation. Though he had never been there, Smith depicted an Edenic land of waterways, fish, timber, and wool, apt for English garrisons, plantation, and governance, for his prospective planters, refracting canned descriptions from earlier exploits and poising them for reuse. Elevating antiquity, the humanist ascertained in a letter to current Irish lord deputy William Fitzwilliam, that “by histories how England was as uncivil as Ireland until colonies of Romans brought their laws and orders.” Centered on a new Tudor-style colonial city named Elizabeth, Smith would now similarly recreate England, exclaiming “How say you now, have I not set forth to you another Eutopia?” A petition to the crown and royal patent for 360,000 acres followed.

By May 1572, Smith had 800 colonists, whittled down to a hundred by their summer departure. Despite protestations that it “neither sought to expel or destroy the Irish race,” but
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203 On the map, see Dewar, Thomas Smith, 118-9.
204 Smith, A letter sent by I.B. Gentleman... wherein is conteined a large discourse of the peopling & inhabiting the cuntrie called the Ardes, and other adiacent in the north of Ireland (London: 1572), STC 1048, especially sigs. A3v-B2r. For the domestic tract, see Smith, De Republica Anglorum (written c. 1562-1565 and circulated widely in manuscript before its publication in London: 1583), STC 22857. On the tract’s circulation and date, see L. Alston, ed., Thomas Smith’s De Republica Anglorum (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906), xiii-liii.
205 Smith, A letter, sigs. E3v-E4r.
207 Smith, A letter, sig. E1r.
rather to order and teach, the colony met native resistance: Smith’s commander (and son) was murdered that fall by his Irish servants.\footnote{Smith to Fitzwilliam, 8 November 1572, as quoted in Quinn, “Smith and English Colonial Theory,” 553.} Smith preserved his patent with a new venture in 1574, but tempered his vision, all civilizing rhetoric dropped as he confessed to Cecil that trade and its security by occupation were his sole ends.\footnote{Smith to Cecil, n.d. 1574, TNA: PRO SP 63/26/18.} But against formidable Gaelic Scots and Desmond rebels who also swallowed up the much larger Antrim project launched by Essex, Smith’s experiment fell apart, though not before imbuing participants and observers with seminal knowledge, theory, and experience.\footnote{Sponsored by a mix of public and private men, control, and finance, yet little systematic scheming or promotion, Essex’s venture was little more than a bloody, costly two and a half year war. For the connection between the Smith and Essex ventures and a more detailed study of Smith’s, see Hiram Morgan, “The Colonial Venture of Sir Thomas Smith,” \textit{Historical Journal} 28, no. 2 (June 1985): 261-278.}

Smith’s schemes informed a retort by the first Desmond rebels that advanced an anti-English, anti-Protestant counter-imperial ideology begun by Kildare in 1535, a rejoinder to Tudor justifications that aligned British identity, religion, and empire. Benefitting from Elizabeth’s recent excommunication, Desmond sold revolt as divine retribution for Elizabeth’s “unjust possession of these kingdoms, which she useth for the chief instruments of her impieties.”\footnote{“Declaration of James FitzMorrice FitzGerald [Desmond] to the prelates, princes, lords, and people of Ireland when he entered into rebellion,” n.d. 1569, Carew MS 607, fol. 35.} Though the crown won out, the mid-Tudor period had solidified the theory of an Irish Catholic holy war against British imperialism.

Thanks to Cecil and decades of experience lauded by Gilbert and Dee, Ireland’s pacification in 1573 paved the way for Newfoundland’s dominance in Tudor adventure through 1583. However, three intertwined events that occurred on the eve of Desmond’s rebellion in 1568 fundamentally influenced Britain’s New World project, expanding its geographical sights, furthering its anti-Spanish cast, and determining the course of Elizabeth’s middle and last decades.
As Camden explained, first, at San Juan de Ulúa, the Spanish routed and pillaged Hawkins’s third expedition, incurring the wrath of English soldiers and mariners who fretted and demanded retribution. Next, Philip’s occupation of Antwerp drove the Merchant Adventurers from their hub and Dutch Protestants into England to escape Habsburg rule. Lastly, Frenchman Dominique de Gourgues revenged the Fort Caroline massacre by destroying St. Augustine. Though he did not stay to take back the land, word of the powerful support De Gourgues had received from local tribes hostile to the Spanish spread—a potent lesson in the utility of indigenous aid and compelling proof for Black Legend propagandists. All three moments escalated the Anglo-Iberian rivalry, forced Elizabeth into a more offensive posture in continental Europe, particularly to protect fellow Protestants, and led her merchants to seek new markets and goods. When Philip issued an embargo, cutting the English off from goods they had become reliant on since 1553, and directed his inquisition to detain British mariners, Tudor Atlantic piracy reached new heights. For Habsburg envoys in London, it was “disgusting to hear Cecil talk of the Queen [as if] no other Christian prince is a king but she!”

Promoters at home responded, most notably Thomas Hackett, who continued his work to translate French intelligence with Thevet’s *Newe founde worlde*, dedicated to Irish lord deputy Sidney. A nationalist, historical plea for empire, Hackett rallied a classical definition of civility perpetuated by Romulus and Caesar, which associated politic law and cultural vitality

---

214 On the importance of 1568 in the Dutch Revolt and the broader context, see Martin van Gelderen, *The Political Thought of the Dutch Revolt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 30-45; on the Merchant Adventurers reaction specifically, see G.D. Ramsay, *The Queen’s Merchants and the Revolt of the Netherlands* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), especially 34-84.  
217 Thomas Hackett’s translation of André Thevet, *The new found worlde, or Antarctike, wherin is contained ownderufl and strange things... And now newly translated into Enlishe* (London: 1568), STC 23950, 1-138.
with territorial expansion and a godly “bridling of the Barbarous and wicked.”"\textsuperscript{218} Hackett counseled that before cosmography, good governance, Anglicanism, and imperialism, the British were precisely such naked, brutish, servile creatures—a state they were dangerously close to repeating should Elizabethans fail to propagate their civility in pleasant, fruitful places eager for reform like Ireland or America. There was no middle ground between nation and empire, each required and reinforced the other. “Leau[e] the Pleasaunt bedde of Delicacie,” he implored, abandon yourselves to “boystrous seas, to the hap of vnconstante windes, to the chayre of fortune, and finally to a thousande imminent euils, onely to encrease the fame and good renownme of their countrey.”\textsuperscript{219} There, they would occupy beyond where the Iberians currently resided, in the dominions discovered by “Sebastian Babat an Englisheman.”\textsuperscript{220} Hackett’s point only echoed louder at the dawn of the next decade, when Spanish Jesuits settled Ajacán – later Virginia – and rumors of docile, easily-converted natives and an entrance to China leaked into Westminster.\textsuperscript{221}

The image of Habsburg minions converting poor, wild brutes fed a rising tide of British anti-Catholicism, extant from 1553 but exacerbated by a confluence of pan-European events: 1569’s Northern Rising of English Catholic earls aimed at installing Mary Queen of Scots in place of her Tudor cousin; Elizabeth’s 1570 excommunication, which rejected her titles, released her subjects from allegiance, and pre-pardoned regicide; and 1572’s St Bartholomew’s Day Massacre. This interrelated set of events provoked rapid response, which sought to nullify Mary Stewart’s claims to political authority, dub all Protestants loyalists and all Catholics traitors, and

\textsuperscript{218} Hackett, \textit{New found worlde}, sig. ii v.
\textsuperscript{219} For “Leau[e] the Pleasaunt bedde of Delicacie,” see Hackett, \textit{New found worlde}, sig. iii r; for “boystrous seas…,” see Hackett, \textit{New found worlde}, sig. iii v.
\textsuperscript{220} Hackett, \textit{New found worlde}, sig. R2r.
\textsuperscript{221} For an example of these Spanish reports, see “Letter of Luis de Quirós and Juan Baptista de Segura, from Ajacán, September 12, 1570,” reprinted in full with translation in C.M. Lewis and Albert Loomie, eds., \textit{Buckington Smith Papers}, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953), 2:85-94.
further entrench a British nationalism linked to confession. As historian Anne McLaren has shown, the result was an “associational triad of militant Protestantism, English national identity, and loyalty to a virginal Elizabeth” promoted via the written word, alongside laws drafted by Cecil to exclude Catholics from parliament and from the succession and exact further recusancy penalties.222 These ideas had imperial significance in an Atlantic frame. Not only did they render Tudor Empire more necessary and godly, but also engendered the first dissident colonial plots for Ireland—a means by which to rid the nation of non-Anglicans, retain loyal subjects, solidify international territorial claims, and propagate secular Britishness abroad. In 1569 and 1572, Thomas Gerrard proposed to re-settle Lancashire Catholics in Ireland in exchange for toleration, while George Carlton offered to send over 3000 puritans to live under Elizabeth’s crown and temporal law.223

***

At this point, such intellectual foment remained just that—ideas. Indeed in many ways, this reflects the nature of mid-Tudor empire, a period that was more about ideology, rhetoric, scheming, and unfulfilled theory, a consequence of the crisis that so many have found in the period. However, as this chapter has shown, here was a critical three-decade period of transition, predicated on westerly interest in an expanded New World, Spanish rivalry, Protestantism, and mixed enterprise. It was this mid-Tudor empire that portended an experimental turn in Ireland and America, apparent as the sixteenth century entered its final quarter.

222 MacLaren, “Gender, Religion, and Early Modern Nationalism,” American Historical Review 107, no. 3 (June, 2002): 739-767, quotation from 758. For a similar argument, see John Guy, Queen of Scots: The True Life of Mary Stuart (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004), 450-1.
223 On these plots, see D.B. Quinn, “The First Pilgrims,” William and Mary Quarterly 23, no. 3 (July, 1966): 359-390, especially 360-361.
“The very path trodden by your ancestors”: Elizabethan Imperial Experimentation in Ireland, Newfoundland, and Virginia, 1574-1588

When Sir Walter Ralegh received an epistle dedicatory written for him in the spring of 1586, Tudor subjects were engaged in empire-building in three overlapping geographies across the Atlantic World: Ireland, Newfoundland, and Virginia. The eminent Elizabethan favorite held the patent to the last and most recent among them, where he had sent two voyages to date. One of them, replete with British colonists to settle Roanoke, ostensibly still remained there. The Virginia project served to raise Ralegh’s public profile and alert a European-wide audience to the imperial aspirations of his monarch, spurring onlookers to reach out to the courtier—and, by extension, his queen—in the hopes of securing some sort of patronage (perhaps a trip to London, perhaps place at court, perhaps a stake in the venture). Such was the case when French Huguenot Martin Basanier addressed his new edition of René de Laudonnière’s *L’histoire notable de la Floride* (1586) to Ralegh that March: “I am assured,” he declared, that further familiarity with America will be both pleasing and rewarding, hardening the British desire to persist in the New World, to continue to “follow the very path trodden by your ancestors when they have desired to profit their realms, immortalize their names and, in the end, attain to the glory of God.”¹ The Elizabethan imperial laboratory had penetrated at least as far afield as Basanier’s home in Paris; even an outsider, studying the progress of British imperialism from abroad, could perceive of the current Tudor climate of experimentation and quickening, ideological and applied.²

Though a Frenchman, Basanier’s words reveal a great deal about the configuration of Virginia in the mental map of Elizabethan Britain, Europe, and the burgeoning Atlantic World,

² Basanier had received the Laudonnière manuscript from Richard Hakluyt, who likely clued Basanier into this atmosphere. Then preparing his own English translation of the same work, Hakluyt had come by the manuscript from André Thevet, see Peter Mancall, *Hakluyt’s Promise: An Elizabethan’s Obsession for an English America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 170-1.
his forthright yet also purposefully vague prose an instructive analytical gateway. When he noted “your ancestors,” Basanier invoked not only Ralegh’s half-brother, Humphrey Gilbert, but also Elizabeth’s royal predecessors since Henry VII. Traveling in their footsteps, which lent legitimacy and justification, Ralegh’s enterprise sought honor and profit for the nation, empire, and the reformed faith. With essential royal aid, his men had uncovered new land south of Cape Breton—the historic locus of British activity—planting and naming the area for the queen, two proofs of Tudor possession. With his flattery, Basanier redoubled Britain’s past claims and future rights, contributing to a rich, homegrown Tudor imperial literature. And, the very next year, that literature grew even more, when Englishman Thomas Greepe celebrated the same British Empire, and Ralegh’s project in particular, as a “happy success.”

For Basanier and Greepe, who lacked the benefit and burden of foresight, Elizabethan Virginia constituted a joyful success, for the Tudor polity and empire, its crown and Church, built on the basis of previous activity and part of a pre-existing, lively imperial Atlantic. Though rhetorically hyperbolic, these writers privilege a contemporary meaning and significance of the Roanoke colonies and related, concurrent projects to reveal a new, quite different appreciation of early Virginia, the 1580s more generally, and their importance for the history of the early British Empire.

***

This chapter argues for the significance of a critical experimental moment—a moment of intense exploration, discovery, and on-the-ground projects launched alongside a concerted, specific propaganda campaign—in the middle of Queen Elizabeth I’s reign. Upon defeat of the
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3 Basanier, L’histoire, sig. A2v.
4 Basanier, L’histoire, sig. A3r.
5 Greepe, The true and perfecte newes of the woorthy and valiaunt exploytes, performed and doone by that valiant knight Syr Francis Drake (London: 1587), STC 12343, sig. C2v. As his title indicates, Greepe’s subject was Drake, however in recounting the captain’s rescue of the first Roanoke colony, he made this comment on imperial progress.
Desmond Rebellion in 1573, interest coalesced around Ireland, Newfoundland, and Virginia, producing a flurry of activity that realized a quarter-century of ideological rumblings and lasted until the Spanish Armada set sail. With essential royal and courtly support, these projects sought to reestablish a legendary British Empire in an expanded Atlantic frame, following in the ancestral wake, as Basanier recognized.

Implicitly and explicitly, the 1580s ventures borrowed from the past, developed features new to the 1550s and 1560s (like collaborative public-private adventure, new Irish plantation, colonization by religious dissidents, and anti-Iberian sentiment), and at times radicalized discourse or changed course in response to new circumstances. This chapter, then, connects Tournai, the Wooings, mid-Tudor crisis, and 1580s experimentation via a winding and often indirect, yet highly meaningful and discernable new narrative. With this contextualization, it shows why contemporaries appreciated Gilbert’s Newfoundland and Ralegh’s Virginia as the triumphal culmination of theory and practice garnered over the dynasty, fruitful in achieving the gains and ends of their backers, as Greepe posited. By underlining ventures traditionally labeled as failures, losses, or prerequisites to subsequent, permanent, Stuart-era colonization and noting

---

6 With the exception of its Ireland theater, this boom was first noted by Kenneth R. Andrews, who identified c. 1570-1587 a “seed-time, a phase of ambitious projects, most of which came to nothing. In practical terms it was a false start, which gained its aura of brilliance from effective publicity.” Though I also find a significant, overlooked moment in oceanic expansion, I disagree with Andrew’s “proto-imperial” label and geographical disassociation, see Andrews, “Beyond the Line Equinoctial: England and South America in the Sixteenth Century,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth Studies* 10, no. 1 (1980): 4-24, quotations from 4. For Ireland, Nicholas Canny highlighted the importance of Henry Sidney’s concomitant deputyship, arguing that with the first systematic, comprehensive, consistent policy of garrisoning and New English colonization, Sidney constituted a “new departure” and created a revolutionary program of conquest, see Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established*, 1565-1576 (NY: Barnes and Noble, 1976), quotation from 45. Conversely, Ciaran Brady cited a “lack of originality… replete with the rhetoric of change,” positing that Sidney summarized contemporary conventional wisdom and never departed from Sussex’s practice, see Brady, *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536-1588* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), quotation from 118. Though I do not find the major shift under Sussex that Brady did, this chapter works in his vein to contextualize Sidney as part of a broader, decade-long experimental wave that adopted old models with new invective—a sort of middle-ground between Canny and Brady lost in an Ireland-only approach.
them as successful manifestations of earlier experience, they become mid-way points in a far lengthier British imperial story—only facets (rather than the whole) of Tudor imperialism.  

***

When longtime-rival clans the Butlers and the Geraldines rose in collective revolt against the crown in Ireland from mid-1569 through early 1573, the rebels had multiple causes for disobedience. Targeting English lord deputies Henry Sidney, John Perrot, Peter Carew, and all who fell in line with their Anglicizing, Protestant administration, specific grievances against a regime that planted strangers on their lands, destroyed traditional Gaelic culture, and preferred Protestant preachers ballooned. Both sides propagated a broad ideological banner of Protestant, Tudor British imperialism.  

The Irish uprising merged powerfully with 1569’s Northern Rising in England, Elizabeth’s 1570 excommunication, and 1571’s Ridolfi Plot to take on a distinctly anti-English, Catholic Gaelic flavour. Elizabethans charged that unclothèd rebels murdered, stripped, and hung Englishmen; raped peasant women inside churches before their husbands and fathers; and set

---

7 An anomaly in colonial American, imperial, and Atlantic historiography that omits sixteenth-century British in the New World, the study of Roanoke stems from the ease with which it fits the conventional narrative: its location in the modern U.S., late-century date, and colonial complexion do not disrupt the entrenched reluctance to name pre-1585, non-settlement projects elsewhere as “imperial.” Chief for Roanoke’s persistence, however, is its mysterious allure (we still do not know quite what happened) as well as its seemingly linear connection to Jamestown’s success. D.B. Quinn first argued for Roanoke’s primacy, see Quinn, *Set Fair for Roanoke* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985). Tellingly, Karen Ordahl Kupperman and James Horn each wrote a pair of books (one on Roanoke, one on Jamestown) ascertaining that, as Kupperman put it, “Roanoke’s enduring contributions [were] the lessons that made Jamestown and the later colonies possible,” Kupperman, *Roanoke: The Abandoned Colony* (NY: Rowman and Littlefield, 2nd edn., 2007), quotation from 173; Kupperman, *The Jamestown Project* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2007); Horn, *A Kingdom Strange* (NY: Basic Books, 2010); Horn *A Land as God Made it: Jamestown and the Birth of America* (NY: Basic Books, 2005). Though highlighting the importance of contingency and experimentation in early empire, in both cases, Jamestown is perpetually waiting in the wings. As this chapter attempts to break the tacit attachment of Roanoke to Jamestown and connect the former to equally-related Tudor projects elsewhere, our historical and historiographical goals differ.

children on fire—all evidence, they contended, of innate Irish incivility, rage, and tyranny. After Irishmen declared that the medieval papal donation of Ireland to the English crown null and void and offered it to Philip II in exchange for aid, a Habsburg alliance further kindled the flames of rebellion. The resultant crusading rhetoric only solidified the insurgency's religious invective and substantiated the Marian theory of a natural Spanish-Gaelic bond based on common barbaric ancestry. Playing right into the hands of a mid-Tudor courtly contingent dedicated to a historic British imperialism and a xenophobic narrative of Iberian-Irish Catholic threats to nation and empire, the revolt raised the specter of anti-Spanish imperial ideology as propounded by Richards Eden and others over the last decades and sanctioned an uncompromising reply. Sidney and his British troops—English officers like Humphrey Gilbert and a core from the West Country, Wales, and Scottish borderlands—put entire native Irish strongholds to the sword and terrorized survivors elsewhere.

The widespread, robust Desmond uprising not only disrupted 1560s colonization and provided a stage for up-and-coming soldiers, but also lent fodder to a nationalist Anglicizing discourse and sanctioned an intensified approach. Perpetuated in his second term, Sidney’s new militarism patently rejected the gradual conciliation promoted by Anthony St. Leger and

---

9 Reports of these occurrences include “Sidney’s Book” (his diary), which has been printed in full as Ciaran Brady, ed., *A Viceroy’s Vindication? Sir Henry Sidney’s Memoir of Service in Ireland, 1556-1578* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2002), see especially 62; Carew’s report to Elizabeth, 21 June 1569, The National Archives (TNA), Public Record Office (PRO), State Papers (SP), document reference number 63/28/45; Thomas Cantwell to Sidney, 21 June 1569, TNA: PRO SP 63/28/46; and an anon. report, n.d. 1569, TNA: PRO SP 63/29/70. All subsequent citations from TNA: PRO will follow this standard format of department code (e.g. SP) and document reference number. If a document contains any internal numbering, the internal reference (i.e. folio number) is provided following the full document reference number.

10 The exchange with Philip is discussed in Edmund Butler to his brother, the earl of Ormond, 24 August 1569, TNA: PRO SP 63/29/47 and “Proclamation of James Geraldine concerning the justice of that war he wageth in Ireland for the faith,” n.d. (1570?), Carew MS 607, fol. 40. The latter particularly emphasized that Pope Pius V’s excommunication of Elizabeth deprived this “patroness of heresies, of all royal power and dominion,” see “Proclamation of James Geraldine,” Carew MS 607, quotation from fol. 40. William Camden reproduced the March 1570 bull, *Regnans in excelsis*, in his *Annales the true and royall history of the famous empress Elizabeth...* (London: 1625), STC 4497, 245-8. For the Habsburg alliance kindling rebellion, see Camden, *Annales*, 226.

clergymen Adam Loftus and Robert Weston. With roots in the transition described in chapter four, a convergence of imperial and civil rebellion, rhetoric, European conspiracy, perceived threats, and opportunity stimulated the project, bolstered by Edwardian and Marian theorists who lent him the tools, rationale, and motivation to challenge passive, moderate, or private visions. Though not novel, a penultimate Tudor phase was underway—an Atlantic-wide British imperial pattern forged in the 1550s-60s and manifest in the late-1570s, that was unequivocally and self-consciously based on precedent, promoted with increased fervor, determination, and trial.

Sidney’s Ireland and mutually-reinforcing, related projects provided an immediate background for 1580s adventure, lending ideology, experience, and finance.

William Cecil, now Lord Burghley, readily admitted, even at the height of the Irish rising, that the threat of Mary Queen of Scots subsumed all other concerns. However, the statesman’s historical knowledge and experience in the 1540s proved how closely entwined the Isles were, England’s superior right to them all, and the likely outcome of continental European intervention there. After all, as he had observed first hand, the French had interfered in Scotland with disastrous consequences for England in the Wooings. Consequently, Burghley’s reluctance to intercede in Ireland gave way in 1574-5. Queen and council levied 2,000 Welsh troops, dispatched an expedition under Francis Drake that massacred the entire population of Rathlin.

---


13 This is a revision of Canny’s interpretation, see Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland*, especially 92, 161-3.

14 As he expressed to Sidney, in Burghley to Sidney, 15 December 1568, TNA: PRO SP 63/26/57. Hereafter, I refer to William Cecil as Lord Burghley (created 1571) to avoid confusion with his son, Robert.

15 For the shift inaugurated in 1574-5, see Privy Council (PC) to Fitzwilliam, 20 June 1574, TNA: PRO SP 63/46/69 and Walsingham to Burghley, 1 June 1577, TNA: PRO SP 63/58/43. For Burghley, this was a marked evolution of his 1560s thought. While the 1560s illustrate the use of joint public-private colonization, an emphasis on quick self-finance, and consistent rejection of evangelical reformation, Burghley had begun to express fears that all of this would provoke dangerous disobedience (see Loftus to Burghley, 2 July 1570, TNA: PRO SP 63/30/64). Ultimately, Desmond’s Rebellion, the queen’s excommunication, Ireland’s Spanish alliance, and the Ridolfi Plot to place Mary Queen of Scots on the English throne also allowed Sidney and the earl of Leicester to conspire to oust Deputy Fitzwilliam, who favored Loftus, Weston, and Anglo-Irish home rule, in 1575. Sidney took his place, see below.
Island off Ulster for resisting settlement, enforced Elizabethan spiritual legislation, and reinstated Sidney, all to pacify and rebuild the imperium in rebellion’s wake. With these moves, the crown rejected its current deputy, the Loftus-Weston program, and the idea that there was any real difference between the Anglo- and Gaelic Irish that made the former suitable, useful partners in Irish rule. Sidney resolved to return to the place “I cursed, hated and detested, and yet confess with supposition that I could do that which had not been done before, and in great hope hit where others had missed.”

Sidney arrived with a nation-wide reform scheme for Ireland’s brutish, lamentable state, as maintained by Papist usurpers “upon the gain of masses, dirges, shrivings and such like trumpery, godly abolished by your majesty” throughout her dominions. Devised with help from Burghley’s client Edmund Tremayne and the crown, the plot struck at native custom, Anglicized by English faith, law, taxation, and property ownership, recommenced plantation and garrisoning, extended royal prerogative. In sum, it addressed the perceived abuses of religion, culture, and governance that crippled the island with new urgency and intensity, the first of the mid-Elizabethan Atlantic projects.

---

16 For the massacre, which took place on 26 July 1575, see the earl of Essex’s report to Elizabeth, 12 August 1575, Carew MS 628, fol. 230. On these brutal events and historical interpretations of them, see Canny, Elizabethan Conquest, 121; Karl S. Bottigheimer, Ireland and the Irish (NY: Columbia University Press, 1982), 30; Richard A. McCabe, Spenser’s Monstrous Regimen: Elizabethan Ireland and the Poetics of Difference (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 223; Thomas Herron, Spenser’s Irish Work: Poetry, Plantation, and Colonial Reformation (Burlington: Ashgate, 2007), 19-20, especially 20, n.12.
18 Sidney to Elizabeth describing the diocese of Meath, 28 April 1576, TNA: PRO SP 63/55/38. The crown reappointed Sidney with detailed instructions, see Elizabeth and PC to Sidney, 2 August 1575, Carew MS 614, fol. 29.
19 For the plot, laid out over the course of five surviving documents, see Edmund Tremayne, “Touchinge the state of Ireland,” 30 June 1571, TNA: PRO SP 63/32/64; Tremayne, “Causes why Ireland is not reformed,” n.d. June 1571, TNA: PRO SP 63/32/65; Tremayne, “Notes and Propositions for the Reformation of Ireland,” n.d. June 1571, TNA: PRO SP 63/32/66; “Advice in Tremayne’s hand touching the cess extorted in Ireland,” 26 February 1572, TNA: PRO SP 63/35/65; and Tremayne, “Undated book on the government of Ireland,” n.d., British Library (BL) Additional (hereafter Add.) MS 48015, fols. 274-279. Tremayne had previously supplied his ideas directly to Burghley and likely received feedback on them, which partly explains the subtle differences between his earlier and later writings. For his earlier ideas, many of which saw play here, see Tremayne to Cecil, 12 April 1570, TNA: PRO...
Burghley was wooed by the plan because it fit an evolved, post-rebellion mentality. In the midst of the uprising, Burghley had received another tract by Rowland White. In it, the Palesman had declared that all Old English were obedient; their poor behavior stemmed only from ignorance of “His worde which they never here truly taught nor can for lack of good mynysters.” The councilor was convinced by the spiritual point, but unlike a decade earlier, he was unswayed by the basic premise. Now, a vote for Sidney was a vote against White. In Sidney’s scheme, as adopted from and first mapped out by Tremayne, all Irishborn were “stubborn, rude and most barbarous,” steeped in wickedness and sin, Anglo-Irish and Gaels alike. Like the rest of Sidney’s program, New English dominance and colonization were not new to 1575; the climate had, however, occasioned a turn away from alternatives and a resolute embrace of this clone of the unadulterated 1550s Leix-Offaly schemes.

Sidney’s experiment began in the religious sphere. Relying on notes from Tremayne and the Anglican Bishop of Meath that the country was devoid of God and spiritual morality, the deputy recommended that the queen abandon her Irish episcopate and send over a handful of grave, learned, and venerable churchmen from home, rebuilding the apostleship with superior subjects. After some initial anxiety on the part of the privy council, by 1577, the crown was on

---

20 White, “The dysorders of the Irissherye,” n.d. 1571, TNA: PRO SP 63/1/72, fols. 165r-176v, especially fol. 165r.
21 White, “Dysorders,” n.d. 1571, fol. 168v. Interestingly, while White wrote to Burghley in 1571, the government momentarily pursued then abandoned another earlier policy, Henry VIII’s surrender and regrant. The only Elizabethan example of the practice I have been able to find, an 11 February 1571 indenture with the O’Farroll clan (Carew MS 611, fol. 170) rehearsed the Henrician form of surrender to the crown, utter disavowal of Gaelic law, and return of the land for rent and fee to the Exchequer, and fit the theoretical outlines of Fitzwilliam’s deputyship.
board and Sidney moved ahead, relying extensively on the wide power of the royal supremacy.

With several new English Protestant clerics—all educated in the studia humanitatis that grounded Tudor imperial ideology—the deputy created a new court of faculties, which merged the archbishop of Canterbury’s Faculty Office and Prerogative Court to subsume multiple bishopric functions under English leadership and tight control. He then reconstituted the 1568 Loftus-Weston ecclesiastical commission as a new high commission, to levy and collect fines, punish reformation statute violations, and fight recusancy among Ireland’s “obstinate papists.”

A careful manipulation of past policy, the body nearly doubled royal incomes. Though Sidney’s tenure ended just one year later, his actions were so extensive and destructive that they prohibited a return to progressive or limited religious reformation, setting a powerful precedent in the late-1570s.

Most important to the crown, however, was debt reduction—that is, the transformation of Ireland from a drain to a profitable holding, as propaganda had claimed it could be for decades. As Tremayne described, Sidney sought a regular, annual rent on the English model, a means to revenue, administration, and quiet in a country oppressed by (he contended) cruel, native

---

24 The new appointments, religious reform, and the authority stemming from the supremacy are described across correspondence, see Sidney to Walsingham, 15 June 1576, TNA: PRO SP 63/55/59; Loftus to Walsingham, 14 September 1576, TNA: PRO SP 63/56/37; Sidney to Walsingham, 20 September 1576, TNA: PRO SP 63/56/33.

25 For the court of faculties, erected in March 1577, see PC to Sidney, n.d. (c. 1576), TNA: PRO SP 63/55/63 and PC to Sidney, n.d. (c. 1576), TNA: PRO SP 63/55/64 (which first outlined its function); “Calendar of Fiants,” in Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records and Keeper of the State Papers in Ireland (Dublin: Thom, 1869-1920), Elizabeth I, entry 2996 (hereafter Cal Fiants reign, entry); and the crown letters patents to the newly-appointed English clerics George Acworth and Robert Gravey ceding ecclesiastical jurisdiction, both n.d. 1578, TNA: PRO SP 63/63/49 (Acworth patent) and TNA: PRO SP 63/63/50 (Gravey patent). Acworth was a graduate of Cambridge and Padua, see L.G.H. Horton-Smith, George Acworth (St. Albans: Compfield Press, 1953).

26 Edward Waterhouse to Walsingham, 31 May 1579, TNA: PRO SP 63/66/66. For the commission, created in May 1577, see Cal Fiants, Elizabeth I, 3074; “The opinion of her majesty’s learned council in the laws touching the validity of the ecclesiastical commission in Ireland,” n.d., TNA: PRO SP 63/71/12; and “The draft of the letters to the lords of the council in Ireland,” n.d., TNA: PRO SP 63/60/71. Unceremoniously excised from his former position, Loftus unsuccessfully petitioned the crown against the Sidney changes, see Loftus to Walsingham, 16 March 1577, TNA: PRO SP 63/57/36; Loftus to PC, 20 February 1579, TNA: PRO SP 63/65/342.

27 On these financial gains and this legacy, see Murray, Enforcing the Reformation, 297-310, especially 299.

28 Elizabeth to Sidney, 2 August 1575, Carew MS 614, fol. 29.
monetary exactions. Upon landing at Drogheda, the deputy declared his intent to replace the variable Gaelic cess, “which discontenteth every state,” with a low, uniform monetary-only tax, purely on “her Majesty’s prerogative [which] was such as she might impose a charge for defence of the country without parliament or grand council.” The argument was seminal: as the Irish chafed, hurrying to Westminster to protest the exactions as contrary to statute and poverty-inducing, Elizabeth defended the tax as wholly consistent with the “laws and ancient usage of the realm [and her] imperially crown…nothing but a prerogative of the prince.”

For Sidney and the court, Irish disobedience over the cess provided an opportunity to reassert the historic British Empire and, because Palesmen had been among its most vocal critics, proved the necessity of an entirely New English approach. Sidney’s council asserted that even Dublin’s Anglo-Irish were degenerate traitors, “blemished with the spots of the Irishry, the sundry good laws from age to age devised to wipe out those stains not executed.” Agreeing, Burghley encouraged the deputy to push consolidation after the national model via increased oversight and common law justice—after all, he had reasoned, “our own nation is grown so perfect that it need only export its own norms to reduce another territory to civility and order.

Sidney responded, calling parliament, shiring Munster, and installing an Elizabethan president to govern there, on the Welsh and Northern English model. Elsewhere, he created other New English constables and JPs to suppress the monasteries and Brehon custom, plant common law,

---

29 Tremayne, “Touchinge,” 30 June 1571, TNA: PRO SP 63/32/64.
31 Elizabeth to Sidney, 14 May 1576, Carew MS 628, fol. 271. For the Irish response to the cess and their protest, see “The Cesse,” 14 May 1576, Carew MS 628, fol. 271; Anon., “Memoranda on cess,” n.d. (c. 1576-7), TNA: PRO SP 63/55/12; “Petition of the Pale,” n.d. 1577, Carew MS 628, fol. 121; and Elizabethan Lord Chancellor of Ireland William Gerrard to Burghley, 1 November 1577, Carew MS 616, fol. 112.
32 Council of Ireland to Elizabeth, 12 September 1577, Carew MS 601, fol. 76.
33 Burghley to Sidney, n.d. 1576, TNA: PRO SP 63/39/40.
34 On the usefulness and limits of a comparison between Tudor Ireland and Wales in this period, see Brady, “Comparable Histories? Tudor Reform in Wales and Ireland,” in Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725, ed. Steven G. Ellis and Sarah Barber (London: Longman, 1995), 64-86.
and bring civil order to the island’s so-called rude savages.\footnote{35}{The crown directed Sidney to begin visitations of ecclesiastical lands, “being deformed and overthrown by the ruin of the temples, the dissipation and embezzling of the patrimony, and most of all for want of sufficient ministers,” see Elizabeth to Sidney 27 April 1576, Carew MS 601, quotation from fol. 54r. For each of the other directives, see Elizabeth to Sidney, 2 August 1575, BL Cotton MS Titus B.XII, fol. 155. For Sidney’s descriptions of the island’s inhabitants as rude and savage and for the progress of these reforms, see Sidney to PC “with an account of his journey through Connaught, the last of the 4 provinces, with the state thereof,” 28 April 1576, printed in Arthur Collins, ed., Letters and Memorials of State… written and collected by Henry Sydney, 2 vols. (London: Osborne, 1746), 1:102-110; Sidney to Walsingham, 20 June 1577, TNA: PRO SP 63/58/80. For further analysis of Sidney’s reform in these years, see Brady, Chief Governors, especially 146-166; Canny, Elizabethan Conquest, chapter five.} Justified not just according to precedent, but based on a specific early Tudor imperial model, official discourse drafted by the crown explicitly couched Sidney as Henrician Deputy William Skeffington reincarnate, pursuing policy first propounded by Henry VIII, but equally fitting forty years later.\footnote{36}{Crown instructions to Sidney, 29 May 1578, Carew MS 611, fol. 351.}

Watching the Pale bristle, the recently-defeated Desmond spotted an opening to curry continental support against the Tudor regime. Sidney manipulated the Irishman’s ostensible treason and the pan-Irish unrest he believed it portended to petition the crown for permanent garrisoning, as a less costly alternative to the £200,000 he estimated it would take to evict a foreign invasion.\footnote{37}{“Sir Henry Sydney to the Lords of the Councell, with a further account of his progress; from Waterford,” 16 December 1575, printed in Collins, ed., Letters and Memorials, 1:81-85, especially 1:83.} He received full power to seize and donate land under the royal seal and instructions to speedily resettle Leix-Offaly (still a crown priority) with “the race of th’English blood.”\footnote{38}{Crown instructions to Sidney, 2 August 1575, Carew MS 614, fol. 29.} But the deputy refused, contending that though all Irish needed to be expelled, everywhere, replaced with “good men, new and new, out of England to rule” as Tremayne had argued, Leix-Offaly simply was not worth it, the charge too great for its potential profits.\footnote{39}{For “good men…,” see Tremayne, “Advice in Tremayne’s hand,” 26 February 1572, TNA: PRO SP 63/35/65. For the deputy’s refusal and his argument regarding Leix-Offaly’s cost, see Sidney to PC, 15 December 1575, Carew MS 601, fol. 42. The deputy reiterated this point in an official report, entitled “The Council of Ireland to the Queen,” 12 September 1577, Carew MS 601, fol. 76.}

Instead, he advocated colonization in Ulster and Munster.\footnote{40}{Sidney to PC, 27 April 1576, Carew MS 601, fol. 54r.}
Sidney’s experiment yielded little. With the exception of Connaught, the deputy met massive opposition.41 Less than two years later, Desmond landed with a joint Vatican-Habsburg force, uniting alienated Anglo-Irish and Gaels in a bloody second rebellion before much could be implemented. By then, Sidney was home, but his militarism, “New English” reckoning of British imperialism, and commitment to colonization marked mid-Elizabethan Atlantic imperialism.

Amid rumor that her deputy had seized the entire island as his private fief, spent exorbitantly, and brought Dubliners to bang down Westminster’s doors, Elizabeth recalled Sidney in March 1578. However, the move did not terminate his imperial trial. The deputy turned to pen, engineering a major literary campaign that, despite failing to win him a third term, perpetuated his project and resonated as a source of policy and theory for future governors, promising obedient empire in exchange for unwavering occupation, regular guaranteed crown support, and new plantation.

The scholarly program began during the administration with a print-edition of the 1570 attainder of the deputy’s principal Irish foe, the “monstrous monarchal Tyrant of all Ulster” Shane O’Neill.42 Subsequently, Sidney procured the creation and publication of Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande* (1577), complete with its lengthy treatment of this final realm in its title, and John Derricke’s *The image of Ireland* (1581).43

---

Extolling the island’s commercial plenty and drawing on medieval and early Tudor chronicles, the tracts accomplished what 1533’s Act of Appeals had for England or 1547’s Epistle had for Scotland: they recounted how Brutus, Malgo, and Arthur had, with “Caesars Croune” of the Roman Empire and with the aid of divine providence, annexed Scotland, Wales, and Ireland to “the whole Empire of all Britaine.”44 The second edition of Holinshed’s history (1587) further elaborated on this imperial scheme, imagining “Albion as the mother, and the rest of the Ilandes as hir daugthers,” along with other unspecified westerly dominions, an important personification of the archipelago.45 Yet all three texts—the attainder, Derricke’s *Image*, and Holinshed’s *Chronicle*—were unmistakably post-1555, as they interwove Galfridian history with purported proof of “mixed Scithian and Spanish blood” shared among Irish and Scottish subjects, which lent all three “Scithian nations” a common ancestry.46 Furthermore, because Seythians were “both by Countrey and manners, a cruell kind of men and much giuen to warres,” Holinshed reasoned, their heritage explained why a naturally well-endowed island such as Ireland should be so spoiled.47 For Sidney and other Elizabethan observers and thinkers, it was a genealogical association neatly employed to feed off an escalating Anglo-Iberian rivalry and a seminal Marian theory that defined British identity against these related, categorically-inferior others—Irish, Scot, and Spanish. As he reasoned his foes’ shared popery, warmongering, and brutishness,

---

Sidney became a Tudor Strongbow, coming to complete the work of his predecessors and propounding his plight to recover Elizabeth’s birthright among a popular audience. The deputy orchestrated an enduring imperial literature, with legal, providential, and cultural-economic inducements for British imperialism.

In the most detailed, practical, and personal contribution, Sidney compiled his memoirs to justify his governorship and recover his reputation, while elucidating the 1575-7 scheme. More than a simple apology, “Sidney’s Book” was part of an emergent humanist memoirs-of-service genre within English court circles. The result was a clear comment on what plagued and could cure Ireland, sent to Walsingham in 1583. Most Irish, Sidney argued, were unwaveringly ambitious, emboldened by their territorial power. If a joint public-private English imperial army destroyed them, mercilessly, and remained permanently, then both the cyclical rebellions and “brutish ceremonies” would cease, royal revenue would increase to self-sufficiency, and “colonies of English and other loyal subjects” could begin. Sidney chose his words carefully—a nod to necessity and sustainability—to advise New English settlement to spread common law.

---

48 As Hiram Morgan suggested, see Morgan, “‘Never Any Realm Worse Governed’: Queen Elizabeth and Ireland,” Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 6th ser., 14 (2004): 295-308, especially 299-300. Morgan also showed that while in office, Sidney renovated the tomb of this Norman invader of Ireland (also known as Richard de la Clare, earl of Pembroke), set up various inscriptions lauding the conqueror, and named various places after him. On this cult, see Morgan, “Overmighty Officers: The Irish Lord Deputyship in the Early Modern British State,” History Ireland 7, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 17-21.

49 Over the previous century, brief accounts of services rendered had occasionally accompanied simple petitions by aged or otherwise retired royal servants seeking redress or reward. Modeled on Caesar’s Commentarrii de Bello Gallico, a history of the Roman Gallic Wars, the approach became formalized in Elizabeth’s reign, particularly in the early 1570s—another element of the humanist reverence for classical scholarship. Though Sidney’s account is the most lengthy, pointed, and adorned, his example was preceded by diplomat and minor courtier Henry Killigrew’s description of his endeavors for the crown in Scotland and on the European continent in the 1550s-70s as part of his suit for a manor in Cornwall (see “A Remembrance of Henry Kyllegrw's Journyes in her Majesty's service,” July 1559, BL Lansdowne MS 106/31, fol. 122). Similarly, former Irish lord deputy James Croft had compiled a record of his service in petition for crown reward, see R.E. Ham, “The Autobiography of Sir James Croft,” Institute of Historical Research Bulletin, no. 50 (1977): 48-57. On the genre, see Simon Adams, “The Patronage of the Crown in Elizabethan Politics: The 1590s in Perspective,” in The Reign of Elizabeth: Court and Culture in the Last Decade, ed. John Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 20-45. On Sidney’s contribution, see Brady, ed., “Sidney’s Book,” especially 1-38.

the parliamentary system, Anglicanism, and English vernacular, but not rule out Anglo-Irish or even Gaelic planters. Moreover, all told, his plot combined experiences and experimentation across imperial enterprises, from Welsh service for Henry VIII to his three ventures into France and Scotland. For Sidney, Wales, France, and Scotland all weighed on the Irish scene.

Sidney’s scholarly campaign appears to have been successful in influencing imperial ideology and policy in the 1580s and beyond because his project was in good company; the deputy aptly reflected the mid-1570s atmosphere in British thought. Most prevalent was the commitment to military force, which gained adherents after Rathlin Island and, especially, after 1579, when Desmond set sail from Corunna with a bull of papal indulgence, a crew of mercenaries, and a claim to fight “for our faith and for the Church of God; and next, that we are defending our country, and extirpating the heretics, and barbarians, and unjust and lawless men.” At the forefront of the violence were Barnaby Rich and new deputy Arthur Grey de Wilton, selected to quell the new uprising. Formerly part of Essex’s Ulster project, Rich tapped his experience fighting throughout the Isles and Europe—including to save the Tudor empire at Calais under Mary and in the Dutch Revolt under Elizabeth, a self-professed warrior, “better practised in my pike than in my penne”—to “allarme” England to Ireland’s vital importance to its empire, as courtiers had since Henry VII. In Rich’s view, to build a lasting imperium, the

54 Rich, A short suruey of Ireland Truely discoveringe who it is that hath so armed the hearts of that people with disobedience to their prince (London: 1609), STC 20999, sig. A3v.
55 Rich, Allarme to England forshewing what perilles are procured, where the people liue without regard of martiall lawe (London: 1578), STC 20979, title-page.
crown had to adopt Rome’s colonial strategy wholesale, including its conquering spirit, and realize that the very equation of civility with Britishness rested on good soldiering and common law, “without the whiche we could not liue in any good order, otherwise then brute beastes.”

Elizabeth agreed: in 1580, Grey and his army met Desmond at Smerwick Harbor in Munster and massacred all six-hundred rebels, initiating a two-year-long bloody slaughter of 1,500 Irish noblemen and innumerable others. The queen exalted her chosen instrument of God’s work, only revoking Grey (without censure) when he began arbitrarily attacking her officials in the Pale. For her, the rebellion of men whom claimed to stand for godly Catholicism and the Irish nation with help from Spain, warranted ferocity and substantiated a narrative of Scythian fidelity and violence. As Holinshed put it, though the British had tried to see “the Irishe deliuered of seruile bondage, [the Irish] fell to their old wonted vomit,” revolting once again, while Tudor officials returned to their history of military occupation, well-practiced in the Isles and France.

Sidney, then, was not alone in encouraging New-English-only, occupied empire, as Anglo-Irish barrister Nicholas White surmised, and feared. Rowland White’s son appreciated a shift, a narrower definition of identity, which prompted this master of the rolls to defend Old English rule and discredit New English servitors to Burghley in 1581. Borrowing a humanist metaphor popular in Wooings discourse, White charged that by experience of what the body

56 Rich, Allarme to England, sig. D1r.
58 Elizabeth to Grey, in the queen’s hand, n.d. December 1580, as quoted in Alfred O’Rahilly, The Massacre at Smerwick (Cork: Cork University Press 1938), 5-6. Grey’s initial appointment read: “As our subjects of that country birth have conceived that we have a determination to root them out, and place there our subjects born in this realm, seek to remove that false impression,” Elizabeth to Grey, 15 July 1580, Carew MS 600, fol. 236. On Smerwick and the massacre’s place in Irish history, see David Edwards, Pádraig Lenihan, and Clodagh Tait, eds., Age of Atrocity: Violence and Political Conflict in Early Modern Ireland (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), part one.
59 A young Walter Ralegh, who participated in the massacre, bemoaned to Grey that Spanish aid had enabled the Desmond Rebellion to persist: “from the iland the traytors can never wante nether wine nor salte, or iron, or any other necessary provision,” all thanks to Philip II, see Ralegh to Grey, 1 May 1581, from Cork, printed in Edward Edwards, ed., The Life of Sir Walter Ralegh, 2 vols. (London: MacMillan and Co., 1868), 2:14-16, quotation from 2:16.
politic can and cannot digest, the current warlike rule would but “exhaust her Majesty’s treasure, waste her revenue, depopulate the Pale, weaken her [Old] English nobility that have been and may be made the security of the state, and leave the wild Irish to their desires”—all reinforcing Catholicism and incivility. Ultimately, however, White’s place in the empire was vanishing. Accused of treason, he died in the Tower, as New English agitators interloped, convinced of their superiority and right.

The winners were a core of gentlemanly officer-adventurers, clients of Burghley, Walsingham, and Leicester, steeped in ideology propounded long before the first Desmond Rebellion, who arrived and wrote after 1573. Smerwick brought together several of these men, physically and intellectually, to fight for “Her Highnes and the Inglyshe nacion”: Sidney, Rich, Grey, and a next generation of empire-builders, Ralegh, Grenville, and Hebert Spenser. Their experience illustrates the scope of the decade’s intensified activity and brought it to bear on late-Tudor and early-Stuart Empire. As Smerwick waged, concurrent, entangled experiments were underway further west, evincing an overlap that Ralegh would epitomize. Fittingly, in 1582, Richard Robinson printed John Leland’s Assertion of Arthurian legend, reminding audiences of the entire imperium inherited from this “King of great Brittaine,” in the new and old worlds.

***

Sidney’s second term formed part of an Atlantic-wide Tudor experimental turn wrought by rebellion’s end as well as the inherited knowledge and palpable nationalism examined in the previous chapter. As theory and activity coalesced around Gilbert in 1578, new American adventure sprang from the very same context and personnel as Sidney’s reform program.

---

61 White to Burghley, 22 December 1581, TNA: PRO SP 63/87/55, fol. 151v.
62 Ralegh to Walsingham, 23 February 1580, as printed in Edwards, ed., Life of Ralegh, 9.
63 Leland, A learned and true assertion of the original life, actes, and death of the most noble, valiant, and renoumed Prince Arthure... newly translated into English by Richard Robinson (London: 1582), STC 15441, title-page.
Dissuaded from Newfoundland by impracticality, Gilbert had jumped into Ireland, deeming it a suitable outlet for his imperial energies and means to promotion. Still, his 1566 *Discourse of a discoverie* lay in wait for other concerns to recede and Eden’s call to take hold.64 That moment came when Martin Frobisher’s Northwest Passage search, in concert with the Muscovy Company and crown, brought Gilbert’s *Discourse* to print ahead of the company’s mid-1576 departure.65 Meanwhile, between 1574–8, independent London merchant Anthony Parkhurst travelled annually to the fishery and John Dee supplemented Gilbert’s tract ideologically. Frobisher’s three voyages, Parkhurst’s four, and Dee’s intellectual heavy lifting produced Gilbert’s 1578 patent, their objectives, schemes, vocabulary, and experience key for a man who had never crossed the Atlantic.

A former African privateer and Irish soldier, Frobisher’s ventures to Greenland and Baffin Island sought evidence of passage, trade, gold equal to the Spanish Indies, and to reassert British claims to the north Atlantic. For observers, the first two voyages did just that. Ore samples were given to enough assayers for one to agree it was gold. The sailors reported fierce, scantily-clad, raw-meat-eating strangers, who “haue their faces marked or painted ouer with small blewe spots” just like the ancient British Picts—those far more familiar others conquered

65 It is unclear whether Gilbert knew about the edition, compiled by George Gascoigne, or how Gascoigne or printer Henry Middleton got the manuscript. Middleton published and sold the tract as *A discourse of a discoverie for a new passage to Cataia. Written by Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Knight* (London: 1576), STC 11881. Merchant Adventurer and London agent of the Muscovy Company Michael Lok’s untitled testimony commented on the importance of Gilbert’s *Discourse* in motivating Martin Frobisher, as a “Boke… [for the] mayntenance of the good hope & likelyhood in this enterprise of new discovery. Whereby men may see many good Causes to move them to like well thereof,” see Lok’s untitled tract, May 1576, BL Cotton MS, Otho E.VIII., quotation from fol. 44v. On Lok’s involvement in the Frobisher voyage, see James McDermott, *Martin Frobisher: Elizabethan Privateer* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 103-119. On royal involvement in the Frobisher voyage, see the narrative by company member and pilot Christopher Hall, “First Voyage of M. Martine Frobisher,” BL Harley (hereafter Harl.) MS 167, fol. 40r-42v.
near home—and willing to trade for English trifles.⁶⁶ These strangers and their behavior all constituted proof, Frobisher reasoned, of native amenability to superior British rule and of a thoroughfare linking “those people of the Northeast, and these of the Northwest [who] are like.”⁶⁷ As reprisal for sailors who were intercepted and cannibalized by these so-called barbarians, the fleet captured an Inuit who compiled a dictionary for future study.⁶⁸ Significantly, on all three voyages, Ireland functioned as a marker, a mid-way point for the captain to track navigation and devolution from Tudor civility in the nation to native barbarity in the empire.⁶⁹ After all, Sidney had made Ireland comprehensible even to those who had never been there.

On arrival in “America… an island inuironed with the sea” like Britain, the crew “all with one voyce, kneeling upon our knees… tooke possession of the Countrey [so] that by our Christian studie and endeuour, those barbarous, people trained vp in Paganism, and infidelitie, might be reduced to the knowledge of true religion.”⁷⁰ It was the first assertion of an Anglicizing, civilizing mission across the Atlantic and only the second formal possession by Tudor subjects, after Cabot. The queen named it *Meta Incognita*, thereby solidifying her legitimate right to this hitherto unknown land and convincing subjects that the adventure was worthy of repetition.⁷¹

The 1578 trip was Frobisher’s last and most significant, largely due to its disaster. The most ambitious British New World trial yet, it combined mining, trade, and colonization, sailing

---

⁶⁶ “A general and briefe description of the Countrey, and condition of the people, which are found in *Meta Incognita,*” printed in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:95.
⁶⁸ For the captive and his transport, see “A discourse of the three Voyages of discoverie, for the finding of a passage to Cathaya, by the Northwest… Penned by George Best,” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:47-60. The dictionary appears as “The language of the people of *Meta Incognita,*” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:32.
⁶⁹ For example the narrative of Frobisher’s third voyage, which emphasized, “our comming by Ireland,” see “The third voyage of Captaine Frobisher, pretended for the discoverie of Cataia, by *Meta Incognita, Anno Do. 1578,*” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), quotation from 3:81.
⁷⁰ For “America… an island inuironed with the sea,” see “The second voyage of Master Martin Frobisher, made to the West and Northwest Regions, in the yeere 1577, with a description of the Countrey, and people: Written by Master Dionise Settle,” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:32; for “all with one voyce, kneeling upon our knees… tooke possession…,” see “Second voyage of Master Martin Frobisher,” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:34.
⁷¹ For the area’s name and Elizabeth’s role in selecting it, see “Third voyage of Captaine Frobisher,” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:74.
with a prefabricated English house and one-hundred settler-soldiers, purportedly at royal command, to guard the territory and discover further. Like its Roman model, they were the “first brunt [to reform] those dangers among a savage and brutish kind of people” and recreate Britain on “that principle of Philosophie… [that] inferiour bodies be gouerened, ruled, and caried after the manner and course of the superiors.” Weather and infighting forced the fleet home, where testing found that the region’s ore was but fool’s gold. This meant no return on investment, soiled reputations, and future caution by crown and investors. Yet the project’s contours—civilizing by inhabitance and conversion, selection of Warwick Island for the colony because of its island location—returned, readily resuscitated by successors. Tudor failure was rarely absolute; the buzzword was “experience.” After all, the seeds of Englishness, agricultural and cultural, had already bore fruit: one sailor recalled, all “grow more ciuil, familiar, pleasant, docible amongst vs in very short time.”

Meanwhile, over the 1560s-70s, the Newfoundland fishery had grown, but remained the purview of West Countrymen who opted not to enforce sole British right. Accordingly, it receded from metropolitan consciousness, despite Cecil’s fast, that is until Dee and Parkhurst wrote, Gilbert their beneficiary. Just off captaining 1,100 men in the Dutch Revolt—another Protestant, anti-Habsburg enterprise like the Scottish and French wars—in late-summer and

---

72 For “first brunt…,” see “Third Voyage of Captaine Frobisher,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:74; for “that principle of Philosophie…[that] inferiour…,” see “Third Voyage of Captaine Frobisher,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:81.
73 The term “experience” was employed several times, for example see “A true report of the second voyage [of Martin Frobisher],” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:66.
autumn 1572, Gilbert’s interest reignited. He would be patented within months, a sign that Newfoundland had escaped Frobisher relatively unscathed, and a symptom of the request, which capitalized on growing Spanish enmity to press possession, passage, fish, trade, and settlement, over gold.

Dee’s contributions to the Newfoundland project in 1577-1578 were ideological. Hoping to “stire upp your Majestie to vndertake this Brytishe discovery and recovery enterprise, for God, immortal fame, and the marvailous wealth publick of your Brytish Impire,” his tract on the Limits of the British Empire legitimized and thereby justified British Atlantic claims. Few of his sources were new, reflective of the 1540s mental world in which Dee had come of age, but the scholar compiled them comprehensively, putting Tudor history with Mercator, Ortelius, Münster, Thevet, law, and classical philosophy. Dee circumscribed the Iberian Empire while expanding “that Brytish plate Imperiall, which by our Brytish Arthur was so valentlie and prosperouslie laid forth” to encompass the north from Iceland to Russia—bounds accepted, Dee argued, by all but willful, wicked distorters. By common, natural, Roman, and divine law, each territory lineally descended unto Elizabeth, confirmed by “possession or iurisdiction actuall,”

76 On Gilbert’s activity and the broader context of Tudor intervention in the Netherlands, see Charles Wilson, Queen Elizabeth and the Revolt of the Netherlands (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), especially 27-30.
77 The quick patent suggests that since Ireland, Gilbert had strengthened his courtly ties. Indeed, he had argued in favor of imperium and prerogative as unequivocal, providential, defining features of English kingship in parliament, see P. Bowes, ed., Simon D’Ewes, The Journals of Parliament during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (London: Starkey, 1682), 167-8, 242; and J.B. Davidson, ed., John Hooker, Hoker’s journal of the House of the Commons in 1571 (Devonshire: Transactions of the Devonshire Association, 1879), XI, 479. Gilbert’s service in the legislature earned him a receiver-generalship (granted by Elizabeth in 1571 in TNA: PRO Chancery Enrollments (C) 66/1081, Patent Rolls 13 Eliz. I, part 2, membrane 1) and a place with Cecil, Leicester, and Smith in an odd alchemical venture, mapped out in an untitled treatise by Robert Cecil, now BL Lansdowne MS 14, fols. 40-41v, which fell apart despite a crown loan and official patent (granted by the queen on 4 December 1572, TNA: PRO C 66/1093 Patent Rolls 14 Eliz. I, pt. 12, m. 22).
79 Macmillan, ed., Dee’s Limits, 32.
regardless of donation, papal or otherwise.\textsuperscript{80} Dee effectively brought theory exercised at Tournai, during the divorce, and in the Rough Wooings to bear on northwest adventure from Cabot to Frobisher, to show that the Newfoundland enterprise was legal, good, and proper.

Among those continually in the northwest (demonstrating the actual possession that Dee described), Parkhurst lent tangible proof to Dee’s thought. His utility was to verify to the crown that Newfoundland offered honor and profit to Britain and its empire and to give practical tips for future enterprise, based on his proclaimed incomparable experience.\textsuperscript{81} Depicting goods consumed voraciously at home, a vent for exports, a gateway east, a military base, and a means to naval dominance, Parkhurst, Dee, Gilbert, and Frobisher agreed that if America were inhabited, Britain could secure its dominion, promulgate its civility and creed, and employ its poor and vagrant.

Like those before him, Parkhurst strove to quell fears of a strange place and cement a now-conventional litany of desirable landscape and commodities that both reflected and suited home: a warm climate, soil specifically fit for English peas, and everything from fur to naval stores, grapes for wine, and olives for oil.\textsuperscript{82} And of course there was fish, which Gilbert soon extolled as vendible everywhere. Also, because Frobisher confirmed the presence of naked natives, investors could be sure of a textile market. There, by land and by sea, Gilbert

\textsuperscript{80} Macmillan, ed., Dee’s \textit{Limits}, 52. Dee never denied right of papal donation for civilizing supposed heathens, because that would have disallowed the right of Elizabeth to do the same under the Royal Supremacy. Instead, he charged that by focusing south, Iberians had surrendered the north, see Macmillan, ed., Dee’s \textit{Limits}, 36, 43-4.

\textsuperscript{81} Parkhurst to Edward Dryer, n.d. 1577, BL Lansdowne MS 100, fol. 10. Gilbert’s petition mimicked Parkhurst’s, similarly citing “greate honour, profytt, & streghte, both of your majestie & also your realme,” see Gilbert’s petition to the crown, n.d. June 1565, BL Add. MS 4159, quotation from fol. 392.

\textsuperscript{82} For the author’s comments on Newfoundland’s climate and commodities, see Parkhurst to Dryer, n.d. 1577, BL Lansdowne MS 100, fol. 10; Parkhurst to Richard Hakluyt the Elder, 13 November 1578, printed as “A letter written to M. Richard Hakluyt of the middle Temple, containing a report of the true state and commodities of Newfoundland by M. Anthonie Parkhurst Gentleman,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:132-134.
summarized, Elizabeth and her realm would be made strong, rich, and immortal, while their “doubtfull frends, or rather apparaunte enemieys, made only weake and poore.”

Gilbert’s proposal echoed this experience and theory, proposing to turn Newfoundland, an island shielded from foreign perils by the sea like Britain, into a springboard to more powerful empire and nation. With the fishery as a base to meet Iberian and French ships, Gilbert offered to seize the best and burn the rest. Without American access, rival European shipping would falter, their empires lost and states beset by famine. Meanwhile, a colony built on the innate British inclination to become lords where they fish (specifically noted by Parkhurst), would increase maritime industry, in turn mending national ills and raising the specter of the Britain. The captain titled his project after its calculated goal, a fundamental aspect of post-1550 Tudor imperialism: to “annoy the king of Spaine, chiefe maintainer of Romish religion, breeder of supersticion.” At core, then, Gilbert understood his plot within a much broader context: with Newfoundland, even “if all monarchies of the world should joyne against us, so long as Ireland be in salf keeping, the league of Scotland maintained… none shalbe hable to crosse the seas, but subiect to your devocion.” Like Gilbert’s career, his late-1570s experiment shows that the Tudor British Empire—past, present, and future—was deeply connected, and entwined with nation and Europe.

In June 1578, the crown responded favorably to the promotional onslaught. Cecil was decisive; after all, the plot fit his vision and Philip’s men bemoaned the sway of this “great heretic and such a clownish Englishman as to believe that all the Christian princes joined...
together not able to injure the sovereign of his country." Largely on 1496’s Cabot model, the patent relied on experience like its promotional literature had, licensing Gilbert to “discouer, finde, search out, and view such remote, heathen and barbarous lands… not actually possessed of any Christian prince,” in exchange for homage and one-fifth profit. It imagined a military-colonial-commercial enterprise, the captain was permitted to occupy, inhabit, and trade. These terms afforded variety, discretion, and royal deniability if Philip was, indeed, annoyed.

Though appointed to govern, Gilbert was circumscribed by English law and policy, the system that made a society British and had come to play an essential role in consolidation and expansion. Similarly, as theorists had emphasized since Henry VIII, royal supremacy was unique to British rule, wherever it existed, so Gilbert received secular and spiritual authority, true imperium, so long as he maintained the “faith or religion now professed in the church of England.” Borrowing Dee’s vocabulary of actual possession and limits, Elizabeth asserted that Newfoundland lay within the confines of her realms and defined its place vis-à-vis her extant dominions: with the goal of uniting Newfoundland in “more perfect league and amitie of such countreys, landes and territories to bee possessed and inhabited as aforesayde, with our Realmes of England and Ireland,” the region was equally subject to her sovereignty and all adventurers were granted the rights and privileges of natural-born Englishmen, precisely as Henry VII had.

Newfoundland was thus added to the Tudor Empire, a British hamlet in America expressly tied to the nation, to Elizabeth’s other dominions, and to earlier northern exploits. Sailor Thomas Churchyard lauded Gilbert’s impending journey as an appropriate welcome home to Frobisher,

---

88 “Relation of the Ambassador, Don Guerau de Spes, respecting English Affairs,” 30 December 1571, in Martin A.S. Hume, ed., Calendar of State Papers Spain (Simancas) (London: Longman, 1894), vol. 2, entry number 301 (hereafter CSPS Simancas, volume/entry number).
89 “The letters patent graunte d by her Maiestie to Sir Humfrey Gilbert, knight, for the inhabiting and planting of our people in America,” 11 June 1578, printed in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:135-137, quotation from 3:135.
both part of “so great a flocke” of Britons who have travelled west, seeking “strange and
forrayne soyle” in recent years, “all for Countreys cause, and to enrich the same.”

Alarmist reports exposed rival fear of Tudor imperialism and entanglement within that
empire. Spaniards judged a western voyage determined to rob Iberian fleets and colonize, unless
anything in Ireland or Scotland should stay them; Frenchmen surmised that Elizabeth sought to
explore where she might expand to greatness via navigation and empire via conquest of a
supposedly wild, naked, and easily-conquered people. Indeed, by August, 500 sailors victualed
for one year with funds raised from Dee, Walsingham, and others, had departed.

But the expedition never crossed the Atlantic, owing to storms and quarrels regarding the
relative merits of American colonization over plundered Spanish treasure; a second was barred
on suspicions of piracy and redirected to Munster. Philip’s envoy basked in his good sleuthing:
“Onfregilberto set to go robbing has been ordered to deal with Irishmen, who have given them a
fright.” In 1580, Gilbert enlisted “mr. Secretary Walsinghams man,” Portuguese pilot Simon
Fernandes, to scout the American coast. The small, brief venture illustrates how Gilbert, like
Henry VII, combined Iberian expertise with British theory and men, a concept influential, in
turn, for Ralegh. But though Fernandes’s participation shows how 1580s transatlantic
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92 For “so great a flocke,” see Thomas Churchyard, _A discourse of the Queenes Maiesties entertainement... whereunto is adioyned a commendation of Sir Humphrey Gilberts ventrous iourney_ (London: 1578), STC 5226, sig. L3r; for “strange and forrayne soyle,” see Churchyard, _Discourse_, sig. I4r; for “all for Countreys cause, and to enrich the same,” see Churchyard, _Discourse_, sig. L3r.
93 Spanish ambassador Don Bernardino de Mendoza to Philip, 3 June 1578, _CSPS Simancas_ 2/503.
95 Gilbert to Walsingham, 23 September 1578, TNA: PRO SP 12/125/70.
96 Mendoza to Philip, 20 June 1579, _CSPS Simancas_ 2/580.
imperialism crossed national lines, observers questioned the foreigner’s loyalty; here and in Virginia, Fernandes was a convenient scapegoat.\footnote{Reminiscent of the role played by João Fernandes under Henry VII, Simon received £500 and swore “good behaviour towards her subjectes” to the crown on 7 April 1580, see “Gilbert enters into a bond,” printed in Quinn, ed., \textit{Voyages of Gilbert}, 2:239. The reports of this reconnaissance voyage are very fragmented and undated, but extant in The National Archives (TNA), Public Record Office (PRO), State Papers Colonial Office Series (CO), 1/1/1.}

Meanwhile, Dee, Richard Hakluyt, and Walsingham gathered more cosmographical data, from British and non-British sources, bringing much of it to print and into the English vernacular for the first time. Their collection, which included Hakluyt’s seminal \textit{Divers Voyages} (1582), resembled what coalesced around 1540s Scotland, influencing projects beyond the 1580s and even promoting America implicitly to replace France.\footnote{Hakluyt, \textit{Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America, and the ilands adiacent vnto the same made first of all by our Englishmen, and afterwards by the Frenchmen and Britons} (London: 1582), STC 12624 (hereafter \textit{DV}).} As scholar John Florio opined in his Cartier, translated for the campaign: “the description of a countrey no less fruitful and pleasant in all respects than is England [or] Fraunce,” full of many of the same goods and a rude people, destitute of religion and law yet apt to receive both, might be enough to induce Englishmen not only to traffic, but to colonize and possess the land, for “the Spanyards never prospered or preuailed, but where they planted.”\footnote{For “the description…,” see Florio’s dedication to his translation of Jacques Cartier, \textit{A shorhte and briefe narration of the two navigations and discoueries to the northwest partes called Newe Fraunce…now turned into English by John Florio; worthy the reading of all venturers, travellers, and discouerers} (London: 1580), STC 4699, sig. B1r; for “the Spanyardes…,” see Florio’s Cartier, \textit{Shorte and brieue narration}, sig. B2r.}

Propaganda merged powerfully with Drake’s concurrent circumnavigation, which docked at Plymouth weighed down with Spanish bullion in September 1580.\footnote{Spanish correspondence reported Drake’s circumnavigation and plunder at one-million-and-a-half pesos, see Mendoza to Philip, 9 January 1581, CSPS Simancas 3/61. English narratives of Drake’s voyage, which particularly emphasized spoil Catholic churches, include the \textit{Leicester} ship diary, which noted the presence of another bark called “the Sea Dragon,” likely a reference to the Welsh dragon of Tudor imperial promotion, see \textit{Leicester} Diary, BL Harl. MS 2202, fols. 55-70v, quotation from 55v. The most detailed narrative of events on the enterprise was by Walter Bigges, \textit{A summarie and true discourse of Sir Frances Drakes West Indian voyage} (London: 1589), STC 3056. During the venture, Drake staked claim to a portion of land in present-day California or Oregon that he dubbed “Nova Albion,” by right of first discovery, see “The course which Sir Francis Drake held,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:440. On the venture and its broader context in Drake’s career and Elizabethan privateering, see Kenneth R. Andrews, \textit{Drake’s Voyages: A Re-Assessment of their Place in Elizabethan Maritime Expansion} (NY:}
called Dee to a two-day, clandestine conference to determine the legality of Drake’s seizure and land claims for the queen. Immediately afterwards, Elizabeth accepted the plunder, despite an irate Habsburg ambassador, mimicking her father’s logic: the Spaniards have no claim, “as Master Dee hath very learnedly of late (in certain tables by him collected out of sundry auncient, and approved writers) showed [that Elizabeth] may justly call herself Lady, and Emperes of all the Northe Ilandes.”

Soon, Walsingham solicited a similar interview with Hakluyt and one David Ingram, who claimed to have walked two thousand miles from Florida to Cape Breton in 1568-9, after being left behind by John Hawkins. Though dubious to say the least, here was a contemporary, native Englishman offering attractive, eyewitness natural and ethnographic information. With a now-canonical list of how America could support British life, improve its markets, and enrich its coffers (wine, oil, fish, fur, metal, naval stores), Ingram described the New World’s suitability for the Tudor economy and verified the passage, all in response to Walsingham’s leading questions.

Moreover, the traveler appealed to a British national and imperial ideology of Anglicizing “brutish & beastly” devil-worshipers eager to barter and revere Britons, preempting Irish ills. Most immediately facilitating Newfoundland, by supporting Drake and Ingram, the court had provided an opening for British imperialism in the West Indies and Virginia.

---

102 According to the report of these events by Charles Merbury, see Merbury, *A Brieve discourse of royal monarchie* (London: 1581), STC 17823.5, 4.

103 For the original copy of the report, *The Relation of David Ingram*, see BL Sloane MS 1447, fols. 1-11; Walsingham’s questions as put to Ingram are “Certeyne questions to be demaunded of Davy Ingram,” n.d. August-September 1582, TNA: PRO SP 12/175/95, fols. 197-8.

104 “The Relation of David Ingram of Barking of sundry things which he with others did see, in traveiling by land from the most Northerly partes of the Baie of Mexico thorugh a great part of America, vntill he came within fiftie leagues or there abouts of Cape Briton,” in Hakluyt, *The Principall Navigations, Voiages, and Discoveries of the English Nation* (London: 1589), STC 12625, 557-562, quotation from 558 (hereafter PN (1589)). For Ingram’s comments on native religion, trade, and obedience, see “Relation” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1589), 561.
Ingram described one more thing, a type of fowl that the natives “call Penguins (which seemeth to be a Welsh name.) And they haue also in vs e diuers other Welsh words, a matter worthy the noting.” Proof of the same Arthurian legend resuscitated by David Powell in 1584 when he brought *The historie of Cambria* to print in London, a lowly sailor had just substantiated the Welsh dynasty’s claim to ancient American empire through Welsh Prince Madoc.

Nevertheless, under pressure from Philip—who was sure that Gilbert, Frobisher, and Drake were mounting an attack on the Habsburg Empire—the council admonished its subjects to stick to discovery and inhabitance. Well-censured, Gilbert jockeyed for a new colonial-commercial plan, with men very much enticed by the prospect of permanent settlement abroad.

Thus far, the moderate church settlement and limited enforcement of uniformity in the 1560s had tolerated the existence of “heretickes in your [Elizabeth’s] realme… contentious and malicious papistes,” despite the displeasure expressed by Commons. But the pope’s preemptive pardon of regicide and St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre upset that equilibrium. The most radical reaction was 1581’s “Act to retain the Queen’s majesty’s subjects in their due obedience,” which made celebrating Mass a capital crime and recusancy punishable by forfeiture.

---

105 Ingram’s “Relation,” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1589), 560. Though Hakluyt struck Ingram’s report from the second edition of his *Principal Navigations*, he did maintain this point on the penguins, writing “it is very euident that the planting [of America] shal in time right amply enlarge her Maie[sties] Territories and Dominions, or (I might rather say) restore her to her Highnesses ancient right and interest in those Countires, into the which a noble and worthy personage, lineally descended from the blood royall, borne in Wales, named Madockap Owen Gwyneth [planted]…where he gau to ceratine Ilands, beasts, and foule sundry Welsh names, as the Iland of Pengwin… Moreover, there are diuers other Welsh wordes at this day in vse, as Daudi Ingram aforesaid reporteth in his relations,” see Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), quotation from 3:172-173. On Hakluyt’s use of the possibly spurious account, see Mancall, *Hakluyt’s Promise*, 191-192.

106 Powell, *The historie of Cambria, now called Wales, part of the most famous yland of Brytaine* (London: 1584), STC 4606.


108 Petition by the House of Commons to the Crown, January 1563, TNA: PRO SP 12/27, fol. 139v-140v, quotation from fol. 140v.
of all property. A major blow to the Catholic elite, the measure conveniently coincided with Gilbert’s most aggressive push ahead of his patent’s expiry.

That fall, Catholic gentlemen George Peckham and Thomas Gerrard signed onto Gilbert’s “nexte viage for conquest… to inhabite and manure heathen barbarous landes between Florida and Cape Bryton.” Like earlier western schemes, they held land by fealty and supplied soldiers to occupy, paying rent and two-fifths profit. The contract incorporated Gilbert’s patent and promotion, promising colonists English privileges and judgment according to Common Law in exchange for helping the British nation by relieving its poor and decayed subjects, improving trade, enlarging the queen’s government, and engendering perfect league and amity with England and Ireland. The colony was part of the British Empire, propagating Tudor society abroad, with one essential difference.

Elizabethan officials, some Marian exiles themselves, were familiar with the idea of either sending dissidents to Europe or seeing them flee there on their own volition, but they borrowed the American vision from their Huguenot brethren. According to Spanish intelligence, Walsingham “put it secretly between spendthrift Catholic gentlemen that if they helped Gilberto, they would escape losing life and property.” However, for Gerrard, the plan was actually an evolution from 1569-70, when he offered to reduce Tudor Ireland by inhabiting Ulster with a group of Lancastershire Catholics in exchange for toleration. Ultimately, like its Irish precursor, the 1583 plan fell through; the concept, of course, survived.

109 23 Eliz. I, cap. 1, as printed in Owen Ruffhead, ed., The Statutes at Large, from the First Year of King Edward the fourth to the End of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (London: Basket, 1786), 2:624.
112 Mendoza to Philip, 11 July 1582, CSPS Simancas 3/275.
113 For Gerrard’s petition to Elizabeth, 15 March 1570, see TNA: PRO SP 63/30/32. On the early configurations of Ireland and the New World as a place for dissident colonists, see Quinn, “The First Pilgrims,” William and Mary Quarterly 23, no. 3 (July, 1966), 359-390. Historians have appreciated the role of dissenters from the Anglican
The 1578 patent, which declared the Church’s transatlantic reach, should have prohibited a Catholic colony, but Burghley used Elizabeth’s spiritual sovereignty as a backdoor, sure as both Henrys had been that consolidation at home (a wholly Protestant nation) would stimulate imperial growth, two strands of a single process: as an anonymous correspondent described to the councilor, travel of “ye papystes… into the newe founde lande” may indeed “prove ye beste Journeye for England yt was made these fortie yeres.”114 With support from Sidney and Walsingham, six Catholics signed on before the council blocked the Catholic element by requiring payment of all recusancy fines before departure. Philip’s ambassador was thrilled at the defeat of a scheme that would “giv[e] advantage to heretics when despite persecution and bloddshed of martyrs, Catholics were increasing in Britain.”115

Back to square one, Gilbert put all his stock in his promoters’ ability to synthesize imperial theory in accessible, easily-circulated form. Elaborating earlier vocabulary and pressing Protestantism (since Catholics were barred), Hakluyt and merchant-privateer Christopher Carleill obliged. In their work, Newfoundland remained a source for commodities “now had out of Dutchland, Italie, France or Spaine… the brodering neighbours [who] are commonly the aptest to fall out with vs,” a vent for English textiles and overpopulation, and a means to naval

---

114 P.H.(?) to Burghley, 19 April 1582, printed in Quinn, ed., Voyages of Gilbert, 2:243.
115 Mendoza to Philip, 11 July 1582, CSPS Simancas 3/275.
proficiency, now couched in an appeal to the godly-minded and national honor. Carleill added that if planted by Brits, Newfoundland would avoid idolatrous faith forced upon them and instead receive a civility, order, and “religion most agreeable vnto their parents and masters,” ostensibly, Elizabethans. Hakluyt sought to embarrass his nation into empire, marveling how some ninety years after the Spanish and Portuguese first planted, Britain had failed to establish permanent settlement. Impelled by the 1581 Iberian Union and Drake, two key exigent factors, the author entreated his countrymen to “share and part stakes” with Phillip, for “the honour of our Countrie” and the sake of those “partes which offer themselves to us, stretching neerer unto her Majestes Dominions then to any other part of Europe.”

The push worked. With Carleill raising subscribers and Hakluyt collecting the best navigation and cosmographical information as Divers Voyages in 1582, Gilbert left Plymouth with five ships and two-hundred-and-sixty men in June 1583. He carried with him a small token from the queen (an anchor guided by a lady) as a symbol of her supportive authority, his proclaimed chief intent to enlarge her territories, revenue, and true faith. According to sailor Edward Hayes’s account of Gilbert’s venture, which he termed a resounding “successe,” the captain set course for “these lands North of Florida [that God] reserued for the English nation to possesse… [and see] reduced vnto Christian ciuility” and arrived at the fishery—the fulcrum of the plan—by August. Explicitly mimicking Cabot and English custom, Gilbert claimed all land in a two-hundred-league radius via “rod & turffe” and hoisted Tudor arms, as both

118 Hakluyt, DV, dedication “To the right worshipfull and most vertuous Gentleman master Philip Sydney,” sig. ¶.
119 For the trinket and its ostensible purpose, see Ralegh to Gilbert, 16 March 1583, BL Add. MS 4231, fol. 85.
120 Hayes used the term “successe” several times, including in his title as related by Hakluyt, see “A report of the voyage and sucesse thereof, attempted in the yeere of our Lord 1583 by sir Humfrey Gilbert... written by M. Edward Haires gentleman,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:143-161. For subsequent uses of “succese,” see Hayes’s “Report” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:143, 145, 146; for “these lands...,” see Hayes’s “Report” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:144.
continental European fishermen and natives looked on. He permitted non-Britons to remain if they consented to pay rent and observe three laws in immediate force: first, to observe the doctrine and observances of the Anglican Church; second, to follow English common law; and third, to agree to a treason provision that required seizure of all goods from any who dishonored Elizabeth. Gilbert thus executed Tudor ideology, his colony a microcosm of the nation, ordered by the same three principles that made its empire British in the Elizabethan period, wherever it existed: reformed religion, common law justice, and royal supremacy.

Half the fleet went on to go uproot interlopers while the rest culled for resources (legally and not) and a place to settle, yet a promising start deteriorated rapidly as a key auxiliary vessel with maps and ore samples struck shoals and sank. Discouraged by his loss and his men’s piracy, Gilbert decided to sail home, straight into a storm off the Azores. From a spared ship, Hayes watched the captain, sitting on deck with a book in his hand, cry out, “We are as neere to heauen by sea as by land!” before disappearing into the sea. In the days prior, Gilbert had mused that the “inestimable good” done to prove that the Newfound lands rightly appertain to the Tudor crown and that the region was inhabitable, just like “the climats of Briton, Aniou, Poictou in France,” ensured that come his return to court “I will aske a pennie of no man”; her Majesty would be eager to bestow the £10,000 necessary for a follow-up. On that score, he was rather deluded, but just as it predated him, the Newfoundland project outlived Gilbert.

122 Hayes, “Report,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:151. Gilbert then leased out drying grounds to the other European fishermen; such passports also granted access to the fishing and trade of Newfoundland under Elizabeth’s name and authority, much to Philip’s ire. On the leases, see Quinn and Neil M. Cheshire, eds., The Newfoundland of Stephen Parmenius: The Life and Writings of a Hungarian Poet (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 1-2.
123 Hayes’s “Report,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:152.
124 Hayes’s “Report,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:159.
125 For “inestimable good” and “I will aske a pennie of no man,” see Hayes’s “Report,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:159; for “the climats of Briton, Aniou, Poictou in France,” see Hayes’s “Report,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:152.
The mythology surrounding the captain’s death is a fitting postscript to the 1583 voyage. Hayes memorialized Gilbert in humanist terms, with Christian stoicism and dying words from Cicero mediated through More, whose text the captain may have been gripping. Gilbert had read Robinson’s 1551 translation of *Utopia*, referencing it alongside his 1566 discourse, when he commented: “You might justly have charged me with an unsettled head if I had at any time taken in hand, to discover *Utopia*, or any country fained by imagination: But *Cataia* is none such,” its goodness and Northwest passage “prooued, by no smal number of the most expert [travelers and scholars].” In the early 1570s, Gilbert, Burghley, and Smith had designed an academy around the *studia humanitatis*, desirous to apply lessons from Livy to Ireland, while Gilbert’s reputation as an antiquarian imperialist had brought Hungarian Calvinist Stephen Parmenius to study the geography and cosmography of the expanding world with the captain, Hakluyt, and Dee. Before he joined the 1583 venture (a fateful decision), Parmenius extolled Elizabeth’s “snow-white Britons” for reviving classical colonization and aped Wooings discourse, personifying the nation as godly “Britannia” seeking to “find her children other settlements” and expand her “empire’s range.” Italian Giordano Bruno continued, praising the

---


127 “A letter of Sir Humfrey Gilbert, Knight, sent to his brother, Sir John Gilbert concerning the discourse of this Discoverie,” prefixed to the print edition of the tract by editor George Gascoigne, see *A discourse of a discoverie for a new passage to Cataia. Written by Sir Humphry Gilbert, Knight* (London: 1576), STC 11881, quotation from sigs. ¶¶iii r-v.


enterprise to “enlarge her dominion, not only Britain and Ireland but some new world, vast as the universal frame, where her all-powerful hand has full scope.”\(^{130}\) Whether Gilbert drowned gripping More’s text or not, Hayes’s manipulation sidestepped a fatal blow to this original Utopian project.

Initial disillusionment and uncertainty over the patent’s fate made neither a positive reckoning of Gilbert’s Newfoundland trial nor its continuation a foregone conclusion. But akin to Somerset’s Scotland, promoters reinvigorated past ideas and experience, brought to bear on a highly charged, changed context. With help from Burghley, Walsingham, and Hakluyt, Hayes and Peckham transformed the captain’s legacy into a nominal “successe,” effectively carrying the project into the 1590s.\(^{131}\)

Cognizant of the difficulty pitching a costly and deadly project, Peckham and Hayes were heavy handed with their references, drawing on history and Gilbert’s humanist reputation to show that their enterprise was legal, beneficial, and godly. This explains why they adopted a kitchen sink approach, mixing classical, ancient, medieval, and Tudor precedent with Gilbert’s triumph as the “first of our nation that carried people to erect habitation and government in America.”\(^{132}\) Elizabeth was Constantine, who subdued his neighbors and barbarous heathens to create an empire, “her Highnesses ancient right lineally descended from blood royall borne in Wales” just like Arthur and Madoc, who had travelled to America and there “planted himself and his Colonies.”\(^{133}\) Infused with new sources and anxiety over Habsburg Empire, Ireland, debt, overpopulation, and the succession, the resultant literature was at once novel and borrowed.

---


\(^{131}\) To use Hayes’s term from the title of his text, see Hayes’s “Report” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:143.


\(^{133}\) Peckham, *A true Report of the late discoveries and possession taken in the right of the Crowne of Englane of the new-found landes* (London: 1583), STC 19523, sig. Diiii v. Peckham quickly joined forces with Philip Sidney, contending that their early participation authorized them to assume his patent, see the July 1583 agreement between
Peckham contested the futility of the 1583 voyage—its lessons were to demonstrate the quick journey from Britain to Newfoundland, the richness of the land, and the ease of winning the territory, each point successfully achieved. Since “enuie hath eyes to see afarre,” Britons must act quickly to head off others from usurping Tudor right. The first Englishman to show familiarity with Francisco de Vitoria, Peckham relied on Spanish material to bolster his points, lauding his Catholic brethren. Indeed, British ideology employed Iberian narratives more and more, but as Anglo-Iberian antagonism reached fever pitch, scholars employed the example paradoxically, positively and negatively, to both induce emulation and propagate a Black Legend against which a Protestant British Empire was defined.

Though atypical in religion, Peckham furthered the formation of British identity in opposition to an American and Iberian alternative, encouraging the Habsburg rivalry to play out on an imperial stage while also strengthening the association between nation and empire. In contrast to barbarous natives and “rude, cruell Nations of Scithians” (the common Iberian-Gaelic ancestor), Peckham praised English law and custom, a unique national characteristic since Madoc’s time, the Welsh prince cited here as evidence of the Tudor British claim. Moreover, according to Vitoria, he added, superiority conferred right to spread superior law, trade, and religion, by force if necessary. Hayes cited Gilbert’s sojourn as proof positive of that natural right, when the whole fishery willingly submitted to the captain and Tudor imperial crown. Yet reinforcement had to follow, if Britons—“pent at home like sluggards we remaine… our
cofers yet to fill”—hoped to be the sequel to Spain’s triumphant conquests.\textsuperscript{140} Dedicating their work to Walsingham and Burghley, Peckham and Hayes demonstrate that despite the rise of private enterprise, imperialism remained an official endeavor, reliant on court for tangible support and intellectual legitimacy. More broadly, they show that nation relied on and reflected the empire, just as the empire relied on and reflected the nation: Britain will give thanks for forging “an other England there.”\textsuperscript{141}

Upon Peckham’s arrest for persistent nonconformity, Hayes vigorously petitioned for a monopoly over the fishery, buttressed by a garrison and colony to protect Tudor right, provision mariners, and harvest supplies.\textsuperscript{142} He imagined a mini-London, a cosmopolitan port city under English governors, law, and custom, to boost the national economy and navy, elbow out rivals, promote expansion, and employ Britain’s merchants profitably, its idle usefully, and its convicts virtuously.\textsuperscript{143} War looming, the plot never materialized, yet it elevated Newfoundland with a practical plan for the future use and found adherents, its maritime commercial colonialism later pitched for Virginia.

Three ventures departed in the promotional onslaught’s wake, one each season captained by John Davis, and it is reasonable to suggest that he benefited from the revisionist narrative of 1583. Davis’s ostensible aim was the passage east, but his petition and grant (made hastily upon Gilbert’s death on advice from Dee and Walsingham and in concert with Humphrey’s brother Adrian), allowed colonization, conversion, and trade.\textsuperscript{144} Revising its 1578 model, the crown patent made two intriguing modifications in response to 1586 concerns: provisions relied heavily

\begin{enumerate}
\item Prefatory verses in Peckham, \textit{True Report}, sig. S r.
\item Prefatory verses in Peckham, \textit{True Report}, sig. Siii r.
\item For the scheme, see Hayes to Burghley, “A Proposal for a corporation of the Newfoundland Trade,” n.d. (c. 1585-6), BL Lansdowne MS 100, fols. 83-94; Hayes to Burghley, n.d. 1586, BL Lansdowne MS 37, fols. 166-7.
\item Hayes to Burghley, n.d. 1586, BL Lansdowne MS 37, fols. 166-7.
\item “A Graunte from her majestie to Adryan Gilbert & his Assoecyates & thier heyres to be incorporated by the name of the Colliges of the dysovery of the north west passage,” January 1584, TNA: PRO SP 15/28/55.
\end{enumerate}
on the queen’s royal “prerogative” and anyone born in the new territory received subject status. The first characterized Tudor authority with a term—prerogative—that had gained currency in Ireland, where it justified unpopular imperial policy like the cess; the second illustrates how important subjecthood had become in a climate of European conflict along confessional and national lines. Now, not only were non-British travelers naturalized, but colonial children were defined, a change that fit the hardening of English, Anglo-Irish, and Gaelic identity in post-1573 Ireland.

With passage, settlement, and conversion elusive, Davis nonetheless amassed ethnographic and cosmological data, witness to the region’s viability for trade, settlement, and civility. Executing what Hayes only most recently described, Davis demonstrated the fishery’s utility as a base to rest, revictual, meet incoming friends and foes, and expand. Beyond Newfoundland, the captain furthered a malevolent reckoning of Amerindians, particularly powerful in the 1590s.

***

Thus, though never rejected outright, Newfoundland did recede after 1583 through about 1597, as another project rose in its place. Unsurprisingly, when the court had rustled up texts as part of its late-1570s western push, much of what they found was Iberian and, by extension, implicated a region below St. John’s. Like Francisco López de Gómara’s history, translated for Walsingham in 1578, scholars enticed their countrymen by relating a well-environed, mineral-rich land of heathens, which God had reserved for Britain’s supreme royal. If Ralegh was

---

145 “Graunte from her majestie,” January 1584, TNA: PRO SP 15/28/55.
146 For the voyages and their representations of the natives, see the travel narratives composed by William Sanderson, John Janes, and another unknown sailor, all printed in A.H. Markham, ed., The Voyages and Works of John Davis (London: Hakluyt Society, 1880).
Britain’s conquistador, Gómara and Bartholomew de las Casas introduced them to the original—Hernán Cortés, alternatively “a mirrour and excellent pre[c]ident” or much-maligned perpetrator of “Spanish cruelties and tyrannies… by all such meanes as barbarousnesse,” a convenient immorality that nullified Habsburg imperial claims. Furthering a Marian legacy, the Anglo-Spanish rivalry both emboldened adventurers to go southwest and furthered combined anti-Iberian, anti-Irish ideology after 1583. Like Elizabethan Stephan Gosson, who praised the translation of Gómara’s history into English, promoters held up the fertile, temperate land south of Newfoundland as Britain’s new “golden fleece” (France in medieval and Henrician England), whereby the nation would be “rewarded with the flower of Greece” (classical imperial greatness).

Before 1584, Tudor activity below the St. Lawrence was stunted, yet the mid-Elizabethan experimental climate penetrated here too. While he busied in Ireland’s interwar plantation, Richard Grenville concocted a plot “southewards beyonde the aequinoctiall.” In 1574, contemporaneous with Sidney and Frobisher, Grenville cited Elizabeth’s “lawfull graunte to Thomas Stucle [for] terra florida” and French activities as precedent, hoping to settle with fellow West Countrymen. When the project failed to gain traction because Anglo-Spanish relations were still too good, yet Gilbert’s did, Grenville latched onto the favorite and positioned himself

---


150 Petition of Richard Grenville and West Country gentlemen to the crown, 22 March 1574, TNA: PRO SP 12/95/63. The plot was elaborated in two other documents from the same date, both entitled Grenville’s “Articles to the Lord High Admiral,” 22 March 1574, TNA: PRO SP 12/95/64 and TNA: PRO SP 12/95/65.

151 Grenville’s Petition, 22 March 1574, TNA: PRO SP 12/95/63.
for service to the captain’s half-brother, Walter Ralegh. Armed with Gilbert’s propaganda, Las Casas, and Gómara, much had changed by the middle of the next decade. Now convinced of American markets, mines, plantations, and masterless natives, Hakluyt declared the time ripe to seize what “equitie and right appertain unto us” and make this New World subject to the Tudor British crown.

British subjects arrived at Virginia following Smerwick, where Ralegh’s prowess and offer to build up and defend Cork for her majesty had earned him the royal ear. It also was emboldened by Newfoundland’s proclaimed success; as such, the court did not require much new, Virginia-specific promotion. There, observers found the same advantages extolled in Britain and each site of Tudor imperialism: as Hakluyt put it, “an Ilande in the mouth of some notable riuers,” readily improved by British labor, Christianity, and civility and anxious to advance the nation in return. Reasoned scholarly arguments were also unnecessary. In 1583 “an international Catholic conspiracy with a vengeance” (as historian John Guy described it), broke in the Throckmorton Plot to crown Mary Stewart. As diplomacy spiraled out of control, the privy council expelled Philip’s ambassador, ending Habsburg presence in Britain, just ahead of William of Orange’s July 1584 assassination. Virginia was an Atlantic antidote to a crisis that threatened Protestant Britain and the Tudor imperial crown, an extra-national response launched at the same moment as the extraordinary Bond of Association on the national stage.

---

152 Apparently, Elizabeth was willing to annoy Spain, but not so brazen as to send her men so far south. On the plan, see Kenneth R. Andrews, “Beyond the Equinoctial: England and South America in the Sixteenth Century,” Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth Studies 10, no. 1 (1980): 4-24, especially 4-10.

153 Hakluyt, DV, sig. ¶r.

154 For Ralegh’s preferment as related to his Irish connections, see Ralegh to Irish Lord Deputy Arthur Grey, 1 May 1581, printed in Edwards, ed., Life of Ralegh, 2:14-16.


156 John Guy, Queen of Scots: The True Life of Mary Stuart (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004), 441.

On 25 March 1584, Elizabeth patented Ralegh, declaring perpetual, sovereign imperial authority over all dominions found by her subjects and bound them to her current kingdom of England, France, and Ireland. Roanoke began with an explicit, self-conscious assertion of Tudor British imperium and dominium, recourse to Roman and common law and history. Despite broad donation, royal control was neither blind nor erratic, an instance of what historian Ken MacMillan called the “clear historical and legal relationship between the imperial center and the colonial periphery” and active courtly imperialism. The patent not only legitimized the project, it went a long way toward determining its complexion.

Overall, the grant relied on Gilbert’s most recent, most applicable reference point, which in turn drew from Cabot’s, and the unique definition of kingship legislated in 1534’s supremacy and solidified amid mid-Tudor crisis. Slight but meaningful modifications from the Cabot version nod to Dee (a right to “territories not actually possessed”), Sidney (emphasis on “prerogative”), and other shifts, with the descriptor “barbarous” preferred over “infidel,” while “sea and land” was added to show a newly-elaborated maritime identity for British Imperialism. Ralegh received his authority directly from Elizabeth, on conditions of homage, one-fifth of all ore, and obedience to English common law, land tenure, royal supremacy, and Anglican Church. Elizabeth allowed any of her subjects—English, Irish, or Welsh—to inhabit, build, and fortify at Ralegh’s discretion, thereby imaging a truly British entity of merchants, soldiers, and settlers. Colonists were permitted to traffic with other imperial subjects or allies, while their children were endowed with “all the priuiledges of free Denizens and persons natie

---

Modern England (Burlington: Ashgate, 2007); John D. Staines, The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560-1690: Rhetoric, Passions, and Political Literature (Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 87-90.

158 Letters patent to Ralegh, 25 March 1584, TNA: PRO C 66/1237, Patent Rolls 26 Eliz. I, pt. 1, mm. 38-40. This roll version is a copy of the original patent, which no longer exists. Hakluyt’s version in PN (1599-1600), 3:243-245 is slightly different, and may have been from the original; accordingly, I have used the latter below.


160 “The letters patents, granted by the Queenes Maiestie to M. Walter Ralegh,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:243.
of Englande… as if they were borne and personally resident within our said Realme of
England.” 161 By these provisions, the crown exported a specific superior British identity beyond
Britain and parsed Virginia’s place in a larger, Atlantic Tudor Empire, drawing on the rights
granted by Henry VII to Cabot, on Henry VIII’s efforts to integrate Tournai, and contemporary
Ireland and Newfoundland—her espoused object to unite these territories with England and
Ireland and better encourage similar enterprises. 162 Tellingly, over 1584-5, the council indorsed
new raids by Drake and Thomas Cavendish’s circumnavigation, all three part of a single,
mutually-reinforcing (and ultimately, contingent) strike at the heart of Habsburg Empire, an
aggressive evolution of Gilbert’s annoyances. 163

In the weeks that followed, Ralegh busied in preparation, taking a two-pronged,
pragmatic line to fund-raising: with royal aid, he solicited literature from Hakluyt and sent
Captains Amadas and Barlowe on reconnaissance with Simon Fernandes. A microcosm of Tudor
dominion-building, the intellectual and practical artfully combined to defend the patent before
parliament in December. 164

In his “Discourse of Western Planting” (1584), Hakluyt made a comprehensive argument
for British Empire that provides insight into mid-1580s imperial ideology, particularly its lack of
novelty. Based on just title inherited from Madoc, Henry VII, and Henry VIII, Hakluyt charged
that Tudor American claims predated all others, even the Treaty of Tordesillas, though the

161 “Letters patent to Ralegh,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:244.
163 On Drake’s raids, see Mary Frear Keeler, ed., Sir Francis Drake’s West Indian Voyage, 1585-86 (London:
Hakluyt Society, 1981); on Cavendish, see Susan M. Maxwell, The First Virginia Voyage: The Cavendish
164 One of the most important contributions that functioned to defend the patent was the “Inducements to the Liking
of a Voyage intended towards Virginia in 40. and 42. degrees of latitude, written 1585, by M. Richard Hakluyt the
Elder, sometime student of the Middle Temple,” printed in E.G.R. Taylor, ed., The Original Writings and
Correspondence of the two Richard Hakluyts, 2 vols. (London: Hakluyt Society, 1935), 2:327-343. For the
parliamentary proceedings, see Bowes, ed., D’Ewes, Journals of Parliament, 339-40; “The Substance of the acte of
Parliament,” December 1584, TNA: PRO SP 12/179/21; and an untitled, contemporary copy of commons debate,
dated December 1584, TNA: PRO SP 12/169/36.
scholar freely borrowed from non-British tracts to substantiate his points.\textsuperscript{165} His principal emphasis was on Britain’s duty to convert gentle yet wretched natives, a cause inherited from Elizabeth’s father after whom all “Kinges and Queenes of England have the name Defendors of the Faithe, by which title I thinke they are not onley chardged to maynteyne… our true and syncere Relligion” but enlarge it, particularly where superstitious Iberians have perpetrated “moste monstrous cruelties.”\textsuperscript{166} Secondarily, Hakluyt underscored empire’s role in national consolidation and improvement, positing that America would yield great return, tangible and not, from self-sufficiency to luxuries, a vent for British textiles, work for the idle, naval stores and experience, while bridling that mortal Habsburg enemy who had embargoed trade and endorsed piracy.\textsuperscript{167} Instead of enriching foes and embarrassing the nation by inaction or error (a distinctly mid-Tudor-esque comment), Hakluyt opined, Virginia would reinforce Newfoundland, Ireland, and Scotland. British failure would be “no small indaungeringe and troublinge of our state.”\textsuperscript{168}

It should not be an insurmountable task, Hakluyt added, because as the Romans had colonized Britain and the English then planted France, America resembled “partes of Gascoigne and Guyen, where heretofore our nation for a long tyme have inhabited.”\textsuperscript{169} The “Discourse” thus drew heavily on Tudor Britain’s past and present to exhort empire. The following year, 1585, Hakluyt the Elder reiterated the case (albeit more succinctly), easing circulation and comprehension with a tripartite inducement to plant Christian religion, traffic, and conquer. Each aim required and facilitated the others, all made possible by superior British identity, which

\textsuperscript{165} Hakluyt, “The Discourse of Western Planting” (1584), as printed in Taylor, ed., \textit{Original Writings}, 1:211-326. The “Discourse” is well-known and well-studied, so my treatment here is brief; for a fuller analysis, see Mancall, \textit{Hakluyt’s Promise}, chapter seven, and David B. Quinn and Alison M. Quinn, eds., \textit{Discourse of Western Planting} (London: Hakluyt Society, 1993).


would draw indigenous inhabitants into love with the British nation and thereby enlarge the
monarch’s dominions, honor, wealth, and power.\textsuperscript{170}

Ralegh had another weapon in his arsenal: practical advice, namely, an anonymous tract
that laid out how the colony should be run to breed success.\textsuperscript{171} Free of flowery language and
musings on New World Edens, its author understood the project as a colony to be sure, yet also a
military occupation to guarantee all the Hakluyts described. Akin to and provoked by the same
bellicose imperialism as Rich’s \textit{Allarme}, the text was an implicit critique of Newfoundland and
Ireland, an attempt to learn from them and even revert to an earlier style, harkening back to
Tournai and Scotland. Likely drafted by a professional soldier with continental experience, the
treatise reasoned that the North American landscape required colonists to deal with naked
savages and armed Spaniards, both of which mandated a complete core of at least 800 soldiers, a
full British military hierarchy, strict chivalric code, and martial law.\textsuperscript{172} Together, the tracts
offered a thoughtful vision and produced subscription from Burghley, Walsingham, Cavendish,
Sidney, Gerrard, and various West Countrymen, with crown ships and capital.\textsuperscript{173}

The Amadas-Barlowe voyage supplemented the homegrown paper campaign, sent to
discover lands between Norembega and Florida, the two poles of prior British knowledge. It
returned with sundry goods that convinced Ralegh of the goodness of the soil and great
commodities that would flow into Britain should its subjects plant there.\textsuperscript{174} Ralegh paraded his

\textsuperscript{173} Ralegh received a royal commission to procure shipping and mariners, see “Commission,” January 1585, TNA: PRO SP 12/185/59. For contemporary comments on investment and the participation of these individuals in the venture, see “An attempt to raise subscriptions,” 16 January 1586, printed in Quinn, ed., \textit{Roanoke Voyages}, 1:471; Ralph Lane to Francis Walsingham, 8 September 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/6; and Grenville to Walsingham, 29 October 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/7.
evidence and a glowing printed report, “by which you may iudge how profitable this land is likely to succeede, as well to myselfe, as also to her Highnesse, and the Common wealth.” Inventoruying the flora and fauna—especially wood, fish, naval stores, and ore—the narrative carefully recalled the moment the captains took possession, according to the traditional English ceremonies. Equally importantly, they described how eager and well-suited Virginia’s natives were for civil rule and religion, because they worship an “idol of whom they aske counsel, as the Romans of the Oracle,” just like ancient Britons. As proof, the captains returned with two Amerindians, Manteo and Wanchese, who traveled back to teach Algonquian, likely to Thomas Harriot, and learn English. By the time the colony departed in April, the experiment was long underway, Philip already much vexed.

As his literature suggests, Ralegh apparently perceived of his project as a military expedition, with auxiliary privateering and colonizing intent: with royal help, he procured arms and 400 soldier-sailors—mostly Welsh or English from Devon, Cornwall, and Bristol, three western ports brimming with experience in the imperial-Protestant cause—to order and defend the seven-ship fleet and 107 settlers. Also in the retinue were at least two Irishmen, both servants, who add to the enterprise’s pan-British tone but New English superiority. Last but not least was Fernandes, a handy scapegoat in the essentially nationalistic task of empire-building. Ralegh’s cousin Richard Grenville was first in command, followed by Cavendish,
who came along with his teacher, Harriot, and Manteo and Wanchese. Artist John White, who had served Frobisher, accompanied them, adding to the scholarly and applied resume of those aboard. Finally, the queen released Ralph Lane from “Her desolate Kingdom of Ireland,” her pick as governor after his service in Ireland, parliament, the Northern Rising, and the Low Countries. After the fleet departed, Lane was to take charge, with the same job and parameters as chief royal executives in Ireland and Tournai. The reflective governor appreciated the parallels and connections: Lane tellingly described that “emungst sauages, in chardge of wylde men” (native Amerindians as well as his own countrymen, who were in danger of Anglo-Irish-style degeneration), he sought to conquer the land for Britain’s use and honour. He hoped that “her Maiesties gretnes to growe by the Addycione of suche a kingdome as thys ys to ye rest of hir Domynyones” and by the rescue of countless native inhabitants from Spanish servitude and tyranny. Lane added that like Cabot, Frobisher, Gilbert, and Davis, he too sought mines and passage east.

The 1585 enterprise’s first stop was Puerto Rico, where its leadership hoped to make a test-run of the Virginia-West Indies route, take fresh victuals, disrupt the Iberians, and construct a fort, in view of Drake’s upcoming trip (sponsored by many of the same men). In all of this, it succeeded. Habsburg reports verify this interpretation, describing how the Elizabethans tarried

---

181 For a list of participants, see “The names of those as well Gentlemen as others, that remained one whole yeere in Virginia, vnder the Gouernement of Master Ralph Lane,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:254.
183 Lane to Burghley, 4 April 1584, in Hans Claude Hamilton, ed., Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland, 1574-1585 (London: Longmans, 1867), vol. 109, entry number 5 (hereafter CSPi volume/entry number).
184 Ultimately, the fleet arrived in Virginia on 26 June and left on 15 August, heading home via the West Indies. The quick departure came in part due the acrimonious relationship between Grenville and Lane, which emerges out of Lane to Walsingham, 8 September 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/6.
185 Lane to Philip Sidney, 8 September 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/5.
186 Lane to Walsingham, 12 August 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/3.
187 Lane to Philip Sidney, 8 September 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/5.
“with great boldnesse” on their way to establish a colony, a troubling development “for that strangers do bere more Rule ther today then the kinge him selfe.”188 Together with “two tall Indians, whom they treated well and who spoke English” as well as a “back-sliding” and “Lutheran Portuguese [man],” they engaged with native inhabitants, hoping to convince them that “they had been deceived by their preachers.”189 The experiment’s first stop, here was a sign of emboldened Tudor imperialism and of its desired hope to function as an implicit counterpoise and alternative to Iberian Empire.

On 26 June, the fleet arrived at the inlet found by Amadas and Barlowe, landing at a coastal haven speckled with islands and determined, according to Spanish observers, “to settle on the Florida coast up towards the Newfoundland Banks.”190 The leadership isolated one of them, Roanoke, believed to be sixteen miles long, pleasant and fertile with notable commodities, and the perfect distance to at once defend from and strike the Spanish, travel home, and discover the American mainland. Understood as geographically and ideologically related to other Tudor projects, Roanoke fit a century of thought. It reflected what theorists from More to Smith assessed as the familiar and ideal form in nationalistic veneration for all that situated Britons for their apogee—an island naturally fortified by the sea, replete with ports and a circulatory system of rivers, and apt for naval travel and trade.191 It also suited and aspired to that domestic archetype: cognizant of Britain’s textile industry, loss of Antwerp, and embargo, Lane described a courteous native population eager for clothing, a land suited for British civility and agriculture that will yield everything that Spain, France, Italy, and the East currently did, in currents, oil,

188 Don Diego Osorio to Philip from Hispaniola, 23 June 1585, TNA: PRO SP 94/2/46.
190 For the description of the haven, see “First voyage… Amadas and Barlowe,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:250; for “to settle…,” see Licentiate Aliaga to Philip, 30 November 1585, printed in Irene A. Wright, ed., Further English voyages to Spanish America, 1583-1594: Documents from the Archives of the Indies at Seville illustrating English voyages to the Caribbean, Spanish Main, Florida, and Virginia (London: Hakluyt Society, 1951), 15.
191 Lane to Walsingham, 12 August 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/3.
flax, rosin, pitch, sugar, and the rest. He concluded, “I dare assume my selfe being inhabited with English, no realme in Christendome were comparable.”

The colonists worked to that end, hastily building homes—timber skeleton with prefabricated panels (probably quite similar to Frobisher’s) reinforced with brick—which were arranged in the pattern of traditional rural English villages. Under a banner of plantation, they busied to manure, plow, and dig “as we in England” in preparation to sow “our kinde of fruites, rootes, and hearbes,” as Harriot described. Meanwhile, Lane ruled by common law and struggled to get the natives to acknowledge Elizabeth as their only sovereign. According to Grenville, all of these policies improved and Anglicized a place never before “labored withmannes hande.”

Yet even as it drew on the past, the project quickly became a revised plan in and of itself, epitomizing the era’s intense experiential spirit. Upon arrival, the flagship struck ground and sank, obliging the rest to anchor along the Carolina Banks, exposed to waves and weather that wrecked their supplies. Accordingly, the governor determined to find a new spot, exploring out from Roanoke for a place “worth the possession… whither M. Ralfe Lane meant to remoue.” Indeed, according to Lane native intelligence isolated “a great towne called Chawanook,” located some 130 miles northwest. Despite lacking the supplies to move in 1585 and a steep learning curve, such fruitful self-correction based on “mine owne experiences”

193 For “as we in England,” see Harriot, “A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia,” February 1587, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600) 3:266-281, quotation from 3:271; for “our kinde of fruites, rootes, and hearbes,” see Harriot, “Briefe and True,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:280. This point was corroborated by Lane in “An account of the particularities of the imployments of the English men left in Virginia,” 18 June 1586, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:255-264, on 3:261-262.
194 Lane’s “Account,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:261-262.
195 Grenville to Walsingham, 29 October 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/7.
197 Lane’s “Account,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:257.
198 Lane’s “Account,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:250.
(Harriot and Lane’s refrain) made the adventure a “success” by Grenville’s estimation, and proved integral to later colonies.\(^\text{199}\)

As personnel, organization, and verbiage all suggest, Roanoke was a self-described conquest and an occupation, with military defense—like location, economy, and land use—an important part of colonial calculus after ancient and early Tudor models. Drawing on Ireland, Lane’s expedition held “a course of insconsing euery two dayes march” and sized up tribes by how many “fighting men” they could put into the field.\(^\text{200}\) The colony’s fort and palisade were both constructed with enough space inside for all settlers and livestock, much as the anonymous instructions written for Ralegh before departure had described.\(^\text{201}\) All practically significant, each move was legally symbolic of Tudor *dominium* and *imperium*.\(^\text{202}\)

Meanwhile, White and Harriot made a systematic review of the territory, with a cultural emphasis that demonstrates an elaborated British identity, the influence of experience, and Roanoke’s role in fueling that nationalism against an Iberian, Irish, and (now) American other.\(^\text{203}\) Promotion in mind, the two increased Tudor knowledge of America’s inhabitants, yet they were very much influenced by past empire, which served as a reference point and justification for their current incursion. For example, Harriot noted how Virginians fished “after the manner as Irish men cast darts,” engaged in ambushes and other subtle malice, and cried out like “wild

\(^\text{199}\) For “mine own experiences,” see Harriot, “Briefe and True,” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:266; for “success,” see Grenville to Walsingham, 29 October 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/7. On the importance of the Roanoke colony for subsequent adventure, including Virginia Company members relying on information from Harriot and Hakluyt, see Kupperman, *Jamestown Project*, especially 4-9, 36-38, and Kupperman, *Roanoke*, 159.


\(^\text{201}\) By early fall, Lane no longer signed his letters “from Port Ferdinando” but from “the new Fort in Virginia.” For “Port Ferdinando,” see Lane to Walsingham, 12 August 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/3, and Lane to Philip Sidney, 12 August 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/5. Compare to “new Fort in Virginia,” in Lane to Walsingham, 8 September 1585, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/6 and Lane to Hakluyt, 3 September 1585, in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:255. For the instructions, see Anon., “For Master Rauleys Viage,” in Quinn, ed., *Roanoke Voyages*, 1:131.

\(^\text{202}\) As others have argued, see Kupperman, *Roanoke*, 78; MacMillan, *Sovereignty and Possession*, 147.

\(^\text{203}\) As Mancall argued, their work was in contrast to “previous travel writers, who wove together stories of individual explorers with observations about what regions looked like or could produce,” see Mancall, *Hakluyt’s Promise*, quotation from 197.
beasts.” Indistinguishable from Gerald of Wales or other depictions of Gaelic Irish or Highland Scots, these familiar terms and tropes redoubled British civility and legitimized their activity.

White’s drawings are most telling. The artist paired Amerindians with similarly positioned and similarly clad Pict warrior and Pict woman Pict, which Theodor de Bry then titled “A British warrior” and “British woman” and arranged alongside White’s sketches of Frobisher’s Eskimos. With this series of portrayals, White offered relatable images of British imperialism over time, from the ancient Isles to the first Native Americans brought to England by John Cabot c. 1501, to 1570s Northwest Passage adventure, to 1585 Virginia. Together, they formed a visual continuum of successful Anglicization, past and future, bolstered by Harriot’s narrative of spiritual and secular conversion, e.g. one Amerindian chief’s prayers to “our God of England” or the author’s conversion of Virginian time and space into “an English acre” or “London bushels.” Though Ralegh had little trouble mounting a second enterprise in mid-1585, positive portrayals of Roanoke’s great achievements became absolutely necessary after the colony’s flight and consequent slander.

When Grenville departed Roanoke, he had promised to return with relief. Ralegh obliged, sending along Captain Bernard Drake in June 1585. However, a nervous crown commandeered the mission, instead directing him to Newfoundland to warn English fishermen to come straight

204 Harriot, “Briefe and True,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:274.
205 For the images of White’s Amerindians as engraved and brought to print by Theodore de Bry, see Hulton, ed., America 1585, 188, 193; for White’s Picts, as named “A British warrior” and “British woman” by de Bry, see Hulton, ed., America 1585, 185; for White’s Eskimos, see Hulton, ed., America 1585, 194. For de Bry’s edition of Harriot’s text, see A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia of the commodities and of the nature and manners of the naturall inhabitants... Typis Ioannis Wecheli, sumtibus vero Theodori de Bry (Frankfurt: 1590), STC 12786.
206 For mention of Cabot’s captives, see “Of three Sauages which Cabot brought home and presented vnto the King in the foureteenth yere of his raigne,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:9.
home, bypassing the usual stop-off in Spain to sell fish and seizing all Iberian shipping along the way. Here were the first rumblings of approaching Anglo-Spanish war and an ironic twist in the entangled Tudor empire. Serendipitously, while Bernard was redirected to aid another part of the British Empire, the more famous Drake (Francis) opted to stop off at Virginia to check on the colony on his way home from his famous West Indies raid. There, a supply-strapped and apprehensive Lane decided to take Drake up on his offer to transport “our English colony out of this paradise,” leaving behind three men who were away on an expedition to the interior and taking natives in their stead. Eventually, two resupplies sent by Ralegh did arrive, the second with twenty or so colonists to retain the Tudor imperium, “v nwilling to loose the possession of the countrey which Englishmen had so lounge held.” Like those Lane had left behind, the reinforcements were never seen again, yet by law, their ostensible presence maintained actual possession and ensured the project’s success.

After ravaging Habsburg colonies like a conqueror and causing them to “tremble and fear lest their Indies will be gone,” Francis Drake’s return home (with Lane’s colony in tow) on 27 July 1585 lifted the hearts of Philip II’s enemies across Christendom, at least according to Mary Stewart. According to Elizabethan apologist John Hooker, Drake “inflamed the whole countrie with a desyre to adventure vnto the seas yn hope of the lyke good successe,” some seeking American colonization, others privateering or Northwest Passage—Lane, Grenville, Drake, and
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208 “Commission to Bernard Drake,” 20 June 1585, TNA: PRO SP 12/179, fol. 47.
209 Lane described Drake’s arrival and the decision to depart Virginia, see Lane’s “Account,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:263-4. For “our colony out of this paradise,” see Hakluyt’s own history of the venture, “The third voyage made by a ship in the yeere 1586, to the reliefe of the colony planted in Virginia, at the sole charge of Sir Walter Ralegh,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:265. Writing from the perspective of Drake’s crew, Walter Bigges also described the episode, see Bigges, A summarie and true discourse, 93-98.
210 “The third voyage… 1586,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:265.
Davis all part of a single Tudor British Empire in 1586. Hailing these men as contemporary classical emperors, equivalent to Alexander the Great and himself as the corresponding Homer, Euripides, or Livy, Thomas Greepe rushed to acquaint the crown with their divers successes in possessing and peopling new lands for her Majesty. As Harriot concluded, Ralegh’s planters had “sufficiently experimented.”

In part, Roanoke’s demise reflected a breakdown of Anglo-Spanish relations. Philip prepared his armada in response to “barbarous foreigners who spread over the earth in search of rich and fertile lands where they can settle… so long as the Queen is alive they extend still further.” Along with Tudor involvement in the Dutch Revolt and another attempted Catholic coup (which finally doomed Mary Stewart), the climate aroused British promoters like Hakluyt, who put pen to paper for empire in late 1586: “Portuguese subdued the tracts of China, And the stout Spaniard the fields of Mexico: Florida once yielded to the noble French: Virginia now to thy sceptre, Elizabeth!” Though blighted by war, the effect was the second Roanoke colony.

As Ralegh rallied courtly support, Hakluyt financed an edition of Antonio de Espejo’s Mexican history and translated Peter Martyr’s Decades, finishing Eden’s seminal 1555 task, to show how “the Spaniardes confesse that our Cabot and the English did first discover [America] for the crowne of England.” Sent to Ralegh with a translation of Laudonnière’s history (the same that Basanier gave him in French), none of the material was new, but in the English vernacular, the language and audience were. Coinciding with Abraham Ortelius’s new map,
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213 Greepe, True and perfecte newes, sig. Aiir r.
215 Junta de Contaduría to Philip, 3 September 1586, BL Add. MS 36315, fol. 92. Kupperman asserted that “So pressing was the need to cope with the threat an English colony posed that in 1588 Philip seriously considered diverting part of the great Armada to attack the English in America,” see Kupperman, Roanoke, quotation from 132.
which recognized Roanoke’s existence and the Tudor claim to possession in Virginia by including both names, the Hakluyt’s *Decades* functioned much as Eden’s had under Mary, with added anti-Spanish invective: imploring subjects to combat Iberian hegemony, butchery, and debauchery and follow “Henry VII, wisest and most fortunate ancestor of our mighty Elizabeth, [the] Empress—as even the Spaniard himself admits—of the Ocean.”

Hakluyt also counseled Ralegh from Irish example, where Henry II first achieved subjection of that warlike kingdom. He contended that a hundred Britons, perhaps drawn from those retiring daily from service in the Low Countries, would be able to do more among the naked, unarmed people of Virginia than a thousand could have ever done in medieval Ireland. In essence, then, the task was easier, no excuses. Seeking to inspire “our own island race,” Hakluyt employed sexualized, gendered language, reviving the image popular in Scottish, Irish, and (soon) Guiana propaganda, despite his female king. In his prose, Ralegh’s Virginia was “the fairest of nymphs [that] our most generous souereign has given you to be your bride… no one has yet probed the depths of her hidden resources and wealth [however] if you perservere, [she] will shortly bring forth new most abundant offspring.”

Fittingly, within the year, the second edition of Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles* (1587) came to print, weaving narratives of Britain, France, Ireland, and New World together, recalling how each of these strange nations and unknown peoples were brought to British obedience. Reminding readers of their queen’s

---


roots, Holinshed contended, no princely deed was more honorable than territorial expansion, as all Tudors had endeavored since Bosworth.²²²

When Drake’s mid-1587 Cadiz raid temporarily thwarted Philip’s Armada, it also opened the way for the “Citie of Ralegh in Virginae” to launch on 8 May. Patented in January 1587, Elizabeth authorized the city to augment the industry and experience that had successfully discovered a barbarous, heathen land in 1585.²²³ Explicitly, then, the new effort was an amplification of that first colony, which lay in wait for reinforcement, rather than a replacement. Under his newly-appointed governor John White, Ralegh decided the City would inhabit the more promising Chesapeake Bay, first isolated by Lane’s reconnaissance, in order to achieve “the glory of God, Thencreasse of Christian Faith and Religyon, Thenlargement of the Queees Maiesties Domynyon, the better excucion of her highness grant [and the] comon vtilyty of the whole realme,” like its predecessor.²²⁴ With 1584’s strictures intact, its charter declared the colony to be “one Bodye pollitique,” governed solely by Englishmen and with a twelve-member privy council, thus utilizing these two cornerstones of British political theory (conciliar and corporate theory) to project British order over the imperial terrain.²²⁵

The changes apparent from 1585 to 1587 reflect a robust experimental vision and evolved practice to match the exigencies of war and interventionism. Whereas the court had handpicked Lane for Roanoke, the City received little royal oversight and White lacked his predecessor’s military experience and Tudor imperial pedigree.²²⁶ Mirroring its leadership, fourteen of the 110 settlers were family-units, overwhelmingly non-nobility who invested in the colony and

²²² Holinshed, Chronicles (1587), epistle dedicatory to Ralegh, 3:60.
²²³ “Grant for Arms for the City of Ralegh,” 7 January 1587, printed in Quinn, ed., Roanoke Voyages, 2:506-511, quotation from 2:506.
²²⁴ “City of Ralegh,” 7 January 1587, printed in Quinn, ed., Roanoke Voyages, 2:508.
²²⁵ “City of Ralegh,” 7 January 1587, printed in Quinn, ed., Roanoke Voyages, 2:508.
²²⁶ Lane’s grandfather was Calais high marshal in the 1530s, his father captained the Mary Rose in the Wooings.
promised to remain permanently—a more communal, egalitarian, and civilian venture. Though “the prototype of all later successful plantations” as historian Karen Kupperman appreciated, the differences were neither absolute nor clear-cut.\textsuperscript{227} Moreover, the colony’s objectives, motivation, and theoretical basis remained consonant with earlier thought, while two connected privateering voyages show that like the rest of Tudor adventure, the City is not easily classified.\textsuperscript{228} Apparent changes from 1585 mirrored context, trial, and error, not a new model. After all, the revered Roman \textit{colonia} dictated an invading occupation followed by planters from the \textit{patria} to preserve national civility. Believing that the first colonists remained, this is precisely what Ralegh did, consistently continuing Lane’s success. Though most foreigners were excluded, fitting stark national lines, the much-maligned Fernandes again led the British and Irish travelers into America, also carrying back the “Sauages” Manteo and Towayne “home into Virginia.”\textsuperscript{229} Further, Ralegh indicated that these various modifications were required, not preferred. For example, he pulled strings to confer gentility on his settlers, appreciably uncomfortable with their lower class.\textsuperscript{230} He also bowed to the reality that Britain’s soldiers were otherwise preoccupied and that the home nation was facing demographic pressures, America a suitable imperial antidote, as Thomas More had suggested. By adapting earlier Tudor models, the City brought the first half of the sixteenth century into late-Elizabethan Empire.

\textsuperscript{227} Kupperman continued: “None succeeded without following this model; and yet this colony failed because the legacy of Roanoke’s past was too powerful to overcome,” see Kupperman, \textit{Roanoke}, quotation from 106.

\textsuperscript{228} Just after the new grant, George Carey financed a joint colonial-privateering venture, which stopped in Virginia. The enterprise helps explain why White anchored at the Isle of Wight, where Carey had served in the past, likely a pre-determined rendezvous. In addition, another fleet organized by Grenville and backed by Barnstable and Biddeford investors, gentleman soldiers, and West Countrymen prepared in spring 1587. Though this expedition never departed, due to Grenville’s other commitments and the crown’s tight leash, its sponsorship indicates it too aimed at privateering and would have provided the piratical side that had been part of Ralegh’s Virginia (and his brother’s Newfoundland) since inception. The three ventures all departed at different times because of the chaos. On these ventures, which emerge out of Spanish sources, see Quinn, \textit{Set Fair for Roanoke}, 289-319.

\textsuperscript{229} A list of White’s colonists including “Sauages” Manteo and Towayne being brought “home into Virginia” appears with the narrative of the venture, entitled “The fourth voyage made to Virginia with three ships, in the yeere 1587. Wherein was transported the second Colonie,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:280-287, quotation from 3:287. Quinn also hypothesized on passenger nationality, see Quinn, ed., \textit{Roanoke Voyages}, 1:77.

\textsuperscript{230} On this point, see Kupperman, \textit{Roanoke}, 106-7.
Interestingly, that same year, Ralegh, Grenville and several associates secured patents to shire and plant Cork and Waterford, conditional on Irish exclusion, New English rule, a standing army, and deferral of all disputes to her majesty. This burst of pre-revolt Irish activity epitomized a heightened militarism and anti-Irish nationalism, two chief attributes of a Sidney radicalism now enshrined in policy. Ralegh’s scheme reflected what English official Andrew Trollope theorized, that Anglo-Irish were neither civil nor human, but savage beasts who propagated treason and mischief out of “hatred and malice against all the English nation” and were even less apt to reform than “wild Irish.” The new plot asked, as Tudor Captain John Merbury would in 1589, if “these weeds choke the corn: why should they not be killed and weeded out in time?” The 1587 Munster plot demonstrates that Roanoke was part of a broader imperial project, the two experiments relatable and constructed in a common space and time that ultimately dictated their fates.

In Virginia, the City was plagued by its structure, which limited White and produced two vying hierarchies, pitting the governor against Fernandes, who insisted on stopping in the Caribbean, where his neglect ruined the flyboat and allowed two Irish servants to desert to Spain. Again, these non-Britons were useful scapegoats in an imperial project that stressed nationality. Only by virtue of the English Captain Edward Stafford did they arrive at Roanoke on 22 July.

---

231 For the scheme, see “Articles concerning her Majesty’s offers for the disposing of her lands in Munster,” February 1586, Carew MS 614, fol. 67; “An Abstract of the Articles for repeopling and inhabiting Munster,” 21 June 1586, CSPI, 124/87; and “Commission from Queen Elizabeth,” July 1586, CSPI 125/30.
232 For “hatred and malice against all the English nation,” see Trollope to Walsingham, 12 September 1585, TNA: PRO SP 63/85/39, fols. 96v-102r, quotation from 98r; for “wild Irish,” see Trollope to Burghley, 26 October 1585, TNA: PRO SP 63/131/64, fols. 200v-204r, quotation from fol. 204r.
233 “Captain John Merbury on the Revolt in Connact,” 27 September 1589, TNA: PRO SP 63/146/57, fols. 177r-179r, quotation from fol. 179r.
234 “Fourth voyage to Virginia,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:81.
constructing a new fort, activity dictated by past experience. With Manteo, who was now perceived as behaving “towards vs as a most faithfull Englishman,” as his guide, White chose to remain in his comfort zone, in Roanoke, despite the City’s lack of provisions. There, five days later, White’s daughter gave birth to a baby girl, whom he declared “the first Christian borne in Virginia.” According to the 1584 patent, the baby—named Virginia after the land and queen—was an English girl, as if she had been born at home; though she never crossed the Atlantic, her Anglican baptismal ceremony, naming, and record exercised central tenets of Tudor imperialism put into effect for the very first time.

Quickly, however, White realized his colony was in trouble as Fernandes prepared to leave for privateering. His men were in sore need of help, especially after one was slain by the local tribe and an ill-conceived, ill-executed revenge made matters worse. Reticent but guided by his charges, White and his colony limped home in the tattered Lion, named after the English chivalric symbol. They eventually made landfall in Ireland, the island once again remarked upon as the beginning of a transition back into civility, as the tired soldiers received food, drink, and good treatment from the Irishmen who met them. Ironically, they had docked in Smerwick of all places, the site of Ralegh’s martial success and the land of his newest project, currently crumbling amid rising multi-front war. White never returned to America.

***

That Davis’s annual search, Ralegh’s Munster, and White’s experiment all halted in 1587 speaks volumes about relationship between the Tudor nation and its empire in the last fifteen

---

236 “Fourth voyage to Virginia,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:283.
237 “Fourth voyage to Virginia,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:284.
239 For this episode, see “Fourth voyage to Virginia,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:283-284.
240 For the Lion, see “Fourth voyage to Virginia,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:285.
241 For the Smerwick landing, see “Fourth voyage to Virginia,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:286.
years of the dynasty, about what pushed projects forward and what held them back. When the Armada set sail, Davis, Carleill, Frobisher, Drake, Hawkins, Ralegh, Grenville, Lane, and all seaworthy ships were pressed to join her Majesty’s navy. The war dulled the immediate effect of Harriot’s Report, printed by Ralegh in early 1588, and mitigated White’s scrambling, as the crown quickly quashed two planned follow-up expeditions and a third failed to make it past Bideford—a testament to the importance of royal involvement and support. Even in an era of private adventure and investment, the court had the final word. By mid-1588, in response to “the wonderfull preparation and inuinicible fleets made by the king of Spaine ioyned with the power of the pope for the inuading of England,” war took over once and for all. Elizabethans abandoned Virginia, Newfoundland, and Ireland for all intents and purposes until 1590.

Though truly the de facto result of Habsburg impetuousness, bad weather, and worse luck, Tudor polemics portrayed their victory as divine sanction for Protestant, British maritime empire. Accordingly, after 1589, Elizabethans were emboldened to bring a full, century-long project of empire-building and state formation to a close in the Queen’s last decade.

---

242 For the stay on shipping, see the privy council ruling on “Sir R. Grenville’s squadroon,” 31 March 1588, APC 16:7-8.
243 In April 1588, the council agreed to release two small Dutch flyboats and Portuguese pilot Pedro Diaz to sail White and fifteen planters to supply Virginia, yet indiscriminate violence against other ships just off the coast of Bideford led to an unfavorable match up and forced White home within a month, see White’s account, entitled “The [fifth] voyage intended for the supply of the Colonie planted in Virginia,” in Hakluyt PN (1589), 771-773. Apparently, the effort was so inconsequential that Hakluyt omitted it from his second edition of PN (1599-1600). 244 “Fifth voyage intended for…Virginia,” in Hakluyt, PN (1589), 772.
245 Elizabeth’s commemorative metal read, “God breathed and they were scattered,” see Garrett Mattingly, The Armada (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), quotation from 309.
Chapter Six
“Travellers or tinkers, conquerors or crounes”:
Tudor British Empire in the Last Decade, 1590-1603

In the middle of the 1590s, some two months after his return from the New World the previous autumn, Sir Walter Ralegh wrote urgently to his patron, Sir Robert Cecil, son of secretary of state Lord Burghley. Anxious to promote his most recent project while drafting a manuscript narrative of his discoveries, Ralegh appreciated the exigent circumstances of 1595—personal, national, and imperial—halfway through what would prove to be the queen’s last decade.1 Earlier that year, these circumstances had given rise to Ralegh’s first-ever Atlantic crossing in over two decades of service to Elizabethan expansion: an expedition aimed at the British conquest of Guiana. Never before had he been so committed, so desperate, as to risk his own person; Ralegh’s fortune, reputation, and life were wrapped up in South America.

He knew his case had to be persuasive. Deep into a multi-front military and ideological battle against the Habsburg Iberian Empire, Britain struggled beneath economic hardship and nonconformity at home, rebellion in Ireland, and the potential loss of western footholds in Newfoundland and Virginia. The courtier-poet-adventurer therefore found himself, his realm, and his monarchy at a pivotal crossroads. As he begged for support by holding up the rumored gold-rich Orinoco and Amazon deltas as the answer to England’s depleted war-chests and Catholic hegemony, Ralegh’s appeal illustrates the significance of late-1595 and its broader context for contemporaries. The gentleman appreciated that a century of experimentation had culminated in this last opportunity for the queen to decide the future of her subjects and of her realm, namely, their place on the Atlantic stage. Ralegh asserted that if winter should pass

---

1 The treatise was Ralegh’s *The Discoverie of the large, rich, and beautifull empire of Guiana* (hereafter *Discoverie*); its manuscript is Lambeth Palace MS 250 (1595), which was then edited and published in London: 1596, STC 20636 (first edn.). The print text was also included in Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, 3 vols. (London: 1599-1600), STC 12626a, vol. 3, pages 627-662 (hereafter *PN* (1599-1600), volume: page).
without preparation for a follow-up voyage, then progress would be stalled that summer, a point which led to his dramatic conclusion: “if it be now foreshadowed, farewell Guiana for ever! Then must I determine to beg or run away; honour and gold, and all good, for ever hopeless,” for the author and his countrymen. With these sentiments, the adventurer aptly reflected the political terrain of the 1590s—the final discursive and practical evolution of the British nation, identity, and empire in the second half of the sixteenth century. For Ralegh, now the Tudors would finally choose, and show the world, whether they were “travellers or tinkers, conquerors or crounes.”

***

This chapter argues for the significance of a broadly-construed “last decade” of Elizabeth’s reign and of the Tudor monarchy more generally—a period beginning with the defeat of the Spanish Armada and last abortive Roanoke rescues and concluding with the accession of James VI&I—to the history of Britain and its empire. It contends that a context of protracted war with Spain in tandem with other concurrent, interrelated developments at court, in Europe, and throughout the Isles emboldened subjects, bolstered resolve, spread knowledge and experience, and produced a sense of urgency to consolidate from within and grow from without. As Ralegh described to Cecil, here was a seminal juncture in nation- and empire-building.

---

2 Ralegh to Cecil, 6 December 1595, British Library (BL), Microfilm (M) 485/8, Hatfield House (Hatfield), Cecil Papers (CP) vol. 36, no. 44 (hereafter BL M number, Hatfield, CP volume, number).
3 Ralegh to Cecil, 6 December 1595, BL M485/8, Hatfield, CP 36, no. 44. “Crounes” meant imbeciles or novices.
4 Until recently, the 1590s might more accurately have been described as the lost (rather than last) decade, for the dearth of attention it garnered. Only a handful of historians had considered the decade: E.P. Cheyney, History of England from the Defeat of the Armada to the Death of Elizabeth, 2 vols. (London: Longman-Green, 1914-26); R.B. Wernham, After the Armada: Elizabethan England and the struggle for Western Europe, 1588-1595 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984); Wernham, The Return of the Armada: The Last Years of the Elizabethan War against Spain, 1595-1603 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); and Wallace MacCaffrey, Elizabeth I: War and Politics, 1588-1603 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992). Otherwise, scholars ignored the 1590s or cursorily lumped them in with the rest of her tenure, too exhausted by the lengthy reign to persist after 1589. In 1995, John Guy invited scholars to consider the decade as a distinct political and cultural fin de siècle atmosphere, with an edited volume, The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade, ed. Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). Anne N. MacLaren agreed, suggesting that the first reign (1558-1588) sought to legitimize the queen, while the second (1558-1603) endeavored to renegotiate the church settlement and secure the crown against Scottish succession, see MacLaren, Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I: Queen and
The previous chapter showed how Habsburg invasion halted overseas enterprise. Once repelled, however, a highly idealized rendering of England’s victory merged powerfully with a newly unencumbered soldiering core and new material on European exploration. This literature charged audiences with evidence of Britain’s lofty inheritance as well as the comparative inferiority of its current empire. Against an influential background of outright Anglo-Spanish war, an aging monarch, divisive privy council, and European tumult, this literature functioned as a catalyst for consolidation, scheming, and adventure. Though tempered by the realities of royal debt and conciliar discord, the resultant decade sought to build upon the perceived successes of the 1580s while fighting Catholic enemies with a more powerful, profuse, and well-defined vision. The ensuing period resembled the Edwardian Moment fifty years earlier, when another war stimulated watershed, intellectual and tangible, for British imperium. Not least in both, conflict produced a transformative anti-imperial discourse forged by the would-be conquered, the Scots in the 1540s and the Irish in the 1590s.

Now, a half-century later, in the shadow of a Catholic offensive, Elizabethan imperialism quickened. Efforts focused on a series of interrelated projects in several, carefully-chosen geographies, each determined by history and Anglo-Spanish hostilities: Newfoundland, Guiana, Ireland, and Virginia. These projects of the “nasty nineties” brought a full century of sustained Atlantic adventure abroad to a close.\(^5\)

***

---

*Commonwealth 1558-1585* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). This chapter finds the “second reign” paradigm applicable and useful to the study of the empire, where the 1590s are also overlooked. It shows that what appears to be a gap of inactivity following the high-profile Roanoke actually saw continued developments that transcended the dynastic divide—no coincidence that the four last decade projects (Guiana, Ireland, Newfoundland, and Virginia) became the Wiapoco Colony, the Munster and Ulster Plantations, Cupids Cove, and Jamestown in 1604-1625.

To use Patrick Collinson memorably phrase, see Collinson, “Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism,” in *Reign of Elizabeth*, ed. Guy 150-170, quotation from 170. He explained that this was no “decade of sweetness and light... but a rather ugly decade, when the going got tough and unpleasant for all parties,” in Collinson “Ecclesiastical vitriol,” in *Reign of Elizabeth*, ed. Guy, quotation from 153.
Perhaps the most significant crisis of Elizabeth’s reign, the Armada redirected British energies inward: Drake, Frobisher, Carleill, Grenville, Hawkins, and Davis all joined the crown “for resisting and destroying the Spaniards and others their allies, adherents or abettors, attempting or compassing any design against our kingdoms, dominions, and subjects.” Apparent in this call to action, then, was the close correlation among the invasion, nation, and empire. Though the war thwarted returns to Roanoke and Newfoundland, Britain’s ostensibly defensive posture bolstered Elizabeth’s navy, promoted consolidation of her realm, engendered Protestant nationalism, and injured Spain’s ego and shipping. Suddenly, the Iberian Empire was mortal.

Between 1588-90, new publications, shakeups at court, religious reform, bad harvest, and mounting debt transformed nation and empire. For what it halted, slowed, altered, and encouraged, the Armada stimulated the second reign of Elizabeth in an Atlantic framework.

Spain’s defeat was far from an overwhelming British victory, far from the marker of “the approaching downfall of Spain and the rise of England as a great maritime power” memorialized in nineteenth-century Whig historiography. More accurately, Philip’s loss was of his own making, the consequence of a hasty disorganization, poor timing, and error, compounded by bad weather and worse luck. Given how severely outnumbered and outmatched the British were, Tudor observers found providence and triumph—in the hands of participants, scholars, even Elizabeth herself, the Armada became both a symbol of and inducement to empire, a godly exercise for honour and profit of the commonweal, Anglican faith, and crown. Their manipulation of memory bred tangible results in the next decade.

---


7 Laughton, ed., State Papers Armada, preface, 1:ix.
The use of the Armada as a propaganda tool began almost immediately upon news of a faltering offense, when the queen addressed her troops at Tilbury on 9 August 1588. Prepared to meet an incoming fleet of 17,000, Elizabeth attired in full armor and described her willingness to lay down her life for God, kingdom, and honour, as “King Henries royall daughter… [with] the heart and stomach of a king, and a king of England too.” Nearby, Captain Thomas Fenner portrayed how God defended the British from “the raging enemy who goeth about to beat down His word and devour his people… as a just plague for their wickedness and idolatry.”

Composed for the interventionist and imperial patron Walsingham, Fenner’s themes met a wider audience in November 1588. On a day of prayer, the crown released verses charged with biblical analogy, divine ordination, and a vocabulary of honour. Quite representative of the moment, Elizabeth likened herself to Deborah and Theodosia, after the Israeli judge and virgin martyr, protected by God from her dishonorable enemies. Employing imperial iconography, she mentioned both “thy bright sphere” (the spherical, physical manifestation of global empire) and scepter; while William Roger’s commemorative engraving placed both objects front and center in her hands. The queen promulgated the success among her allies—James VI most of all—citing their shared religion, geography, and kinship as the antidote to Spain’s conquering nature. The defeat of the so-called invincible Armada, then, became the ultimate David versus Goliath, good and godly triumphing over the sinful and heretical in a pitched battle miraculously

---


10 “A godly prayer,” 23 November 1588, BL M485/37, Hatfield, CP 147, no. 214.

11 Rogers, Eliza Triumphanes (1589), reproduced in Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debora Barrett-Graves, eds., Elizabeth I: Always her Own Free Woman (Burlington: Ashgate, 2003), fig. 8.3, p. 141.

12 Elizabeth to James, July 1588, BL Additional (hereafter Add.) MS 23240/22, fol. 71; Elizabeth to James, July 1558, BL Add. MS 23240/24, fol. 77. James responded with similar sentiment, see James to Elizabeth, 1 August 1588, BL Add MS 23240/23, fol. 75r.
won by the hand of God and a truly British cause. In the days that followed, the celebration only continued, as Spaniards lamented the endless boasting.

William Camden and Richard Hakluyt spotted an opportunity. If, as the first of these scholars had it, Spain had sent its most famous captains and best ships, and they had been defeated, then the conqueror and his empire was fallible, in Europe and America. Further, in Camden’s reading, the Armada was a culmination of the last two decades of British Atlantic successes: Philip had invaded because the queen had fought the Church of Rome, supported rebels in the Netherlands and France, sacked Iberian holdings, and executed Mary Queen of Scots. Hakluyt capitalized on the climate, printing his most ambitious work, the *Principall Navigations* (1589), within one year of the Armada holiday. The most comprehensive piece on European imperialism thus far, the text chronicled “the industrious labors, and painefull travels of our countrey men…[from] the olde Navigations of our British Kings, as of Arthur, of Malgo, of Edgar Pacificus, [and Madoc] the Prince of Northwales in sayling and searching towards the west more than 400. yeeres since.” And the appeal was pointed and specific: like Eden before him, Hakluyt embarrassed and admonished his complacent countrymen into action and defined the precise expanse of the historic British imperium. Among the crowning literary achievements of the Tudor Empire, *Principall Navigations* reflected the newfound self-confidence (or perhaps simply optimism) of post-Armada Britain and deployed accumulated western knowledge to an imperial end.

---

For this imagery, see Theodor Beza’s single-page celebratory poem, *Ad serenissimam Elizabetham Angliae Reginam* (London: 1588), STC 1999.


Hakluyt’s epistle dedicatory to Walsingham, 17 November 1589, in Richard Hakluyt, *The Principall Navigations Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (London: 1589), STC 12625, sig. *2v* (hereafter *PN* (1589)).

Hakluyt’s dedication to Walsingham, 17 November 1589, in Hakluyt, *PN* (1589), sigs. *2r*-*3r.*
The propaganda continued five months later, when at Hakluyt’s urging, Frankfurt printer Joannis Wechel published Theodore de Bry’s edition of Harriot’s *Briefe and True Report*, in four editions (English, Latin, French, and German).\(^\text{18}\) As historian Peter Mancall showed, it was “an astonishing publishing event,” by which “inhabitants of Roanoke became international celebrities across Europe.”\(^\text{19}\) Wechel’s efforts exposed the western headway made by Elizabethans in the previous decade to a wide audience. In its pages, after encountering Harriot’s narrative, readers were introduced visually to Americans who, like “the Pictes which in the olde tyme dyd habite one part of the great Bretainne,” would be subdued and civilized by modern-day Elizabethan Britons.\(^\text{20}\) Wechel disseminated news of Britain’s historic empire in a way that was far cheaper and more accessible than Hakluyt’s. Furthering the English vernacular, both induced American expansion and acted as a boon for Ralegh’s reputation and newest interests.

Though Virginia remained in the dialogue, apt for resurrection, the fate of its chief personnel ultimately held the mid-Atlantic enterprise back and promoted Newfoundland, Guiana, and Ireland in its stead before 1600—these projects benefited from the post-1588 rush and political machinations.

The first blow came in Francis Drake’s English Counter-Armada, funded by £49,000 from the queen.\(^\text{21}\) Drake had been a major proponent of Roanoke and its savior; when he faltered in war, so did Virginia. Sent to enthrone Portuguese pretender Dom Antonio, break up the Iberian union, capture the Spanish treasure fleet, and “honour the cause laid upon our whole

---

\(^{18}\) Thomas Harriot, *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia of the commodities and of the nature and manners of the naturall inhabitants... Typis Ioannis Wecheli, sumtibus vero Theodori de Bry* (Frankfurt: 1590), STC 12786.


\(^{20}\) Harriot, *Briefe and true* (1590), sig. E1r.

Nation,” the venture was an absolute fiasco.²² Drake disobeyed orders and sacked Corunna, where he lost control of his men and abandoned the Portuguese plot, limping home to Plymouth.²³ His political capital (and the crown’s financial capital) was spent, lobbies for a Chesapeake base rendered futile at best. The captain would not sail again until late-summer 1595.

Equally significant for the empire’s direction and for propaganda, in 1591, Munster veteran and Roanoke captain Richard Grenville sailed the queen’s Revenge to meet the Habsburg fleet off the Azores. Ignoring orders to retreat, he perished under Spanish fire.²⁴ His loss was compounded over the next two years: by 1593, Cavendish (former Harriot student, Ralegh servant, circumnavigator, and beloved high-marshal of the 1585 Virginia expedition) was also dead and both Governors Lane and White had settled permanently in Ireland to defend Munster and the Pale.²⁵ Ralegh’s pen ensured, however, that what was left in their wake was a powerful imprint of imperial and national honour: “what good, honour, or fortune euer man yet by them atchieued, is yet vnheard of,” particularly among greedy, ambitious, and cruel Catholics.²⁶ As a post-Armada promotional tract, Ralegh’s story of the Revenge cultivated the dialogue of 1590s expansion.

Though some historians have deemphasized the role of the court in Elizabethan empire-building, focusing instead on wholly private (rather than public or official) merchants or sailors, I argue that with few exceptions, courtly politics determined the final complexion of 1590s

---

²⁶ Anon. [Ralegh], *A report of the truth of the flight about the Açores, this last sommer Betwixt the Reuenge, one of her Maiesties shippes, and an armada of the King of Spaine* (London: 1591), STC 20651, sigs. A1r-D2r, quotation from sig. C4v.
expansion—official participation thereby fundamental to Tudor imperialism from start to finish.\textsuperscript{27} The Armada, Drake’s punishment, and \textit{Principall Navigations} all reinforce this: without crown and conciliar support, projects simply did not depart overseas, full stop. Indeed, this is why Hakluyt ascribed past achievements to the crown (Brutus to Henry VII) and hoped aloud that “her gratious Majesty, whome I feare not to pronounce to have received the same Heroicall spirit, and most honourable disposition, as an inheritance from her famous father.”\textsuperscript{28} Though addressing Elizabeth directly, Hakluyt mediated his plea through a man most likely to respond: Walsingham—as Hakluyt explained, the councilor “had a speciall care for the honour of her Majesty, the good reputation of our country, & the advancing of navigation.”\textsuperscript{29} But just months later, in the spring of 1590, Walsingham died.

As a principal secretary and head of the bloc that encouraged intervention in the French Wars of Religion and Dutch Revolt, Walsingham was pivotal. Perceptively, when he heard of the Englishman’s death and incumbent Elizabethan grieving, Philip wrote “There yes! But it is good news here.”\textsuperscript{30} The king’s relief must have been for his whole empire; since 1578, Walsingham had promoted British adventure, receiving Hakluyt’s plea to engender discovery and plantation\textsuperscript{31} and composing a Gilbert-esque “plotte for the anoyeng of the K. of Spayne” in 1585.\textsuperscript{32} British

\begin{footnotes}
\item[28] Hakluyt’s dedication to Walsingham, 17 November 1589, in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1589), sig. *3r.
\item[29] Hakluyt’s dedication to Walsingham, 17 November 1589, in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1589), sig. *3r.
\item[31] For example, Walsingham praised Hakluyt and Humphrey Gilbert for giving “much light for the discouery of the Western partes yet vnkownen” and urged him to “continue your trauell in these and like matters, which are like to turne not only to your owne good in priuate, but to the publike benefite of this Realme,” see Walsingham to Hakluyt, 11 March 1582, printed in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:181.
\end{footnotes}
America had lost another chief sponsor, but Burghley and Hakluyt’s history kept the northwest firmly in Tudor sights.

Walsingham’s loss was so momentous because it was not in isolation. Now in her third decade as queen, Elizabeth was aging, and she was not alone: a series of deaths radically altered the cast and tenor of the privy council, removing the earls of Leicester and Warwick, Walter Mildmay, and Christopher Hatton between late-1588 and 1591. Burghley remained, manipulating the vacancies to fit his agenda, which looked inward, north, and west rather than to continental Europe, even appointing his son, Robert Cecil. But Burghley was also slowing down and posts lay vacant for sometime, utilized by Elizabeth to emphasize her prerogative and avoid hard choices. Her indecision increased the rivalry between the Cecil faction (which included Ralegh) and Essex faction (supported by Sidney), a fight to control the peerage, doll out royal patronage, and wield executive power. Until Essex’s 1601 execution, their feud fractured the court; the result was that little was agreed upon and even less got done, a political crisis that spilled over England’s borders, limiting the extent of Atlantic activity and polarizing the empire. Ireland was the turf and brainchild of Essex and Sidney, while the Cecil-Ralegh contingent favored Newfoundland, Virginia, and eventually Guiana. The wax and wane of each locale mimicked conciliar fluctuation.

Accordingly, Ralegh’s spectacular fall from grace, after impregnating and marrying royal maid Bess Throckmorton behind Elizabeth’s back, finally doomed Virginia. When the courtier was imprisoned in August 1592 and Harriot went down with him, Ralegh frantically fumbled for


the most audacious new scheme that appertained to his inherited 1578 patent, questing for anything that might endear him to Elizabeth. His strategic choice – the expansion of the British Empire into South America – elucidates the 1590s context, telling of royal desires and courtly culture. Empire was the means to salvation, he determined, lamenting his fate in humanist terms to Cecil: “I have followed so many years with so great love and desire, in so many journeys, and am now left behind her, in a dark prison all alone… I that was wont to behold her riding like Alexander, hunting like Diana, walking like Venus.”

And just one month into his Tower stay, Ralegh found his answer. In the short window between his marriage and arrest, Ralegh had sent a privateering expedition to the Azores, with crown and London Merchant Adventure investment. At the helm, fittingly, was Frobisher, sent off “well knowing that the Spaniard made ware, not so much with the strength of Spaine, as with the gold of America.” His timing was impeccable. In mid-September, the fleet returned with a massive Iberian prize, arguably the richest haul of plunder taken by Brits in the second half of the century, the Portuguese carrack Madre de Dios. The queen was thrilled and, at Burghley’s urging, released Ralegh and granted him property. Elizabeth’s forgiveness demonstrates that in 1592, she sought overseas success, money, naval superiority, and honour at the expense of her ex-brother-in-law, whose heart lay in southwesterly waters. The court harbored an anti-Iberian, anti-Catholic Atlantic imperial vision. Described as the obverse to Virginia, which was

35 Robert Parson (alternatively given as Persons), Elizabethae Regnae Angliae edictum (Rome(?): 1592) accused Ralegh of orchestrating and running a school of atheism, which served as due cause for imprisoning him and Harriot as a suspected participant. The tract was printed in English as Parsons, An advertisement written to a secretarie of my L. Treasurers of Inglond by an Inglishe intelligencer (Antwerp: 1592), STC 19885.
37 Camden, Historie of the life and reigne of that famous princesse Elizabeth (London: 1634), STC 4499, 71.
38 “Commission,” 30 October 1592, BL Lansdowne MS 70, fols. 60-1. Historian J.W. Shirley claimed that the prize was the biggest of the century, see Shirley, “Sir Walter Ralegh’s Guiana Finances,” Huntington Library Quarterly, 13, no. 1 (1949): 55-69. Nicholls and Williams suggested that the death of the couple’s child also garnered royal sympathy and, accordingly, clemency, see Nicholls and Williams, Raleigh, 68, 80.
undertaken at the height of his favor, by Fuller, the Guiana project was Ralegh’s negotiation of this new context. As Camden related, Ralegh watched the Anglo-Spanish war deepen and determined to regain his honour by conquering remote countries.

Though on a slow ascent, Ralegh remained banished from court. As its patent holder, his fall—more than any other—halted Virginia, while his marriage, the Madre coup, and anti-Catholic nationalism made 1591-94 a seedtime of research and planning for Guiana. Ralegh, however, was not the sole architect and executor of Tudor imperium, a point evinced in the adventures waged during his exile, as his rival, the earl of Essex, assumed the role of favorite and Burghley plotted. Indeed, in the very year of Ralegh’s fall, the oldest site of British imperialism in the New World became part of the realm’s imperial calculus yet again.

***

Since the first rumblings of an Armada interrupted British enterprise, little had gone northwest. Burghley, the region’s chief courtly devotee, looked to reconstitute the area, though without the rich triangular trade to the Iberian Peninsula. Principall Navigations, four consecutive bad harvests, and war debt all helped, evincing Britain’s historic right and its need for the cod, victuals, naval stores, and other commodities that Tudor explorers had described there since Cabot. Newfoundland was ultimately moderated by the primacy of Ireland and points further south, as the remainder of this chapter will suggest. Still, after 1591, Burghley lent a

---

39 Fuller, Voyages, 57-58. Andrews agreed: “it was at this juncture, ‘left of all, but of malice and revenge’, as he put it, and ‘in the darkest shadow of adversitie’, that he looked to Guiana as a means of recovering the queen’s favour and his own fortune,” see Andrews, Trade, Plunder, and Settlement, quotation from 288. Lorimer concurred, see Lorimer, “Ralegh’s Frist Reconnaissance of Guiana?” Terrae Incognita 9 (1977): 7-21, especially 21.

40 Camden, Historie, 129.

41 Following the declaration of war against Iberian shipping, see “Commission to Bernard Drake,” 20 June 1585, The National Archives (TNA), Public Record Office (PRO), State Papers (SP) document reference number 92/2, fol. 96. All subsequent citations from TNA: PRO will follow this standard format of department code (e.g. SP) and document reference number. If a document contains any internal numbering, the internal reference (i.e. the folio number) is provided following the full document reference number.
sympathetic ear to efforts to reinvigorate the harbor and colony as a site of the fight against Spain, focusing on the fishing banks and the Isle of Ramea.\textsuperscript{42}

The Anglo-Spanish war had had a powerful effect on the makeup of Newfoundland’s fishery. From 1585 to 1589, not a single Habsburg ship made the voyage and Iberians became a negligible presence.\textsuperscript{43} Meanwhile, the French assumed primacy, with merchants from St Jean de Luz who flooded in and ensconced themselves. When Henry IV abandoned Protestantism and his men began supplying Newfoundland fish and naval supplies to their new Spanish coreligionists, Tudor subjects were less than thrilled.\textsuperscript{44} Armed with Hakluyt’s proof of British right, competition and rivalry inspired English sailors to wage a nine-year-long seasonal piratical battle in the North Atlantic.

Between 1591 and 1600, Frenchmen funneled a litany of grievances through the Tudor crown and council, citing ships plundered for train oil, fish, and fur.\textsuperscript{45} For Elizabethans, here was a way to make up the ground lost since 1583, as news spread like wildfire from Bristol through the West Country and along the Thames that French prizes were rich and rarely restored. Privateering ballooned accordingly—even Ralegh got involved, “the ship of Peter de Hody, merchant of Bayonne, returning from Newfoundland, laden with 108,000 dry fish, 4,000 green, and 14 hogsheads of train oil, total value 6,000 crowns, was taken by a ship of war appointed by Sir Walter Raleigh, and brought to Uphill, near Bristol.”\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{42} As Andrews also surmised, see Andrews, Trade, Plunder, and Settlement, 304-306.
\textsuperscript{43} For example, an English report that Iberian “ships bound for the Newfoundland fishing, have been stayed at the Passage. The King of Spain has no ships ready,” see John Welles to Walsingham, 7 May 1589, TNA: PRO SP 78/19, quotation from fol. 129.
\textsuperscript{44} For example, see “Relations with England,” n.d. 1591, in Wernham, ed., List and Analysis of State Papers, Foreign Series: Elizabeth I (London: Stationery Office, 1980), vol. 2, entry number 485 (hereafter volume/entry);
\textsuperscript{46} Bernard de la Laude, deputy of the inhabitants of Bayonne, to the Privy Council (PC), 6 June 1592, CSPD 242/44.
Significantly, when the Tudor crown did make restitution, the effect was momentous. In April 1591, privateers captured a Basque vessel of furs intended for Henry IV’s sister. In charge of returning them was Burghley, who for decades had shown an interest in the North Atlantic.\(^47\)

Just after concluding the negotiations, the secretary received a tract from Bristolman Thomas James, owner of a ship that had recently seized a Breton prize. In it, James’ captain set down his expedition, which had both plundered and discovered an isle. To a British audience that had, since the 1500s, appreciated islands as the ideal geography and recognized first discovery as possession, the description of Ramea fifty leagues from the Bay was tempting. There, the tract reported, enormous walruses climb the banks by the thousands, their skin like leather, meat like veal, and bellies capable of producing oil, “which if it will make sope, the king of Spaine may burne some of his Oliue trees” and end Tudor reliance on the Mediterranean.\(^48\) Once again, official support proved essential—Burghley’s interest had been piqued. Much as it was a defining year for the council, then, 1591 was imperially significant, as Brits waded back into Atlantic waters.

In these two voyages, Burghley saw an opportunity to further his long-held vision, first forged in the 1540s, and achieve five interrelated ends: the expansion of civility by Anglicization; improvement of England’s navy by transoceanic practice and new resources; increase of food by fishing; consolidation of the nation by expelling dissidents; and promotion of his son by endearing the family to the queen. Not one of these arguments was new to 1591, but the last decade’s tensions made each especially attractive. The domestic context explains how Burghley secured crown funding for a Newfoundland enterprise for the first time in a decade and selected Ramea’s colonists.

\(^{47}\) As also noted in D.B. Quinn, “The First Pilgrims,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (July 1966): 359-390.
Back in September 1583, as Gilbert drowned off Newfoundland, Elizabeth had appointed John Whitgift Archbishop of Canterbury.\(^49\) The nation’s chief archdiocese now lay in the hands of a man infamous for his vigorous campaigns against recusancy and statement that “whatsoever cometh from the Pope which is antichrist, commeth first from the devil.”\(^50\) Faced with more powerful dissenting Protestants at home and a global Catholic threat, Whitgift faced intense opposition from both sides. After the Armada subsided and death robbed the council of its most reform-minded members (Leicester and Walsingam), he had leave to act. In 1591, he used the Star Chamber to make a show of Puritan clergyman Robert Cawdry, who had refuted the Anglican liturgy. Arraigned under common law, Cawdry’s case was a referendum on the relationship between statute and ecclesiastical law and the queen’s jurisdiction in spiritual cases.\(^51\) Edward Coke delivered the guilty judgment, concluding that full spiritual and temporal supremacy lay, “by the ancient laws of the realm parcel of the King’s jurisdiction and united to his Imperial Crown,” as invested there by parliament since Henry VIII, and reproducing 1533’s Act of Appeals.\(^52\) A sign of continuity and a powerful reassertion of the Tudor imperium, the decision upheld Britain’s unique monarchy and reformed faith as foundational tenets of a


\(^{50}\) Whitgift, *The defense of the aunswere to the Admonition against the replie of T.C.* (London: 1574), STC 25430, 746.


\(^{52}\) John Davies, *England’s Independency Upon the Papal Power Historically and Judicially Stated* (London: 1674), Wing STC D397, 45. Camden asserted the queen’s personal involvement in the matter, see Camden, *Historie*, 54-55.
peaceful, rich, honorable nation. As Whitgift charged, “part of obedience to princes is
‘honour’… Where this love and fear is, commonwealths prosper and flourish and increase.”

Ejected from the church, Cawdrey served as a warning—as Elizabeth proclaimed the
following year, “unity is the stronger, disunity the weaker and the quick to fall into ruin.” Two
years later, the rest of the realm felt Whitgift’s ire. In 1593, parliament expressed its post-
Armada anxiety and its newly confirmed empire. Via acts against “puritan” and “popish
recusants,” the legislature sought to stymie “such great inconveniences and perils as might
happen and grow by the wicked and dangerous practices of seditious sectaries and disloyal
persons.” The statutes required all subjects hear Elizabeth’s service, follow her laws, and
maintain her imperial authority, on penalty of banishment. The changes were essential for the
Ramea project: the government had statutorily wed national safety to spiritual obedience and
proposed resettlement as an alternative to conformity. Sitting in the session that passed the bills,
Ralegh mused in April 1593, “the Brownists are worthy to be rooted out of a commonwealth,”
yet he wondered aloud “at whose charge shall they be transported or wither will you send
them?”

Except for their faith, these subjects appeared to be devoted Britons. Burghley agreed;
as anti-Catholicism and anti-Puritanism mixed with commercial and territorial inducements for
expansion, he found a solution.

---

54 Elizabeth’s Latin speech to the heads of Oxford University, 28 September 1592, translated and printed in Leah S. Marcus, Janel M. Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose, eds., Elizabeth I: Collected Works (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 327-328, quotation from 328.
The secretary set the plan into motion with two ships to Ramea in 1593. Richard Fisher’s expedition narrative described a plentiful, profitable land and furthered late-Tudor imperial ideology. He lamented that Elizabethans “haue stood still and haue bene idle lookers on” to “the manifold gaine which the French, Britaynes, Baskes, and Biskaines do yerely returne from the sayd partes.”\(^{57}\) With cod, timber, rosin, pitch, and tar, it would “dishonour” the nation if his countrymen should not continue the project.\(^{58}\) This specific rhetoric pushed the enterprise forward, while the sailors benefited from the 1580s experiential boom, commenting that the natives not only willingly traded, but behave “as the Sauages vse to doe in Virginia.”\(^{59}\) The similarity lent familiarity, even legitimacy. The following year, Bristolman Silvester Wyet departed with Burghley’s backing, further attesting to economic and settlement potential, as well as the arrival of French frigates transporting Spanish fishermen to Newfoundland.\(^{60}\) The troubling news spurred Elizabeth. That spring, she responded swiftly to protect her dominion, releasing thirty-six ships to the fishery in March 1594;\(^{61}\) then, she dispatched six of her own fleet under Admiral Howard in May, at a cost of £4,334—not an insignificant sum and a sign of the region’s perceived importance.\(^{62}\) Afterwards, however, things fell silent amid the earl of Tyrone’s threat of rebellion in Ireland.

\(^{57}\) “A briefe note concerning the voyage of M. George Drake of Apsham to the Isle of Ramea in the aforesaid yere 1593,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:193.

\(^{58}\) “A briefe note concerning the voyage…to the Isle of Ramea,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:193.

\(^{59}\) “The voyage of the ship called the Marigold of M. Hill of Redrife vnto Cape Briton beyond the latitude of 44 degrees and a half, 1593 written by Richard Fisher Master Hilles man of Redriffe,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:191-193, quotation from 3:192.

\(^{60}\) “The voyage of the Grace of Bristol of M. Rice Iones… into the Bay of Saint Laurence to the Northwest of Newfoundlande, as farre as the Isle of Assumption or Natiscotec, for the barbes or yynes of Wales and traine Oyle, made by Siluest Wyet, Shipmaster of Bristoll,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:194-195. The bothersome Spanish-French alliance was noted in separate correspondence, see “Trade with the Enemy,” n.d. July 1593-December 1594, in Wernham, ed., \textit{List and Analysis of State Papers, Foreign}, 5/609.

\(^{61}\) “List of ships and men released,” 2 March 1594, TNA: PRO SP 12/248, fol. 1.

\(^{62}\) “Vessels victualed,” 15 May 1594, \textit{CSPD} 238/150.
The brief show of force appears to have done little: three years later, the French began planting the Sable Islands, just beyond Newfoundland’s banks.\textsuperscript{63} The move prompted British action. In the fall of 1597, Surrey gentleman Charles Leigh petitioned to garrison and colonize Ramea, “planting and building… by which means all other nations wilbe discoraged in shorte tyme and wholly wonne out of the trade, then shall [Elizabeth] have the whole trade of the inland contries only in your owne hands.”\textsuperscript{64} In lieu of the on-going proxy war, he would also pillage French ships, hoping to cripple Philip. On the basis of earlier reports, Leigh charged, the colony would be fruitful, a means to protect Britain’s monopoly and stall Catholic Europe.\textsuperscript{65} Newfoundland would again become the linchpin of the Tudor nation and empire, with a last-decade twist.

When it launched that April, the venture carried four Brownists colonists, on Burghley’s counsel and Elizabeth’s assent. This fitting marriage of national and imperial ends befit the Whitgift-era: “Mr. Francis Johnson, Pastour of the banished” and his congregants readily asked to travel west, so that “wee may not onlie worshippe God as wee are by conscience persuaded by his Word, but also doe unto Her Majesty and our country great good service, and in time also greatly annoy that blodie and persecuting Spaniard.”\textsuperscript{66} Reminiscent of Gilbert’s treatise and his

\textsuperscript{63} On this French activity, see Quinn, \textit{North America from Earliest Discovery} (NY: Harper and Row, 1977), 422, 472-473.
\textsuperscript{64} Leigh to PC, “A briefe platforme for a voyadge with three ships into the Iland of Ramea,” 4 October 1597, BL Add. MS 14027, fol. 289.
\textsuperscript{66} For “Mr. Francis Johnson, Pastour of the banished,” see George Johnson (brother of Francis, and also along on the voyage), \textit{A discourse of some troubles and excommunications in the banished English church} (Amsterdam: 1603), STC 14664, sig. A3v; for “wee may not…” see Leigh’s petition to the crown, n.d. November-December 1593, TNA: PRO SP 12/246/56. The crown’s acceptance of the petition is recorded in The National Archives, Privy
proposed Catholic colony, in which Burghley had played a central part, the scheme found a solution for natural-born, loyal subjects to remain within the queen’s dominions.\textsuperscript{67} Leigh thus carried the first English dissenters to the New World, three decades before Plymouth.\textsuperscript{68}

It was not, however, a particularly successful standard. The expedition went wayward before it left Falmouth, when Francis circulated an evangelical pamphlet, upsetting the crew.\textsuperscript{69} After losing one ship to wreckage and Basque raiding, the men made it to Conception Bay on Newfoundland’s Avalon Peninsula, where “three hundred Sauages” unceremoniously chased them out of the bay and then out of the region, opting to flee home lest “they should be subject to be devoured by the wildes.”\textsuperscript{70} After allowing his charges to escape to Amsterdam, no Tudor grants to colonize the “strange land as newfound land” were forthcoming, in large part because on 4 August 1598, Burghley died.\textsuperscript{71} A blend of continuity and change, domestic and imperial, the 1597 venture was a fitting capstone to over a century of Tudor activity in Newfoundland, only an end for Leigh and the region in the narrowest sense. In 1602, he set out with Cecil’s help to add a different American territory to the empire. There, Leigh no longer attended the ghost of Gilbert, but the captain’s lively half-brother. And, some eight years after that, the British founded a settlement at Cupids Cove, at the very bay where Leigh had been routed.

***

\textsuperscript{67} As explained in Leigh’s petition to the crown, , n.d. November-December 1593, TNA: PRO SP 12/246/56.
\textsuperscript{68} Quinn, “First Pilgrims,” 390.
\textsuperscript{69} Johnson, \textit{A discourse of some troubles}, 109-110.
\textsuperscript{70} For “three hundred sauages,” see “The voyage of M. Charles Leigh, and diuers others to Cape Briton and the Isle of Ramea,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:195-201, quotation from 3:196; for “they should be subiect…,” see Johnson, \textit{A discourse of some troubles}, 110.
\textsuperscript{71} For “strange land as newfound land,” see Johnson, \textit{A discourse of some troubles}, 111.
In 1593, the same parliament that passed Whitgift’s statutes authorized a defense subsidy. Hinging on the legality of the war supposedly instigated by Philip to overthrow the queen, extirpate Anglicanism, and confuse her subjects, the debate pressed a rhetoric of foreign danger and Protestant nationalism. Ralegh seized the occasion: he declared, prophetically, “in Ireland I speake upon knowledge the people are so addicted to papistrie that they are readie to ioyne with anie forreine forces... the tyme is now more dangerous than it was in anno ’88, for then the Spaniards which came from Spaine were to passe dangerous seas [and] had no place of reliefe.” Soon, when Tyrone offered Ireland to Philip, this would no longer be the case, but for now, the imperial buffer remained, and the crown’s chief concern was to maintain its possessions accordingly. As Elizabeth avowed never to invade or usurp another prince’s territory, rather to rule justly over her own kingdom, before her MPs, Ralegh listened. Conveniently for him, literature showed that, as Hakluyt had reasoned, the Tudor Empire extended well southwest, “the lymites of the Kinge of Spaines domynions in the West Indies be nothinge so large as is generally yimagined.” Under cover of security, Britain assumed a more aggressive posture in the 1593 parliament; the theory behind the subsidy and broader war allowed Ralegh to mount his Guiana project as an antidote to Habsburg take-over.

---


75 “Queen Elizabeth’s speech at the closing of parliament,” 10 April 1593, BL Cotton MS Titus F.II., fols. 98v-99r.


77 The study of Tudor and Stuart Guiana is hugely indebted to Joyce Lorimer, who first highlighted the region’s importance for the British Empire and masterfully traced a century of English and Irish efforts there, see Lorimer, ed., *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon, 1500-1646* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1989); Lorimer, ed., *Sir Walter Ralegh’s Discoverie of Guiana* (London: Hakluyt Society, 2006); Lorimer, *Untruth and Consequences:*
Much as the Armada had encouraged privateering and proxy warfare off Newfoundland, it too emboldened a similar phenomenon off Brazil and Peru. English ports flooded with American sugar, indigo, timber, and, most of all, ore and information from Iberian sources, both enticing and enraging the Tudor crown and subjects.\textsuperscript{78} As a Plymouth merchant complained to Burghley just after parliament, sought-after goods entered “more by strangers than by Englishmen, to the hindrance of the English merchant, and decay of navigation.”\textsuperscript{79} A permanent presence in South America would satiate the crown’s pleas for money and Iberian hurt; the privateer’s for ready access to plunder; the merchant’s for sailing experience and markets; and, most critically, Ralegh’s for prestige. Moved by the archetypes and nemeses of \textit{Principall Navigations}, British and not, the courtier promised to spend his life in pursuit of Guiana, where he “shall perfourme more then euer was done in Mexico by Cortez, or in Peru by Pizarro.”\textsuperscript{80}

Indeed, in Hakluyt’s pages—which had now made it into Ralegh’s hands—the courtier found a veritable guide to South America. From Francisco López de Gómara, Pedro Cieza de León, André Thevet, and Agustín de Zárate, Ralegh gleaned a pleasant, fruitful place, warm and full of the now-standard list of Tudor desires: dyes, spices, timber, and ore.\textsuperscript{81} And, perhaps most inspiring, according to the mid-Tudor translation of André Thevet’s \textit{New found worlde} (1568), Guiana had once been a country of giants, but was now inhabited by “poore brutish men,” who

\textsuperscript{78} During the war, Spanish officials reported the loss of these particular commodities as pilfered from their countrymen by British sailors, see Bernardino de Mendoza to Philip, “Advices from London,” 23 December 1589, CSPS Simancas 4/573; Don Pedro de Valdes to Philip, 19 March 1593, CSPS Simancas 4/612.
\textsuperscript{79} Robert Zinzan to Burghley, 3 July 1593, CSPD, 245/48(i).
\textsuperscript{80} Ralegh, \textit{Discoverie}, in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:634.
\textsuperscript{81} Ralegh named each of these sources as one of his own and mentioned these specific commodities, see Ralegh, \textit{Discoverie}, in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:634, 638, and 661.
“sometimes colour al their bodies” blue and pierce their faces like “Scithians.” The parallels to the Picts and the barbaric Gaelic-Iberian ancestor could not have been lost on the courtier. The sources provided proof not only of goldmines, but also of an historic British right to conquer, civilize, and convert. Fittingly, the best evidence of El Dorado reached London by way of the sea war, when Drake, Cumberland, and Ralegh’s pilots seized Iberian captives and their treatises and turned them over to Hakluyt and Harriot for study. Tale after tale reinforced the paradise.

Watching from the sidelines was court poet Thomas Watson, who seized on the literature as pointing the direction of Britain’s post-Armada glory. With classical and geographic imagery, he explained that though the Spanish had invaded Britain’s sacred island, “our august, bright-faced Diana” had repelled them. The author exhorted his gentlemanly audience to follow Willoughby, Frobisher, Drake, and Cavendish, yet “shift your eye to the cloudy south, where the inhabitants stand upside down from us, see new people… bring them into league with the

---

82 For “poore brutish men,” see Thomas Hackett’s translation of André Thevet, The new found worlde, or Antarctike, wherin is contained ownderufl and strange things... And now newly translated into Englishe (London: 1568), STC 23950, 48v; for “sometimes colour al their bodies,” see Hackett, New found world, 49r; for “Scithians,” see Hackett, New found world, 102r.

83 Ralegh remarked, “I haue been assured by such of the Spaniards as haue seene Manoa the Imperial Citie of Guiana which the Spaniards call El Dorado, that for the greatness, for the riches, and for the excellent seat, it farre exceedeth any of the world, at least so much as the world as is known to the Spanish,” see Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), quotation from 3:634. Indeed, Gomara and Cieza introduced Hakluyt and his audience to Guiana, from the 1531 journey of Diego de Ordaz, to Francisco de Orellana, who first explored the entire Amazon River, to subsequent evidence, see “Svndry voyages made from Nueva Gallicia and Nueua Viscala in new Spaine, to the 15. Prouinces of New Mexico and to Quiuira and Cibola,” in Hakluyt, PN (1589), 369-72. Hakluyt also included his 1586 interrogations (with Harriot) of Drake captures “Pedro Morales a Spaniard” and “Nicholas Burgoignon, alias Holy” and Portuguese sailor Lopez de Vaz’s “Discourse of the West Indies and South Sea,” see Hakluyt, PN (1589), 361 and 778-801. Lastly, and the ingredient that confirmed Ralegh’s interest according to Lorimer, in 1586-7, Ralegh’s Serpent and Mary Sparke returned from a privateering voyage off the Azores with a rich haul and an important captive: Spanish captain Pedro Sarmiento de Gamboa, the author of a history of the Incas and a firm El Dorado believer. Brought before the queen, Burghley, Howard, and Ralegh by the sailors, the group conversed for some time before Gamboa returned home to Spain. Less than two months later, an Anglo-French voyage launched in concert with the effort to save the Portuguese pretender to scope out the eastern tip of the Spanish main in 1587, however the venture failed to learn much more about the region or to establish a permanent settle there. Contemporary developments in the empire (Virginia) and at home (the coming Armada) combined to mitigate its effects in the 1580s, but the enterprise did add fodder to the 1590s, when news of the plot first reached and panicked Philip. The initial episode, including Sarmiento’s capture, is related in “A voyage to the Azores with two pinases,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 2:120-121. Lorimer compiled and printed Philip’s reports relating the subsequent Anglo-French voyage, see Lorimer, ed., Ralegh’s Discoverie, Appendix I. On the 1587 voyage and its impetus, see also Lorimer, “Ralegh’s First Reconnaissance?” 7-21.

English, and that they would acknowledge only the laws of our eternal God,” not the Catholics.\textsuperscript{85}

For Watson, 1588 had fundamentally reoriented the British Empire.

Together, the litany of Spanish failures and cruelties, side-by-side with the exaggerated feats of Arthur and Madoc as well as the pliable deeds of Cabot, Hawkins, and Thorne under Henry VIII, convinced both men: Hakluyt ascertained, “it hath pleased God of his infinite goodnesse, in his will and purpose, to appoint and reseuer this empire for vs.”\textsuperscript{86} Ralegh echoed, “this empire is reseued for her Majesty and the English nation.”\textsuperscript{87} Indeed, their message held strong through the subsequent dynasty, a testament to its strength (or its appeal): Samuel Purchas deduced that the New World might more accurately be called “Cabotiana,” for Cabot had discovered more of America, north and south, than either Vespucci or Columbus.\textsuperscript{88}

With his wide patent still applicable and a convincing corpus, Ralegh only awaited funding and a specific plan of attack. Following Gilbert’s model, and his own from Roanoke, Ralegh sent Captain Jacob Whiddon on reconnaissance to explore off Trinidad, where he likely captured Amerindian informants for transport back to England.\textsuperscript{89} Meanwhile, the courtier interviewed participants in the Caribbean offshoot of the privateering war, drawing navigational.

\textsuperscript{85} Watson, \textit{Amintae Gaudia}, sig. K2v.
\textsuperscript{86} “Here follow the names of the worthie Spaniards that haue sought to discouer and conquer Guiana...An aduertisement to the Reader,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:692. Hakluyt argued that these ancient, medieval, and early Tudor travelers had discovered Brazil and the mines of Peru for the Tudor crown. He bemoaned: had “manly courage” not be wanting in the 1550s (a nod to the mid-Tudor era) then “the rich treasurie called Perularia might long since have beene in the tower of London,” see “The voyage of Sir Thomas Pert, and Sebastien Cabot, about the eight yeere of King Henry the eight, which was the yere 1516,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), quotation from 3:498.
\textsuperscript{87} Ralegh, \textit{Discoverie}, in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:636.
\textsuperscript{88} Purchas, \textit{Hakluyts posthumus or Purchas his pilgrimes} (London: 1625), STC 20509, part IV, book 6, chapter 3, page 1177.
and ethnographical data from their experience.\(^9^0\) All of this practical information culled over 1594 completed the imperial jigsaw, detailing where the Iberian presence was strongest, where Spaniards had executed their worst cruelties, where the passage to El Dorado lay, and where the celebrated Sebastian Cabot had taken possession.\(^9^1\) It also attracted money. Because war, rebellion, and the Throckmorton scandal rendered official investment unlikely, the project was wholly privately funded. However the court played an absolutely vital role. The Burghley bloc raised essential contributions, from the Cecil, Howard, and Hawkins families, while Harriot and London Merchant Adventurer William Sanderson raised credit among traders.\(^9^2\) Guiana, then, was truly Britain’s Armada-era imperial project, its impetus, legitimacy, ideology, and approach all products of the last decade—a merger of Iberian and British myth, precedent, and circumstance made possible by a war-torn Europe and struggling monarch. Though much had changed since Elizabeth’s grandfather sent Cabot to Newfoundland almost exactly a century earlier, much had also stayed the same. The Tudor court, European

\(^9^0\) Ralegh wrote in the dedication of his Discoverie to Admiral Howard that while Whiddon was gone, he had “had some light from Captaine Parker” and other sailors, see Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:628.

\(^9^1\) Hakluyt, in turn, printed the material, see “Certaine voyags navigations and traffiques both ancient and of late… together with a Ruttier or all that coast [of South America],” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:700-728, see especially the section on Sebastian Cabot, on 3:719-728. Additional essential information came at this very moment from letters captured by Captain George Popham and delivered to Ralegh. They related the history of Spanish general Antonio de Berreo’s exploration of the Caroni in 1593 and forcefully asserted El Dorado’s veracity. The letters were printed as “Fourre severall testimonies concering the rich Empire of Guiana, called by the Spaniards El Nuevo Dorado, collected out of certaine Spanish letters taken at sea by captaine George Popham,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:663-665. Popham was certainly convinced, and set out with Robert Dudley (Elizabethan favorite the earl of Leicester’s son) in November 1594, either in competition or cooperation with Ralegh, who had not yet secured funding. Claiming Trinidad for Elizabeth and then continuing down the Orinoco, Dudley described a wild Eden eager for Tudor rule, but never returned there. His report soon reached Hakluyt, printed as “A voyage of the honourable Gentleman M. Robert Duddeley,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:575-578, and likely elicited jealousy in Ralegh, who now sped up preparations. On Dudley’s venture, see G.F. Warner, ed., The Voyage of Robert Dudley to the West Indies, 1594-1595 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1899). On Popham and Dudley, see Lorimer, ed., Ralegh’s Discoverie, especially xxxi-xlvi.

\(^9^2\) On the subscriptions, see Shirley, “Guiana Finances,” 55-69. With his fall, Ralegh had little wealth of his own. Meanwhile, Sanderson’s lengthy imperial fiscal resume included contributions to Davis’s Northwest Passage searches, Ulster Plantation, and the first English globes. Married to Ralegh’s niece, he named his sons Ralegh, Cavendish, and Drake. Ultimately, however, the relationship soured, as Sanderson later found himself in the High Court of Chancery accused of mishandling £60,000 of Guiana investment. On Sanderson, see Ruth McIntyre, “William Sanderson,” William and Mary Quarterly 13, no. 2 (1956): 184-201. Also contributing, but in a different way, Cecil finagled Whiddon’s release from prison so that he could again pilot, see Andrews, Trade, Plunder, and Settlement, 291.
competition, and national exigency continued to underwrite imperial adventure. Early the following year, Ralegh departed, convinced by his close study that “it is no dreame which I have reported of Guiana.”

What we know of the 1595 project emerges from Ralegh’s Discoverie, a lengthy promotional tract nominally dedicated to Cecil and Howard, yet expressly composed to induce the queen to float subsequent adventure and restore his favor. An exemplary piece of imperial discourse and rhetoric critical to the development of the English travel narrative, the manuscript was painstakingly edited by Cecil to balance believability with attractiveness and feasibility. After all, memories of Frobisher’s gold and Gilbert’s Northwest Passage—both described hyperbolically yet never found—remained fresh. In the experiment it depicted and its very prose, the Discoverie illustrates both the nature and execution of Tudor imperialism in the last decade.

Armed with three hundred men in four ships, several of them veterans of the Dutch, French, and Irish campaigns, Ralegh made landfall at Trinidad in March. There, anti-Iberian, anti-Catholic sentiment combined with experience to direct his efforts. Straightaway, the courtier sought to cultivate indigenous relationships, stoking complaints of Spanish cruelty and desirous to avoid the ill-will that had beset Roanoke. Indeed, Roanoke served as a convenient excuse, as he told Trinidadian officials that he “was bound onely for the reliefe of those English which I had planted in Virginia.” Claiming to act on native command, Ralegh destroyed the Spanish settlement, leaving only a stone engraved with a clear statement of Protestant invective: “every plant, which my heavenly father hath not planted, shall be rooted up” (Matthew 15:13).

---

93 Ralegh to Cecil, regarding the evidence gleaned from Popham’s seizure of Spanish intelligence, 22 November 1595, BL M485/8, Hatfield, CP 36, no. 9.
94 As Stephen Greenblatt also suggested, see Greenblatt, New World Encounters, xiv.
95 As Lorimer and Fuller showed, see Lorimer, ed., Ralegh’s Discoverie, xix-xx; Fuller, Voyages in Print, 57-75.
96 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:642-643.
97 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:632.
98 This moment is only related in the manuscript version, see Ralegh, Discoverie, Lambeth Palace MS 250, fol. 317r.
Through his interpreter, Ralegh proclaimed himself “servant of a Queene who was the great
Casique of the North, and a virgine, and had more Casiqui vnder her then there were trees in that
yland: that shee was an enemie to the Castellani in respect of their tyrannie and oppression, and
that she deliuered all such nations about her.” It was an assertion of Iberian inferiority, British
imperial prowess, and, it seems, either religious reform in France, the Netherlands, Scotland, and
Ireland or Anglicization in Newfoundland and Virginia. Now, Ralegh explained, it was Guiana’s
turn. On 17 May 1595, with reduced men and supplies, Ralegh set out for El Dorado. He was
sure that when they learned of Elizabeth’s defeat of the Armada, the Amerindians in his path,
“barbarous in nature,” would readily submit their obedience—the long sought-after Tudor
imperial goal. In a world of war with Spain, nationalist zeal brought on by the 1588 victory
helped define the ideology and practice at work on the ground in South America.

As befit the nasty nineties, the course of Ralegh’s march was determined by past
knowledge and couched as the key to Britain’s future. During the Trinidad raid, the British
captured Antonio de Berrío, the Spanish governor and a firm El Dorado believer. Spared for
his expertise, which Ralegh employed much as his predecessors had retained Portuguese and
Italian aid, Berrío guided them along the Amazon, where the British soldiers used native “good
councell” to temper the “euill counsell” of their potentially deceitful captive. It was a striking
juxtaposition, one that reflected an integral humanist doctrine and showed the transmission of
British domestic political theory from nation to empire. Throughout, Ralegh was cautious—the

---

99 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:633.
100 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:641.
101 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:634. As Andrews aptly described, Berrio emerges from the
text as a “wily” foe, eager to tell Ralegh of Guiana’s wonders yet also dissuade him from proceeding, eager to keep
the golden prize for himself and the Spanish crown, see Andrews, Trade, Plunder, and Settlement, 291.
102 For “good counsell,” see Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:654; for “euill counsell,” see
Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:655.
group ultimately turned back for want of victuals after fifteen days, leaving only two Englishmen behind—perhaps a lesson learned from the fate of his brother or Roanoke colonists.\textsuperscript{103}

In excusing his restraint, Ralegh exemplified his project’s importance. Throughout the narrative and letters to Cecil, the author portrayed his rivalry with Berrío as the Anglo-Spanish war in microcosm, whoever claimed Guiana would declare victory with the ensuing gold and conquest: “we must not looke to mayntayne war uppon the revenus of Inglond…[while] the enemy by the addition of so much wealth weare us out of all.”\textsuperscript{104} The consequence would be the “general losse and impouerishment of the kingdom and common weale.”\textsuperscript{105} Far more than a theater of the 1590s, Ralegh refracted Guiana through the prism of inextricably-linked national survival and imperial expansion.

As explored above, in the half-decade after the Armada, court, church, and parliament attempted to standardize practice, foster nationalism, and imagine imperial greatness as bulwarks to foreign threats. As his use of the black legend attests, that patriotic fervor pervaded Ralegh’s project, but it also influenced how the courtier portrayed Guiana to his British audience. Throughout, he labeled tribes as “nations.”\textsuperscript{106} Though comparatively inferior to Britain, Ralegh’s terminology demonstrates the growing currency of the word as well as a heightened appreciation of cultural and political differences among others, dividing between cannibals and somewhat more civilized ally nations in a way not present in earlier Tudor projects. British nation-building thus pervaded the imperial realm. In addition, the Discoverie labeled Guiana an “empire,” a

\textsuperscript{103} The author’s principal alliance was with the native chief Topiawari, who sent his son to England in exchange for the two Englishmen left behind, according to Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:650-651.

\textsuperscript{104} Ralegh to Cecil, 22 November 1595, BL M485/8, Hatfield, CP 36, no. 9.

\textsuperscript{105} Ralegh, Discoverie, “To the Reader,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:630.

\textsuperscript{106} For the term “nation” or “nations” used to describe native populations, see Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:632, 633, 637, 638, 639, 640, 643, 644.
characterization unique among Tudor projects. Laden with rhetorical baggage in the sixteenth-century as the aspiration of Tudor imperial promoters and theorists, the word’s use here could not but be significant: it imbued Guiana with a semblance of superiority (among natives) for its gold, and thereby worthy of British energy; second, it evoked other (even classical) empires, rendering conquest of it all the more glorious; third, like “nation,” empire demonstrates how the courtier conceived of political units based on the vocabulary popular at home. There was one more, equally significant term, peppered throughout the treatise: “honour.” With this word, ubiquitous in the decade, Ralegh stressed not only his personal honour, but his effort to “honour our nation”; the enterprise “only respected her Maiesties future Honour and riches.”

Much as he relied on contemporary terminology, Ralegh too drew on the tropes and rhetoric of imperial propaganda that he had studied from Hakluyt. Like his predecessors, Ralegh compared his project to an ideal British geography, society, and economy. He equated fruitful fields to English parks, beasts to English beef, rivers to the Thames, islands to the Isle of Wight, and the passage between Trinidad and Guiana to the channel separating Dover and Calais—a particularly striking simile relating one imperial journey to another. Further, Guiana not only mirrored but complemented Britain: its Edenic, temperate land suited British bodies and harbored precisely those goods that the nation required, from wine to fish to naval stores and (of course) gold. There, Elizabeth could employ all subjects troubled by poverty, famine, or

---

107 For Guiana as an “empire,” see Ralegh, *Discoverie*, in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:634, 635, 640, 656, 661, 662. Ralegh added that the conquest would yield an incomparable British Empire: “whatsoever prince shall possesse it [Guiana], that Prince shall be Lord of more golde, and of a more beautifull Empire, and of more Cities and people, then [sic] either the King of Spaine, or the great Turke,” see Ralegh, *Discoverie*, in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), quotation from 3:634.


unemployment. Likewise, Ralegh’s description of the natives themselves mimicked the terms of incivility solidified from Newfoundland to Ireland, Scotland to Virginia, of a warmongering people, apt to commit infidelity, incest, and cannibalism, yet ready to obey. Indeed, though Cecil struck out the most otherworldly components, wild monsters remained in Guiana, conjuring up ancient Galfridian Britain and the mythology surrounding Mandeville’s journies.

And all of it, Ralegh carefully explained in terms drawn from earlier discourse, including John Cabot’s 1496 patent, existed in a place never conquered nor possessed by any Christian prince. Guiana belonged to Britain by right of first discovery, and need only be garrisoned and then planted. Personifying the land much as Wooings theorists had anthropomorphized Scotland, he offered, “Guiana is a countrey that hath yet her maydenhead, neuer sackt, turned, nor wrought, the earth hath not bene torne, nor the vertue of the salt of the soyle spent by manurance, the graues haue not bene opened for golde, the mines not broken with sledges, nor their images puld downe out of their temples.” Under a virginal female king, Ralegh’s comment was risky, walking a fine line between flattery and offense, but the point was made lucid. Ostensibly idolatrous, savage, and under Spanish threat, yet wealthy and untouched by European imperialism, Guiana needed Anglican civility.

Guiana’s perfect fit within the British Empire was providential: after all, Ralegh asserted, the entire region, including Spain’s “West Indies were first offered to her Majesties grandfather

10 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:660-662.
11 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:655-656.
12 For Ralegh’s most detailed monstrous description, which related the “Ewaipanoma who… haue their eyes in their shoulders, and their mouthes in the middle of the breasts, and that a long traine of haire growth backward bewteene their shoulders,” see Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), quotation from 3:652-653. And Ralegh specifically noted Mandeville as a defense for dubious evidence, see Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:653.
13 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:661.
14 For the need to garrison, see Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:643. Though never declared outright, a colonial plan is strongly implied: “besides by keeping one good Fort, or building one towne of strength, the whole Empire is guarded, and whatsoever Companies shall be afterwardes planted within the land… those shall be able all to reunite themselues,” see Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), quotation from 3:661.
15 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:661.
by Columbus.”

Though reliant on Iberian sources, this was a Tudor project, with long roots. After he docked at Plymouth that September, Ralegh set down his experiences in hopes of an imminent return. Taking the manuscript from its author, Burghley’s son Robert had accomplished literary alchemy, turning no discovery at all into *The Discoverie* of gold, commodities, conquest, and Habsburg defeat in print.

For Ralegh, here was the pivotal mid-decade juncture: by winter, he was lobbying, pleading with Howard that “Her Majesty shall, by foreslowing it, lose the greatest assurance of good that ever was offered to any Christian prince…the surest way to devert all attempts from home.” Six weeks later, amid rumors that Philip had colonized El Dorado, Ralegh enlisted Harriot and another scholar to memorialize his voyage, in maps and in prose. The latter commission yielded “Of the voyage for Guiana,” the single most comprehensive ideological argument in favor of the project. Legitimizing the expansion as profitable, necessary, and honourable, the anonymous writer explicitly equated Catholicism and Spanish rule with barbarity and removed all traces of positive Iberian example. Further, he appealed to feudal, natural, and Roman law to assert that Elizabeth held all right to Guiana, regardless of what Rome’s “great Inchantor or cousner, & troubler of the world” might charge. Characteristic British faith and law had induced Amerindians “to doe homage & to hold her Majesty as ther vassell” and offered

---

118 On Cecil’s transformation of the manuscript into its print version, see Lorimer, ed., *Ralegh’s Discoverie*, lxxvi-lxxxiii.
119 Ralegh to Howard, 10 December 1595, BL M485/8, Hatfield, CP 36, no. 42.
120 For the rumors of a Spanish colony, see John Gilbert to Ralegh, 17 January 1596, TNA: PRO SP 12/256, fol. 26; for the map, which was first promised to Ralegh’s audience in Ralegh’s *Discoverie*, in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:637, see Harriot to Cecil, 21 July 1596, BL M485/9, Hatfield, CP 42, no. 36, which explains that the chart’s preparation was underway. The resultant map survives as BL Add. MS 17940A.
121 Anon., “Of the voyage for Guiana,” n.d. (c. 1595-6), BL Sloane MS 1133, fols. 45r-52v, quotation from fol. 49r. Lorimer hypothesized that the poet was likely Harriot, Hakluyt, or Lawrence Keymis, see Lorimer, ed., *Ralegh’s Discoverie*, xxxv-xxxvii.
an opportunity “to strengthen ourselves at home… [and] annoy our enemy abroad.” The tract thus united watchwords from across Tudor theory.

Strikingly, the tract concluded, other indigenous populations will readily follow, if “the maps of the several shires in England & the large map of the City of London should be conveyed unto them,” then it will function as proof of Elizabeth’s “great magnificence & puissance, her countryes populous, rich, warlike & well provided of shippes as any state in the northern world.” Imperial expansion, then, was part and parcel with national consolidation, Atlantic and domestic entwined as ever in 1596; like the first English shires bred those of Ireland and Wales, America was next, but only if Ralegh received support.

As royal funds vanished in Ireland, Burghley’s crew made a broad appeal, printing the Discoverie in mid-March. Though enthusiastic responses were few, one came, significantly, from Edward Hayes, the staunch advocate of post-Gilbert Newfoundland. On the heels of post-war Atlantic privateering, the merchant volunteered for service, lauding the action as just, defensive, and profitable. The offer never materialized; however it ties the Tudor Empire together, a sign of continuity and overlap: Ralegh may have styled himself a conquistador and hunted for El Dorado, but his project was British, a piece of the century’s imperial puzzle and perceived as such by participants.

Similarly encouraged, poet George Chapman added a piece that recalled Rough Wooings allegory and fit contemporary Irish literature described below. His verse, De Guiana, carmen Epicum described a burgeoning British Empire built on providence, trial and error, and prophecy

---

122 For “to doe homage…,” see Anon., “Of the voyage,” BL Sloane MS 1133, fol. 47r; for “to strengthen ourselves at home…[and] annoy our enemy abroad,” see Anon., “Of the voyage,” BL Sloane MS 1133, fol. 45v.
123 Anon., “Of the voyage,” BL Sloane MS 1133, fol. 49r.
124 Lorimer also noted the tempered reply, see Lorimer, ed., Ralegh’s Discoverie, lxxxiv.
125 Hayes to Cecil, 15 May 1595, BL Lansdowne MS 6, fols. 182-183.
by Diana and Merlin. To this entity, a personified, feminized, and inferior Guiana “stands on her tip-toes at faire England looking, Kissing her hand, bowing her mightie breast, And euery signe of all submission making, To be her sister, and the daughter both Of our most sacred Maide.”

Promising honour, gold, and renown, while deterring “all blacke tempests of invasion,” Chapman depicted the Thames running to meet the Orinoco, which cyclically crested on England’s shores. “So let thy soueraigne Empire be encrease,” he summarized, “Where new Britannia humblie kneels to heauen, The world to her, and, both at her blest feet, In whom the Circles of all Empires meete.” Much as Ralegh related 1595-6 as the crucial moment, Chapman submitted that Guiana was the Tudor Empire’s apogee.

The influx of interest and capital was enough to float two small enterprises, sent by Ralegh in 1596. The first, by auxiliary captain Lawrence Keymis, yielded a lengthy travel narrative. His Relation was meant to “remove all fig-leaues from our vnbeliefe,” recommend Ralegh as a modern Pericles (a significant humanist complement), and cement the project in Tudor imperial calculus, “worthy the ancient fame & reputation of our English nation.”

Keymis’s two ships landed in mid-March, bearing towards the Orinoco. They followed Tudor precedent to advance, take possession, and describe the land: relying on native interpreters; imposing English names, e.g. “Cape Cecyl” and “Raleana”, and noting “whole shyeres of fruitfull rich groundes lying now waste for want of people, doe prostitute themselues

126 Chapman, De Guiana, carmen Epicum, printed in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:668-672, for the emphasis on “prophecie,” as Chapman put it, quotation from 3:668.
127 Chapman, De Guiana, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:669.
128 Chapman, De Guiana, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:669.
129 For “So let thy soueraigne Empire be encrease,” see Chapman, De Guiana, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:669; for “Where new Britannia…,” see Chapman, De Guiana, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:672.
130 Described in Harriot to Cecil, 21 July 1596, BL M485/9, Hatfield, CP 42, no. 36.
132 On Keymis’s uses of native intelligence, see Vaughan, “Ralegh’s Indian Interpreters,” 361-369.
133 For “Cape Cecyl,” see Keymis, Relation, sig. B1r; for “Raleana,” see Keymis, Relation, sig. B1v.
unto us, like a faire and beautifull woman, in the pride and flower of desired yeares.”\footnote{Keymis, Relation, sig. F2v.} The report carefully related that Spanish settlement was imminent, cause for action and proof of the region’s value. Moreover, Keymis explained how the Amerindians excitedly greeted his men, familiar with their reputation for justice and virtue—a clear avowal of British identity in contrast to both tyrannous Spanish and uncivil natives.\footnote{Keymis, Relation, sigs. B2v-B3r.} Another year into the Anglo-Spanish war, with new threats of Habsburg encroachment, the Relation could advance a more pointed argument for the honour and advancement of “our weale publique”—domestic and imperial inextricably tied—than ever.\footnote{Keymis, Relation, sig. A2r. As David Armitage noted, Keymis drew on this and other “techniques of the \textit{ars rhetorica} to achieve the great end of Roman moral philosophy—the good of the commonwealth through the promotion of action which was at once \textit{honestum} and \textit{utile}… This supplied the political and moral context within which he expected Elizabeth and her counselors (all trained and many, like Sir William Cecil and Elizabeth herself, very much committed humanists) to judge his proposals for English colonization,” see Armitage, “Literature and Empire,” in \textit{The Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume I: The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century}, ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 99-123, quotation from 107.} While the Spaniards brought looting, enslavement, and death, Britain brought gracious government.\footnote{Keymis, Relation, sigs. D2v-D3r.} But cognizant of the lack-luster response to the \textit{Discoverie}, he opted to espouse Guiana’s more verifiable goods, like brazilwood, spices, and fish, than its gold, and soon turned home.\footnote{Keymis, Relation, sig. B4r.} Keymis thus reinforced Cecil’s carefully-constructed platform with further experience, heightened classical and nationalist allusions, and economic/agricultural inducements.\footnote{He even dubbed the \textit{Relation} “your second Discouerie,” see Keymis, Relation, quotation from sig. A2r.} Meanwhile, at court, Cecil took solace in Hakluyt’s new translation of José de Acosta’s \textit{Naturall and Morall Historie of the West Indies}, which, though ambivalent on El Dorado’s location, relayed the same magnificence and limited Iberian discovery.\footnote{Hakluyt, “Notes concerning Sir Walter Raleigh’s discovery of Dorado, translated out of the natural and moral History of the Indies, written by Joseph Acosta,” n.d. (c. 1596), TNA: PRO SP 12/235/43.}

In their wake, Leonard Berry set out for a yearlong venture in late-1596, sailor Thomas Masham keeping his log. A repeat of Keymis only superficially, the enterprise accrued more
practical British knowledge and kept the region in British sights. Berry stopped off at the Cape Verde Islands, collecting salt for Newfoundland cod and adding to the venture’s profitability—the captain in the service of an interlocking imperial system.\footnote{The third voyage set forth by sir Water Ralegh to Guiana, with a pinnesse called the Watte, in the yeere 1596. Written by M. Thomas Masham, a gentleman of the companie,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:692-698, for salt collection, see 3:692.} Proceeding to “Cape Cecill,” an act that solidified the claim and (hopefully) heartened its namesake, the crew was feted as soon as they revealed their identity: tractable natives were “kinde to all Englishmen generally; as by experience we sound [sic].”\footnote{For “Cape Cecill,” see Masham, “Third voyage… to Guiana,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:693; for “kinde to all…” see Masham, “Third voyage…to Guiana,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:697.} Masham further echoed Ralegh’s notes of domestic comparison and natural richness, with deer like England’s and timber to improve the navy, all “to the benefit of our countrey.”\footnote{Masham, “Third voyage… to Guiana,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:697.} To further his point, the sailor adapted the classical dialogue to cast himself as the skeptical student and Ralegh as the philosopher, making his reports of gold and temperateness—two mainstays of Newfoundland rhetoric—more convincing. Having verified Eldorado, the expedition departed, eagerly leaving the final discovery for Ralegh.\footnote{Masham, “Third voyage… to Guiana,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 3:697.}

The promotion showed court, scholar, and adventurer working in concert to, as Hakluyt wrote in the vein of Dee’s \textit{Limits}, “stirre vp her Majesties heart… to increase her dominion, enrich her cofers, and reduce many Pagans to the faith” by exploration and colonization, in “like images of [her] famous predecessors.”\footnote{For “stirre vp her Majesties heart… to increase…,” see Hakluyt “To the right honorable Sir Robert Cecil Knight, principall Secretarie to her Maiestie, master of the Court of Wardes and Liueries, and one of her Maiesties most honourable priuiue Counsell,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 2:sig. *3r; for “like images of [her] famous predecessors,” see Hakluyt to Cecil, in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 2: sig. *2v. For Dee’s similar statement, analyzed in chapter five, regarding his desire to “stire upp your Majestie to undertake this Brytishe discovery and recovery enterprise,” see Ken Macmillan, ed., \textit{John Dee: The Limits of the British Empire} (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004), quotation from 29.} They formed a critical intellectual circle that mirrored what had coalesced around the Rough Wooings. Separated by fifty years, their goal—a British Empire under the Tudor crown—remained the same, albeit with a geographic shift.
Accordingly, Masham’s report of an independent London trader by the name of John Ley who had followed the guide Keymis offered in his Relation into the lower Amazon miffed Ralegh greatly, a rare example of a clandestine trip for private profit that was no part of the circle’s vision.146 Berry outted Ley and brought him squarely into the official project, for two more voyages, as the interloper supplied favorable reports and combined colonial prospecting in Guiana with profitable Caribbean trade and privateering.147 As the Gilbert-Ralegh clan had long sought, Ley demonstrated the sort of imperial multitasking that had been the Tudor bread-and-butter. And, indeed, it was not surprising for this veteran of the Dutch Revolt, Frobisher’s 1592 Atlantic raid, and Deputy Russell’s Ireland, an organic progression of his career.148

But the Londoner had also simply gotten lucky: his timing found the court much distracted. In June 1596, Elizabeth’s factious council united in the Capture of Cadiz, another ephemeral English victory in the Spanish war turned to nationalistic, literary gold by Essex and Hakluyt.149 Ralegh led the rearguard, for the queen’s honour, “glory, the triumph of their fame, and surety to the realm, with the least loss of English blood.”150 Subsequently, Elizabeth allowed her former favorite to return to court and charged him with a follow-up Azores expedition that fall, “so that Thy name be spread for wonders wrought and the faithful encouraged.”151 Ralegh’s

146 Masham described meeting “a Barke called the Iohn of London captaine Leigh [Ley] being in her,” see Masham, “Third voyage… to Guiana,” in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), quotation from 3:695-696. Ley’s story emerges from a brief family history penned by his brother, James Ley, entitled “Ley his pedigree,” n.d. (c. 1609), transcribed and printed with original folio pagination in Lorimer, ed., Ralegh’s Discoverie, Appendix IV, no. 2, pp. 312-331 (fols. 15r-21v).
147 Ley, “Pedigree,” fols. 15v-16r, in Lorimer, ed., Ralegh’s Discoverie, 313-315.
150 “A prayer made by her majesty herself on the behalf of her army sent into Spain,” May 1596, BL Add MS 38823, fol. 96r.
new ship—the *Guiana*—was in the retinue, an Elizabethan use of naval nomenclature to assert Tudor Empire, a practice begun by Henry VIII.\(^{152}\)

Expectedly, Essex’s star waned, often the inverse of Ralegh’s, but as he groped for restoration, the earl followed his rival’s model: imperialism. Instead of a new project, however, Essex chose a century-long standby, looking closer to home in Ireland. Conversely, Guiana became less of a priority; the courtier would not return to South America until 1617, when he needed to in order to regain an again compromised reputation. Meanwhile Ireland grew to assume royal and courtly preeminence.\(^{153}\)

***

Back in mid-1592, at the lowest of his lows, Ralegh had refuted the image of incomparable quiet in Ireland that others, like Camden, asserted.\(^{154}\) Perhaps merely a plea for service, the disgraced had courtier warned that the queen was at imminent risk of losing the island, which he regarded—much like America—as a “strang country” and part of her “inheritance,” which needed to be “new built and planted with Inglishe.”\(^{155}\) Choosing his diction carefully, Ralegh illustrated overlap among the decade’s projects. The next year, he wrote again, sure that a storm was brewing: before long “the Kinge of Spayne, who seeketh not Irlande for Irlande, but havinge rayesed up troops of beggers in our backs, shall be able to inforce us to cast our eyes over our shoulders, while thos before us sterk us on the braynes.”\(^{156}\) His words were prophetic—within the year, as he planned Guiana, Ireland became another site of the Anglo-
Spanish war and its discourse. Evidence of the special proximity between the two locations abounds in Ralegh’s mindset. As he pitched the southern scheme, he did so as an antidote or offshoot of the fight over “the desolate place” off England’s western shore. As the Discoverie explained, Philip’s American gold endangers all of the Atlantic world; if he keeps Elizabethans from foreign enterprise, “either by offer of invasion or by besieging vs in Britaine, Ireland, or elsewhere, he hath then brought the worke of our peril in great forwardnes.”

In 1594, in the shadow of the second Desmond Rebellion, earl of Tyrone Hugh O’Neill took up his countryman’s mantle. With a counter-imperial ideology of “faith and fatherland,” the Ulsterman encouraged pan-Irish revolt against a so-called “strange and foreign prince,” in defense of their native soil and Catholic faith. Though he admitted rampant savagery in Ireland, Tyrone turned Tudor imperial doctrine on its head, charging that Gaelic society was civil, whereas English planters had introduced barbarity and slavery. Moreover, the well-educated earl shrewdly manipulated the civic humanism of mid-Tudor theorists Burghley and Smith, gravitating towards republican (rather than imperial) Rome as his model. Rather than conquering colonizers, Tyrone described a peaceful unitary state as the classical ideal. He too addressed the economic argument, endorsing reports of agricultural fertility and boundless resources, but admonishing his deluded countrymen for believing that they would ever see the

157 Ralegh to Cecil, 10 November 1595, BL M485/8, Hatfield, CP 36, no. 4.
158 Ralegh, Discoverie, in Hakluyt, PN (1599-1600), 3:630.
“commodity and profit of our country” under British rule.\textsuperscript{162} Most strikingly, he appealed to Scotland, which had refused the “yoke of English slavery” under Henry VIII and Edward VI, despite worse geographical odds; his island’s physical independence proved divine sanction of their sovereignty.\textsuperscript{163}

As essential as the *patria*, Tyrone plea’s was religious. He invoked Elizabeth’s 1570 excommunication and the contemporary French precedent to sanction holy war against a sitting monarch.\textsuperscript{164} Like Desmond, the earl knew where to turn for help on this count. In September 1595, he wrote to Philip II, declaring, “Our only hope of re-establishing the Catholic religion rests on your assistance. Now or never our Church must be succored.”\textsuperscript{165} The most telling insight into the budding alliance stems from a concurrent message he sent to a Habsburg official, which promised that by assisting, Philip will “re-establish our religion and acquire a kingdom.”\textsuperscript{166} With Ralegh out discovering, the king must have been enticed by equivalent poaching and aligned with O’Neill in 1596.\textsuperscript{167} Importantly, the pact appealed to the Scythian bloodlines supposedly shared by Iberians and Gaels, first used by Desmond in 1528 and reified in 1556’s union. Forty years on, Tyrone manipulated the hereditary link, Iberians thrilled that though “Most nations dislike Spain: the Irish love it.”\textsuperscript{168} Yet despite the promise of a Habsburg Ireland and weakened Britain, the accession of Philip III upon his father’s 1598 death stalled the invasion until 1601.

Accordingly, in 1599, Tyrone sent archbishop of Armagh Peter Lombard to Rome for aid and legatine status, which would allow him to nominate bishops and excommunicate. Born in

\textsuperscript{162} “A seditious lybell sent by Tyrone,” n.d. November 1599, BL Add. MS 38139/1, fol. 11.
\textsuperscript{163} “Pronouncement of the Munster Lords,” 19 November 1598, BL Add MS 34313, fol. 119.
\textsuperscript{164} “A seditious lybell sent by Tyrone,” n.d. November 1599, BL Add. MS 38139/1, fol. 10.
\textsuperscript{165} Tyrone to Philip II, 27 September 1595, Carew MS 612, fol. 46. Further correspondence pushed the point, e.g. Tyrone to Philip III (who succeeded his father in September 1598), 31 December 1599, Carew MS 632, fol. 188.
\textsuperscript{166} Tyrone to John DeLaguila, 27 September 1595, Carew MS 612, fol. 45r.
\textsuperscript{167} Philip II to Tyrone, 22 January 1596, Carew MS 612, fol. 65.
\textsuperscript{168} “Report of the Council of State to Philip III on the communication from the Irishman Richard Owen, giving advice as to the best way to effect the war in Ireland,” 28 November 1600, *CSPS Simancas* 4/696.
Waterford and trained in theology and philosophy, Lombard happily obliged. Deploying the same history as Tudor theorists to opposite ends, the clergyman reminded Clement VIII that 1155’s *Laudabiliter* made Ireland a special papal fief, offered only conditionally to the English. Lombard added that in legend, Ireland was among the first Christian countries, converted by St. Patrick and nicknamed the island of the saints. Tudor heresy, he argued, undercut all this prior British right. Luckily, the pious Tyrone arose, an Israelite crusader to rescue Jerusalem from Henry VIII’s schism and devilish seduction. Clement was swayed, commending Tyrone as captain-general of Ireland’s Catholic army, appointing Lombard archbishop of Armagh, and pre-pardoning all who “throw off the yoke of slavery imposed on you by the English, deserters from the Holy Roman Church.” With Philip’s aid, it was a powerful combination that realized Britain’s anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish xenophobia.

In short, by circular letters, petitions, and clandestine Catholic clergymen offering salvation to rebels, Tyrone inverted British imperial theory. Armed with ideology, disgruntled men, and European support, he engineered the Nine Years’ War throughout Ireland and its Pale. The impact of “faith and fatherland” as a unifying theory and rhetoric was minimal during the war, a consequence of its inability to animate Anglo-Irish who conceived of themselves as English, Tyrone’s limited popularity as a rallying figure, and the strength of Tudor
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169 As Lombard argued in *De regno Hiberniae, sanctorum insula commentarius*, c. 1599-1600 (Louvain: 1632), reprinted and translated by Patrick F. Moran, ed., *De regno Hiberniae* (Dublin: Duffy, 1868), especially part two.
170 Moran, ed., Lombard’s *De regno Hiberniae*, part one.
171 Moran, ed., Lombard’s *De regno Hiberniae*, part four.
172 “Bull of indulgence,” 18 April 1600, Carew MS 608, fol. 84.
173 For example, see Bishop of Cork and the “Vicar Apostolic” to Viscount Barry, 13 February 1600, Carew MS 615, fol. 2, which asserted: “we have, for the maintenance of the Catholic religion to be planted in this realm, as also for the expelling of our enemies for their continual treachery and oppression used towards this poor country, undertaken a journey [for]… that godly enterprise,” quotation from fol. 2; and Tyrone to Lord Roche, 21 February 1600, Carew MS 615, fol. 2r, in which Tyrone described his objective “to erect the Catholic religion and further the general good of the realm of Ireland,” quotation from fol. 2r.
governance. This anti-imperial ideology was fundamentally significant, the first to come out of Tudor empire-building since the Wooings and the trigger for an Elizabethan response.

The crown’s ideological retort especially revolved around “honour” and a defense of the traditional Tudor imperial theory that the earl exploited. Though not new to the 1590s, the dialogue again illustrates how inextricably tied nation and empire were, the successful defense of one part and parcel with that of the other. It is also where Essex reenters the narrative.

Appreciable from the start of the rebellion, when Ralph Lane and others labeled Tyrone wild and Caesar-like, plotting to pull the crown from Elizabeth’s head and ennoble wild, barbarous savages, official discourse quickened c. 1598-9. Royal correspondence helps contextualize the increase, describing a major defeat at Armagh as much “to Her Majesty’s dishonour, and the increasing of the traitor’s pride.” Reports detailed how Tyrone’s “traitorous and villainous libel… is divulged and spread abroad by these Popish priests and Jesuits (whereof this country doth swarm), and do mightily infest and seduce this bad nation, being apt to embrace anything that may have any colour to maintain their rebellious actions.” Passed to the court to encourage an answer, Cecil labeled the earl’s vision “Ewtopia,” scribbling More’s title in the margin of Tyrone’s articles. Whether he did so to imply impossibility (as in modern usage) or that Ireland could be an Atlantic colony (like the book’s Utopia) is unclear. Regardless, the
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174 As Morgan argued, see Morgan, “O’Neill and the Nine Years War,” 37.
176 For the comparison of Tyrone to Caesar, see George Carew to Cecil, “Treatise on Ireland,” 13 April 1594, CSPI 174/13(I); for plotting to pull the crown off Elizabeth’s head, see Anon., “Discourse for Ireland,” n.d. 1594, Carew MS 632, fol. 106r; for Tyrone’s rebels as wild and barbarous, see Lane to Burghley, 2 February 1595, CSPI 178/31.
177 Earl of Ormond to PC, 21 October 1598, CSPI 202/3/117.
178 Lord Justice Carey to Cecil, 4 December 1599, CSPI 206/65. The first report that Tyrone would use foreign forces comes from official Henry Bagenal to Burghley in March 1594, CSPI 173/97, predating the rebellion proper.
179 As appears in the entry, “Articles intended to be stood upon by Tyrone,” n.d. November 1599, CSPI 206/55.
annotation poignantly recalls the lengthy history of Tudor imperialism; as the Irish Earl of Ormonde described, the crown looked to make Tyrone “an example for all other traitors to the world’s end.” ³¹⁸⁰

In mid-1598, relating the most recent rebel offensive, Tudor official Geoffrey Fenton described the miseries of Ireland, arguing only Tyrone’s complete extirpation and banishment would secure the queen’s honour and, by extension, her kingdom.³¹⁸¹ The queen agreed, similarly describing Tyrone’s vision and any unsanctioned peace talks “derogatory to our honour” and “a disgrace to us in government.”³¹⁸² The council agreed to send in an eager Essex, who campaigned on his military expertise, power, wealth, and chivalric honour.³¹⁸³ The new deputy’s appointment was laced with the same vocabulary, and justified militarism: Elizabeth’s March 1599 instructions railed against “this great infection of Popery… massings and idolatry winked and tolerated at.”³¹⁸⁴ She explained that “we find it necessary, both in regard of our honour and the safety of Ireland, to end the rebellion there by a powerful force,” in defense of kingdom and subjects.³¹⁸⁵ With a large force and three-pronged attack strategy, expressly financed by Irish revenues that exceeded that of her father and siblings, Essex plowed ahead, but found himself stymied and disillusioned at every turn.³¹⁸⁶ By fall, the courtier sailed home and Tyrone reported that he had very nearly convinced Essex to surrender and join the rebellion against Elizabeth, but the English hatred of Spain ran too deep, as the Irish alliance with Philip halted the prospective deal.³¹⁸⁷ The queen was incensed, chastising the pope and Spanish king for raising ungodly and malicious rebellion, causing rightful subjects to “shake off the yoke of obedience which they

³¹⁸⁰ Ormonde to Elizabeth, 18 June 1598, CSP I 202/2/75.
³¹⁸¹ Fenton to Cecil, 11 June 1598, CSP I 202/2/62.
³¹⁸² Elizabeth’s response to Tyrone, c. 1598-1599, as quoted in Morgan, Tyrone’s Rebellion, 165.
³¹⁸³ For Essex’s appointment and campaign, see Camden, Historie, 236-250.
³¹⁸⁴ Elizabeth’s instructions to Essex, 25 March 1599, Carew MS 601, fol. 166.
³¹⁸⁵ Elizabeth’s instructions to Essex, 25 March 1599, Carew MS 601, fol. 166.
³¹⁸⁶ Camden, Historie, especially 239, 240, 241.
owe unto us… under the pretext and colour of religion.” Indeed, she swore upon her princely honour that no Tudor had ever sought to conquer Ireland, only to maintain their loyal servitors with equal love and favor as English subjects.\footnote{Elizabeth to (?), n.d. December 1599, CSPI 206/136.}\footnote{Elizabeth to (?), n.d. December 1599, CSPI 206/136.}\footnote{Elizabeth’s “Instructions” written to accompany Mountjoy’s patent, n.d. March 1600, Carew MS 632, fol. 189.}\footnote{On the battle, see Hiram Morgan, ed., The Battle of Kinsale (Bray, Co. Wicklow: Wordwell, 2004).} Dismissing Essex, whose fall culminated in his 1601 execution, the queen retained Lord Mountjoy, granting him authority to “prosecute with fire and sword all rebels and malefactors,” just as Barnaby Rich had advised the previous decade.\footnote{Carew to Cecil, “A discourse of Ireland,” n.d. 1600, Carew MS 600, fol. 190.} When the long-awaited Spanish expedition finally landed in Cork, Mountjoy oversaw the Tudor victory at Kinsale in early 1602.\footnote{Mountjoy to Carew, 29 July 1602, Carew MS 612, fol. 574.}

The official propaganda found further expression by Tudor Lord President of Munster George Carew and Mountjoy. Carew’s language is particularly salient, describing “this realm of Ireland…the second kingdom over which her Majesty weareth a crown, and therefore as the second jewel to be preserved and, as near as may be, to be made a help unto England”—a statement that evinces Ireland’s importance to empire and nation and is arrestingly similar to Queen Victoria’s India, the brightest jewel in the more modern British imperial diadem.\footnote{On India as the crown jewel of the later empire, see Jenny Sharpe, Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 28, 149, 152.} Charging that despite religious rhetoric Tyrone sought only greed and glory, Carew explained that the British and Irish harbor different ends: the former to recover the Henrician supreme government, the latter to rule by barbarous extortion, a heinous, treasonous, and dishonorable crime against queen and her progenitors.\footnote{Carew to Cecil, “A discourse of Ireland,” n.d. 1600, Carew MS 600, fol. 190.} After Kinsale, Mountjoy extended the point, offering that with the involvement of Spain and Rome, “this war then will not be any longer the war of Ireland, but the war of England in Ireland, to the infinite danger and cumber to them both.”\footnote{A discourse of Ireland, sent to Sir Robert Cecil, her Majesty’s principal secretary, from S.G[orge].C[arew].,” n.d. 1600, fol. 190. On India as the crown jewel of the later empire, see Jenny Sharpe, Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 28, 149, 152.}
Quite simply, a rebel victory would deal a deathblow to English governance, religion, and civility, at home and abroad, while a Tudor win would be a double success, over Irish and Spanish, for nation and its empire.¹⁹⁵ Aptly, Mountjoy was the one to accept Tyrone’s surrender at Mellifont in March 1603, having carefully kept his queen’s death just days prior a secret to avoid any last hiccups.¹⁹⁶

While Mountjoy fought, his vision was bolstered by three new theoretical tracts, which brought the project of Tudor Ireland to a close with striking resonance, in their humanism, belief in English civility, socio-economic arguments, militarism, and vocabulary: William Herbert’s *Croftus sive de Hibernia liber* (c. 1591), Richard Beacon’s *Solon his Follie* (1594), and Edmund Spenser’s *View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596) blended earlier Atlantic imperial thought (Wooings theory in particular) with 1590s elements to fit the changed landscape.¹⁹⁷

The three authors worked, thought, and wrote alongside and in response to one another—all close contemporaries, born around Mary’s accession, Protestant, and Oxbridge-educated, who

¹⁹⁵ Mountjoy to Carew, 29 July 1602, Carew MS 612, fol. 574.
made their way to Ireland in the 1580s. Yet their narrative methods and arguments were not identical. Together, they form a dialogue as well as a spectrum, from the most moderate and restrained (Herbert) to the most drastic and radical (Spenser). Set against the backdrop of late-Elizabethan Britain, looking back to old ideas and ahead to new policies, they sought a single (albeit loosely-defined) object: as Spenser put it, “reducing that salvage nation to better government and civility” under Elizabeth’s imperial crown.\(^{198}\)

Of the three, Spenser came to Ireland earliest. As secretary to his beloved Deputy Arthur Grey, he may have fought against Desmond, perhaps even at Smerwick with Ralegh.\(^{199}\) The only non-Englishman of the group, Herbert was a Welsh nobleman and close friend of John Dee.\(^{200}\) In 1586, all three men arrived in Munster as undertakers. Beacon, in fact, made all of their grants, a member of the commission to reallocate and adjudicate rebel land to New English planters.\(^{201}\) Herbert wrote first, perhaps explaining his temperance, while Spenser remained through Tyrone’s Rebellion, with Beacon.\(^{202}\)

Their most obvious commonality is a shared Renaissance reverence for imperial antiquity—Roman and British—used to justify expansion, conquest, and colonization. Heavily sprinkled with references to Tacitus, Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero, each counseled use of the

\(^{198}\) Bear, ed., Spenser’s View, 1.

\(^{199}\) On Spenser’s career, see A.C. Judson, The Life of Edmund Spenser (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1945); Willy Maley, A Spenser Chronology (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press, 1994).

\(^{200}\) On Herbert’s career, see Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, introduction.

\(^{201}\) For the commission, see “Book of the proceedings of Munster,” n.d. 1586, TNA: PRO SP 63/136/22. Beacon adjudicated several high-profile disputes over Irish land grants, one involving Herbert, see “Thomas Norris, Jessua Smythes, and R. Beacon to Walsingham,” 2 December 1587, TNA: PRO SP 63/132/25. Beacon received his own land in Cork and Waterford, see “An Abstract or brief particular of all the names of undertakers,” 31 December 1592, TNA: PRO SP 63/167/44 (ii). For Herbert’s early comments on colonization, see Herbert “The Description of Munster,” n.d. April 1587, TNA: PRO SP 63/135/58.

\(^{202}\) Though typically dated to c. 1591, and even as late as 1593, Herbert’s work properly belongs to this context, see Armitage, The Ideological Origins of the British Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 52.
colonia to achieve Tudor Empire. As Beacon described, corrupt commonwealths require reformation by sword and royal troops. Then, Herbert continued, under a permanent standing garrison to maintain justice, the land must “be cultivated afresh by settlers from England, protected by castles and fortifications.” In particular, Spenser and Herbert pointed to Tudor favorite Henry II as an abject lesson, explaining that the failure of English rule in Ireland stemmed from a failure to uphold the Roman archetype. While readily admitting that the medieval army had utterly subdued Gaelic foes, both charged that the twelfth-century king never planted settlers in their wake, he had only left a few soldiers. If, Herbert explained, Elizabeth’s predecessors had filled Ireland “with citizens and farmers and enriched [the land with] peace and industry, they would for this long time past have added to our state quite as many benefits, distinctions, and troops as Sicily of old bestowed on the Romans.” Instead, barbarous laws, wicked religion, rude customs, and tyranny had continued.

It was left to the queen to achieve classical greatness where others had not.

Each tract furthered the association in its form or style, adopting the classical dialogue. Beacon organized his work into three books, suggesting humanist Rodolphus Agricola’s popular dialectic, and generated an extended allegory around the historical figure of Solon, who had risked execution to debate the place of Salamis Island within the Greek system in the sixth century BCE. Revered by Plutarch, the statesman had counseled conquest, convincingly arguing that Salamis would glorify a declining Athens, hurt its imperial rival Megara, and bring civility

Examples include: for Tacitus, see Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, 75; for Plato, see Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, 97; for Aristotle, see Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, 65 and Bear, ed., Spenser’s View, 54; for Cicero, see Beacon, Solon, sig. C4v.

Beacon, Solon, sig. F1v.

Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, 42.

For Henry II, see Bear, ed., Spenser’s View, 11; Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, 30-31.

Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, 27.

Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, 45.
to the island’s depraved inhabitants.209 For Beacon, it served as a powerful image—England as Athens, Spain its Megara, Ireland its Salamis—and he quoted at length from Plutarch’s Lives to demonstrate the “publicke good” of expansion, for the nation and its colonies.210 Herbert constructed a eulogy of Wooings veteran and Edwardian Irish deputy James Croft, styling himself as Cato or Suetonius to his subject’s Roman imperial general.211 Spenser Latinized “England” and “Ireland” to cast a dialogue between “Eudoxus” and “Irenius,” who engage in point-counterpoint debate.212 His personification technique was a mainstay of 1540s ideology and, as this chapter attests, 1590s theory.

Though it did not ascend to same heights as Rome, ancient Britain was also central. The authors pushed Elizabeth’s imperial status as a British monarch, both as a statement of her authority (sovereign and absolute, over church and state) and her territorial reach (England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and beyond). Herbert is perhaps most apropos, extolling “our Virgin Queen… She, with stately sceptre, guides the British realms. Kingdoms and kings she rules—Nymph with a lofty diadem. Lighting the orb with her rays, her virtue and her strength, she binds the Alps to Orkneys with her wisdom, her name o’ertops all lands and conquers the seas.”213 The British corpus that came out of the Henrician Reformation and Rough Wooings was also most important to Herbert, who was wholly about looking back to inspire the future. There was, purposefully, nothing new here. From title to content, Herbert memorialized Croft’s administration, lauding the Leix-Offaly plantation and Edwardian reformation for replicating the colonia, propounding true worship, and spreading the vernacular.214 Adopting the medieval body
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211 Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, especially 7-8.
212 Bear, ed., Spenser’s View, 5.
213 Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, 119.
214 Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s Croftus, especially 97-113.
politic metaphor, wherein the former deputy was the physician and Ireland the patient ravaged by ills, *Croftus* might easily have come out of the 1540s, Scotland exchanged for Ireland. Indeed, Herbert specifically praised Croft’s courage in East Lothian, which “tamed the French who were running riot in their youthful ardour,” without noting his ultimate failure.\(^{215}\) Here, the author hoped, Elizabethans could see that military might was the essential first step, after which private colonies of native Englishmen could recreate English society abroad.\(^{216}\) Beacon harbored a related gaze, counseling the “most mighty and renowned Queene, and Empress… goe forwarde Brutus, for thy glory in reforming is farre greater than the glory of Romulus in building and and instituting the citie of Rome.”\(^{217}\)

It was no longer 1552, however, and, in construing the queen’s power, the 1590s context of Herbert’s *Croftus* is plainly apparent: the queen had inherited a “diadem superior to that of all kings adjoining,” responsible for the admirable and virtuous government of England, the defense of Scotland, the repression of French madness and frenzy, the protection of the Netherlands, and the containment and repulsion of the arrogance, ambition, and “all inhuman cruelty” of the Spaniards.\(^{218}\) With nods to the French and Dutch wars, England’s identity remained Protestant, but was now defined primarily against the Catholic Spain.

All three writers agreed on Ireland’s current ills, none new to the 1590s and particularly stunning by comparison to England. Brehon law, Gaelic language, blackrents, coign and livery, and barbarity, Beacon argued, were “the very nurse and teate, and that gave sucke and nutriments to all disobedience, rebellion, enormities, vices, and iniquities of that realm.”\(^{219}\) Compounding this error and trouble, Spenser specifically drew on Spanish-Irish consanguinity to explain their

\(^{215}\) Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s *Croftus*, 17.
\(^{216}\) Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s *Croftus*, 17.
\(^{217}\) Beacon, *Solon*, sig. ¶3r.
\(^{218}\) Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s *Croftus*, 117.
\(^{219}\) Beacon, *Solon*, sig. ¶3v.
natural alliance, shared savagery, and Catholicism. In the voice of Irenius, he reminded his readership, “the Irishe doe derive themselves from Gathelus the Spaniard,” their brutish behavior “Scythian or Scottish manners.”

Spenser went a step further than the others, constructing an ethnographic theory whereby culture and behavior were inextricably tied to environment: Irish Catholicism stemmed from the basic fact that “all barberous nacions are commonly great observers of cerimonies and superstitious rights.” Similarly, Anglo-Irish degeneration was the consequence inhabiting an uncivil land for decades. Accordingly, whereas Herbert and Beacon suggested the wholesale import of Englishness, Spenser argued that the extension of common law justice and Anglicanism would only compound the problem: justice and religion were only meet for civil people and nations; those who live licentiously, could “never be made dutiful and obedient, nor brought to labour or civil conversation.” Only the colonia and Grey’s extreme violence, he continued, would frustrate old ways, ridding the land of beasts that could never be tamed. Then, the same English law, shiring, labor, religion, language, and dress modeled at home and advocated by Herbert and Beacon could be carefully introduced, according to a special order and timeline. As the one wearing the “imperiall crown,” royal involvement was absolutely essential to success in each scheme, against the “rude, cruell, and wilde, in Ireland.”

The late-Tudor ideology of Herbert, Beacon, and Spenser all agreed on one final, key point, aimed at bolstering official resolve. Drawing on Gerald of Wales’s standard description, each lauded Ireland’s benefits for England and the British Empire, much as contemporaries
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Burghley or Ralegh cheered Newfoundland or Guiana. Spenser in particular painted “a most bewtiful and sweete Coutnry as any is under heaven,” temperate with fertile soil, timber, fish, and ore. When worked with English hands, by English means, this land would engender self-sufficiency and profit. Meanwhile, Ireland’s close geographical proximity would shield England from its enemies and function as an Atlantic trading hub. Most significantly, with control of the neighboring island and its resources, the Elizabethans “would soone hope to be lords of all the seas, and er longe of all the worlde.” As Herbert concluded, due to “its location in the west, we should note how much support and assistance this kingdom would have brought us in carrying out our vest enterprises in the Atlantic and West Indies.” Indeed, then, in the 1590s, Ireland was part and parcel of a Tudor British nation and empire, with roots in the past and equally significant implications for an Atlantic-wide future.

***

Despite Irish rebellion overwhelming court and council, American projects did not fall entirely by the wayside, primed for one last Tudor go in 1602-3. This final burst of activity was the direct outcome of promotion, crown policy, and the ongoing Atlantic privateering proxy war.

In 1597, following British offensives in Cadiz and the Azores, Iberian officials counseled an aged Philip II to turn from Ireland to America if he hoped to rebuff rival incursions. Though the king did not listen, Hakluyt did: upon receiving the intercepted letter, he not only printed it, but used it to reassert British Empire, writ large, with a treatise on “The True Limites” of Iberian rule (c. 1598) and a new edition of *Principal Navigations* (1599-1600). Highly reminiscent of
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228 Keaveney and Madden, eds., Herbert’s *Croftus*, 29.
229 For the printed letter, see “A special letter written from Feliciano Cieça de Carualsho Gournour of Paraniu,” in Hakluyt, *PN* (1599-1600), 3:716-718; for the treatise, see Anon., “The True Limites of all the Countries and Provinces at this present actually possessed by ye Spaniards and Portugals in the West Indies,” TNA: PRO CO 1/1/32, where it is misdated to 1613. David Beers Quinn ascribed the tract to Hakluyt, c. 1598, see Quinn, *The
Dee’s work, the treatise stressed the legality of Tudor America, positing that Iberians only “actually possessed” Mexico, Florida, the West Indies, Trinidad, and Brazil, while the pope could not donate waterways, trades, or absolute right anywhere.\textsuperscript{230} By laws of nature and nation, “all those large and spatiuous countries on the easte part of America from 32 to 72 degrees of northerly latitude… are both by right of first discovery performed by Sebastian Cabota at the cost of King Henry the 7\textsuperscript{th}, and also of later actual possession taken on behalf and under the sovereign authoritie of her Majestie” by Ralegh, Gilbert, Frobisher, and Davis.\textsuperscript{231} Sporting a new dedication to Cecil and edited, expanded text, the new \textit{Principal Navigations} also confirmed Tudor \textit{imperium}, especially counseling the court “not to meddle with the state of Ireland, nor that of Guiana, there is under our noses the great & ample countrey of Virginia.”\textsuperscript{232}

A former member of Ralegh’s Virginia syndicate, John Gerard echoed Hakluyt with his \textit{The herball or generall historie of plantes} (1597). Expressly affirming the Virginia project on commercial and legal lines, Gerrard joined reports by White and Harriot with information “out of the Antientes,” the author well-studied in classical theory and science.\textsuperscript{233} Based on 1580s data, he presented a temperate Eden, with wood, plants, dyes, and foodstuffs that mended Britain’s trade imbalance, benefiting home as the ancient empire had sustained Rome. Moreover, he added that though the colonists might be “dead by murdering, or pestilence, corrupt air, bloody fluxes, or some other mortal sickness,” they had lived well there for some period of time, their possible fate

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{230} Hakluyt, “True Limites,” c. 1598, TNA: PRO CO 1/1/32.
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\textsuperscript{232} Hakluyt, “To the right honorable Sir Robert Cecil,” in Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1599-1600), 2:sigs. *2r-*4v, quotation from sig. *2v.
\textsuperscript{233} Gerard, \textit{The herball or Generall historie of plantes} (completed and first circulated in 1597, pub. London: 1633), STC 11750, sig. ¶7v.
\end{flushright}
no more than a cautionary tale of an underpopulated, undersupplied empire. War, death, and changes at court had hindered further experimentation in Tudor Virginia, but this inconstancy was characteristic of sixteenth-century Britain, neither a nail in the coffin nor evidence of contemporary disregard. A piece of well-researched, well-executed propaganda, Gerard reminded audiences “where our English men dwelled” (proof of actual possession), and the fruit of their trial amongst “the Sauages.”

With Hakluyt, Gerrard furthered the Tudor imperial discourse of Tudor imperialism and issued the first pointed arguments in favor of Virginia since the Armada. Helped along by royal support and continued war, the promotion ultimately boosted both Virginia and Guiana—each gaining essential momentum at the end of the dynasty, court and subjects alike emboldened by their persuasive sway.

The impulse fit with correspondence Cecil that received from his Spanish spies, who anxiously reported Tyrone’s ambassador dealing in Spain, with Philip III, but energetically reminded him that: “The king of Spain wants to attain the name of Renowned King…but as the Queen is now the ancientist prince in Christendom, both for years, long reign, and happy government, she will be Prince of peace; and as she is the principal diadem of Christendom, she should enact that as the Pope and King of Spain wish all Christians to be called Catholics, all her subjects should be termed defenders of the faith.” It was a clear statement of the Spanish-Irish collusion distracting Cecil in 1598, but also the unique Tudor imperial monarchy—alone in all of Europe for its joint temporal and spiritual authority, overseas territoriality, and papal title defenders of the faith.
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Ireland remained a priority through Tyrone’s defeat and Elizabeth’s concurrent death, but something began to change c. 1600, as Essex languished in the deputyship, soon to repeat “the examples… of Wolsey, and Cromwell” after engaging in unauthorized talks with Tyrone.237 As Carew won a major victory and the long-awaited Habsburg aid entered its final preparations, anti-Spanish fervor grew. The queen scrambled for allies, making peace with France and ending their North Atlantic piratical war. Meanwhile, as Camden recited, Philip boasted his superiority, “by reason of his large & vast dominions spread far and neere, by reason of his power ouer other Princes, and his Merits from the Church of Rome.”238 Irked, the court responded with a palpable effort appreciated by Camden to look abroad to benefit home.239 The most noted consequence was the East India Company, but its late-1600 charter was symptomatic, rather than definitive.

Earlier that summer, the council requested an estimate of the cost to victual eighty men in Guiana for four months. The answer of roughly £250 was neither insignificant nor a windfall, and must have been seen by Cecil and/or Howard.240 Meanwhile, Cecil worked on another project: freeing Richard Hawkins, the sailor son of John, and Francis Sparrey, an Englishman left behind by Ralegh in 1595 Guiana, from Spain. Both were key players in British America and the broader Anglo-Spanish war—Sparrey had managed to get a valuable Atlantic map to Cecil in 1599—and demonstrate the court’s continued engagement in the region.241 As he negotiated, Cecil received added impetus in the form of a powerful letter from Anglo-Irish loyalist Valentine Blake. Blake described how Philip uses “our English, especially those taken about the Indies and
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Brazil, cruelly, yoking them in prison, condemning them to the galleys…even to death."\(^{242}\) Now, not only was the horrible Spanish cruelty memorialized in the black legend executed upon defenseless Amerindians, but (he claimed) some three-hundred Englishmen, Hawkins and Sparrey included. Blake’s well-timed appeal, which mimicked Eden’s mid-century call, was a pitch for Ireland and Atlantic empire more broadly: due to Spain, “England [is] impoverished, and these strangers enriched and trained in navigation,” and Anglicans are made Catholic.\(^{243}\)

The following year, the imperial again pervaded the national, in the last Tudor parliament, which met in autumn 1601. Perhaps the ugliest, most fractious of the reign, debate clustered around monopolies, which had mushroomed in the last four years.\(^{244}\) Granted by royal prerogative (the same tool of statecraft extended by Henry VIII and used by Sidney in Ireland) for domestic exports like textile, Newfoundland commodities like salt and train oil, and imports like currants or powder, only the Star Chamber, rather than the common law courts, could adjudicate them. “To what purpose is it,” one MP demanded, “to do anything by act of Parliament when the queen will undo the same by her prerogative? [T]here is no act of her that hath been more derogatory to her own majesty and more odious to the subject or more dangerous to the commonwealth than the granting of monopolies.”\(^{245}\)

To avoid a melee, Cecil opted to annul the condemned grants by proclamation and be done with it.\(^{246}\) Two days later, though, Elizabeth addressed the assembly with a scarcely-veiled defense of her authority and nationalistic honour: “God hath made me His instrument to maintain His truth and glory, and to defend this kingdom from peril, dishonour, tyranny, and oppression.

\(^{242}\) Blake to Cecil, n.d. (c. 1600-1), TNA: PRO SP 12/287, fol. 1.
\(^{243}\) Blake to Cecil, n.d. (c. 1600-1), TNA: PRO SP 12/287, fol. 2.
\(^{244}\) Guy, *Tudor England*, 399-401.
\(^{245}\) Speech in parliament by Francis Moore, 20 November 1601, printed in Marcus, Mueller, and Rose, eds., *Collected Works*, 346.
There will never a queen sit in my seat with more zeal to my country.”

Lauding her empire, which had saved subjects from foreign foes and tyrant’s rules, the acrimonious legislature had elicited royal imperial ideology. Two weeks later, in her final speech before the body, she justified the Spanish war as as godly and asked her subjects to “return to the ocean again.” As she did, Ralegh sat in the audience.

Ironically, the once-interloping John Ley now proved Guiana’s most important traveler and spokesman. He surveyed the region’s geography and ethnography, bolstered British claims, and beautified the project for future travellers—all by manipulating the Anglo-Spanish sea-war and a monarchy that hoped to throw Philip off Ireland by attacking his empire. Indeed, when he took to Guiana again in 1598, Ley was in public service, his second enterprise crown-authorized and funded, though in an indirect way: the merchant had joined Cumberland’s military expedition to Puerto Rico, and then stole off to the Amazon. Like Ralegh, he used an interpreter trained in England to index native culture, distinguishing their “nations” from superior Britons. Attuned to the century’s narrative, his writing related stereotypes of painted bodies, savage behavior, unchristian worship, and monstrous creatures, while evincing native pliability and eagerness for reform. Throughout, the captain described a domestic complement, complete with dyes for English textiles, gold for royal coffers, Mediterranean commodities for

---

248 Henry Howard’s transcription of Elizabeth’s final speech before parliament, 19 December 1601, BL Cotton MS Titus C.VI., fols. 410r-411v, quotation from 410r.
249 For the voyage, see G.C. Williamson, ed., *George, Third Earl of Cumberland, His Life and Voyages: A Study from Original Documents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920), especially “A Journall of the Eleventh and later Voyage to the West India 1597 with his memorable action performed at Sct. John Porto Rico 1598,” 171-218; Purchas, *Hakluyts posthumus*, pt. IV, bk. 6, 1155-1176. Ley’s pedigree claimed that Captain Ley’s intent was to voyage to Guiana all along. Moreover, he may have been encouraged towards this end by Ralegh and the threat of Dutch interest in the region: in 1597, Ralegh had received a letter from Andrian Cabeliau of Zeeland, encouraging a joint Anglo-Dutch settlement (see Andrian Cabeliau to Ralegh, 20 March 1597, TNA: PRO SP 94/5, fols. 177r-v). There is no proof that Ralegh answered the Dutchman, but Cabeliau went ahead to Guiana alone in mid-1598. For the pedigree entry on the sailor’s intent, see Ley, “Pedigree,” fols. 15v-16v, in Lorimer, ed., *Ralegh’s Discoverie*, 313-6; for the Dutch expeditions more broadly, see Lorimer, ed., *Ralegh’s Discoverie*, Appendix XI.
British consumers, and a ready market for Tudor trifles, made comprehensible by comparison to home, with comments on fruits “in England Called a Lady Nutt” and natives who “make their bodies and faces Red all over,” painting themselves like the ancient Picts.\textsuperscript{251}

Now, three years later, in late-1601, the “strange wildernes” drew him in again, hoping to add further experience and a golden payday to his exploit.\textsuperscript{252} But as the year faded into the next and the captain’s queen entered her final months, the expedition was beset by foul weather along the Wiapoco. There, after Ralegh’s example, Ley left some of his countrymen behind, a shot in the dark at Guiana’s colonial future in the new century.\textsuperscript{253} Fittingly, one would soon be found by a captain very familiar with the circuitous route of Tudor expansion.

Though Ley’s report did not make it to England until 1602, the Cecil circle likely kept abreast of the goings-on, now that the captain was in royal service.\textsuperscript{254} In fact, they appear to have been awaiting an opportunity. One quick came when, fresh off parliament, Cecil managed to free Hawkins and Sparrey in 1602. The latter set about distributing his American intelligence, “so that the Queen might know from the quality and riches of those provinces and send another fleet for its discovery.”\textsuperscript{255} Harboring claims of painted natives eagerly awaiting English masters, Sparrey’s information merged with Ley’s, the charged national context, and imperial literature since 1597.\textsuperscript{256} Two western voyages followed in short order: one to Virginia, the other to Guiana.

Set in motion first, on 26 March 1602, Bartholomew Gosnold departed with thirty-two passengers for “Virginia, being a most pleasant, fruitful, and commodious soile,” resonating

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{251} Ley, “Pedigree,” fol. 21v, in Lorimer, ed., \textit{Ralegh’s Discoverie}, 331.
\item \textsuperscript{252} Ley, “Pedigree,” fol. 16v, in Lorimer, ed., \textit{Ralegh’s Discoverie}, 314.
\item \textsuperscript{253} Ley, “Pedigree,” fols. 15r-v, in Lorimer, ed., \textit{Ralegh’s Discoverie}, 313.
\item \textsuperscript{254} As Andrews suggested, see Andrews, \textit{Trade, Plunder, and Settlement}, 364-5.
\item \textsuperscript{255} Letter of the Council of the Indies to Philip III, 31 October 1602, printed in Lorimer, ed., \textit{Ralegh’s Discoverie}, 274.
\item \textsuperscript{256} For Sparrey’s report, see “Francis Sparrey’s memorial,” in Lorimer, ed., \textit{Ralegh’s Discoverie}, 269-271.
\end{itemize}
Gerard’s terms.\textsuperscript{257} Familiar with \textit{Principal Navigation}, Gosnold sailed on Ralegh’s orders, stopping at Martha’s Vineyard (which he named for his mother) and selecting a nearby archipelago for plantation.\textsuperscript{258} Declared Elizabeth’s Island, the captain followed the naming and geographical techniques of his predecessors and European rivals, staking possession as well as reaffirming the superiority of their home-nation’s form.\textsuperscript{259} There, home remained the reference point, model, and beneficiary, as Gosnold declared the fertile soil comparable “to one of our best prepared gardens in England,” while his men sowed and built according to British norms.\textsuperscript{260} They added further British witness to the area’s desirable commodities: naval stores, cod, wine, oil, skins, even gold, all “profitable for the State of England… for the imploiment also of our people and ships; the want whereof doth decay our townes and ports of England, and causeth the realme to swarne full with poore and idle people.”\textsuperscript{261} And the project drew explicit comparisons among British conquests: the barbarous natives painted their skins, wore “seal skins tied fast like to Irish dimmie trousers,” and inhabited land “resembling France.”\textsuperscript{262} Tudor imperial promotion and experience remained potent in 1602.

Within a month, however, the company returned home in need of victuals, landing at Exmouth in July and divvying up their haul without Ralegh. Infuriated, the courtier determined to send his own, more closely-guarded colonial and mercantile venture, telling Cecil: “shall yet live to see it [Virginia] an Inglish nation[…]and what a pretty, honorabeil, and sauf trade wee

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{257} As recorded by colonial scribe John Brereton, in Brereton, \textit{A Brieve and true Relation of the Discoverie of the North parts of Virginia, being a most pleasant, fruitfull and commodious soile} (London: 1602), STC 3611, quotation from title-page.
\item \textsuperscript{258} Brereton, \textit{Brieve and true}, sig. A4v.
\item \textsuperscript{259} Brereton, \textit{Brieve and true}, sig. B2v.
\item \textsuperscript{260} For “to one of our best prepared gardens in England,” see Brereton, \textit{Brieve and true}, sig. A4r; for the descriptions of plantation, see Brereton, \textit{Brieve and true}, sigs. A3v-A4v.
\item \textsuperscript{261} Brereton, \textit{Brieve and true}, sig. C1r.
\item \textsuperscript{262} “The Relations of Captain Gosnold’s Voyage to the North parts of Virginia, begun the six and twentieth of March, Anno 42, Elizabetheae Regiae, 1602, and delivered by Gabriel Archer, a gentleman in the said voyage,” printed in David B. Quinn and Alison Quinn, eds., \textit{The English New England Voyages, 1602-1608} (London: Hakluyt Society, 1983), 113-133, quotations from 117.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
will make.  Though brief, Gosnold’s settlement was of great contemporary importance, and a
sinew for the historian between Roanoke and later North American adventure. Colonist John
Brereton rushed his report of the enterprise to print, with Hakluyt the Elder’s 1585 Inducements
appendied to his own narrative, before year’s end. In text, Brereton assured his readership that
the colony’s departure was by choice, positing that all the settlers left healthier than they had
been at home.

According to Brereton, Ralegh immediately secured a new ship and enlisted Bristolman
Samuel Mace to explore, settle, trade, and search for his “Colonie in Virginia.” After
harvesting flora along the Outer Banks for several weeks, inclement weather forced them back
without plantation. Within the year, in April 1603, Ralegh deployed Captain Martin Pring,
after a brief period of intense study with Hakluyt and two of Gosnold’s men. Arriving at
Massachusetts Bay, the expedition constructed a fort encompassed by a palisade—Lane’s model
from Roanoke—and remained for seven weeks, collecting commodities and exemplifying
Brereton’s positive report, before docking home in October 1603. The voyage was the last
made on Ralegh’s Tudor patent, a final Elizabethan burst of Virginia attention. Moreover,
Gosnold played a key role in Jamestown, while one of his crew, Gabriel Archer, was in tow at its
1607 creation. But most fitting of all, Pring followed the trajectory of his patron and late Tudor
imperialism southward.

263 Ralegh to Cecil, 21 August 1602, BL M485/19, Hatfield, CP 94, no. 160.
264 Inducements to the liking of the voyage intended towards Virginia in 40. And 42. degrees of latitude, written in
1585. by M. Richard Hakluyt the elder, sometime student of the Middle Temple,” in Brereton, Brieue and true, sigs.
D1r-E2v.
265 Brereton, Brieue and true, sig. B2r.
266 Brereton, “A briefe Note of the sending of another barke this present yeere 1602. by the honorable knight, Sir
Walter Ralegh, for the searching out of his Colonie in Virginia,” in Brereton, Brieue and true, sig. B4r.
268 On the Pring venture, see David B. Quinn, Alison M. Quinn, and S Hillier, eds., New American World: A
Just as Virginia was not alone in the new century’s propaganda, Gosnold and his followers were not alone in their experimentation. In late 1601, Cecil and Howard—the two recipients of Ralegh’s *Discoverie*—plucked Charles Leigh from his post-Ramea obscurity for a piratical adventure against Spanish shipping in the Mediterranean.\(^{269}\) Now 1602, the three men united again, this time for Guiana, funded by courtly capital, privateering profits, and Leigh family money.\(^ {270}\) Later that year, Leigh followed precedent and reconnoitered the region, happening upon the “English man which was left there by Captain Lea [Ley]” and determining its suitability for inhabitation.\(^ {271}\) Duly convinced, the captain returned home in early 1603 and, with royal support and Captain Pring as an auxiliary shipmaster, began to plan his intrepid colony—the apparent culmination of a decade of practice in nasty nineties imperialism. Hoping to secure additional monies for the costly experiment, Leigh received crown leave to send his *Lioness* privateering. But but upon reaching the coast of Spain, a cease and desist order halted the vessel in its tracks in mid-1603.\(^ {272}\) The queen was dead, her multifront war with Spain discontinued throughout the Atlantic. With the end of the dynasty, the Tudor Empire had come to an end as well; at least in name, it no longer existed. The British Empire, however, endured.

***

Under a year after his interruption off Spain, Captain Charles Leigh set sail on 28 March 1604, with forty-six British men, a gold-refiner, and an England-educated Amerindian, “to discover and inhabit some part of the Countrie of Guiana.”\(^ {273}\) Though under the auspices of a new sovereign and labeled “first of the Jacobean colonists” by historian Kenneth R. Andrews,\(^ {274}\)

\(^{269}\) “Commission,” n.d. September 1601, TNA: PRO SP 98/2, fol. 93.
\(^{270}\) Leigh must have known of Ley’s accomplishments before departure, following his predecessor’s footsteps perfectly despite no experience in Guiana. On this, see Lorimer, ed., *English and Irish Settlement*, 26.
\(^{271}\) Charles to Oliph Leigh, 2 July 1604, in Purchas, *Hakluyts posthumus*, pt. IV, bk. 6, 1255.
Leigh’s expedition related most directly to the 1602 reconnaissance and, more broadly, to the queen’s last decade: Ralegh’s impetus, rhetoric, and first voyage to Guiana; Leigh’s own 1597 trial off Newfoundland; funding and promotion by Elizabethan stalwarts Cecil, Howard, and Hakluyt; Tudor royal investment; and the Anglo-Spanish war that spilled over into the Irish and wider Atlantic frame. Its promotion, justification, legitimacy, historical precedent, and practical exemplars lay in the sixteenth century. As colonist John Nicholl aptly described in 1607, “Guiana was first discovered or made knowne to our English Nation… about the yeare of our Lorde 1594.” Unlike later Jacobean exploits at Cupid’s Cove, Guiana, and Jamestown, which show continuity but were planned and executed under the Stuarts, the 1604 experiment’s timing and tenor properly ascribe it to the end of the last century. A microcosm of British imperialism since Henry VII, the project serves as a fitting conclusion to the story of Tudor Empire.

Setting his course to the passage created by Berry and Ley, Leigh landed at the mouth of the Amazon and, in spring 1604, “took possession of the Countrey in sight of the Indians.” Following precedent, he claimed right by discovery, twig and turf ceremony, and renaming, with the Caroleigh River and mounts Howard (for the Elizabethan Lord Admiral) and Oliph (for his brother). As he progressed, Leigh benefited from his interpreter, hoping to settle away from native communities, but then accepting offers to dwell in the finer Amerindian homes and gardens—that is, those structures that most closely approximated domestic civility. As historian Alden Vaughan argued, “thanks to Ralegh’s culture brokers, the first English outpost in Guiana was about to be established.” Like Lane’s Virginia or Frobisher’s Baffin Island, the captain felt secure enough to remain with forty men to mine for gold, build houses, and convert

277 Leigh to PC, 4 July 1604, TNA: PRO SP 14/8, no. 87.
indigenous inhabitants.\textsuperscript{280} As the rest of his retinue sailed home with four natives anxious to live
in England (or so the captain proclaimed), Leigh requested Anglican preachers and royal
protection and free passage for any settlers;\textsuperscript{281} he was particularly eager, he confided in his
brother, for “sober and discreet men, and such as are well persuaded of the Church government
in England.”\textsuperscript{282} Further, to any unconvinced by Ralegh’s \textit{Discoverie} or Keymis’s \textit{Relation}, Leigh
offered detailed descriptions of how well he, his men, and the local “Salvages” lived, and the
plenty of much-sought-after dyes, spices, and timber.\textsuperscript{283} Gone from this scheme was any
separatist element; Leigh sought to recreate and benefit the British nation in South America. It
was a familiar appeal in 1604.

Though less glowing in his report to his brother, which lamented a discontent crew and
near-mutiny executed by former Virginia colonist Martin Pring, the captain stressed his
dedication to plant and “make full triall both of people and Countrey”—highly reminiscent of the
trial-and-error attitude of most of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{284} But by late summer, Leigh was more
desperate, complaining of illness and native malice, and relying on a common trope of incoming
Spaniards to request additional supplies and men before Guiana was lost to another nation.\textsuperscript{285}
The Anglo-Spanish war may have come to a formal end with James’s accession; however, the
last decade’s enmity pervaded project and rhetoric.

When crown and council, dictated by Cecil, Howard, and Olyph, finally came to the
colony’s rescue with a resupply ship in early 1605, its leader had had enough. He would return to

\textsuperscript{280} Nicholl, \textit{Houre Glasse}, sigs. C3r-D1r.
\textsuperscript{281} Leigh to PC, 4 July 1604, TNA: PRO SP 14/8, no. 87.
\textsuperscript{282} Charles Leigh to Olyph Leigh, in Purchas, \textit{Hakluys posthumus}, pt. IV, bk. 6, 1253.
\textsuperscript{283} “Leigh his voyage and plantation,” in Purchas, \textit{Hakluys posthumus}, pt. IV, bk. 12, 309.
\textsuperscript{284} For Pring, who was identified here as Martin Prinx, see “The Relation of Master John Wilson of Wansteed in
Essex, one of the last ten that returned to England from Wiapoco in Guiana 1606,” in Purchas, \textit{Hakluys posthumus},
pt. IV, bk. 6, 1260; for “make full triall both of people and Countrey,” see Charles Leigh to Olyph Leigh, in Purchas,
\textit{Hakluys posthumus}, pt. IV, bk. 6, 1253.
\textsuperscript{285} Charles Leigh to Olyph Leigh, in Purchas, \textit{Hakluys posthumus}, pt. IV, bk. 6, 1253.
England and live to promote the British Empire further. But before he made it aboard, Charles Leigh died. His men clandestinely buried the body, so as not to derail the project as Gilbert and Newfoundland in 1583. Following another ill-fated resupply in April 1605, Leigh’s colony came to inglorious end; Guiana’s surviving Englishmen stumbled their way home across 1605-6.286 As they floundered, the project’s founder sat in the Tower of London, imprisoned for treason five days before James I’s July 1603 coronation.287

After falling out with Cecil and losing his queen, Ralegh found himself in much the same spot he had been over a decade earlier, but with no past history with the monarch and a much graver charge than an inappropriate tryst. Despite the change, he looked to what had rescued him in 1591: British Empire. Ralegh, Cecil, Hakluyt, even Gosnold, Leigh, Tyrone, and James VI&I, carried the imperium forged in the sixteenth century into the seventeenth. I find that a dividing line does exist, properly, circa 1603, though imperial ideology, Atlantic adventure, and British nation- and identity-formation persisted with similarities across that date. Indeed, six Tudor geographies (France, Scotland, Ireland, Newfoundland, Virginia, and Guiana) remained part of early Stuart Empire, whether nominally attached to the crown as or active sites of adventure. As Jacobean panegyrics and polemics manipulated his inheritance to cajole the king into one policy or another, the immediate legacy of the Tudor Empire took shape, alongside the successful colonization and companies studied by historians of early modern imperialism.

286 Nicholl chronicled their adventures home, see Nicholl, *Houre Glasse*, sigs. D4r-F1r.
287 On Ralegh’s imprisonment in 1603, see Nicholls and Williams, *Raleigh*, 223-244.
Sometime in mid-1609, six years into the English reign of the first Stuart king, London bookseller Samuel Macham made a rare, transitory turn away from financing and disseminating the Anglican word of God. Beneath his trademark bull’s head shop-sign, Macham produced a pamphlet dedicated to fellow Londoner Thomas Smythe, knight, merchant, parliamentarian, and an administrator for the Muscovy, Levant, East India, and Virginia Companies. Since its incorporation three years earlier by crown charter, the Virginia Company had sent four voyages to date. In 1609, it had a landmark new charter that offered self-governance, joint-stock organization, and an enlarged land claim centered on the burgeoning Jamestown. For Smythe and other powerful Company men, Macham temporarily abandoned the age’s raging religious debate and tried his hand at New World colonial prospecting.

In the resultant tract, *Nova Britannia* (1609), writer Robert Johnson sought to provoke adventure at a seminal moment in the history of Jamestown and British America more generally: with its new patent and emergent propaganda, Virginia’s profile was on the rise, transforming into a truly national enterprise in interest and funding. Yet from its title to its content and tenor, the pamphlet evinced little that was new or fundamentally different. Indeed, resurrecting the past

---

1 What I have been able to glean about Macham’s career (c.1606-15) comes from a search of the *English Short-title Catalogue. 1473-1800*, ed. Alfred W. Pollard and Donald Goddard Wing (London: British Library, 3rd edn., 2003), available online at [http://estc.bl.uk](http://estc.bl.uk). With the exception of a vernacular Iliad, also 1609, Macham constrained himself to printing sermons and devotionals by royal chaplain Joseph Hall and London preacher Samuel Hieron.


was precisely the point, as Johnson endeavored to extoll, justify, and legitimize the Company’s object. The text may have been written for a Stuart audience in a new century, but its proofs, examples, and arguments were Tudor—and not just Elizabethan. Applying a term from 1540s discourse, this new *Britannia* traced its lineage to “when Christopher Columbus… chose Henry the seventh of England, as in those dayes the most worthy, and best burnished for Navigation, of all Kings of Christendome: offering to invest his Majestie with the most pretious and richest vaines of the whole earth.” The author had reproduced the apocryphal Columbus myth, the tale of British imperial greatness nearly squandered by ill-fate.

Thankfully, divine providence had reserved the region for British rule. Henry and his successors sent fleets “into all parts and round about the Globe with good succese, to the high fame and glorie of our Nation,” reducing a savage wilderness to Anglican faith, Tudor kingship, and civil manners. Such dynastic feats continued through Elizabeth I, entailing abundant territories, wealth, and strength to the kingdom and rivaling the empires of Hercules, David, and Solomon. There, Britons worked to replicate and reinforce their home, easing overpopulation, underemployment, poverty, and religious dissension while bolstering the navy and economy with fish, timber, ore, wine, oil, and dyes. Johnson wrote, “how much good we shall performe… will easily appear by comparing our present happinesse with our former ancient miseries, wherein we had continued brutish, poore and naked Britanes to this day, if Julius Caesar with his Roman Legions had not laid the ground to make us tame and civill.”

*Nova Britannia* made one more appeal to its audience. The narrator enjoined, “I leave it to your consideration, with a memorable note of Thomas Lord Howard, Earle of Surry, when K.

---

Henry the eight, with his Nobles at Dover tooke shipping for Turwin [Thérouanne] and Turney [Tournai],” leaving Surrey behind to meet the incoming Scottish invasion by James VI’s great-grandfather, James IV, at Flodden: “The Story sayeth that the Nobleman wept, and took his leave with teares, an admirable good nature in a valiant minde, greeving to be left behinde his Prince and Peeres in such an honourable service.”9 Just like that, the tract closed; its pitch was sealed.

The pamphlet’s final reference needed to be rhetorically powerful and meaningful, one last chance to impart a lesson. When coupled with his previous examples of Romans conquering Britain, Henry VII claiming the New World, and Elizabeth securing Ireland and Virginia, the author’s meaning becomes clearer. Perhaps he implied that those subjects left behind in Britain would miss something if they did not follow (financially or physically) into Jamestown; they would miss some “honourable service” like Henry VIII’s venture. At the least, the Tournai-Flodden context was applicable to Jamestown, if not somewhat equivalent. A tantalizing signoff, the tract’s overarching, salient point emerges even without the fitting French mention. According to *Nova Britannia*, the Stuart colony—the permanent, seventeenth-century settlement of Virginia revered in the origins of the British Empire—was firmly rooted in Tudor imperialism.

* 

Much as Johnson hoped to leave his audience with a powerful comment on the litany of evidence that preceded his final page, rallying Tournai to conclude a recital of Tudor history, this dissertation uses *Nova Britannia* to close out its broader study. Only one, representative example of a wider imperial literature, his pamphlet demonstrates the enduring importance of Tudor examples and illustrates the relevance of imperial theory and practice forged in the sixteenth

---

century to the subsequent development of the British Empire. This coda endeavors to evaluate that legacy and its meaning, commenting on the continuities and changes evident over the Tudor period in order to assess what the British Empire looked like in 1603, when its cooption by Stuart successors began. It suggests that a complicated, multifaceted, but clear Tudor heritage evolved across the sixteenth century, poised to survive the dynastic divide and function as a germane, useful foundation for Stuart imperialism. With interests sparked, maintained, and legitimimized by 1500s experience, subjects active in the Isles and the Americas in the first quarter of the 1600s participated in a process of empire- and nation-building that carefully deployed and manipulated elements of their inheritance. The fact that they could speaks to the existence of a Tudor Empire.

* 

When Henry VII seized the crown in 1485, he became the founder of a new monarchical regime, a new dynasty, and a new, post-war polity. Paradoxically, each novel component was threatened yet ultimately sustained, served, and empowered by the king’s Welsh birth, executive inexperience, and ancillary lineal claim to the throne. These challenges forced Henry Tudor to grope for security and legitimacy, to engage rivals, pretenders, and foes by recourse to precedent and folklore, ceremony and imagery, avant-garde culture and marriage diplomacy, consolidation and centralization. Inspired by the validating power of history, he inaugurated a reliance on and reverence for Britain’s imperial past (classical, ancient, and medieval) and first lent royal assets to enterprise in Ireland and the Americas. Bridging a profound curiosity for the world beyond his archipelago with an overriding concern for its defense, the first Henrician court fashioned and propagated ideas and icons that survived the Tudor century: the two-toned rose, domed diadem.

and red dragon; Arthurian legend; the English vernacular; the reform of Ireland by English law, custom, and governors; and north Atlantic exploration to benefit the commonwealth and barbarous natives. Most of all, he solidified his dynasty. Henry VII originated the Tudor Empire, fostering the desire for expansion abroad and strength at home that his progeny advanced.

Quickening and change first came under his son, who was far freer from the constraints of security that hemmed in his father and far more influenced and emboldened by the mental world that his family had nurtured. These characteristics engendered the evolution of Henry VII’s model. Drawing on ancient archetype, medieval conquest and enmity, and the example of his predecessor, Henry VIII injected unparalleled funds, energy, and personality into the growth of his realm. He harbored a vision of a territorially-vast kingdom dictated by sovereign royal command, which his father did not. First appreciable at Tournai, the second Tudor king crafted a concrete experiment in empire-building that clarified the meaning of Tudor rule. Equally, the project illustrated the difficulties of integrating a foreign people and region into crown governance and the limits of the current monarchy. Concomitant with related, officially-sponsored activity in Ireland and Newfoundland, Tournai functioned as a trial run that isolated a future route for British imperialism.

The divorce and Reformation fundamentally altered the Tudor imperial terrain. Endowed with supreme, sole authority over all subjects, clerical and lay, and a new church, when Henry VIII returned to expansion, his nation had been consolidated and his kingship had been redefined as expressly imperial—major transformations. Deeply informed by what the dynasty had accomplished and been stymied by in its first decades, the events of the 1530s served to bolster the ideology of empire. Armed with new power, vocabulary, and perceived European-wide distinctiveness and superiority, as well as the applied knowledge accrued in France, the crown
and its subjects looked to annex Scotland. Over the 1540s, Henrician and Edwardian theorists developed the concept of an “Empire of Great Britain.” Though only ever created in the minds of participants, this empire crystalized the germ apparent since 1485: it too was engineered against an inferior French alternative and meant to improve uncivil natives, restore a historic empire, and both augment and replicate the national ideal currently at work in England and Wales. Now, however, the Tudor Empire was Protestant, explicitly imperial and British, and publicized by an advanced polemical literature. The Rough Wooings created a new discourse and elevated a circle of courtly scholar-soldier-statesmen that persisted through the remainder of the century. The war also induced the first and, until the 1590s, only examples of anti-British-imperial rhetoric.

The royal and spiritual tumult of the second Edwardian regency, Marian regime, and early Elizabethan polity bore watershed. At this pivotal juncture, the Auld Alliance partners receded and the geographical foci of expansion shifted from France and Scotland back to Ireland and Newfoundland and into an expanded New World—a physical reorientation west epitomized by the unrequited loss of Calais. In this cohesive three-decade-long period, British imperialism reformulated around anti-Spanish, anti-Catholic xenophobic nationalism, as Habsburg global hegemony and prosperity seemed to risk Tudor independence. As the crown and court deployed Wooings imagery and vocabulary to cement a tenuous minority and two female kingships, empire became the silver bullet to reverse ostensible crisis and decay and realize a golden future. While the corpus of imperial literature swelled to include more non-English travel narratives and models, several specific methods of empire formation took center stage: the new English colonization of Ireland, public-private collaboration, corporate adventure, and settlement by religious dissidents. Though not entirely novel to the mid-Tudor era, these plots now received greater attention, a result of unmatched royal debt, continental discord, variable European
alliances, and unceasing Irish upheaval. This environment rendered each feature an essential mechanism of British empire-building in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Whereas war had prohibited the intense scheming of the 1540s, 1550s, and 1560s from becoming policy, transient peace in Ireland and intelligence of non-British incursions into North America provided an outlet. An experimental boom emerged, the manifestation of thirty years of theorizing. Focused on Ulster and Munster, the Northwest Passage, the Newfoundland fishery, and Roanoke, and undertaken by a tight network of courtly adventurers, the mid-Elizabethan empire put planning into practice—less about creating new models than putting current ideas to work. The most fundamental difference between late-1570s and 1580s imperialism and its predecessors was intensity, particularly militarism and clearly-drawn national lines that separated British from Irish and Iberian. These were catchall ventures, which combined privateering, trade, garrisoning, mining, colonization, conversion, and attacks on the Habsburgs. In this light, with nearly a century of activity behind them, what Elizabethan subjects accomplished—especially in Virginia and Newfoundland—constituted the successful pursuit and elaboration of past schemes, profiting Britain and native inhabitants at the expense of European rivals.

Abruptly discontinued with the opening of outright hostilities against Philip II, the Anglo-Spanish war of Elizabeth’s last decade induced the final evolution of the Tudor Empire. Characterized by heightened resolve, a proclaimed providential Protestant invective, glorified reckonings of Britain and the queen, and a (frequently misplaced) sense of indestructability, 1590s imperialism evinced a set of developments that sprang from the embrace of full-on war with Spain alongside conciliar and ecclesiastical friction in England and a new, powerful revolt in Ireland. For the first time, British subjects sought a permanent presence in South America (in Guiana), the settlement of Protestant dissenters off Newfoundland (on the Isle of Ramea), and
the destruction of the Gaels and Anglo-Irish (in Ireland). Yet again, change existed alongside and in concert with continuity, as Elizabethans resuscitated a latent medieval theme—the chivalric duty of honour—in retort to the most sustained anti-British imperial ideology to date, the Irish discourse of faith and fatherland. A time of both plotting and activity, here was a critical decade that provided the mental and geographical space for a Stuart Empire based squarely on Tudor ideas and practices.

*

Over the course of the sixteenth century and down to the death of Elizabeth in 1603, then, much had stayed the same. Change crept in with the use of certain history and incumbent terms, vocabulary, and genres. The medieval past remained relevant, with conquering exemplars like Edward I, Henry II, Edward III, and Henry V persistent through the 1590s alongside discussions of honour, fealty, and liege. However, these figures and concepts were augmented by the additions of Brutus, Arthur, Cadwallader, and Madoc, who were relevant to a Welsh dynasty that claimed superiority over all of Britain and harbored an interest in expanding into France and the New World. Equally, the influx of Renaissance humanism brought equally important classical elements, of emperors Augustine, Caesar, and Justinian into the fray, together with Latin terms imperium, dominium, and colonia and the literary dialogue. James VI and I ascended with the precedent and diction of empire and imperialism; colony, possession, and plantation; supremacy, sovereignty, dominion, and prerogative forged across the sixteenth century, especially in the 1510s, 1530s, and 1540s.

Similarly, from the first to the second half of the sixteenth century, European rivalries and areas of interest shifted, more accurately realigned by politics than modified outright. In the first half of the period, part and parcel of the mutually-reinforcing Hundred Years War, Auld
Alliance, and English royal title, France monopolized Tudor scheming, its primary foe and foil for identity construction. Moreover, for Henry VIII and Edward VI, France and Scotland took precedence themselves as the most important locations of imperial activity. In the second half of the century, as a result of Edward’s Protestantism, Mary’s marriage, Habsburg preeminence, and Iberian imperialism, Spain assumed pride of place as the premier Tudor enemy, in both nation- and empire-building. Simultaneously, part and parcel of Spain’s place in Tudor thought, the New World and more southerly latitudes like Virginia and Guiana became more important to British expansionary calculus. Nevertheless, throughout the century, the existence of a continental European rival fueled these interconnected processes of national consolidation and imperial expansion, while Newfoundland and Ireland functioned as geographical regions of continuity, from 1485 through 1603. In addition, whether the subject was Irish or Amerindian, even Tournaisien or Scottish, tropes of incivility, wild, rude, and animal-like barbarity remained applicable, across time and space.

As the era of the Reformation, of splintering doctrines and confessional civil war, religion was certainly important to the Tudor Empire. As we have seen, Henry VII distinguished between lands known and unknown by Christian princes in his patent to John Cabot, Henry VIII built canons after the twelve apostles and aimed them at Tournai’s Cathedral, Edward VI sought a Protestant Britain, Mary refused to repeal the law negating her imperial crown, and Elizabeth tried to send Catholics and Brownists into the New World. Accusations were leveled at French, Scots, and Irish, then at Spanish and Amerindians for flawed religious practice. Yet throughout, missionary objectives were only a part of Tudor imperial ideology, perhaps a justification rather than a true aim. Arguably, among a group of royals whose personal religion could be enigmatic, even ambivalent, the creation of the Anglican Church was more important for what it meant in
terms of monarchical reach and means of expansion, rather than liturgy. The break from Rome endowed the Tudor crown with *imperium* (secular and spiritual) and royal supremacy. Soon, the rejection of the Pope and Roman Catholic Church, even if only nominal, allowed for incursion into Catholic territories and engendered a narrative of barbaric, cruel, Scythian collusion between the Spanish and Irish as well as acts of aggression aimed at mitigating that peril. Religion was a potent tool for Tudor Empire, and an avenue worthy of further study.

Finally, though the monarch remained perennially at the top of the Tudor order, approaches to promotion, finance, and adventure were evolving. The crown, council, and court were absolutely essential to British imperialism in this period, start to finish; however, as the creation of corporate bodies like the Muscovy Company show, it was rarely tenable for the ruler to support all overseas enterprise. Further, as interest in America grew, it was equally impossible for the dynasty to rely on its own head to march at the fore of the conquering army, as Henry VIII had in France or Somerset had in Scotland. Accordingly, though the language of national benefit and royal honour by expansion remained, the monarch necessarily receded somewhat. Whereas only a handful of non-royal individuals speckle the story of Tudor imperialism through the Rough Wooings, as the dynasty wore on, these actors become more numerous, surnames other than Tudor more common in the pursuit of British Empire. What remained potent was the political, cultural, and intellectual milieu at court, where ideas circulated, personnel found reward or censure, patents were granted, and administrators were made. After all, the only way to replicate and improve the national ideal—an oft-cited goal of empire—was if the monarch remained at the apex of power abroad.

*
When James VI and I came to the throne in 1603, circumstances had, in many ways, come full circle, producing a context reminiscent of the one that Henry VII faced in 1485. Like his great-great-grandfather before him, James was the founder of a new regime and a new dynasty, similarly forced to deal with the problems, threats, and opportunities inherent in his own non-English heritage—though his background was Scottish rather than Welsh. The Stuart monarch too governed over a new, post-war polity, in the wake of the Anglo-Spanish and Nine Years wars.

The symmetry between Henry VII and James I was not lost on seventeenth-century observers, nor was it simple or straightforward. The dramatic revision of the Columbus Myth c. 1612 serves as a powerful illustration of this relationship, as scholars trotted out the tale to encourage imperialism, much as Johnson had, but modified its core. In their transmutation, the first Tudor king refused the proposal for discovery, nearly condemning Britain to isolation and ruin and thereby affording a dire warning: if James neglected empire, he risked irreparable hurt to his commonweal. As colonial adventurer Robert Harcourt begged him, “wipe away from your eyes, the cloudie incredulous blindnesse that possessed our forefathers in the dayes of Henry the seuenth, when they reiected the offer made by Bartholomew Columbus.”¹¹

The use of Tudor discourse was fitting; after all, Jacobeans penned work to promote four areas of late-Elizabethan enterprise: Virginia, Ireland, Newfoundland, and Guiana. Yet as this alteration of the Columbus legend indicates, even as the first Stuart ruled with Robert Cecil and Lord Mountjoy, retained Archbishop John Whitgift, and received inducements to empire from Richard Hakluyt and

---

Walter Ralegh, he and his subjects pressed an imperial vision related but not identical to that of their predecessors, signaling continuity across 1603 as well as change. In either case, the Tudors functioned as highly visible, expedient references throughout the coming century, tools by which to measure, cajole, gratify, exalt, and criticize the Stuart kings and their dynasty under a cloak of remembrance.

Three years after it was laid to rest with Edward VI and Henry VII in Westminster Abbey, beneath an effigy complete with domed crown, orb, and sceptre, Elizabeth’s body was exhumed in 1606. James saw that she was reinterred with Mary I along the north aisle of the chapel. Though completion of the full scheme was delayed until 1612, Elizabeth eventually lay right across from a new tomb that the king had commissioned to revive the image of his mother, Mary Queen of Scots. Faced with the challenge of a predecessor who had overseen his mother’s execution, James sought security and legitimacy by recourse to the sixteenth century. In that period, his job was a familiar one; James’s feat of symbolic self-fashioning resonates with those of his progenitor over a century prior. However, as his careful balancing act suggests, James’s work required both the rejection as well as the embrace of the Tudor past.

The reign of a virile man practiced in Scottish kingship, attended by his own royal theory, courtiers, church, and parliament, and eager to unite the crowns without subordinating Scotland, evinced a break from the Tudor monarchy.\textsuperscript{16} To this day, at the head of Elizabeth’s 1606 tomb, a Latin epigraph lauds the “queen of England, France, and Ireland, Daughter of Henry the eighth, Grandchild to Henry the seventh… [with] Vertues beyond her Sex a Prince incomparable, James, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, heir of the virtues and the reign, piously erects this good monument.”\textsuperscript{17} With these lines, James squarely situated himself within a Tudor lineage, glorifying his predecessor, while also asserting himself as her superior, exchanging her title to England with his own to all of Great Britain and privileging a gendered rendering of her rule to emphasize his own masculinity. From his promise to relocate the court to York and split his time between Edinburgh and London, to the new Union Jack heraldry combining the cross of St. George with that of St. Andrew, much had changed in British calculus, yet much also remained hinged on Tudor deeds and discourse.\textsuperscript{18} Indeed, in a proclamation from the first year of his reign, the king asserted that his accession was not revolutionary; rather, he had but “Reunit[ed] these two mightie, famous and ancient Kingdomes of England and Scotland, under one Imperiall Crowne,” effecting the formal merger of two lands predestined by God to be together by virtue


\textsuperscript{17} “Queuene Elizabeths Monument,” in John Stow, \textit{The Survey of London} (London: 1633), STC 23345.5, 827.

of a shared island, language, civility, and religion. But this British union certainly looked quite unlike the unequal, Anglocentric version propounded in the 1540s. Wearing the enclosed crown flaunted by his ancestors, it was an altogether familiar phrase but an equally unfamiliar concept when James VI and I declared himself “King of Great Britaine.”

* 

By recalling the Tudors, the Stuarts memorialized sixteenth-century imperialism, whether positive or negative, actual or imagined. Continuity in personnel and the survival of popular texts and thought merged with changes brought by or circa the new dynasty, as flatters and critics fashioned history to fit their own ends. Consequently, they perpetuated certain images, diction, objectives, and regions of interest from sixteenth-century British imperialism, duly elevating some areas and ideas over others. Accordingly, Queen Elizabeth I and the empire of her last decade seemed most apropos to Jacobean conversations, and not surprisingly so. However, as the popularity of the Columbus Myth and references to Henry VIII in Tournai suggest, just as nasty nineties imperialism was squarely rooted in earlier experiences, so too did seventeenth-century theorists look back even further.

This dissertation has pointed to the value of studying the emergence and elaboration of the British Empire over the course of the sixteenth century. The Tudor era was characterized by an interest among crown and subjects in territorial expansion beyond England and Wales, which was part and parcel of the growth and evolution of a British nation. These intertwined processes of national consolidation and identity formation produced a certain style of imperial activity, one which defined Tudor engagement with the world both close to home, in Tournai, Scotland, and Ireland, and farther afield in Newfoundland, Virginia, and Guiana. By the time James I came to

---

19 “Proclamation declaring what flags…,” April 1604, in SRP, 1:95.
20 “Proclamation declaring what flags…,” April 1604, in SRP, 1:95.
the throne in 1603, a British Empire, with its own history, theories, statutes, and symbols existed in sufficiently coherent form that the new monarch and his subjects could both build on his predecessor’s endeavors and deploy a language of imperialism to solidify and legitimate his own reign. What has long been a starting point for so many scholars of the British Empire and the British Atlantic World turns out to be merely a waystation that reaches back to 1485.
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