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Chapter 1

Introduction

London as Jerusalem – Jerusalem as London

The penultimate illustration in Richard Blome’s 1688 edition of Nicolas Fontaine’s The history of the Old Testament, which serves as the frontispiece for this dissertation, bears the title “The New Jerusalem.” At first glance, it seems a fairly faithful representation of Revelation 21-22, where an angel shows St. John the celestial city that descends from heaven at the end of history. The city is perfectly rectangular, plausibly “four-square,” and framed with the requisite walls and gates as described in scripture. But instead of showing “a pure river of water of life…proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb” (22:1), the illustration places the city upon the right-hand bank of a broad river basin, surrounded by a moat, with no indication of the source of either waterway. One might infer from the biblical context that the water flows from a supernatural spring somewhere within the city, a key feature of John’s vision. But the frame of the image cuts against the lower left corner of the city’s walls, so that while the river flows into the valley and towards the image’s vanishing point, it seems to flow past the city as would a natural body of water.

This idealized urban image, its architecture dominated by rows of attached townhouses with peaked roofs and lacking any orientalist domes or arches that often appear in early printed depictions of Jerusalem, thus recalls the square-mile City of London that occupies the north bank of the Thames. Indeed, the buildings closely
resemble those in Anthony van den Wyngaerde’s famous *Panorama of London* (1543). On the other hand, the moat that describes this urban rectangle suggests Westminster, adjacent to London. Westminster was originally built upon Thorney Island, formed by rivulets from the River Tyburn that have now been covered over, but which are still visible in Wyngaerde’s *Panorama* with Fleet Street forming the northern boundary.

The plate from Blome’s text sets the New Jerusalem along the right side of the river. Insofar as it suggests London or Westminster, the orientation of the image suggests a westward trajectory translating biblical Jerusalem to Restoration England. The resemblance of this “New Jerusalem” to early modern London demonstrates how the repetition of an analogical figure can lead to reciprocity between tenor and vehicle.
Frequent employments of Jerusalem as a figure through which early modern writers imagined and addressed London have engendered a reversal whereby Jerusalem is imagined through the topography of London.

* * * * *

Jerusalem as sign of glory and calamity

Centuries before William Blake would call for “Jerusalem” to be built “in England’s green and pleasant fields,” early modern writers depicted London in the guise of both positive and negative iterations of Jerusalem and, in doing so, shaped their readers as subjects of a uniquely privileged nation. Indeed, these comparisons structure the literary and ideological background for Blake’s poem, which has been set musically as a popular Anglican hymn and features prominently in English national rituals to this day. The Jerusalems to which Blake’s antecedents compare London include the various depictions of the biblical capital in the prophetic and historiographic books of the Hebrew Scripture, including the Book of Lamentations, which depicts its destruction by Babylon in vivid and often gruesome verse. They also invoke the city over which Christ weeps as he foretells its doom in Luke 19. As the plate from Blome’s text demonstrates, they employ the New Jerusalem that descends from heaven in Revelation. In addition to these scriptural images of Jerusalem drawn from both testaments, they often pair London with depictions of Jerusalem’s destruction by Rome drawn from the account of Flavius Josephus and subsequent traditions that are built upon his text, though often with striking alterations. Whereas these available Jerusalems include the most sublime imagination of an ideal polity and its physical glory, the most exalted civitas and most pristine urbs, they
also include texts that focus on reproving its shortcomings and the calamities interpreted
as divine justice.

Early modern writers and preachers made ample use both of Jerusalem’s
apotheoses and calamities in addressing their own emergent capital. Jerusalem’s status as
an object of idealization and contempt leads its positive depictions to gesture to its
negative depictions, and vice versa. God’s unique ire at Jerusalem’s shortcomings only
appears just or makes sense given the exalted position he had granted the city and its
people. On the other hand, when we consider the idealized depictions in scripture, we
recall its two destructions. Christian exegetes frequently read the latter calamity as God’s
ultimate repudiation of his original elect nation. This repudiation fulfills a crucial,
perhaps even necessary function for Christian claims, as it enabled Jerusalem’s
replacement by its celestial counterpart as an image of heaven, or by various other centers
that have laid claim to its mantle. Although London is not unique in aspiring to this
status, few other cities have done so with the same enduring national effects. Christianity
thus casts Jerusalem as a tragic figure, once glorious and favored but ultimately doomed
when it refused the incomparable grace offered by its rightful king and heavenly savior in
the figure of Christ.

The dichotomous tragic composition of Jerusalem as a figure for London made it
suitable for a wide variety of occasions. Cumulatively, its employments produced an
ideological construct in the sense of what Debora Shuger articulates as a “habit of
thought,” one of early modern English culture’s “interpretive categories” that help to
organize “specific beliefs, ideas, and values” shaping, in this particular instance, religious
and national subjectivities. The earliest parallels between England or Britain and Israel can be located in St. Gildas’ *De excidio et conquestu britanniae*, composed in the first half of the sixth century. But the twin phenomena of London’s emergence at the center of national life and the Reformation in the sixteenth century consolidated national and religious affiliations and produced a popular national subjectivity focused on a capital increasingly compared to the biblical capital. In his magisterial *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (1995), Lawrence Manley contends that in the wake of the Reformation “London became less and less an alien Babylon or Nineveh,” two gentile biblical cities to which it is compared, “and more and more a likeness of Jerusalem, the accepted if not unambiguous symbol of the nation’s identity.” This dissertation enters into Manley’s litotes to explore the nationally generative ambiguities inherent in likening London to Jerusalem. My readings of late Elizabethan texts suggest that the parallel between the two cities is neither merely a symptom of Reformation England’s aspiration to Israel’s privilege, nor an epiphenomenon of that broader ideological trope. Rather, articulations of parallels between the two cities in this period propelled the development of a homiletic trope into a historiographic framework for an emerging nation; a mode of national imagination that sped the development of providential strains in American political thought, as Perry Miller and Sacvan Bercovitch, and more recently Nicolas Guyatt have explored.

---

1 *Habits of Thought* 9.
2 Gildas writes that after some victories won by Ambrosius Aurelianus. “sometimes our countrymen, sometimes the enemy, won the field, to the end that our Lord might this land try after his accustomed manner these his Israelites, whether they loved him or not….”
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The city and the word: the reciprocal causality of discursive and material phenomena

Early modern hermeneutic developments aided the availability of Jerusalem for appropriation by historicizing the city in the ancient past. Shuger’s *The Renaissance Bible* (1994) lays out how humanist hermeneutics focused on locating the objects, rituals, and laws that scripture presents in a particular cultural-historical past, producing a “new historical imagination: a realization of the solidity of historical existence, of bodies located in chronological rather than sacral time.”

New methodologies read the particulars of scripture “to retrieve the exemplary past, unearthed alien cultures fixed in time.” They engendered mechanisms for the defamiliarization of the past that resonate with contemporary historicist approaches. Scripture no longer functioned as a repository of raw material for spiritual exempla, and “although unfamiliar, the rediscovered visage remained the face (and law) of the father, remained the matrix of early modern identity.”

This resulted in a “duplicity of the ancestral past” lending it a “double status as mirror and other” and situating it as “the site of ideological crisis and therefore of knowledge.” In rooting depictions of Jerusalem in terrestrial antiquity, humanist exegetes situated them as synchronically strange and diachronically distant, but nonetheless in a continuum within the same temporal plane. Attention to historical and cultural particularities situated Jerusalem as both London’s mirror and its other, and the crisis of this conflict produced a particular mode of knowledge, specifically the ongoing production of English national self-knowledge.

---

5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
The rhetorical purchase of texts that claimed Jerusalem’s privilege on behalf of early modern London drew upon the English capital’s increasingly dominant position in national, political, economic, and religious life, its demographic expansion, and its near monopoly on print capitalism. These texts suggest that material and discursive phenomena fed one another in reciprocal fashion. This centrality lent credence to parallels with Jerusalem’s dominance in the national narratives in Hebrew Scripture from II Samuel and that occupies no less central a position in the Gospels. Manley captures London’s unprecedented demographic explosion in the period succinctly: “Between the death of Thomas More and the death of Milton, the population of London increased from 50,000 souls to half a million, transforming a late medieval commune into a metropolis that would soon become the largest capital and entrepôt in Europe.”

Similarly, John Schofield attributes London’s growth in the period to “the centralization in London of the nation’s political and economic life” and to “upheavals in provincial communities” and characterizes “London’s resulting extraordinary growth” as making England “one of the most urbanized countries in Europe by 1650.”

London could also be conceived as resembling Jerusalem in its capacity as a forum for the performance of public ritual. Steven Mullaney illustrates London’s ceremonial public life in *The Place of the Stage* (1988), describing the city as “a dramatic and symbolic work in its own right, a social production of space, an oeuvre…composed

---

9 125
10 296. See also *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis*. 11. London’s demographic explosion led Peter Earle to entitle his important social history of a slightly later period in the city’s life, *A City Full of People: men and women of London, 1650-1750* (1994), employing a biblical description of Jerusalem for London, even though this work does not discuss the parallel at all. His title also demonstrates the capacity of negative and positive depictions of Jerusalem drawn from biblical literature to gesture to one another, for his source is the opening verse of Lamentations: “How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people! how is she become as a widow! she that was great among the nations, and princess among the provinces, how is she become tributary!” (Lam. 1:1). Earle thus entitles a study of London in its ascendance with a biblical verse that sets the scene for mourning Jerusalem’s destruction.
and rehearsed over the years by artisanal classes and sovereign powers, for whom meaning was always a public event….” London’s ceremonial culture situated the city as a performed text that hearkened back to the urban center of biblical ceremony and pageantry. Even before the Reformation and Caxton’s introduction of moveable type placed Bibles in the hands of increasing numbers of English subjects, or at least in their parish churches, this ceremonialism evoked Jerusalem. John Lydgate’s *A Mumming for the Goldsmiths of London*, composed for performance before the Lord Mayor Eestfeld at Candlemass, cast London artisans as David and representatives of the twelve tribes carrying the ark into Jerusalem.¹²

Two texts composed at opposite extremes of the Elizabethan period map Israel onto England by positioning London as England’s Jerusalem, framing the era in which parallels between the cities leant form and momentum to the development of English national imagination. In 1561, three years after Elizabeth’s accession, James Pilkington returned from exile on the continent, where he had spent the entirety of Mary’s Catholic regime. He was installed as the first Protestant Bishop of Durham and in the following year published *Aggeus and Abdias prophetes the one corrected, the other newly added, and both at large declared*. The first part of the work presents a highly polemical commentary on the prophet Haggai. Haggai is a relatively minor prophet, neither as theologically significant as Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, nor as popular in homiletics as Hosea and Jonah. Yet Haggai narrates Israel’s return from Babylonian exile and the complications involved in reestablishing the rituals of its national religion. It was

¹¹ 10 ¹² *Mummings And Entertainments* (2010).
therefore an apt text for a preacher who himself had recently returned from exile.

Comparing his nation unfavorably to ancient Israel, Pilkington declares:

> If all men in Englande shoulde goe thri se in the year to London, leauing none at home but women & chyldren as thei did to Ierusalem, and tarie there eight daies (for soo longe continued their feaste) we woulde thinke the Scots & all round about vs, woulde inuade our countrie: but if we were as ernest in religion as they were, God woulde defende vs as he did them, & no enemy shoulde hurt vs, whan we kept religion…¹³

The exiles returning from Babylon resumed the pilgrimages to Jerusalem, which according to biblical law obligated all males to ascend to the capital on the Feasts of Tabernacles, Passover, and Pentecost. Pilkington’s hortatory comparison of restored Protestant England to restored Israel positions London, not Canterbury, where the chief prelate sat, as England’s national and religious capital. In 1603, in the final year of Elizabeth’s reign, the merchant and travel writer Henry Timberlake published an account of his journey to Palestine, entitled *A True and Strange Discourse of the Travailes of Two English Pilgrimes*, which was reprinted eight times in the seventeenth century. Like Bishop Pilkington, Timberlake maps Israel onto England by positioning London as Jerusalem:

> The field where the Angell brought tydings of ioy to the Sheepeheards, is from *Ierusalem* as *Greenwich* from *London*. Mount *Oliuet* is from *Ierusalem*, as *Bowe* from *London*.

> *Bethanie* is from *Ierusalem*, as *Blackwall* from *London*. *Bethphage* is from *Ierusalem*, as *Mile-end* from *London*. The valley of *Gethsemanie* is from

¹³ Sig. D viii r.
Jerusalem, as Ratcliffe fields from London. The brooke Cedron is from Jerusalem, as the ditch without Algate, which runnes to the Tower from London. Mount Sion is now adioyning to new Jerusalem, as Southwarke to London.  

Whereas Pilkington’s mapping depends upon London’s religious functions, Timberlake’s depends upon London’s establishment as England’s most broadly common geographical point of reference, which surely reflects its economic and social functions.

Elizabethan London indeed came to resemble a pilgrimage destination, often somewhat accidentally through its dual functions as the dominant economic and religious center. As merchants and trades folk were drawn to the emerging metropolis for various reasons, they might also participate in the city’s renowned ritual and homiletic activities. London was the central market of the island realm and a location where an increasing percentage of the nation’s population spent some portion of their lives in service or apprenticeships.  

Citizens, temporary residents, and visitors drawn to the city for any number of reasons would attend sermons at the preaching cross in St. Paul’s Churchyard, which Susan Brigden describes as “the first pulpit in the land,” and from which beginning in the Henrician period “the changes of the Reformation were expounded.” In his 1583 edition of Actes and Monuments, John Foxe cites the criticism of Richard Wolman, Henrician Reformer and chaplain to Henry VIII, who described “the Church of Paules” as “a house of theeues: affirming that Priests, and other Ecclesiasticall persons there, were not liberall geuers vnto the poore.” Here we have a prime example of a negative trope assigning the status of Jerusalem’s Temple to London’s central religious institution, long

\[14\]
\[15\] According to Keith Wrightson, in 1550 “there were an estimated 7,250 apprentices living in the City of London – roughly a tenth of the entire population. 33
\[16\]  
\[17\] Vii. 799.
before John Milton would compare London’s schismatics to builders of “The Temple of the Lord…some cutting, some squaring the marble, others hewing the cedars” and argue that “there must be many schisms and many dissections made in the quarry and in the timber, ere the house of God can be built.”

St. Paul’s Cross stood at the center of England’s capital, functioned as the central forum for its religious debates, and also marked the center of England’s rapidly developing industry of print capitalism. Religious and non-religious texts of all sorts could be purchased in the stalls and stores encompassing the Churchyard, joining the dissemination point of sacred and secular textual activity in a single condensed geographical point. It was from here that the word went forth, whether doctrine, edicts of the crown, poetry, sensational and apocalyptic pamphlets, ballads and broadsheets, Bibles and even bawdy material. All these could be purchased steps from England’s central pulpit. While the term nationalism is contested with respect to the Elizabethan period, Benedict Anderson stresses the centrality of print capitalism and of newspapers to its development. By the late sixteenth century, print capitalism was thriving and the phenomenon of Strange Newes pamphlets were laying the groundwork for the newspapers that would begin to reach their recognizable form in the next century. Furthermore, while nationalism is often considered a thoroughly secular phenomenon, the literal mix of secular and religious printed materials in St. Paul’s Churchyard suggests that even if this is so, the conditions of its emergence can hardly be conceived as neatly

---

18 Complete Poems and Major Prose (1957) 744.
19 Imagined Communities 39-42.
20 For detailed discussion of this genre, see Alexandra Walsham’s Providence in Early Modern England, 181-203.
Whether or not one defines nationalism in such a way that it may be located in this time and place, national imagination and discourses germinated in the fertile ground of St. Paul’s.

* * * * *

The vexed appropriation of Israel’s discredited national privilege

These early modern comparisons of London with Jerusalem that were disseminated through print materials sold in St. Paul’s Churchyard implied, whether intentionally or inadvertently, the possibility of England’s election. In Foxe’s Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation (1963), William Haller sparked a long-running scholarly debate regarding whether a biblical concept of national election could be located as early as the sixteenth century. Objections have focused on Foxe’s apocalypticism, and on his prioritizing of affiliation with a transnational Protestant true church over national affiliation. Indeed, Foxe spent his final years at Salisbury engaged in apocalyptic calculations and speculations regarding the proximity of history’s closing event, apparently no longer interested in celebrating the reign of Elizabeth, whom he had anointed the new Constantine. His Eusebian interests seem to have faded. While Foxe’s contribution proves both pivotal and unique in many respects, his conviction that history was all but exhausted places him in a long tradition of Christian theologians who focused on the proximity of history’s end. Like these antecedents, his apocalyptic perspective did not prevent his works from communicating formative historiographic implications, even as history continued well beyond his expectations. Paul himself believed Christ’s return was not far off and his Epistles certainly continue to inform Christian theological

21 Anthony D. Smith
22 Firth 106-9
development. In the next century, millenarian historiography that posits a period of earthly triumph before the final consummation of history would become current, but its English articulations at this juncture were meager and marginal. Precisely at a time when English national aspiration is growing, when Protestants devoted to their Queen and nation are seeking a role for their nation in a world-historical drama, the clock of history threatens to run out. Yet this conflict between apocalyptic expectation and national aspiration produces a generative tension that lays the groundwork for millenarian thought. Additionally, *Actes and Monuments* records the suffering and resistance of Marian martyrs who are all English and does so in a pronounced English idiom. Foxe indeed intended their travails primarily as testimony to the theological truth of a transnational and invisible church, but his examples vividly depict that church as thoroughly English in character. They model election, even if accidentally, as almost exclusively English. Discourses of nationhood in sixteenth-century England, beginning with Henrician satirists such as Henry Brinkelow, envision Reform by comparing the dissemination of theological truth on English soil, often specifically from London, to the prophetic privilege of ancient Israel. While Reform unquestionably percolates and even originates on the continent, England’s Reformation excels others in both quality and quantity of theological repair and instruction. The Reformers’ interest in reaching back across Roman corruption to the primitive church, together with Luther’s emphasis on individual engagement with scripture, amplified unsettled questions regarding the valence and status of Jerusalem. For Jerusalem functions as both the setting of significant biblical episodes and the sign of the ancient Jewish polity, the site of its zenith and nadir and the emblem of its glory and tragedy.
The question of how Jews were viewed in early modern England has also been the subject of significant debate. David Katz’s *Philo-semitism and the readmission of the Jews to England, 1603-1655* (1982) examines how certain strains of English Protestantism emphasized a positive view of Jews leading up to the Whitehall Conference, convened by Oliver Cromwell to debate the question of Jewish settlement in England. James Shapiro’s *Shakespeare and the Jews* (1997) focuses on the figure of the Jew as primarily a threatening other against which English identities were formulated. Most recently, Achsah Guibbory’s *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (2010) evinces a more nuanced and complex approach. Guibbory recognizes that the “Protestant imagination identified Catholic worship with Jewish ceremonialism,” enabling the “potential for intensified hostility to Jewish elements—a sense that the remnants of Judaism had to be purged from Christianity.” But she emphasizes the degree to which Protestants also “embraced the biblical history of the Jews.”

My view aligns closely with Guibbory’s, but I focus on earlier material and specifically on how London paralleled with Jerusalem drove this conflicted perception. I explore the tensions involved in appropriating Jerusalem’s privilege for England’s national center and how they generated the momentum of this ideological development.

Since Paul, the status of Judaism and Jews has remained unresolved or contested in Christian thought, eluding any stable or final consensus. Christianity requires Judaism as its grounds and requires a separation from its failure that does not undermine the Jewish source of its authority. Contemporary ecumenical discourse has eschewed the terms “Old Testament” and “New Testament” because it implies that the former has been superseded. But these terms themselves model the irresolvable tension between

---

23 1-2
privileging origins and privileging perfection. Christian scriptures must exceed their Hebrew antecedents, but despite Marcion’s efforts to exclude them, they remain dependent upon their predecessor. Similarly, the nation whose history produced the Hebrew writings and Jerusalem, the capital city that constitutes the image of their national culture, provides a foundational model whose authority must be preserved, while at the same time it must be subordinated as a flawed preliminary for the history of Christian churches and nations. The status of the Jew and the Jewish polity remain undecidable. Efforts to resolve this tension have produced creative syncretisms that are revisited and modified repeatedly, driving Christian intellectual history. Calvinism in particular reinvigorated these encounters in the early modern period by extending typology beyond the efforts to harmonize the testaments according to the logic of type and anti-type, bringing it to bear upon the present with renewed force, so that scripture presented the period with possibilities of prophetic fulfillment and not just exempla and allegories.

My argument does not impute intentionality to individual texts and writers with regard to the national and ideological implications of the parallels they draw between Jerusalem and London, nor do their readers and auditors necessarily apprehend these analogies in a literal or thoroughgoing manner. Rather, their cumulative effects over time engender the habit of thinking about London as a successor to Jerusalem and England as a successor to Israel. Writers and preachers may do so for particular occasional and local homiletic purposes. As with Foxe, they may intend less nationally specific messages. Mary Morrissey argues that the Paul’s Cross sermons of the Jacobean period do not communicate any form of national covenant or privilege. Distinguishing between

---

“types” and “examples,” she emphasizes that Israel generally functions as an example of “sinfulness” particularly with regard to “her ingratitude in prosperity” and that “Israel is the most common example used because Israel afforded the greatest range of examples.” Both of these critiques ring true to a certain extent: preachers indeed employ Israel as a negative example, and the frequency of their employments can indeed be explained in part by Israel’s central position in scriptural narratives. However, when these preachers and writers held up negative examples of Israel they forged resemblances between the biblical and English nations. Indeed, the rhetorical effectiveness of Israel as an example depends directly upon the creation of parallels and resemblances with England. When they addressed England in the guise of a sinful Israel, their calls to repentance and reform functioned as something approaching an Althusserian “hail” that interpellates subjects by eliciting a response to institutional authority. Like a citizen who acknowledges the authority of a policeman simply by attending, English Protestants embraced the parallel with Israel by accepting the examples as credible. These parallels functioned as a central mode according to which these subjects were oriented into a scheme that structured their identities, both individually and collectively. Furthermore, these exhortations to repentance do not exhaust or constrain the multivalence of the analogies they employ. An encounter with one of the available examples, as I have already begun to demonstrate, brings others into play. For even as the range of examples may be heterogeneous, they are nonetheless interconnected through the signifiers of “Israel” or “Jerusalem.” Morrissey’s argument calls for closer rhetorical analysis of

25 53
26 Althusser presents his classic discussion of this mechanism in “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation).” Lenin And Philosophy, And Other Essays. (1971). 127-188.
individual iterations closely, but fails to consider rhetorical effects. “Israel” and “Jerusalem” may indeed be employed most frequently because the range of their attestations increases their availability, but this means they are also most commonly heard and read. The effect of a particular iteration cannot be apprehended solely according to this question. Indeed, Morrissey concludes by faulting scholarship on prophetic preaching for having “failed to take account of the stated primary aims of these sermons or the interpretive bases of the preachers’ Old Testament examples.”

Yet while the aims of preachers indeed function as necessary context for studying these works, so do the collective effects of their analogies on their audiences.

* * * *

_Doctrine, ideology, and modes of assent_

Morrisey’s critique would persuade more thoroughly if it were demonstrated that these tropes could be restricted to the inculcation of doctrine, yet even then they may bear ideological functions that are less subject to the control of the rhetor and the internal, local logic of his argument. In “Odysseus’ Scar,” Erich Auerbach argues that in the literature of the Hebrew Bible, “[d]octrine and the search for enlightenment are inextricably connected with the physical side of the narrative” and that together this functions as a “frame” through which an often incompatible historical world is apprehended. This incompatibility triggers an interpretive dialectic whereby the “frame” demands interpretation of history, but history “also reacts upon the frame,” requiring its reinterpretation. Whereas doctrine and biblical narrative may indeed be inextricably linked, they are not identical. In a sense, Auerbach presents us with three

---

27 54.
28 *Mimesis* (195). 15-16
29 Ibid.
terms: narrative, doctrine, and history. The first two are more closely aligned. Doctrine is often rooted in scriptural narrative. Narrative may also be interpreted in accord with doctrine as an exegetical lens that decides a reading of a particular textual moment. Finally, doctrine may function as a way of instantiating biblical narrative in lived experience and of ensuring its continued transmission. For instance, performance of the Eucharist makes present the narrative of Christ’s final supper with his disciples and the subsequent events of his passion. On the other hand, doctrine and narrative often differ essentially in how they obligate religious subjects. If one is asked a doctrinal question, such as whether one believes that the real presence of Christ inheres in the Eucharistic host, there are only two answers: yes or no. Doubt falls short of the demand to believe and thus functions as a negative response, as would an assertion of ignorance. But the encounter between history and scripture engenders a different and more elusive ideological framework, one not dependent upon a conscious and decidable binary for its effect. One can answer with clarity a doctrinal question regarding whether or not St. Paul’s bears the same spiritual status as the Temple in Jerusalem. On the other hand, if asked whether there is historical contiguity between Jerusalem and London entailing a narrative logic of succession, one can answer in the negative and still be affected by repeated exposure to a parallel, especially one that asserts resemblance between the material and cultural realities of these two geographically and historically distant cities.

* * * * *

Fear for the future: the pivotal locus of late Elizabethan London

The primary texts that organize the three chapters of this dissertation, Book I of Edmund Spenser’s *The Fairie Queene* (1590), Thomas Nashe’s *Christes Teares Over Jerusalem*,
whereunto is annexed a comparative admonition to London (1593), and Spenser’s *The Ruines of Time* (1591), were all published within three years of one another. Though Spenser likely began composition of *The Faerie Queene* around 1579, the content of the other two proves they were composed proximate to their publication dates.\(^{30}\) The decade and a half which witnessed their conceptions was marked by an anxiety regarding the future, particularly among Protestants, that even the seemingly miraculous victory over the Armada did not fully ameliorate. As the Reformation proceeded alongside the interrelated development of national consciousness, the apocalyptic historiography of the former vexed the possibilities of the latter. Hortatory warnings by preachers both interpellated Christians as religious subjects and simultaneously threatened national subjects. William Hunt suggests this conflict in his definition of Puritanism:

> I understand by puritanism a body of opinion characterized by an intense hostility to the church of Rome as the incarnation of anti-Christ; an emphasis on preaching and Bible study rather than ritual as the means of salvation; and a desire to impose a strict moral code…upon society as a whole. These attitudes were generally accompanied by an aggressive, imperialist conception of England’s national vocation.\(^{31}\)

Until millenarian thought took hold in the next century, the conflict with the Roman anti-Christ was largely understood as apocalyptic and its final engagement as imminent. The success or failure of preachers to impose a “strict moral code” had bearing both on the individual fates of England’s subjects and upon the nation’s success or failure in leading the transnational Protestant true church to its victory. Yet these same subjects were often


dedicated to a national vocation with historical goals, whether imperialist or not. When we label anyone in this period as a puritan we commit an anachronism, as the term was not yet current. Yet the particular qualities that Hunt draws together for his definition inform Spenser’s and Nashe’s texts.

The concern for England’s national future that reverberates through these texts can be attributed to the fact that Elizabeth, the Protestant monarch that Spenser mythologizes in *The Faerie Queene*, was aging and clearly destined to remain childless. Insecurity regarding the succession entailed insecurity regarding the nation’s religious status. A Catholic successor would tip England into the hands of anti-Christ. Both the anxiety regarding apocalyptic closure and the anxiety regarding a possible Catholic succession threatened the vision of an English Protestant nation. London’s emergence as a national symbol, and its religious significance, offered an alternative image through which nationhood could be imagined. The parallel with Jerusalem served this purpose at precisely this juncture.

In my first chapter, “Hierusalem-upon-Thames: London and Jerusalem in Book I of Spenser’s *Faerie Queene,*” I explicate the narrative arc of the opening book of Spenser’s epic as dependent upon four different Jerusalems: crusader Jerusalem, the anagogical celestial Jerusalem, the apocalyptic New Jerusalem, and the disemboding allegorical conflation of Jerusalem with Eden as a figure for the challenges of the temporal present. Spenser’s text negotiates the historiographic complications that attend each of these and ultimately conceives a privileged, world-historical role for the English nation through Cleopolis, a figure for Elizabeth’s capital. Spenser situates Cleopolis/London as a fifth, alternative kind of Jerusalem that functions as an authorizing
center for agents whose deeds might be translated into textual “signe[s] of victoree” (I.x.61). In this scheme, London approximates a central function of biblical Jerusalem while resisting the threat of closure inherent in apocalyptic historiography. Spenser thus anticipates millennial historiography by several decades and his text reveals the conditions of its emergence.

Chapter II, “Peter Morwen’s Josippon and Thomas Nashe’s Teares over London: The Reformation of Vindicta Salvatoris and the National Utility of Jerusalem’s Destruction,” traces a sixteenth-century shift in vernacular narratives of Jerusalem’s destruction by Rome in 70 CE. This shift culminates in Nashe’s Christes Teares Over Jerusalem, whereunto is annexed a comparative admonition to London (1593).

Morwen’s translation of Sefer Josippon, a Hebrew document erroneously considered Flavius Josephus’s eyewitness account intended for Jews, served as a pivotal mechanism for the dissemination of a historicized alternative to medieval vindicta salvatoris traditions that glorified Rome and impeded sympathy with Jerusalem and its citizens. Morwen’s text eschews the flagrant anachronisms and Catholic hagiographical elements that are central to vindicta salvatoris texts. It thus brings the history of Jerusalem’s downfall into line with emerging critical historiographic perspectives, enhancing its credibility and offering Protestants a more theologically suitable narrative of this event. This more nuanced and occasionally sympathetic account of Jerusalem’s destruction makes the biblical capital more available for appropriation as a model for London.

32 All quotations from The Faerie Queene are taken from A.C. Hamilton’s 1997 edition, first published in 1977.
Nashe’s employment of this narrative ultimately undergirds his declaration that no “image or likeness of…Jerusalem on earth is there left, but London.”

In my final chapter, “‘To avoide that fowle blot of unthankefullnesse’: Jerusalem’s Destruction and English Nationhood in Spenser’s The Ruines of Time,” I read allusions to the specter of the destroyed Jerusalem, personified in the female figure that dominates the Book of Lamentations, as they inform a work that has been relatively neglected in Spenser scholarship. Ostensibly a poem that seeks to repair Spenser’s failure to compose an elegy for Sir Philip Sidney, it reaches toward a privileged paradigm for London and England that avoids the alternatives of divine repudiation and apocalyptic closure. In dedicating the poem to the fallen poet-knight’s sister, Mary Sidney Herbert, Spenser engages homiletic traditions that threatened London with Jerusalem’s fate through imputing “unthankefullnesse” to citizens of both capitals. Writers often insert this term into paraphrases of Luke 19, where Christ weeps over Jerusalem in the episode that Nashe alludes to in his title. I demonstrate how Spenser positions Philip Sidney’s funeral as an imitatio Christi that provides London with an opportunity to correct the error that doomed ancient Jerusalem and opens the possibility of imitating and surpassing its predecessor.

Collectively, these chapters trace a formative dynamic in the development of English national thought and participate in the reexamination of interactions between discourses that have too often been parsed into impossibly distinct secular and sacred spheres. Granting the importance of secularism to theories of nationalism, I seek to illuminate its dependence upon religious concepts and narratives without embracing a simplistic and/or teleological trajectory of secularization. Furthermore, my focus on

33 Christs Teares over Jerusalem (1593) 91.
London engages the city’s material and social history as a third term, emphasizing how these dynamics cannot be productively apprehended as exclusively elite, intellectual, and discursive formations. Given the particularly formative impact of the late Elizabethan milieu on the pre-history of the British Empire, which continued to be shaped by London even as the Empire’s legacy continues to shape the modern city and much of the world around it, this dissertation aspires to contribute to conversations well beyond the specificities of its locations and time frame. Ideas of privilege, election, and exceptionalism that inform our political, economic, and cultural lives owe much to the parallel drawn between these two cities at this juncture. Their often violent effects have unmistakably engendered chauvinism and been used to legitimate violence and exploitation. But they have also challenged national communities to aspire to contributions beyond their own local affairs, enabling developments of cosmopolitan modes of thought and forms of interconnectedness that may also suggest more benevolent ways forward. Jerusalem functions as a complex sign of past glory and historical calamity, as well as the aspirational image of an ideal civilization that knits the histories of nations into a perfect consummation. Given the extremes of violence and wholeness that Jerusalem represents, it makes a certain sense that London, imagined in the formative Elizabethan period as its analogue and even successor, became the source of both destructive and constructive political and cultural engagements that helped to shape modernity. The degree to which the effects of this history has shaped our present problems and possibilities cannot be overstated. It is my hope and conviction that further analysis will continue to illuminate the past, but also inform a future that must both preserve and exceed its lessons.
Chapter 2

Hierusalem-upon-Thames: London and Jerusalem in Book I of Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*

*Narrative and historiographic medias res: the hero between cities, past and present*

Edmund Spenser opens *The Faerie Queene* with his Redrosse Knight “pricking” across a geographically unspecified “plaine.” Yet in contrast to the ambiguity of this setting, two very specific capital cities, Cleopolis and Jerusalem, loom at his back. The first of these cities, the seat from which Gloriana authorized his quest, functions as a poetic figure for London. Spenser telegraphs the context of Jerusalem, a city that lies deeper in the past, through his description of the armor and insignia that Redcrosse receives at the occasion of his commission. When Spenser describes his knight’s emblem as a “bloudie Crosse” that serves as a “remembrance of his dying Lord” (I.i.2), he conjures the setting of Christ’s crucifixion. This emblem likewise recalls the crosses worn by crusaders, especially the red crosses associated with Knights Templar, to broadcast their affiliation with medieval Jerusalem. As Spenser’s knight “armes till that time did he neuer wield,” his garb and equipment bearing “old dints of deepe wounds” and “cruell markes of many a blody fielde” suggest relics of a crusader that employed them in battles to capture and defend Jerusalem. While Redcrosse’s vision of *Hierusalem* plays a pivotal role later in the Book, the Jerusalem of Christ’s Passion and of the Crusades casts an allusive shadow over his initial appearance, establishing the city’s critical role in the work’s historiographic underpinning.
In this chapter, I foreground how Spenser frames Book I, his *Legende of Holinesse*, with images and evocations of Jerusalem, and pairs the biblical city with Cleopolis to articulate a national mission for England. Redcrosse, the knight initially designated as the “Patron of true Holinesse,” eventually discovers he is also destined to become his own “nations frend / And Patrone, Saint George of mery England.” Accordingly, Redcrosse must bear both the standard of holiness, a transnational moral virtue to which all Christians must aspire, and that of England, his particular nation. Spenser illustrates the tension between these roles at the Book’s pedagogical climax in Canto x, when he places his hero’s anagogical desire to ascend to *Hierusalem* in conflict with his allegiance to the queen of Cleopolis. Yet instead of leaving this double role as either a paradox or syncretism, Spenser calibrates his hero’s national and transnational affiliations to one another in the context of a reflection upon both cities. The result is a necessarily symbiotic relationship between them and the imperatives they represent. For ultimately, Redcrosse cannot effectively fulfill his role as one kind of patron without embracing the other as well, and the same two cities that provide the background for the poem’s opening frame its climactic moment. Spenser’s juxtaposition of Cleopolis with *Hierusalem* negotiates multiple binaries that structured the ideological commitments and national imaginations of early modern English Protestant subjects. These binaries—of public and private holiness, of temporal and eternal obligations, and of national and transnational imperatives—led many who identified with a transnational Protestant Church to promote a highly activist conception of a particular English national mission.34

---

34 This trio of binaries reveals that the nation represents an intermediate and, I will argue, a mediating category between the particular and the general, or in its largest sense transcendent. While this scheme
Whereas the setting in which we first encounter Redcrosse, riding in mid-quest through a proverbial middle of nowhere functions as a literary medias res inspired by Spenser’s humanist orientation, the cities at his back represent the anchoring poles of an historiographic medias res in which he grounds his vision of an English national vocation. In his “Letter to Raleigh,” Spenser distinguishes between methods of the “poet historicall” and the “historiographer.” While the latter is bound to chronological narrative, a “poet historicall…thrusts into the middest, euen where it most concerneth [them], and there recoursing to the thinges forepast, and diuining of thinges to come.” When Spenser dresses Redcrosse in armor that evokes the failed project of the Crusades, a discredited endeavor in the eyes of Protestants, he signals a reorientation of Christian chivalry that cannot focus on the terrestrial Jerusalem without recapitulating Catholic error. Jerusalem thus represents “thinges forepast,” a material city whose historical role has been exhausted. Yet when the young and unproven English knight reclaims this armor for the sake of a quest authorized by the ruler of Cleopolis, his action suggests that London’s historical significance, of necessity both distinct from and continuous with Jerusalem’s, lies in the unaccomplished future “to come.” Spenser, who famously aspired to become England’s Virgil, opens his magnum opus by positioning its initial hero similarly to Virgil’s Aeneas, between a glorious ruined city and a city whose glory awaits accomplishment. Just as Virgil positions Rome to revive, inherit, and potentially surpass the glory of Aeneas’ fallen Troy, so Spenser positions Cleopolis/London to succeed Jerusalem. Accordingly, Redcrosse occupies a mid-point in an historical

seems to pair the nation with public, temporal life as potential impediments to the affiliation of the individual with a transnational church that pre-figures eternal transcendence of the temporal realm, Spenser positions the nation, or at least the English nation, as a corporate entity that promotes individuals toward eternity.
narrative bounded by two sacred cities. In accepting his mission from Gloriana at Cleopolis, Redcrosse becomes an instrument of national actualization and the paradigmatic agent of England’s destiny. He signals England’s emerging national significance and at the same time functions as an exemplum for the pursuit of the transnational virtue of holiness. Spenser thus positions Redcrosse and the nation he represents in the middle of an unfolding Christian *heilsgeschichte* and, as a poet historical, reflects upon both “thinges forepast” and “thinges to come.”

In Spenser’s text, the terrestrial Jerusalem has fulfilled its historical functions and must be left in the past, yet other iterations of Jerusalem describe present and future goals. In Canto x, Redcrosse grasps Cleopolis’s futurity, its unaccomplished significance, by considering it in the context of his vision of *Hierusalem*, a Jerusalem that likewise lies in the future. This Jerusalem, the celestial city that descends to earth at the end of the Book of Revelation, represents the perfected end and ultimate consummation of Christian history. Through nine cantos of elaborate folly, Spenser’s Redcrosse Knight fails to fulfill his mission. He can only succeed after he comprehends his own true identity as St. George in the context of a vision that juxtaposes the celestial *Hierusalem* with Cleopolis. Yet another Jerusalem organizes the Book’s dénouement in the final two cantos. After Redcrosse is appropriately oriented — a particularly apt term given its etymological connotation of an eastern point of reference — toward the interdependent goals of *Hierusalem* and Cleopolis, he fulfills his charge by liberating Eden, a besieged earthly paradise, drawing upon traditions that conflate the garden of origin with the city of perfection. Here, Jerusalem functions as the sign or paradigm of a beleaguered present, one that requires the intervention of the paradigmatic English hero. If the
opening scene of Spenser’s *Legende of Holinesse* unfolds with London and Jerusalem structuring Redcrosse’s personal and England’s historical background, the end of the Book employs these same cities to illustrate the present and future obligations that he and his nation must fulfill.

By orienting Cleopolis to a range of referents communicated by the signifier “Jerusalem,” Spenser provides readers with a partial survey of the Jerusalems employed by early modern writers and accords London and England a privileged, though circumscribed role in a transnational Christian historiographic narrative. In Book I, Spenser orients Cleopolis to five Jerusalems, situating London as a successor to the biblical city. But in doing so he seeks to avoid both repetition of Jerusalem’s failures and the attribution of a too powerful a role to London and England, one that would potentially slight the prerogatives of divine providence. In the course of Book I, Spenser employs the terrestrial Jerusalem 1) of the Passion and 2) of the Crusades to structure the past; he preserves England’s national and historical opportunities by deferring his hero’s ascent to the celestial *Hierusalem* that represents both 3) the ultimate destination of the individual soul and 4) of collective human history. Finally, Spenser draws on traditions that conflate Eden with 5) Jerusalem as an allegorical figure for the challenges of the Christian present, wherever such challenges may be engaged, that require the intervention of English heroes. Whether or not London’s agents bear responsibility for driving history toward its triumphant conclusion, when they fulfill the paradigm that Spenser articulates through his Redcrosse Knight, their acts and virtues provide material that can be fashioned by English poets, whom Spenser implicitly invests with responsibility for the production of its heroes’ fame, into “signe[s] of victoree.” Accordingly, while Cleopolis
pales in comparison to *Hierusalem*, it is “nonetheless for earthly frame, / The fairest peece, that eye beholden can” in appearance, and it functions as the city most fit for knights who desire inscription in “th’immortall booke of fame” (I.x.60). Spenser thus adapts a classical link between terrestrial success and poetic achievement to a Christian mode that places both in the service of heavenly salvation. The English capital does not represent an earthly ideal, nor does it necessarily function as a privileged engine or object of Providence. Rather, Cleopolis/London becomes Providence’s organ of publication, both through directing the exemplary efforts of Christian heroes and even more importantly by publicizing their acts as testimony to the providential movement of history. Ultimately, the figure of Cleopolis suggests that early modern London indeed inherits the mantle of the new terrestrial Jerusalem in the specific sense of its role in producing providential testimony.

* * * * *

“Holinesse” as private and political

Cleopolis and Jerusalem share the capacity to represent both individual and corporate aspirations, as well as private and public imperatives. At Cleopolis, Gloriana authorizes Redcrosse to undertake a quest through which he may pursue personal aspirations to knighthood; yet he does so by prosecuting the political project of liberating the Kingdom of Eden. Redcrosse’s quest thus facilitates his individual/private aims, but the political context of its authorization and execution demonstrates how it also represents the interests of a national community as defined and articulated by its sovereign. Similarly, the *Hierusalem* of Revelation that Redcrosse envisions in Canto x represents both the anagogical end of each individual soul that finds salvation, and the eschatological end of
world history, both of which are subject to the will of a divine sovereign. Jerusalem functions as both the figure for heaven and for the Kingdom of God that will follow history’s final, apocalyptic upheaval. Allegorically, Redcrosse therefore functions simultaneously as a figure for the individual pursuit of holiness and for the providential political imagination of Protestant England, objectives that Spenser juxtaposes and seeks to harmonize just before the Book’s climactic struggle.

The title page of the first installment of *The Faerie Queene* emphasizes the private orientation of its pedagogical objectives, describing the project as a poem “disposed into twelve books,” each “fashioning” one of Aristotle’s twelve “morall vertues.” Yet the opening Book’s concern with holiness focuses on a concept that defies clear distinction between private and public. Of the first three virtues addressed in Spenser’s initial 1590 edition, only temperance derives directly from Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*. Chastity, the theme of Book III, might be considered as a species of temperance, suggesting a redundancy in Spenser’s text, or of modesty, both of which Aristotle includes in his list. As Aristotle was not a Christian, he does not discuss holiness. Indeed, scholars have long since given up the game of trying to locate Spenser’s virtues in Aristotle’s text. Roger Kuin has argued that “Aristotle’s contribution as seen by Spenser was not so much to draw up a list but to establish the distinction between ‘private’ and public, or ‘polliticke,’ virtues.” Accordingly, Aristotle provides Spenser with a formal template rather than content. The virtue of holiness may be distinguished from temperance and chastity as specifically Christian, or at least

35 He does reference piety, but only once as that which “requires us to honour truth above our friends” (I.1096a16). This seems only tangentially related to religion at best, instead expressing an ethical dutifulness, in accord with the term’s etymology. Aristotle quotation from W.D. Ross’s translation of *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford [England]: Oxford University Press, 2009.

36 “The Double Helix” 2.
theological, as well as in the fact that they are primarily attributes of personal conduct, while holiness pertains more evenly to both individual and corporate entities.

Before discussing private and public aspects of Christian holiness, it bears mention that Spenser’s classical source does not distinguish between these aspects in a simple manner. Recent scholars have re-examined Aristotle’s conception of the relationships between the ostensibly private issues of happiness, individual virtue, and friendship on one hand, and the proper functions of the *polis*, on the other. Kuin’s discussion draws on the work of Judith Swanson to emphasize that virtues, in an Aristotelian context, do not connote individual qualities, but relate to actions. The terms public and private therefore describe dimensions of action, and they are distinguished in that private virtues are developed at a remove from the immediate pressures of social conventions that often constrain and determine individual actions. While “the private and the public are not fundamentally distinct, still less in competition with one another…and as such part of a continuum,” privacy represents “the condition in which such actions can be undertaken by choice, free from the leaden pressure of common opinion and the immediate demands of social responsibility.”

Edward Halper similarly reads Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* alongside his *Politics* to amplify the former text’s engagement with public life. Responding to interpreters who have too often read Aristotle’s concept of the state as a social arrangement that provides “the security and stability that individuals need for virtuous acts,” so that public operations are subordinated as the means to private interests, Halper argues that such readings rest upon an assumption that “personal

---
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interests must conflict.” Instead of adopting this proto-Hobbesian perspective, Halper reads Aristotle’s conception of happiness as involving both “living with friends in a state” and in “governing a state.” The result is a more balanced view between individual interests and political life, wherein neither is subordinated to the other. Ideally then, the continuum between private and public virtues enables “the best states [to be] knit together so tightly that the interests of one person are the same as the interests of all,” and emphasizes how “the virtues [Aristotle] describes in his ethics are meant to be exercised in the governance of such a state.” According to this view, political community takes the shape of a corporate entity that operates according to a set of ethics expressed both through the whole and through its members individually, both publicly and privately in a reciprocal, self-reinforcing fashion. Part and whole relate to one another as in a hermeneutic circle, where the meaning of a sentence arises from its individual terms, while at the same time these same terms depend upon their collective syntactic arrangement for their significance. While the state must allow for and enable opportunities to cultivate private virtue, private individuals must participate in the public project of the state.

Scripture presents holiness as a virtue that is enacted through both private behavior and public functions, resembling the dual functions that Halper sees in Aristotelian virtue. The Hebrew Bible most frequently applies the concept of holiness to God, to the objects and occasions dedicated to his worship, and to Israel in a collective sense. God charges the children of Israel in the desert to become “a kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Ex. 19:6), stressing holiness as the attribute of a political

community. The singular kingdom binds its plurality of priests into a singular nation, whose holiness is expressed here in singular form. In the opening of Leviticus 19, YHWH directs Moses to address “the Congregation of the children of Israel, and say vnto them, Ye shalbe holy, for I the Lord your God am holy” (19:1). The term congregation, or edah in Hebrew, refers to a singular corporate entity, as it does in English. Yet while the injunction “ye shalbe” may be read as either plural or singular in English, Hebrew grammar features no such ambiguity. The term t’hiyu, rendered as “ye shalbe” by the Geneva translators, is an unambiguous plural conjugation. Likewise, the form of “holy” here, a modifier that does not differentiate between singular and plural in English, maintains consistency with the plural pronoun in Hebrew: k’doshim as opposed to kadosh. While Moses addresses the singular corporate entity of the “Congregation of the children of Israel” through the plurality of its individual members, the question of whether Israel functions as a corporate unit or an aggregate of individuals becomes particularly difficult as what follows is a list of injunctions pertaining to private, interpersonal behavior, mostly addressing economic and sexual transactions between individuals. Yet the repeated calls to holiness throughout this section emphasize a collective difference between Israel and other national communities, even as they render this charge in plural terms: “Therefore shall ye be holie vnto me: for I the Lorde am holy, and I haue separated you from other people, that ye shoulde be mine” (20:26). All the terms here are plural, excepting “I the Lorde am holy,” yet Israel appears as a collective to be separated from all other collectives, suggesting a particular unity of one group singled out from many others.

---

39 All biblical quotations from the 1587 Geneva edition.
Holiness in Christian scriptures pertains more frequently to individual behavior. The prophecy of Zacharias in the first chapter of Luke argues that “we being deliuered out of the handes of our enemies, should serue [God] without feare, All the daies of our life, in holinesse and righteousnesse before him” (1:75). The Pauline epistles also occasionally employ holiness as an individual virtue. Hebrews instructs that we must “followe peace with all men, and holinesse, without the which no man shall see the Lord” (12:14), making apprehension of the divine contingent upon peaceful social relations and the virtue of holiness. One can read peacefulness here as it regards interpersonal ethics, but “all men” suggests something more than circumscribed private relations between individuals and gestures to a larger public context. If we read “peace with all men” broadly, as one’s relationship to a public polity, then peacefulness either leads to holiness, or individual holiness balances the public virtue of peacefulness with a private one.

In common English usage, holiness often blends with piety, far more commonly attested as an individual attribute than a collective one, so that these terms often function as synonyms. Vernacular translations of the Bible participate in amplifying the individual connotations of holiness. For instance, the Geneva Bible introduces the opening chapter of Job with an epigraph that highlights his “holinesse, riches, and care…for his children.” The Hebrew text introduces him twice in the opening of the first chapter with the same formula that describes him instead as “tam ve-yashar ve-yareh elohim ve-sar me-ra,” meaning “an vpright and iust man, one that feared God, and eschewed euill” (1:1, 8). The Hebrew term for holiness, kadosh, appears in neither verse.

---

40 For additional examples see Romans 6:19, I Thessalonians 4:3-4, and Titus 2:3.
nor do the Geneva translators insert it into the actual text. But the epigraph distills Job’s tripartite innocence, uprightness, and fear of evil into this single term of “holiness.”

Spenser devotes a significant portion of his “Letter to Raleigh” to distinguishing between public and private virtue, but the placement of his *Legende of Holiness* as the opening Book he undermines clear distinction. Opening with “holiness” announces the poem’s theological commitments by ultimately grounding all virtues in a necessary orientation to God. Protestant separatists and dissenters in the next century who opposed Archbishop Laud’s comprehensively authoritarian episcopacy testify to how Protestant disdain for mediation between subject and deity and subsequent suspicion of publicly performed ritual could oppose individual salvation to affiliation with public institutions. Yet these conflicts underscore how “holiness” vexed the divide between private and public in this period. Spenser nonetheless attempts to parse public and private according to literary antecedents. Where Homer distributed them between two separate figures, whereby “in the Persons of Agamemnon and Vlysses hath [he] ensampled a good gouernour and a vertuous man,” Virgil and Ariosto each “comprised them both” in their heroes Aeneas and Orlando respectively. Tasso, in his *La Gerusalemme liberata*, “disseuered them againe,” with Rinaldo representing what “they in Philosophy call Ethice, or vertues of a priuate man” and Godfredo representing “Politice.” Spenser chooses to follow Tasso, announcing his chief hero as “Arthure, before he was king, the image of a braue knight, perfected in the twelue morall vertues,” but reserves the possibility that he “may be perhaps encoraged to frame the other part of polliticke vertues in his person, after that hee came to be king.” Yet Spenser opens with Redcrosse, who as a figure for holiness, which pertains to both private and public contexts, more closely
resembles Aeneas and Orlando. Even if we interpret Redcrosse’s quest as the allegorical representation of an individual’s pursuit of private holiness, his eventual identification as his “nations frend / And Patrone, Saint George of mery England” explodest restriction of the plot to the vehicular function of representing private virtues. Ultimately, in the course of his plot, Spenser orients his paradigmatic pursuer of holiness and iconic English saint according to the cities of Cleopolis and Hierusalem, both of which represent public forums that function simultaneously as the means to, as well as the reward for successful private aspirations.

* * * * *

Jerusalem, Eden and the English Protestant hero

Redcrosse’s armor and emblem position the pursuit of holiness as a public and political endeavor centered on a terrestrial Jerusalem that had acquired edenic associations through biblical and post-biblical traditions. Spenser makes two comments on the subject of this armor in his “Letter to Raleigh,” the first regarding its provenance and the second its effect on the recipient. He relates how Redcrosse’s quest originates at Gloriana’s feast, presumably at Cleopolis, where a “Ladye in mourning weedes, riding on a white Asse, with a dwarfe behind her leading a warlike steed, that bore the Armes of a knight” solicits aid from the “Queene of Faeries” to free her parents and their castle from siege by a dragon. Spenser does not identify the location of this castle here, and the terms of her request make it seem like the private affair of an aristocratic family’s plight. Indeed, Spenser only identifies this home explicitly as Eden in the closing stanzas of Canto xii. However, when he introduces this woman as Una at the opening of Canto i, he emphasizes her “descent from Royall lynage came / Of ancient Kings and Queenes, that
had of yore / Their scepters stretcht from East to Westerne shore, / And all the world in their subiection held….” (I.i.5). Early modern writers often interpreted the injunction included in God’s blessing of Adam and Eve to “fill the earth, and subdue it, and rule ouer the fish of the sea, and ouer the foule of the heauen, & ouer euery beast that moueth vpon the earth” (Gen. 1:28) in political terms, characterizing Adam as a King or Emperor of the entire earth.41

Spenser’s introduction of Una in Canto i accordingly positions her family as a microcosm for humanity and its post-lapsarian plight, an emblem of human history. He employs the past tense in his description of her ancestors to look back across the fall toward a beleaguered felicity, to recall the “ancient Kings and Queenes…of yore” (my emphasis) and the scope of the dominion they “held.” Now that this dominion has become less universal, Una’s status is diminished so that she comes as a supplicant seeking aid for the restoration of Adam and Eve’s world-encompassing dynasty. Their transnational, or pre-national, kingdom requires the aid of a figure for the ruler of the English nation. Gloriana and Faerie, Elizabeth and England, have become humanity’s hope, the instrument of providence in world history.

The enduring imprint of the Crusades on Spenser’s Protestant vision of Christian chivalry becomes clear when we read the effect of Redcrosse’s reception of his armor in the “Letter to Raleigh” likewise in consort with its description in the opening of Canto i. According to the “Letter to Raleigh,” a “clownishe” young man immediately volunteers in response to the Lady’s request for relief of her home. She stipulates that he can only

41 For instance, the antiquarian Lodowick Lloyd’s 1590 text, *The consent of time disciphering the errors of the Grecians in their Olympiads*, describes the Adam as “Emperour of the whole world, a commander of all the whole earth.” In the next century, Robert Filmer would employ this perspective to defend monarchy against republicanism in his *Patriarchia*. 
succeed if he dons this armor, which Spenser identifies as “the armour of a Christian man specified by Saint Paul v. Ephes.” (738). In this biblical passage, Paul instructs the Ephesians to “[p]ut on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the assaultes of the Devil” (Eph. 6:11). Yet he does not refer to a private struggle against temptation and sin. Rather this armor is required because “we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, and against worldly governours, the princes of the darkenesse of this worlde, against spirituall wickednesses, which are in the hie places” (6:12). One might expect a dichotomy opposing “flesh and blood” in the first part of the verse with individual spirit in the second half. Such a construction would more easily support interpretation of this passage as promoting the metaphorical trope of the miles Christi, a figure for the individual Christian who follows his divine commander in a spiritual battle with sin. Instead, the “spiritual wickedness” Paul refers to does not indicate anything abstract or invisible that might tempt individual Christians, but that “spiritual wickedness” which is propagated by political communities who follow governors and princes wielding corrupting political authority from lofty positions. While donning this armor may be an act of private virtue, its purpose is public struggle. In the case of Redcrosse, even the first occurs in a public context. The “armour of a Christian man” equips its wearer to defeat public exercise of “spiritual wickedness,” and when the “clownishe” young man dons it “with dewe furnitures thereunto” he is transformed into “the goodliest man in al that company” attending Gloriana’s feast. The “dewe furnitures,” we learn from the opening of Canto i, feature the “bloudie crosse” of the crusaders. If the project of the Crusaders pursuit of Jerusalem has failed, its trappings still ennoble an aspiring Christian knight. When Spenser aligns the biblical text with a
discredited medieval image, he suggests that this image retains some integrity as the symbol for political pursuit of the sacred.

Spenser explicitly identifies Una’s home as Eden near the very end of the Book in Canto xii, but he often describes it with allusions to Jerusalem. In his “Letter to Raleigh,” he summarizes her family’s predicament as besieged “by an huge dragon many years shut vp in a brasen Castle.” The imagery corresponds less to Genesis than to Revelation, where Satan is referred to as a dragon and their castle resembles more a walled city than a garden. In Canto i, Spenser describes how her family had held the entire world securely in “subjection” until an “infernall feend with foule vprore /
Forwasted all their land, and them expeld” (I.i.v). Satan, who orchestrates the Fall, is often referred to as the “infernal fiend,” but this is the only term in the passage suggesting that event. In the biblical account, Satan does not destroy Eden, nor does he expel the first humans. He tempts them into a transgression that leads God to expel them from the garden and place an angelic sentry at its gate, armed with a flaming sword to maintain the pristine purity of its topography as utterly free from sin. While the “Letter to Raleigh” describes a siege, Canto i presents a scorched-earth sack and an expulsion. Instead of the trickery and deceit that the serpent practices in Genesis 3, both text and para-text describe a military event that recalls Jerusalem’s fate at the hands of the Romans and, more recently, the Muslims who dismantled the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem. The martial terms he employs undoubtedly serve his syncretism of chivalric romance and Christian moral allegory, but the image of a besieged castle, of a land wasted by an enemy, and of an expulsion, evoke popular narratives of Jerusalem’s destruction that circulated in the Elizabethan period.
Spenser’s association of Una’s home with both Eden and Jerusalem draws on conflations that begin in biblical literature, engendering traditions that circulated in the early modern period. John Donne’s *The Progress of the Soul (Metempsychosis)* draws on an exegetical tradition developed by “devout and sharp men” who “fitly guess”

That Cross, our joy, and grief, where nails did tie

That all, which always was all, everywhere,

Which could not sinne, and yet all sinnes did beare;

Which could not die, yet could not chuse but die;

Stood in the same room in Calvary,

Where first grew the forbidden learned tree… (72-8)\textsuperscript{42}

Here the relationship appears typological, folding the location of the Crucifixion on Calvary, a hill outside Jerusalem, into “the same room” or space where the fateful “forbidden learned tree” stood in Eden. But Genesis refers to two trees that grew in the middle of the garden. The Cross becomes the anti-type of the “tree of knowledge of good and evil.” Aligned with Eden’s second tree, the “tree of life,” the relationship and identities of these two trees are no longer fraught with ambiguity. While the first man and woman ate from the “tree of knowledge of good and evil,” references to the “tree of life” are extended to the Cross, a prophetic gesture to the future remedy for the Fall even before it occurs. The Cross functions as the “tree of life,” and as such, as the anti-type of the “tree of knowledge of good and evil,” and Jerusalem functions as Eden’s anti-type.

The typological association between the tree and the Cross, and thus between Eden and Jerusalem, draws on Ezekiel’s vision of Jerusalem restored, which John in turn adapts when he conceives the historical unification of the sacred city and the sacred

\textsuperscript{42} [CITATION]
garden in the New Jerusalem in Revelation. In Ezekiel 47, the prophet envisions waters flowing forth from the restored Temple in Jerusalem. These vivifying waters flow “towarde the East countrey, and runne downe into the plaine” restoring the waters of the Dead Sea and making them once again “wholesome” so that “euery thing that liueth, which moueth, wheresoever the riuers shal come, shal liue, and there shalbe a very great multitude of fish, because these waters shall come thither: for they shall be wholesome, and euery thing shall liue whither the riuer commeth” (8-9). On either side of its banks, “there will grow all kinds of trees for food” (12), echoing the description of Eden in Genesis, where God makes “to growe euery tree pleasant to the sight, and good for meate: the tree of life also in the middes of the garden” (2: 9). Though Ezekiel does not include a singular “tree of life,” he ascribes to all these trees vivifying qualities: “Their leaves will not wither, nor their fruit fail, but they will bear fresh fruit every month, because the water for them flows from the sanctuary. Their fruit will be for food, and their leaves for healing” (12). His miraculously fortifying and healing trees, in proximity to healing waters, imports edenic imagery into Jerusalem. John’s Jerusalem in Revelation also features a “river of the water of life, bright as crystal, flowing from the throne of God and of the Lamb through the middle of the street of the city. On either side of the river is the tree of life” (22:1-2). Several verses later, the Apostle blesses those “who wash their robes, so that they will have the right to the tree of life and may enter the city by the gates” (22:14). John’s New Jerusalem, like Ezekiel’s vision of a restored Jerusalem, features urban architecture reminiscent of the ancient capital, as well as an edenic river and a miraculous tree identified with the one that stood at the center of Eden. In Redcrosse’s battle with the dragon besieging the castle of Una’s parents in Canto xi, he
is revived both by a “well of life” (I.xi.29) and then a “tree of life” (I.xi.46), the two key features whereby Eden and Jerusalem are eschatologically united in the New Jerusalem. If Una’s homeland corresponds not only to Eden, but to Jerusalem as well, then the armor and insignia she brings to Cleopolis bears more than a general or accidental resemblance to that of Crusaders, a resemblance that suggests an adaptation of their heritage in a new context. Indeed, the allusion here is self-reinforcing. The provenance of Redcrosse’s armor, with its allusions to Jerusalem, strengthens its association with the Crusades. But its aesthetic resemblance to the trappings of a Crusader also contributes to the association of Una’s home with Jerusalem. As her home still requires rescue, the battered armor underscores the failure of the Crusades. When she brings this armor with her as a supplicant before the figure of an English Protestant queen, Spenser does not look to revive the Crusades but to revise them.

Melding Eden and Jerusalem extends the application of Crusader imagery to causes beyond that of the medieval Kingdom of Jerusalem. In From Pilgrimage to History: The Renaissance and Global Historicism (2006), John Demaray discusses how paradigms of pilgrimage informed early modern concepts of historical engagement. According to his research, Christopher Columbus envisioned his exploratory voyages as a search for the earthly paradise, while at the same time envisioning himself as “a militant

43 The “well of life” also occurs in John’s Gospel, where Jesus bids a Samaritan woman to draw water for him from a well associated with the patriarch Jacob. When she expresses surprise, given that “the lewes meddle not with the Samaritans” (4:9), he responds: “If thou knewest that gift of God, and who it is that saieth to thee, Giue mee drinke, thou wouldest haue asked of him, and hee woulde haue giuen thee, water of life” (4:10). He then elaborates that “whosoeuer drinketh of this water, shall thirst againe: But whosoeuer drinketh of the water that I shall giue him, shall neuer be more a thirst: but the water that I shall giue him,shalbe in him a well of water, springing vp into euerlasting life” (4:14). While this entire episode occurs at a town in Samaria named Sychar, it frames a discussion of localized privilege. When she seeks to distinguish between them, noting that “Our fathers worshipped in this mountaine, and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship,” he responds by prophesying that “the houre commeth, when ye shall neither in this mountaine, nor at Hierusalem worship þ Father” (20-21). Christ thus appropriates the privilege of the “well of life” to himself, but in doing so reaffirms the prior connection between the city and miraculous living waters.
pilgrim commander ready to direct an armed force which would liberate Jerusalem.”

Columbus de-localizes, or re-allegorizes Jerusalem to appropriate the image of the Crusades, and pursues a religious claim to the holy city while searching for a contemporary Eden. He thus uses the same conflation of Eden and Jerusalem that Spenser employs to describe Una’s home. Unlike Columbus, Spenser’s melding of Eden and Jerusalem does not serve a particular mission, but serves to construct a broad paradigm for all English national-historical engagements. Spenser’s allusions to Jerusalem restrict Una’s home to a more historical and geographically specific position than Eden, amplifying his use of the Crusades as a heroic Christian paradigm. Yet at the same time, when he evokes Jerusalem in his description of Una’s family’s predicament, he frees the idea of the Crusades from its fetishistic focus on a particular city. For Eden and its beleaguered rulers function as a microcosm of humanity’s vexed historical situation between its Fall from primordial felicity and the apocalyptic establishment of its perfection. Instead of Crusaders contesting control of a city associated with historical privilege by seeking control of a terrestrial Jerusalem that functions as an object of heroic Christian desire, Spenser uses their iconography to depict an English knight dispatched from Cleopolis, a city whose historical privilege consists in directing Christian heroism wherever it is required in the world. His hybridization of Jerusalem and Eden accordingly produces an allegory for the historical present that requires English engagement.

* * * * *

---

Reforming the Crusades

While the Crusades were public endeavors, they also organized individual spiritual pursuits of holiness, both on the part of their agents and of the pilgrims to Jerusalem that they enabled and protected. Tasso captures the interrelation of their public and private aspects in Book III of La Gerusalemme liberate, when Godfredo’s army reaches the city. He depicts the crusaders’ initial response as the collective jubilation of an energized corps:

Hierusalem (behold) appeer'd in sight,
Hierusalem they view, they see, they spie,
Hierusalem with merrie noise they greet,
With ioyfull shouts, and acclamations sweet. (III.3) 45

After comparing them to sailors, energized by sight of land at the end of a perilous sea passage, they soon undergo an abrupt change in affect:

To that delight which their first sight did breed,
That pleased so the secret of their thought,
A deepe repentance did foorthwith succeed,
That reu'rend feare and trembling with it brought.
Scantly they durst their feeble eies despreed
Vpon that towne, where Christ was sold and bought,

45 I employ here the Fairfax translation. Tasso, Torquato. Godfrey of Bulloigne, or The recouerie of Jerusalem. Done into English heroicall verse, by Edward Fairefax Gent . (London : By Ar. Hatfield, for I. Iaggard and M. Lownes, 1600). Early English Books Online. Web. May 5, 2011. Though Richard Carew’s 1594 translation appeared six years earlier, neither text was critical to Spenser’s reading of the poem. As both translations were published after his 1590 Faerie Queene, Tasso’s influence on Spenser depends upon his reading of the original Italian.
Where for our sinnes he faultlesse suffred paine,

There where he dide and where he liu'd againe: (III.5)

This dichotomous response emphasizes the conflicted affect, triggered by contemplation of Christ’s Passion, a tragic and graphically depicted drawn-out murder that also functions as the emblem and mechanism of soteriological triumph. Jerusalem accordingly inspires dichotomous emotional responses. But Tasso also describes a public scene that turns inward and engenders an overwhelming private experience. When he pivots from jubilation to reverie, he revises the initial public response to stress its dependence upon the “secret...thought” of each, or, in Italian, an inward experience that occurs in the “petto” or chest of each warrior. Their shared “sight” of Jerusalem engenders an inward secret thought in each individual, which swiftly gives way to “deepe repentance,” or high contrition (Alta contrìzione). Repentance can indeed be performed publicly and collectively. Early modern preachers often gestured to the example of Nineveh in the Book of Jonah, goading their auditors to imitate the ancient Assyrians who repented together in order to forestall the doom of their city. However, Protestants emphasize sincere individual contrition as critical to public expressions of repentance. The public virtue of Godfredo’s army is rooted in the private virtue of its pious members who experience “reu'rend feare and trembling” when they behold the “towne” that functioned as the setting for Christ’s Passion. Similarly, the “bloudie Crosse” worn by Spenser’s Redcrosse Knight upon his chest functions as a “deare remembrance of his dying Lord,” while that upon his shield signifies the “soueraine hope, which in his helpe he had” (I.i.2). Like Tasso’s Crusaders in their vacillation between jubilation and contrition, exultation and pious fear, Redcrosse’s “cheere did seeme too solemne sad”
While cheer in this context clearly functions as an archaic term for mood or affect as such, it also bears the positive connotations that dominate current usage and resonates with definitions. The tragedy of the deicide cannot but color otherwise exultant gratitude for the “help” it provides, which finds expression in the potential contradiction between the terms “cheer” and “sad.”

Tasso, writing in a Catholic context, could express explicit nostalgia for the Crusades, but Spenser’s Protestant context restrains his impulse to imitate Tasso too wholeheartedly. The Crusades had become emblematic of the incarnational folly of Catholicism quite early in the Reformation. According to Tyndale, both ancient Jews and medieval crusaders lost possession of the terrestrial Jerusalem because they overplayed its importance. He argues that just as God destroyed the ancient Jewish Temple because of the “false confidence” that they placed in it, “no doubt for our false faith, in visiting the monuments of Christ, therefore hath God also destroyed them, and given the place under the infidels.” Individual, private false faith in temporal objects undermines the public and political project of controlling Jerusalem. The Crusades were thus ultimately doomed by their objective of commanding a city that had itself come to function as an idolatrous relic. Spenser thus endeavors to re-work the image of the heroic Christian warrior that is deeply informed by the heritage of the Crusades, a political project that proved inseparable from the private and corrupt practice of pilgrimage.

The resemblance of St. George’s emblem, which Redcrosse wears, to that of the Templars, known as such due to their headquarters on Temple Mount in Jerusalem, reveals their enduring and vexed influence on English chivalry into the Reformation. Spenser adorns his paradigmatic image of Protestant chivalry with the badge of a

---

46 Answer to Sir Thomas More’s Dialogue. 86
decidedly Romanist order of warrior monks, intimately associated with the failed project of the Crusades and its focus on the terrestrial Jerusalem. Not only does this emblem distinguish Redcrosse aesthetically, its description constituting almost the entirety of the knight’s appearance, but it also functions as his name throughout the Book, even after he discovers his derivation and true proper name. In escorting Una to her beleaguered home, which he is pledged to deliver, Redcrosse also resembles a Templar in function. Just as the Templars were initially authorized to escort and protect pilgrims to the capital of the Crusader kingdom, thus embodying both public and the private aspects of the Crusades, so Redcrosse is dispatched to escort a woman who resembles a nun to an embattled center of Christian history to wrest it from the control of anti-Christian domination and secure it.

The Templar influence on the English chivalric imagination links London with Jerusalem in a heroic Christian history with a heritage of opposition to Rome. In, “Spenser’s Rehabilitation of the Templars,” Gregory Wilkins reads the figure of Redcrosse in the context of early modern references to the order that was suppressed by Pope Clement V under pressure from Philippe IV of France in 1312.47 He notes the prominence in Spenser’s dedicatory verses of members of the Inner and Middle Temples, influential Inns of Court in the Elizabethan period that housed in buildings originally inhabited by Templars.48 Furthermore, the fathers of Lady Douglas, who inspired Spenser’s Daphnaida, and of the two brides whose marriage he celebrates in his Prothalamion were also Templars. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, may have been the

---

47 “Spenser’s Rehabilitation of the Templars” 89-100.
48 Ibid. 89
most influential Elizabethan Templar in Spenser’s biography. According to Richard McCoy:

He was an effective patron of the Inner Temple, assisting the Templars in a dispute over property, and he was honored as their Christmas Prince at the holiday revels of 1561-62. As the Knight Pallaphilos, champion of Queen Pallas and ‘high Constable marshall of the Knights Templars,’ Dudley presided over the induction of knights, a great banquet and tournament, and a series of pageants.⁴⁹

Leicester’s London residence was conveniently located adjacent to the grounds of the Middle Temple. John Dixon, the first annotator of The Faerie Queene, identifies Redcrosse as a figure for Leicester, though Spenser’s depiction of Redcrosse as a somewhat naïve initiate in second-hand armor makes this unlikely.⁵⁰ His gloss may have been motivated in part by Leicester’s position as the most prominent contemporary representative of the Temple known to be admired by the poet and to whom Spenser was indebted. If so, Dixon’s reading suggests that for the first generation of Spenser’s readers, a strong association held between Redcrosse’s emblem, the medieval order, and the Elizabethan institution.

Beyond simply inhabiting buildings that originally housed the medieval order, Elizabethan Templars imagined themselves as successors to the previous inhabitants. The Templar legacy survived both Catholic suppression and the Reformation through the emblem of the Order of the Garter. A full half of Spenser’s dedicatory sonnets are addressed to Knights of the Garter, founded in 1348, less than four decades after the

⁴⁹ The Rites of Knighthood: The literature and politics of Elizabethan chivalry. 41.
Templars were suppressed. The emblem designed for the new Order of the Garter, a red cross on a field of argent, preserves the Templar emblem and hints at the degree to which this new order aimed to fill a void left by its antecedent’s violent dissolution. Indeed, Edward II initially resisted the dissolution, decreed that Edward required papal pressure to force his hand testifies that the Templars were viewed more positively in England than elsewhere. According to Malcolm Barber, “the fate of the Templars continued to feature in the historical surveys and debates of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries” (317). Some of these accounts display more credulity with regard to the accusations against them and some evince a more skeptical attitude. Evelyn Lord sums up the particular predicament that the Templar legacy presented for Protestants interested in images of medieval chivalry:

> The Reformation put Protestant writers in a difficult position with regard to commenting on the Templars. On the one hand they wanted to point out that they were an example of the corruption of the Roman Church, but on the other the Templars were branded heretics and persecuted by the Catholics. As the Templars were victims of papal tyranny and their culpability was established by a papacy now viewed as corrupt, the charges against them became suspect. Furthermore, their suppression distinguished them from the Roman Church and enabled recovery of their legacy.

> While the medieval order had established outposts throughout England, by the Elizabethan period their legacy was nurtured and adapted by the Middle and Inner Temples in London. Some elite Elizabethan Templars, such as Leicester, were also

---


52 *The Templar Knights in Britain*. 208
members of the Order of the Garter, which appropriated the Templar emblem. Founded on St. George’s day in 1344, they established the Chapel of St. George at Windsor Castle as their primary official place of meeting and thus linked London, Jerusalem, and England’s patron saint. Whereas the Temples remained associated with London and shared the emblem of a red cross on a white background with the flag of the City of London, the Knights of the Garter, an aristocratic order that represented the nation’s elite more generally, appropriated this same symbol, which had also represented England as a whole. Redcrosse, the agent and emissary of a poetic figure for an English Queen, a monarch whose court most frequently resided at London, likewise bears an association with London specifically and England generally. When Gloriana commissions him at her feast, ostensibly at her capital Cleopolis, he is transformed by arms delivered from Jerusalem bearing the Templar emblem and that of the Order of the Garter in an ennobling moment that recalls an investiture that associates him with both cities.

While Redcrosse’s appearance triggers associations with the official symbol of London and of its Templars, his mission recalls the medieval order’s initial raison d’être: to escort and protect pilgrims to Jerusalem and to fight non-Christians who claim the city, enemies who would besiege it and expel its Christian inhabitants. The image of a knight bearing a red cross and accompanying a lady leading a lamb corresponds to a stock tableau of St. George employed both in aristocratic and popular contexts. As Mary Ellen Lamb has argued, “[b]y the time of Edward VI, this martial and illustrious St. George, together with the maiden and her lamb, had entered contemporary iconography.”

If Spenser’s elite readers, affiliates of the Temples and Knights of the Garter would have

---

responded most immediately to Redcrosse’s Templar associations, more common readers would have also grasped his iconography. Indeed, Lamb argues that St. George, who had featured prominently in parish festivals that were discouraged in this period, had come to comprise both aristocratic associations and more popular ones: “As a figure of unsponsored and increasingly discredited festivity,” frowned upon by Protestant clergy empowered by the Elizabethan Settlement, “St. George became a sign of a once shared common culture through which middling and elite groups were marking their social identity by establishing their differences.”

As a result, Book I presents “not only a narrative, but an aesthetic capable of engaging readers of several levels simultaneously.” The simultaneity of these levels in a single hybrid or syncretic figure melds their associations.

If Redcrosse’s resemblance to a Templar restores or revives associations between the Holy Land and St. George, the popular image of St. George escorting a vulnerable figure of female piety restores to the Templar allusion an association with its original mission of escorting and protecting pilgrims to Jerusalem. Redcrosse’s hybrid allusions combine to activate an historical past within a mythic and symbolic context. Una brings Redcrosse armor that previously belonged to a Templar from her home, which resonates with both Eden and Jerusalem; Gloriana commissions him and he dons this same armor that is associated with London and England; and he embarks on a mission to escort Una from Cleopolis, a figure for London, safely back to her home and to liberate it from anti-Christian forces. As Una’s plight is both familial and historical and as Redcrosse’s mission guides his personal aspirations into a national political context, this mission

54 Ibid. 197-8.
55 Ibid.
reflects both the private and public significance of holiness. The path he must take stretches between figures for London and Jerusalem. But he must find a way to fulfill his quest while avoiding repetition of Templar follies, emblematic of the private and public corruptions of a Catholic mode of chivalry, and effect a Protestant redemption and reformation of the Templar legacy.

*   *   *   *   *

City of national fame and sacred history: Cleopolis between London and Jerusalem

At the end of Canto x, Spenser positions three cities in a hierarchal scheme that updates the heroic imagery of the Crusades according to a Protestant vision of Christian salvation history and then employs this scheme to authorize a pivotal role for London’s heroes and poets. Only two of these cities are explicitly named: the celestial New Hierusalem, which governs his scheme at its top, and Cleopolis, his poetic figure for London. Yet as an allegorical figure with clear vehicular functions, Cleopolis gestures to the unnamed London as its tenor. Spenser thus slots his poetic figure for London in between his national capital and the heavenly capital. This scheme suggests the potential for reconciliation of Redcrosse’s individual aspirations with his role in England’s national destiny. For Cleopolis suggests a continuum between Hierusalem and London, the respective realms of private and public virtue. Spenser also provides with an exegete in the figure of the Hermit Contemplation, who parses its hierarchical relations by joining the revelation of Redcrosse’s identity and destiny to an articulation of the ontological status of Gloriana’s capital and its functions.

Spenser’s scheme faces two significant challenges: 1) his emphasis on Redcrosse’s national particularity stands in tension with affiliation to a transnational true
church and 2) the implication of a providential role for English national politics engages controversies that pit voluntarism, which predicates salvation on human endeavor, against pre-destination, which situates it as entirely dependent upon divine prerogative. The Hermit suggests a resolution of both conflicts through subordination of value and through a proper temporal order of performance. Accordingly, the national particularity of England’s agents feeds the production of poetry. English agents must first fulfill their obligations to their Protestant monarch, English poets will then fashion them into figures that gesture to the eternal and transcendent polity of heaven. Like the terrestrial Jerusalem before it, Cleopolis/London becomes a venue for the production of providential signs dependent upon its heroes, whose fame depends upon the office of the “poet historical” that Spenser discusses in his “Letter to Raleigh.” Canto x functions as the pedagogical climax of *The Legende of Holinesse*, a necessary preliminary to the narrative climax, when Redcrosse defeats the dragon besieging the castle of Una’s parents, and ultimately its dénouement in their betrothal before he embarks on his return journey to Gloriana’s court. Through the Hermit’s instruction, Spenser ties Redcrosse’s self-knowledge and his apprehension of the correct way to pursue holiness to a correct understanding of his Englishness. England’s capital comes to occupy the space of a new terrestrial Jerusalem, a necessarily imperfect but nonetheless privileged city, distinguished by its role in producing providential signs.

In Canto x, Spenser draws a clear distinction between God’s eternal capital, *Hierusalem*, and Gloriana’s temporal capital, Cleopolis, but maintains enough continuity to allow his figure for London to assume the position of a new terrestrial Jerusalem. Critics have largely failed to analyze the correspondence between Cleopolis and
Jerusalem, in part because of the traditional juxtaposition of the celestial New Jerusalem with Babylon as its negative counterpart. This scheme, suggested in Revelation, enabled Augustine to contrasts his City of God with the unambiguously negative City of Man. Furthermore, despite its privileged status in Hebrew Scripture, the terrestrial Jerusalem carries significant problematic associations. The Hebrew prophets frequently directed their ire against Jerusalem’s corruptions, providing early modern preachers with negative exempla for London. Jerusalem’s role as the setting for Christ’s Passion amplifies its negative connotations. The calamities and destructions visited upon Jerusalem by Babylon and Rome, narrated in graphic detail in the biblical Book of Lamentations and post-biblical accounts that circulated in the period, situated its history as something to be avoided. All of these associations, along with the specter of the historical failure and theological folly of the Crusades, combine to make Jerusalem a less than obvious or desirable counterpart for Cleopolis and London.

Although Carol Kaske presents a rare consideration of the parallel between Cleopolis and the earthly Jerusalem, she repeatedly qualifies it as “faint” and struggles to apprehend its value largely because she only recognizes the secular functions of “fame.” After noting that “the praise of Cleopolis is assigned to the Hermit because of his authority, to assure us that it is not being ironized or corrected, to insist that both cities are truly good,” she strains to articulate the particular goodness that inheres in the earthly Jerusalem. Although she recognizes that the Hermit relates the city “to its heavenly counterpart not as bad but as merely earthly or human” and thus employs “the language of Neoplatonic scalarism,” she casts doubt on the idea that these cities

56 Kaske, Carol. *Spenser’s Biblical Poetics*. 93, 94. Kaske focuses on the precise application of specific scriptural hermeneutics to Spenser’s text to address its apparent contradictions in the context of early modern doctrinal controversies.
participate “in a Neoplatonic and syncretistic hierarchy” that pairs a “heavenly idea” with its “imperfect copy.” Indeed, she finds the analogies between the cities “insufficient” and argues that “the fact that they are attained by contradictory means” — Hierusalem through election, Cleopolis through effort — “stretches correspondence to the breaking point.” Ultimately, she emphasizes that “the Hermit refuses to evaluate the cities except with a temporal ‘when,’” situating each as “permissible at a certain stage in an individual’s life” and concludes that he “voices a situational ethic, a historical relativism” that leaves the relationship between the cities “undecideable.” Kaske’s reading struggles to specify the value of Cleopolis because she reads Spenser’s treatment of “fame” and its dependence upon human effort, even when Spenser celebrates them, as purely secular phenomena that function as temporary goods at best.

Given that Redcrosse’s “path” in the service of Cleopolis doesn’t merely precede his ascension to Hierusalem, but will ultimately “send” him there (I.x.61), Spenser’s juxtaposition of these cities suggests a relationship between secular politics and Protestant soteriology that approaches a voluntaristic model. When Contemplation shows Redcrosse the heavenly Hierusalem, which Spenser renders according to its appearance in Revelation 22, its “wals and towers…buildeed high and strong / Of perle and precious stone” (I.x.55), the knight’s initial wonder quickly gives way to dismay. Until now, he has considered “great Cleopolis,” the city in which “that fairest Faerie Queene doth dwell,” to be the “fairest Citie…that might be seene” (I.x.58). But Gloriana’s capital suffers by contrast. While he once considered the “bright towre all built of christall cleene, Panthea” in Cleopolis to be “the brightest thing, that was,”

57 Ibid. 94.
58 Ibid. 95.
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appehension of Hierusalem now constitutes “proofe all otherwise” (ibid.). He concludes that “this great Citie that does far surpas, / And this bright Angels towre quite dims that towre of glas” (ibid.). The Hermit’s response confirms the heavenly city’s superiority as “[m]ost trew,” but explains the earthly city’s significance:

Yet is Cleopolis for earthly frame,

The fairest peece, that eye beholden can:

And well beseemes all knights of noble name,

That couet in th'immortall booke of fame

To be eternized, that same to haunt,

And doen their seruice to that soueraigne Dame,

That glorie does to them for guerdon graunt:

For she is heauenly borne, and heauen may iustly vaunt. (I.x.59)

Stressing the etymology of Cleopolis as “fame city,” Kaske correctly describes it as a place where “knights must earn [fame] as a ‘guerdon’ for specific achievements…as a reward for serving the common good or contributing to the glory of a nation.” Yet she deems fame in this context simply “fame for the sake of fame” and declares that “the centrality of fame renders Cleopolis irreconcilable with Christianity.”

In Book I, and indeed throughout The Faerie Queene, Spenser treats “fame” as morally ambiguous, reflecting his engagement of the complex ironies that attend both Homeric kleos, embedded in the name of Gloriana’s capital, and of Virgilian fama. He introduces the concept of fame in the opening stanza of Canto vi, with a cautionary

---

60 Ibid. 92.
61 Ibid. 92, 93.
apostrophe to young knights who “through long labours huntest after fame,” warning
them of “fraud” and “fickleness” that might lead them to change their “deare loued
Dame,” declaring that “vnto knight there is no greater shame, / Then lightnesse and
inconstancie in loue” (I.vi.1). The alexandrine that closes the stanza moves from general
moral to his particular exemplum “[t]hat doth this Redcrosse knights ensample plainly
proue” (ibid.) when he too easily abandons Una and allows Duessa to lead him to the
House of Pride. Spenser’s rhyme scheme hammers home that desire for “fame” can lead
one to inconstancy with regard to one’s “Dame,” and from there to sinful pride and
“shame.” But if fame can lead to a prideful downfall, Spenser also employs it to suggest
the opposite. When Redcrosse flees the House of Pride and comes upon Duessa, he
makes “goodly court” to “his Dame, / Pourd out in looseness on the grassy grownd, /
Both careless of his health and of his fame” (I.vii.7). Here, Spenser employs fame in the
sense of reputation, the care of which, along with one’s health, should help one avoid
sexual profligacy. If the first instance represents a failure of private virtue motivated by a
public aspiration, the second suggests that the public social context can and should
strengthen one’s exercise of private virtue.

Later in the same Canto, when Una recounts her story to Arthur, she articulates a
positive political function of fame. Fame facilitates her pairing with Redcrosse and
Gloriana’s authorization of a quest that evokes the activist foreign policy advocated by
Spenser’s most important patrons, including Leicester, Sidney, and Raleigh, who
frequently urged Elizabeth to dispatch more forces to fight on behalf of beleaguered
Protestants on the continent. Given the desperate plight of her parents, besieged by a
dragon that had already defeated “[f]ull many knights aduenturous and stout” (I.vii.45), she was

At last yledd with farre reported praise,
Which flying fame throughout the world had spred,
Of doughtie knights, whom Faery land did raise,
That noble order hight of Maidenhed,
Forthwith to court of Gloriane I sped,
Of Gloriane great Queene of glory bright,
Whose kingdomes seat Cleopolis is red,
There to obtaine some such redoubted knight,
That Parents deare from tyrants powre deliuer might. (I.vii.46)

“Flying fame” has disseminated the “praise” of the Knights of “Maidenhed,” Spenser’s figure for the Order of the Garter, “throughout the world.” While Redcrosse bears discarded Templar armor and insignia as opposed to the device of “[t]hat noble order hight of Maidenhed,” he receives his arms from Una and not Gloriana, both of whom are described as maids. The fame of the order that brings Una to Cleopolis presumably motivated Redcrosse’s knightly ambitions, positioning him as an aspiring member of his Queen’s elite order. Furthermore, Spenser’s replacement of “Garter” with “Maidenhed” participates in the appropriation of marian imagery by Elizabeth’s mythographers.

Indeed, the device that adorns Guyon’s shield in the next Book, “that faire image of that heauenly Mayd” (II.i.28), and represents Gloriana, the Queen of “Faerie lond,” but also the Virgin Mary, the Queen of Heaven. Similarly, the Hermit assures Redcrosse that his “soueraigne Dame,” described by Una as “Gloriane great Queene of glory bright, /
Whose kingdomes seat Cleopolis is red.” is worthy of service and entitled to distribute “glorie” to her knights “[f]or she is heauenly borne, and heauen may iustly vaunt” (I.x.59). The proximity of “glorie” to the emphatically repeated “heauen/heuenly” in these consecutive lines suggests that the ruler of Cleopolis dispenses something that exceeds temporal and secular gloria humana.

Indeed, Una’s revelation of her backstory reveals how fame’s social functions can facilitate political participation in salvation history. The “fame” that has circulated the “praise” of Gloriana’s agents brought her, a figure for the true church, to Cleopolis on a mission to free Eden/Jerusalem from Satan. While Redcrosse’s desire for fame leads him to the House of Pride and his neglect of his fame leads to his promiscuous dalliance with Duessa, both of which represent private moral failures in a secular context, this third instance of fame participates in public events that make up political history and furthermore employs fame in the service of holiness. When Una brings Redcrosse to the House of Holinesse, she tells Caelia, the “matrone sage” whose very name evokes heaven, that she and Redcrosse were led to her by her “prayses and broad-blazed fame, / That vp to heauen is blowne” (I.x.11), rendering praise and fame explicitly sacred.63

Even the generally negative idea of pride and the desire for profane fame may play productive political roles in encouraging service to the ruler of Cleopolis. The Hermit rehearses Redcrosse’s origins and childhood, explaining how he originally “sprong out from English race” as a descendent “Of Saxon kings,” but was stolen by a Faerie who transported him “into this Faerie lond, / And in an heaped furrow did thee hyde” (I.x.60, 65, 66). Found by a “Ploughman” who names him “Georgos” to

63 Indeed, of the nine attestations of fame in Spenser’s Legende of Holinesse, five occur in this Canto that contains the most explicit pegagogies dealing with the virtue that Spenser places at the center of his opening Book.
seemingly reinforce the humble context of his childhood, the changeling grows “Till prickt with courage, and thy forces pryde, / To Faery court thou cam'st to seeke for fame” (I.x.66 emphases added). Pride and desire for fame bring Redcrosse from his humble childhood to a heroic quest that includes divine instruction and spiritual growth, honing his private virtue and committing it to public use. In Book II, Archimago is positioned as the arch-villain of the epic because his sole purpose is “to deceiue good knights, / And draw them from pursuit of praise and fame” (II.i.23), without which virtue cannot be demonstrated, spread, and recorded as history. Indeed, the name of Cleopolis refers both to Homeric kleos, the fame, renown, or glory that immortalizes heroes, and to the proper name of Clio, the goddess of history. These two terms share the root κλύω or κλέω, which pertain to the sense of hearing or its causative corollary, to proclaim or to make heard. Cleopolis is thus a city associated with the production of heroic fame and also of history, at least in the sense of a record of political action that, for Protestants like Spenser, must contain evidence of Providence.

If concern with one’s fame can fortify one’s continence or enable the redemption and salvation of both individuals (Redcrosse) and communities (Eden), then it contributes pivotally to constructing the continuum between private and public virtue. Fame places the “Ethice” and “Politice” Spenser distinguishes in his “Letter to Raleigh” in the service of one another so that they reinforce each other in reciprocal fashion. Care of fame both bolsters private, individual virtue and then makes it available for political application. Accordingly, Spenser positions Cleopolitan fame as something more than a synonym for vainglory, or as the organizing currency of a chivalric economy that values human effort to the exclusion of divine election. Rather, it proves a crucial vehicle for Christian
history. Roger Kuin’s discussion of the distinction between private and public moral
virtues helps explain this mechanism. Kuin relies in large part on Judith Swanson’s
conception of privacy in Aristotle as a situation in which one is “free of both the
responsibilities and the pressures of public life” and that affords “not a right to do as one
pleases but an opportunity to do as one ought” (3). The House of Holinesse and its
Hospital provide Una and Redcrosse with a refuge from the world of action in which
Redcrosse hones his private virtue. But this freedom from social pressure functions as a
preliminary to political action. Redcrosse’s retreat from the world of politics culminates
in his vision of Hierusalem. It orients him to recognize the superiority of the celestial
city over Gloriana’s capital, but the Hermit’s final instruction presses what he has learned
in this private setting back into the service of Eden and Cleopolis.

While Hierusalem and Cleopolis may represent both private and public virtue,
their juxtaposition in Canto x places them in conflict in order to articulate their
harmonization. Kaske describes the two cities as “somewhat analogous” in that “a ruler
with a tower grants ‘grace’ of one kind or another to a social circle,” yet notes that “the
means to attaining grace in them are diametrically opposed” (92). The New Jerusalem is
an egalitarian society in which “are they Saints all in that cities same” (I.x.57), but
“Cleopolis is hierarchical—a hierarchy based on deeds, a meritocracy” (ibid.). She is
certainly correct that election, once granted, is egalitarian. Divine prerogative raises the
elect to an equal state of perfection. As such, the New Jerusalem is a city wherein all its
inhabitants’ interests are pure and thus in consort, enabling a perfect coincidence of
public and private virtue that effaces the difference between them. Cleopolis, on the
other hand, belongs to the imperfect post-lapsarian world, a world marked by conflicting
interests that requires both private and public virtue. It thus requires that they be brought into line in order to serve the political community and its members. Indeed, participation in providential history depends upon this alignment. The state functions as a power structure that mediates between subjects with competing desires, requiring those in power to operate with public virtue. Gloriana’s public virtue enables her to dispatch Redcrosse and knights of her “Order of the Maidenhed,” like Guyon in Book II, to appropriate tasks. But Kuin reads Spenser as working the other way as well, placing the private in service of the political. Accordingly, the allegories of the seven deadly sins in Lucifera’s House of Pride in Canto iv present “a warning to the reader that in courts politic virtues more than ever depend on the mature and energetic exercise of private ones” (5). Indeed, Una’s explanation to Arthur of how she initially came to request aid of Gloriana simultaneously credits both the private virtues of her knights and the public virtues that structure her realm, claiming that she was “yledd with farre reported praise, / Which flying fame throughout the world had spred, / of doughtie knights, whom Faery land did raise” (I.vii.46). Faerie land is both known through the virtues of its individual knights and is credited as the generative context that “raise[d]” them to be “doughtie,” and thus worthy of “praise.”

When the Hermit assures Redcrosse that all who “couet in th’immortall booke of fame / To be eternized” should “haunt” Cleopolis, where Gloriana “glorie does to them for guerdon graunt” (I.x.59), he positions Cleopolis as a successor to the terrestrial Jerusalem in its capacity to produce textual testimony that resembles scripture. His description of Cleopolitan fame as an “immortal booke” that has the power to eternize the acts of individuals, as the “glorie” dispensed by a queen who is “heauenly borne, and
heaven may justly vaunt” (ibid.) approaches the production of Biblical text, which presents historical humans as signs of the eternal glory of heaven. At the opening of Book II, Guyon confirms Redcrosse’s success when they part with the blessing:

Joy may you haue, and euerlasting fame,
Of late most hard atchieu’ment by you donne,
For which enrolled is your glorious name
In heauenly Registers aboue the Sunne,
Where you a Saint with Saints your seat haue wonne: (II.i.32)

Once again, Spenser hints at a voluntarist position on salvation. Redcrosse’s defeat of the dragon has “wonne” him “euerlasting fame” through an “atchieu’ment” that transcends temporal history. But whether or not we should take his sainthood as truly “wonne” through his own efforts, rather than freely granted through the grace of divine election, his actions have “enrolled” his “glorious name” in heaven.

In his temporal interactions, Redcrosse never employs the proper name George he receives from the ploughman, the name of his canonization and election and the name inscribed both in eternity and history. Jonathan Goldberg points out that Spenser initially names Redcrosse “only through a sign” that he bears as an emblem, and reads it as a fraught and unstable Derridian signifier gesturing to a meaning that is endlessly deferred and ultimately indeterminate. Ake Bergvall historicizes this reading according to Augustinian linguistics to argue that beyond being named through a sign, “Redcrosse forms a sign,” one that is alienated from the “transcendental Sign that gives validity to all
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conventional human signs,” which is the *logos*, or Christ.\(^\text{65}\) He thus reads the *Legende of Holinesse* as a logocentric quest after the unification of a temporal sign in the fallen world with this Augustinian transcendental sign. Goldberg presents a post-structuralist reading that Bergvall re-focuses on Augustinian theology and linguistics. He thus historicizes the central terms of the Book in terms of early modern intellectual history. These readings facilitate the situation of Spenser’s text within early modern historiographic debates that undergird English national discourses in the period. For Goldberg, the sign by which we know Redcrosse will remain indeterminate and for Bergvall the sign of Redcrosse dissolves into the transcendence of the *logos*, but Spenser asserts the privilege of Englishness and its capital at the same juncture. The “atchieu’ment” to which Guyon refers, the defeat of the dragon that leads to the inscription of Redcrosse’s “glorious name” in heaven, only occurs after a prior conceptual achievement on Contemplation’s mountain. When the Hermit instructs the English knight regarding his function as an allegorical sign, an Augustinian *signum translatum* that gestures toward the transcendental sign of the *logos*, declaring Redcrosse to be the “signe of victoree” (I.x.61), he becomes something more than the paradigmatic successful *miles Christi* or an *imitatio Christi*.

Early modern writers often employ “signe of victoree” in profane histories to describe emblems of military conquest, such as banners and triumphal arches, but in Spenser’s text, beyond functioning as a conventional martial metaphor for Christian spiritual triumph, it may align Redcrosse specifically with the crucified Christ. In his *Preparatio to deathe* (1538 and 1543), Erasmus declares “Christ hangyng on the crosse

is a signe of triumph, a signe of victorie, a signe of euerlastynge glorye.” Additionally, in his commentary on Collosians in *The seconde tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the Newe Testament conteynyng the epistles of S. Paul, and other the Apostles* (1549), he casts the Crucifixion as a triumphant act of signification wherein Christ “by his owne myghty power, what tyme he vpon the crosse hanged vp so royall a sygne of victorie, and that in suche a hyghe place, whereas euery manne might see it” (fol. vi, italics mine).

But Redcrosse is not simply another instantiation of a sign of universal Christian triumph, for in this same line the Hermit prefaces his declaration of the knight’s function with his identity: “Saint George of mery England, the signe of victoree” (I.x.61). Redcrosse functions simultaneously as the paradigmatic English knight and, given Spenser’s employment of a definite article, the unique sign of Christian triumph. No longer an aspiring novice, known through the outmoded emblem of a discredited Crusader order, Redcrosse has become both more paradigmatically English and uniquely Christ-like, his representative capacities actualized through their intertwining. The image of Christ on the Cross depends upon the national specificity of his claim to be King of the Jews and on the local political dynamics that structured this historical event, but its theological significance lies in its claim to universality. Similarly, Spenser’s *Legende of Holinesse* suggests that evidence regarding the unfolding fulfillment of Christ’s promise depends upon England’s national context and its historical engagements, directed by a capital city that, like Jerusalem before it, produces signs of his universal victory.

* * * *
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*66 sig. F, italics mine.*
Parsing Jerusalem: London’s limited mimesis

Spenser employs Cleopolis to position London as a new terrestrial Jerusalem, but only through the specific and circumscribed capacity to produce providential signs. He thus wrests an unambiguously positive aspect of the biblical capital from its fraught history, and in doing so marks out a path for England between uncomfortable historiographic options. London appropriates the privilege of Jerusalem as the city that bore witness to Christ and produced foundational testimony of Christian truth without becoming the city that betrayed him and more generally the city with the power to generate soteriological types that promise future fulfillment without mimicking Jerusalem’s temporal and historical failures. It reveals an aspiration to Jerusalem’s historical significance and an anxiety about repeating its predecessor’s corruption and repudiation. Finally, the text’s emphasis on textual production prevents London from becoming an idolatrous fetish, thus avoiding the repetition of past errors that doomed adherents of the ancient Judean Temple cult and of medieval Crusades. Unlike these antecedents, Spenser seeks to avoid over-valuing a limited temporal locality by investing it with unique access to eternity and infinity. If Scripture represents an unambiguous good as the key to salvation, then Jerusalem, the city most prominently associated with its production and dissemination, possesses an unambiguously positive aspect for London to inherit. Spenser’s emphasis on Cleopolis as a city that inspires and directs praiseworthy heroes and publicizes their acts through the mechanism of fame suggests London’s appropriation of Jerusalem’s privilege. Like its antecedent capital, London sacralizes its temporal actors and agents through the production of signs, so that their historical glory gestures to the greater glory...
of universal Christian victory and to the consummation of history in the image of a
celestial city established on earth for eternity.

By subordinating secular politics to sacred poetry, Spenser’s text navigates a path
between two unsavory historiographic options, avoiding chiliastic claims on the one hand
or apocalyptic closure on the other. The disastrous example of the failed 1534 Anabaptist
Münster rebellion, where religious radicals declared their city to be the “New Jerusalem,”
and which rapidly collapsed, demonstrated the vulnerability of chiliastic endeavors to
enact a final glorious chapter of history prior to the apocalypse. Münster came to
represent the error of an overly carnal and voluntarist historical imagination and was
dismissed as judaizing, employing John Chrysostom’s pejorative. While millenarian
historiography came to play a role in the next century, in the Elizabethan period even
perceived providential deliverance from the Armada in 1588 failed to produce a
widespread stable claim for England’s unambiguous privilege. Elizabeth’s steward
Anthony Marten published an attempt in An exhortation, to stirre vp the mindes of all her
Maisties faithfull subiects, to defend their countrey in this dangerous time, from the
inuasion of enemies (1588), which in the immediate aftermath of the Armada encouraged
material and spiritual preparation for the next conflict. Success, according to Marten,
would produce perpetual peace and prosperity:

The glory of the kingdome shall remaine as the Sunne in the sight of the Lord:
And as the Noone in the night season, so shall our Elizabeth give light unto her
people. Her foode shall be of the tree of lyfe, that her age may neuer decay. All
the blessings of the Lord shal plentifully be poured upon her, and by her shall be
giuen unto you. The right administration of Gods word and Sacraments, shall be
with you for euer: Neither shall the power of Antichrist be able to wrest them from you. There shall be no decay, no leading into captiuitie, nor complayning in your streetes. (sig. F 1)

This vision, with the miraculous sustenance of the “tree of lyfe” that recalls both Ezekiel’s vision of a restored Jerusalem and John’s apocalyptic New Jerusalem suggests that England possesses the potential to become an earthly, millennial paradise, in which case neither Elizabeth nor her realm will admit natural “decaye.” England will exhibit an enduring political peace and material prosperity, together with a perfection of religious observance. Furthermore, he envisions England as maintaining its national distinction as an example that will function as the engine of providential history: “Yea, and when they shal see your godly life ioyned with so excellent gouernment of the Realme; It will make them draw more and more from the Romane, to the right and true Religion” (ibid.). Yet in the very next year Marten published A second sound, or vwarning of the trumpet vnto judgement Wherein is proued, that all the tokens of the latter day, are not onelie come, but welneere finished. With an earnest exhortation, to be in continuall readinesse (1589), where he predicts the apocalypse within five years.

Whereas Marten’s first tract fantasizes about a permanent and perfected Elizabethan realm, blessed with the “tree of lyfe” and impervious to “decaye,” the second provides little opportunity for England to perform any historical role. Like John Foxe, Marten’s historical optimism ultimately founders in its circumscription by acute apocalyptic expectation. Frank Kermode captures the formidable durability of eschatological historiographes when he notes that “the apocalypse can be disconfirmed
without being discredited” (8). Apocalyptic and millenarian historiographies certainly have demonstrated the ability to survive countless disappointments. But aligning any historical city with the future New Jerusalem situates it to bear the brunt of any disconfirmation. Indeed, the survival of the providential paradigm requires that it discredit any event, location, or historical moment that enables disconfirmation.

Spenser’s text inoculates London and England against the historical vulnerability of shouldering the blame for eschatological disconfirmation, and by qualifying London’s resemblance to Jerusalem he protects them from the inevitable and all too evident temporal fallibilities of an earthly city. The “goodly towre of glas” cannot match the towers of its celestial counterpart. It does not posses the capacity for perpetual peace, prosperity, or religious perfection that Marten suggests. Claims to the mantle of the New Jerusalem risk two theological errors. They threaten to reverse the Christian shift from national to transnational election and emphasize human effort at the expense of omnipotent divine prerogative. As Grace Tiffany correctly points out, when “Redcrosse is promised sainthood only if he arrives at the earthly ‘Hierusalem’ (Cleopolis), which is the Faerie Queene’s glorious court and an image of London, Queen Elizabeth’s seat of power,” Spenser creates an interpretive problem, as “holiness so earned will also be curiously earthbound, or regional.” Yet Spenser’s treatment of the association between Cleopolis and Hierusalem, London and Jerusalem, eschews claims to perfection incompatible with temporal existence. Instead, Spenser assigns London the distinction of a unique, exemplary capacity that serves heaven through facilitating the inscription of figures such as Redcrosse that represent temporal and terrestrial pursuits of holiness. If
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London emulates Spenser’s poetic rendering of the English capital in Cleopolis, it will place England’s national aspirations in the service of transnational Christian truth while leaving the latter’s ultimate establishment to providence.

Spenser articulates the mechanism that connects temporal and eternal inscription in a single sonnet of his *Amoretti*. The neo-platonic pedagogical arc of Spenser’s sonnet sequence remains incomplete, deferring its consummation to the *Epithalamion* with which it was published, but Sonnet 75 represents a singular moment of clarity. The apparent cruelty and pride of the speaker’s beloved trains him to recognize transcendent and divine beauty reflected in her earthly appearance and virtues. Sonnet 27 expresses resentment at her putative pride. He challenges her to explain: “Faire proud now tell me, why should faire be proud, / Sith all worlds glorie is but drosse vncleane: and in the shade of death it selfe shall shroud.” Her pride, rooted in temporal and carnal phenomena, must be vain. He calls her beauty a “goodly Idoll, now so gay beseene” and predicts that it “shall doffe her fleshes borowd fayre attyre: / and be forgot as it had neuer beene.” But unlike her mortal beauty, he ascribes endurance to his inscription. For after her death, “Ne any then shall after it inquire, / ne any mention shall thereof remaine: / but what this verse, that neuer shall expire.” He thus closes by bidding her acknowledge his verse: “Faire be no lenger proud of that shall perish, / but that whichshal you make immortall, cherish.” In Sonnet 29, the speaker concedes that “sith she will the conquest challeng needs / let her accept me as her faithfull thrall.” Yet this concession proves tactical, for “her great triumph which my skill exceeds, / I may in trump of fame blaze ouer all.” Ultimately, he will “decke her head with glorious bayes, / and fill the world with her
victorious prayse.” Nevertheless, this fame remains earthbound, the praise profane, and the victory self-serving.

Sonnet 75 reverses the accusation of vanity to prompt a refutation that celebrates spiritual virtues, attests to the immortality of the soul, and suggests the power of poetry to facilitate resurrection. After watching the speaker inscribe her name in the sand, only to have it repeatedly washed away, the beloved mocks his efforts:

Vayne man, sayd she, that doest in vaine assay,

a mortall thing so to immortalize,

fir I my selve shall lyke to this decay,

and eek my name bee wiped out lykewize. (5-9)

The assertion of the futility of human endeavor through the repetition of “vayne”/“vaine,” followed by the reference to mortality in the next three, recalls the opening of Ecclesiastes: “Vanitie of vainities, sayth the Preacher: vanitie of vainities, all is vanitie. What remaineth to main in all his travaile, which he suffereth under the sunne. One generation passeth, and another generation succeedeth” (1.2-4). The opening argument of Sonnet 75 thus turns the logic of Sonnet 27 back on the speaker. In the earlier poem, the speaker disparages his beloved’s pride by contrasting her mortal beauty to the relative permanence of its representation in verse. In this poem, the beloved impugns the speaker’s alleged vanity in attempting to effecting permanence through inscription. She then employs her own mortality, in which he grounded his rebuke of her in the previous poem, to undermine his argument linking poetry to eternity, claiming that after her mortal “decay,” her “name” will “bee wiped out lykewize,” just as the waves have washed away his inscription. The sign will prove as ephemeral as her mortal life. At the volta of this
sonnet, however, the speaker revises his earlier position, abandoning his previous emphasis on physical beauty in favor of the eternal qualities he now sees in his beloved:

Not so, (quod I) let baser things devize
to dy in dust, but you shall live in fame:
my verse your vertues rare shall eternize,
and in the heavens wryte your glorious name.
Where whenas death shall all the world subdue,
our love shal...

Where the poem at first portrays material and thus ephemeral inscription, her name in the sand, the final lines add two higher levels: her virtues in verse and her name in the heavens. But these three levels of inscription are functionally connected.

Spenser’s placement of poetic verse between the sand and the heavens recalls his placement of Cleopolis between London and Hierusalem, and his Christianization of the classical view that poetry can mediate between temporal/terrestrial and eternal/celestial writing recalls Cleopolis’ mediation between affiliations to a particular nation and the kingdom of heaven. Both in The Legende of Holinesse and in this sonnet, poetry possesses the power to effect an apotheosis or at least to demonstrate one that lies in the future. The speaker represents her presumably spiritual and eternal “vertues” in her temporal presence and material signifier, and inscribes them in their proper heavenly context. The speaker’s declaration that he will ensure her “fame” and “eternize” her virtues by inscribing her “glorious name” in heaven recall his treatment of Redcrosse. Indeed, just as Redcrosse will become a “signe of victoree,” like Christ on the cross, so this inscription testifies to the triumph of life over death. Indeed, a biblical resonance in
Sonnet 75 reveals an imbedded *imitatio dei,* for the speaker’s disavowal of his previous pride in temporal verse and current aspiration to heavenly inscription recalls Christ’s caution of his disciples against the sin of pride in Luke 10:

> And he said unto them, I saw Satan, like the lightening, fall downe from heaven. Beholde, I give unto you power to treade on Serpents, and Scorpions and over all the power of the enemie, and nothing shall hurt you. Nevertheless, in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subdued unto you: but rather rejoice, because *your names are written in heaven.* (Luke 10.18-20, emphasis added)

Luke’s description of Satan’s fall rehearses Isaiah 14.12: “How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer son of the morning?” Lucifer, of course, represents the epitome of pride, and his fall from heaven demonstrates its consequence. Christ thus prefaces his warning to his followers against taking pride in the power he has given them to triumph over enemies with a cautionary image that consists of an emblematic figure of pride itself falling earthwards. He then directs their attention upward, urging his disciples to value their future salvation and immortal place in heaven above their temporal endeavors.

When Redcrosse momentarily abdicates his commitment to temporal struggle in favor of his desire to join the saints in *Hierusalem,* he is in the opposite position. His pride first leads him to Gloriana’s court to seek fame. He initially undervalues holiness in favor of earthly valor, like Christ’s disciples in this passage of scripture. The travails of his quest enable a vision of *Hierusalem* that swings the pendulum in the opposite direction.

Ultimately, Spenser connects the two poles by arguing, through the Hermit, that his acts will enable temporal inscription that will testify to Christian “victoree,” so that the inscription of his name in heaven depends upon the earthly inscription of temporal acts.
Sonnet 75 stages this mechanism, beginning with an act of inscription that is literally earthly, scratching his beloved’s name in the sand, and narrating a temporal encounter between them that unbinds his verse from its material context and projects it into eternity.

For Spenser, a poet may mediate between temporal and eternal phenomena. Whether or not his juxtaposition of the eternal *Hierusalem* with the temporal Cleopolis is ordered according to a neo-platonic methodology, such as he demonstrates in his “Hymne of Heavenly Beautie,” it clearly suggests neo-platonic continuity as opposed to the Platonic dualism that Redcrosse evinces in his momentary *contemptus mundi*. But this continuity becomes clearer when we consider that Cleopolis is not a temporal city at all, but a poetic figure for temporal London. As a poetic figure, it lies in between. Marsilio Ficino places every “reasonable soul” upon “a horizon” that constitutes “the line dividing the eternal and the temporal, because it has a nature midway between the two.”69 This “middle” position lends it the capability “of rational power and action, which lead up to the eternal, but also of energies and activities which descend to the temporal” (ibid.). The soul then vacillates between temporal and eternal engagements. But in Spenser’s invocation to his “Hymne of Heavenlie Beautie,” this vacillation describes both spiritual ascent and descent and the ability to connect the two realms and make the eternal visible through signification, asking the “most almightie Spright” for enlightenment regarding “eternall truth” in order to “show / some little beames to mortall eyes below,/of that imortall beautie” (6, 11-13). The poem purposes to “show” eternity to earthbound mortals and thus occupies an intermediate space, neither fully temporal nor eternal.

Spenser positions the poetic figure of Cleopolis in between London and the celestial city as an analogue to the biblical city’s representation in Scripture. He thus
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assigns London the gesturing functions that Augustine asserts were function to the earthly
Jerusalem in the biblical past in his *City of God*:

There was, indeed, a kind of shadow and prophetic image of this City of the
Saints: an image which served not to represent it on earth, but to point towards
that due time when it was to be revealed. This image, Jerusalem, was also called
the Holy City, not as being the exact likeness of the truth which is yet to come,
but by reason of its pointing towards that other City. (XV.2)

London, inscribed by Spenser as Cleopolis, becomes an “image,” a sign pointing to
something beyond itself. Its knights must sally forth not in search of an earthly
Jerusalem, but as its representatives. They must struggle on behalf of and for the sake of
London, “not as being the exact likeness of the truth which is yet to come, but by reason
of its pointing towards that other City,” its heavenly counterpart. Spenser thus transforms
concepts of pilgrimage and crusade into a kind of Christian chivalry that avoids the
corruptions of Catholic versions, but also avoids the opposite tendency to translate
everything allegorically into adventures of inwardness, heroic pursuits of private moral
virtues and spiritual perfection. Instead, he advocates that London and its representatives
remain engaged in history so that poets may eternize them in “th’immortall booke of
fame” and show mortals the eternal glory of heaven through signs of victory while each
*miles Christi* combats the darkness of this world. Unlike its predecessor Jerusalem,
London has not yet seized its historical opportunities to inspire the type of literary
production that Spenser seeks. Richard McCabe emphasizes that both of the heroes of
Book I, Redcrosse and Arthur, are depicted prior to their accomplishments: “Yet the
Arthur of Spenser’s poem is…the young Prince Arthur as yet ignorant of his own
identity…like George, he too is in the process of proving himself, of winning the glory he pursues.”

The relationship between Cleopolis and London accords precisely with the distinction between scriptural representation of the earthly Jerusalem and its material reality. In each case, the former functions as the mediating middle term between the latter and the celestial New Jerusalem. Augustine argues that prophecies regarding Jerusalem in Scripture “refer partly to the handmaid…that is, to the earthly Jerusalem,” while others “refer partly to the City of God: that is, to the true Jerusalem, eternal in heaven,” but there are also some “which we are to understand as referring to both” (XVII.3). When interpreted according to the third category, representations of the glory of the earthly Jerusalem at its apex and the virtuous deeds of its inhabitants also prefigure the glory of the New Jerusalem. These prophetic renderings of historical material function as middle terms between the two cities, just as Cleopolis represents a poetic rendering of London that enables apprehension of the celestial city.

Spenser thus creates a tripartite relationship among London, Cleopolis, and the New Hierusalem that situates them in a vertical order of holiness. Cleopolis stands between London and Hierusalem as a poetic middle term. Redcrosse possesses the capacity to recognize the superlative status of Hierusalem specifically because his experience of Cleopolis supplies him with an appropriate contrast, an orienting reference point with enough continuity to enable comparison without conflation. The poet, who narrates the vision for the reader, may be able to depict qualities that “earthly tong / Cannot describe,” an ability approaching prophesy, but Redcrosse’s response assimilates this vision through the fact that it surpasses the city that has already awed him. Cleopolis
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recalls Augustine’s conception of the earthly Jerusalem as a “kind of shadow…not as being the exact likeness…but by reason of its pointing towards that other city” (XV.2). London, Cleopolis, and Hierusalem all feature commanding towers that represent the hierarchical relationship between them in ascending order, each one pointing upwards toward its superior counterpart, just as the earthly Jerusalem becomes a scriptural figure that points toward the City of God. At the same time, Spenser’s narration moves in the opposite direction. The narrator describes Redcrosse’s vision, Redcrosse in turn articulates its relation to Cleopolis, and the reader is left to parse Gloriana’s city as referring to London. Through this descent, one may comprehend the hierarchy of value through a figural overflow of holiness that elevates the readers’ attention, a process that indeed recalls a neo-platonic scalarist pedagogy. The tripartite hierarchy of inscription of names seen in Sonnet 75 is replicated here, but in connection with the political and historical names of cities. London is the name scratched into the strand to be washed away by the tides. Cleopolis functions as the inscription of its virtues in verse. Finally, this verse evokes and/or effects the eternal writing of a heavenly city’s name, Hierusalem, which for reasonable souls represents the ideals of heaven and of the eventual establishment of the heavenly kingdom at the end of history.

Spenser’s text embraces London’s ephemerality, but suggests a way for his city to participate in eternity. Without capitulating to chiliastic pretension or apocalyptic abdication of history, Cleopolis encourages hope for the attainment of its eternal counterpart and positions its agents to become signs of victory. The errors and digressions of Redcrosse and the knights whom Spenser encourages to follow his paradigm enable recognition of impediments on “the path,” the historical challenges that
must yet be overcome but will ultimately “send” them to their place in the celestial counterpart of their earthly city. By situating English nationhood as the source of deeds whose inscription testifies to the transnational promise of providential victory, Spenser articulates a national mission and purpose for London and England that encourages participation in history without subordinating Providence to human effort. Though its ultimate goal is transnational, this role depends upon the political functions of a capital that is also an emergent forum for textual production.
Chapter 3

Morwen’s *Josippon* to Nashe’s *Teares*: from *Vindicta Salvatoris* to London’s Apotheosis

In 1579, around the time that Spenser first mentions working on *The Faerie Queene* in a letter to Gabriel Harvey, John Stubbs compared the prospective union of his Protestant Queen and the Catholic Duke of Alençon, brother to the King of France, to the erection of “an Idolatrous altar… on the hyghest hyll of the land, in London which is our Jerusalem.”

Stubbs’ pamphlet, *The discoverie of a gaping gulf whereinto England is like to be swallowed by an other French marriage*, perturbed Elizabeth’s regime enough for its officials to order the severing of his pen hand in response. However, his comparison of London with Jerusalem enshrines one of that same regime’s great successes. After all, the Elizabethan settlement had successfully elevated London, consolidating the capital as England’s religious, political, economic, and cultural center to an unprecedented degree, just as David, according to the biblical account, established Jerusalem as the dominant capital of virtually all spheres of Israel’s national life by bringing the Ark of the Covenant to rest there.

Given that England’s capital, situated on the north bank of the Thames river basin, lacks elevation comparable to that of Jerusalem, located on a plateau high in the Judean Mountains, Stubbs’ analogy cannot be understood topographically. His description of London as England’s “highest hyll” therefore indicates a functional analogy that implicitly celebrates Elizabeth’s success in
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centralizing political and religious power in her own court and capital. Stubbs’ protest demonstrates how rhetorical comparisons between London and Jerusalem both reflect social and political phenomena and contributed to London’s emergence as a focus for the imagination of a Protestant English nation.

Stubbs’ qualified claim that London represents “our” Jerusalem based on functional resemblance supplies no rationale for the unique relationship between the two capitals that Spenser creates with Gloriana’s Cleopolis, for it does not preclude other nations from similarly conceiving their own capitals as versions of the foremost biblical city. However, it illustrates how urbanization and centralization that positioned London to become England’s national symbol combined with theology to create an enabling context for this claim. Of all the imaginative assertions of London’s relationship to Jerusalem, none is as explicit as that of Thomas Nashe, who asserts an unambiguously exclusive relationship between the two cities in *Christ’s Teares over Jerusalem, whereunto is annexed a comparative admonition to London* (1593). The opening lines of Nashe’s text plead “for London to harken counsaile of her great Grand-mother *Ierusalem,*** suggesting a diachronic familial relationship between the two capitals. Whereas Stubbs articulates functional resemblance, Nashe asserts filial descent. Such descent does connote a necessarily exclusive tie between London and Jerusalem, for a “great Grand-mother” may have many descendents. Yet Nashe’s peroration dispenses with any ambiguity in this regard, declaring that no “image or likenes of…*Ierusalem on earth is there left but London.” Nashe’s text thus ultimately presents London as Jerusalem’s sole great grandchild, its unique remnant, and accordingly its only potential heir. While this assertion might seem merely an instance of rhetorical hyperbole, it
depends upon popular hermeneutic and historiographic shifts driven in part by the circulation of competing narratives of Jerusalem’s destruction by Rome in 70 CE that ultimately derive from Josephus’ account. When read in a genealogical context, Nashe’s declaration that London alone preserves a remnant of Jerusalem’s “image or likenes” encapsulates a key development in the history of English national consciousness. Indeed, it emerges as both participant and product of a sixteenth-century transformation of medieval narratives of Jerusalem’s destruction effected by historically interested Protestants, ardent devotees of a transnational and invisible true church who were, at the same time, acutely interested in conceiving a highly particular national-historical mission for England.

*  *  *  *  *

*From Josephus to Vindicta Salvatoris*

Medieval texts popularized a tradition, begun in late antiquity, of Christianizing Flavius Josephus’ account of Jerusalem’s destruction in his *Jewish War*. Initially a Greek text, it was composed by a Jewish general in the Judean revolt who switched sides to support the province’s Roman rulers. In the original source, the author’s sympathies appear complex. He maintains both his affiliation with his nation of origin and his allegiance to Rome and its Flavian rulers, Titus and his father Vespasian, with whom he had cast his lot and whose patronage is demonstrated in his adoption of their *nomen gentilicum* as his new *praenomen*. Generally, Josephus attributes Jerusalem’s downfall to the rebels’ failure to recognize that “government… had been newly conferred upon” Vespasian and Titus “by God,” and to the rebels splitting into “three factions” so that “one faction fought against the other; which partition in such evil cases may be said to be a good
thing, and the effect of divine justice‖ (5.1). Josephus’ assertion that God had anointed foreign rulers over Israel, and that the rebels’ fractiousness was ultimately providential, adapts a logic drawn from the Hebrew prophets, according to which the ascendance of various foreign powers had been assimilated into a historiographic paradigm governed by a universal deity. He thus attributes Jerusalem’s fall to a refusal to recognize God’s historical plan and to factional strife that functioned as an instrument of God’s will.

Josephus’ account appears particularly realist in that he avoids homogenizing Jews as evil and Romans as good, enabling him to maintain his sympathy and affiliation with his own people while embracing his Roman patrons who destroyed their capital. Indeed, he asserts his purpose in the opening lines as corrective to other accounts marred either by ―flattery‖ of the Romans or ―hatred‖ toward Jews. He positions the zealot leaders who refuse to surrender to Rome as antagonists who both resist their legitimate rulers and oppress and condemn their own Jewish compatriots. He frequently calls John and Simon, two of the three most prominent rebel leaders, tyrants. Though this perspective serves Josephus’ interested polemic, similar negative attitudes evinced in Rabbinic texts suggest the credibility of this view, particularly in the aftermath of the calamity that included the Temple’s destruction. At one point, after Josephus appeals to his people to surrender, he records the discord between “the rebellious” on the one hand, who “would neither yield to what he said, nor did they deem it safe for them to alter their conduct,” and “the people” on the other, who “had a great inclination to desert to the Romans” (5.10).

73 They are often referred to as biryonim, meaning brutes or ruffians. The Babylonian Talmud relates that they actually destroyed food stores and other supplies in the city to force Jerusalem’s citizens to fight (Gittin 56b).
The besieging forces appear no less heterogeneous, at least with regard to their motivations and conduct. Josephus depicts Titus and Vespasian as honorable, but those under their command display particular brutality at turns. For instance, Syrian and Arabian mercenaries discover a desperate practice of Jewish deserters who sell their possessions in the city and swallow the gold they obtain in exchange in order to elude bandits. After escaping to the Roman camp, they would then go “to stool,” and would extract from their excrement the “wherewithal to provide plentifully for themselves” (ibid.). Whereas Titus wants to encourage desertion, his mercenaries “cut up those that came as suppliants” to search “their bellies” (5.13). Josephus deems this the worst “misery” suffered by “the Jews…since in one night's time about two thousand of these deserters were thus dissected” (ibid.). When Titus hears of this, he is outraged. Josephus quotes him as exclaiming:

Moreover, do the Arabians and Syrians now first of all begin to govern themselves as they please, and to indulge their appetites in a foreign war, and then, out of their barbarity in murdering men, and out of their hatred to the Jews, get it ascribed to the Romans? (ibid.).

Josephus presents Titus’ outrage as motivated both by practical and moral considerations. Concerned with maintaining his authority, and interested in encouraging desertion, Titus also distinguishes himself from his troops’ “barbarity” and rejects their anti-Jewish “hatred” and then proceeds to proclaim their practice a capital crime. This one episode demonstrates how Josephus negotiates his vexed allegiances, positioning the Jews as less than unified in the revolt. The Roman commander expresses no particular enmity toward Jews as such, and attempts to restrain the cruelty of the conspicuously non-Romans under
his command. Beyond questions of historical veracity and the author’s highly motivated interests, these complexities convey a realism that suggests credibility.

Christian appropriators of Josephus’ account generally ignore his complex descriptions of the participants in this conflict. They seize on his apologetic association of Rome with divine providence, cast the Romans as clear protagonists and the Jews as antagonists, and ascribe an anachronistic Christian theological rationale to the Roman campaign. Several important early Christian writers refer to and/or cite Josephus, including Theophilus of Antioch, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Origen. But Eusebius of Caesarea bears responsibility for situating his account of Jerusalem’s destruction in the framework of a prophetic Christian historiography in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III.5-10. He explicitly attributes the gruesome details of the siege and sack to retribution for the Jews’ “crimes against Christ and his apostles,” which he asserts that “anyone who wishes may see accurately stated in the history written by Josephus (III.5).” He opens a chapter entitled “The predictions of Christ” by proclaiming: “To these accounts it may be proper to add the sure prediction of our Savior, in which he foretold these very events,” and proceeds to align his source’s account with Christ’s prophecies of Jerusalem’s destruction in Matthew 24: 19-21, Luke 19:42-44 and 21:20, 23-24. While Eusebius interprets Josephus to support his theology, he does not alter the substance of its content or ascribe to it a Christian perspective. For instance, he chides the historian for associating a prophecy that a ruler from this “region would obtain sovereignty over the world” (III.8) with his patron Vespasian. As the Flavians only ruled over the Roman Empire and not the entire world, Eusebius argues: “More justly, therefore, would it be referred to Christ” (ibid.).
Whereas Eusebius exercises interpretive latitude without distorting Josephus’ account, his focused appropriation of this source, which situates it as evidence of Christian truth and as documentation of the fulfillment of Christ’s prophecies, contributes to the beginning of a popular tradition that adapts Josephus with more extravagant interventions. Two Latin narratives abridge and embellish Josephus’ narrative with significant legendary accretions and ideological emendations. The first, a Latin paraphrase alternately ascribed to Rufinus Acquileia, Ambrose, and Jerome, becomes the most common source for citations of Josephus into the late medieval period, following the replacement of Greek with Latin as the primary *lingua franca*. This text, which lies somewhere between a translation and a paraphrase, reorganizes the source material and interpolates into its narrative significant passages of theological exposition. The second, more distant from Josephus but nonetheless often mistaken for his text, is a narrative found in manuscript traditions of Ambrose that comes to be known as *De excidio urbis Hierosolymitanae* and is ascribed to a shadowy figure who was likely a Christian of Jewish background, known as pseudo-Hegesippus. 74

These works facilitate the incorporation of apocryphal sources, such as the *Acta Pilati* and the *Cura Sanitatis Tiberii*, which become integral to medieval poetic, dramatic, and prose romance traditions. The latter of these contains the oldest version of the legend of St. Veronica, who wipes the face of Christ during the progress of his passion with a cloth that subsequently acquires his image and becomes imbued with mystical healing powers. Veronica’s cloth, known as her ‘vernicle,’ facilitates the anachronistic

conversions of the pre-Christian Flavian Emperors Titus and Vespasian, who carried out
the siege and sack of Jerusalem, as well as their Julio-Claudian predecessor Tiberius, who
reigned at the time of Christ’s crucifixion. After being cured miraculously by Veronica’s
vernicle, these Roman potentates vow to take vengeance upon the Jews. Whereas
Josephus associates his Flavian patrons with general divine favor, these texts convert
them to Christianity so that the Roman forces become a volitional instrument of divine
vengeance upon the city and people that rejected Christ. The influence of Mors Pilati
Qui Jesum Condemnavi leads to the additional and no less extravagant anachronism of
depicting Pontius Pilate, who governed the city and province from 26-36 CE, as still
controlling Jerusalem 34 years after his dismissal. No longer a loyal servant of Rome,
Pilate now appears as one of its chief antagonists in league with Judean rebels. Some
versions also maintain the presence of Caiaphas, the high priest named in the Gospels of
Matthew and John who commissioned Judas to betray his master and who turns him over
to the Romans.

The combination of these anachronisms with Josephus’ account contribute to a
narrative tradition focused on divine vengeance, encapsulated in the title of an eighth-
century Latin text, Vindicta Salvatoris, which comes to designate these traditions more
broadly. Some of the medieval vernacular texts bear similar titles, such as the twelfth-
century poem La Venjance Nostre Seigneur and Eustache Marcadé’s 1437 La Vengean
Jhesucrist. Stephen Wright’s study, The Vengeance of Our Lord (1989), traces the
dramatic performance tradition of these narratives from the mid-fourteenth century to
1622 in German, French, Italian, Spanish, and Latin, and argues that on the continent
they rivaled the English pageant cycles, which have received significantly more scholarly
attention, in spectacle and popularity. Based on extant texts and performance records, he finds that versions were staged in five different German communities before 1603 and more than a dozen full scale productions in France between 1396 and 1609 (7). Editions of Mercade’s text were produced by five different Parisian printing houses before 1539.

While dramatic performances of these narratives were far more popular on the continent than in England, English poetic and prose renditions circulated in both manuscript form and in texts that belong to the first generation of English printing. Middle English versions include the alliterative Siege of Jerusalem, a romance in rhymed couplets entitled Titus And Vespasion; or, The Destruction of Jerusalem, and a late fifteenth-century prose redaction of the latter referred to, a bit confusingly given its provenance in the latter text, as the Prose Siege of Jerusalem. According to Wright’s research, these three works are represented in 22 surviving manuscripts, a significant number especially compared to the single source of the Pearl poet’s works in Cotton Nero A.x. The Middle English prose translation of Roger d’Argenteuil’s Bible en Francois also contains a version that circulated in manuscript, and served as a likely source for these late medieval vernacular English works. Three editions of a separate prose romance, The dystruccyon of Iherusalem by Vaspazian and Tytus, were printed before 1529, two by Wynkyn de Worde and another by R. Pynson. Abridgements of these traditions appear in English editions of Ranulf Higden’s Polychronic hon (1482) and Jacques de Voragine’s Legenda Aurea (1483), in the section on St. James the Less, both of which were translated and produced by William Caxton.
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One of the most extravagant common embellishments of Josephus’ text that encapsulates the imaginative and gruesomely sadistic anti-Judaism of these narratives radically revises the episode of the deserters who convert their wealth into coins and swallow them to evade bandits, only to be “murdered” and “dissected” by the “Syrians and Arabians.” Whereas in Josephus’ text, Titus condemns and attempts to stop these attacks, the *vindicta salvatoris* traditions fashion them into a culminating act of vengeance upon the perpetrators of Christ’s Passion. In *Titus and Vespasian*, the latter vows that if he is healed of a malady by the power of Veronica’s mystical vernicle bearing Christ’s image, he will agree to be baptized and take up the cause of punishing Christ’s betrayers:

> And I shall sleen all þat I fynde
> Of all þe Jewes in her kynde,  
> And xxxti of hem I shall sell and give  
> For oon peny, if þat I live;  
> For þei hym boȝte, for despyt yplight,  
> For xxxti penes with oonright.

He thus commits to a motive of retribution before leaving Rome and devises a poetic inversion of the price paid to Judas for Christ’s betrayal. Toward the end of the poem, when the siege becomes untenable and the city’s capitulation imminent, Pontius Pilate, who still participates in ruling the city, summons the Jews to the Temple. In Wynkyn de Worde’s printed prose romance, he explains that the Temple contains “moche greate rychnesse of golde and siluer and of precious stones” and convinces the people to “grynde the precyous stones and the other treasour” and eat it so that “the Emperour and
his men shall take the cyte they shall fynde not the treasoure” (sig. E vi). After the
surrender, when Vespasian sees “so many Jewes bounde” he informs his commanders of
his intention to fulfill his vow:

Lordes syth that our sauvoir Jhesu cryste hathe done vnto vs so grete grace and
he hathe gyuen vs vyctorye I wyll auenge his dethe as I haue promised hym. And
wyl that these Jewes whyiche we haue taken be solde. And in lyke wyse as they
bought Jhesu cryste for xxx. pens soo wyll I y³ xxx. Jewes be solde for a peny.
(sig. F iv).

When the first “knyghte” comes forth with his single penny and spears the first of his
thirty Jews, “there yssued out of his body a grete streme of golde and siluer” (ibid.).
Another Jew then offers to explain on the condition that his own life will be spared, after
which the Roman knights rush to purchase and slaughter their thirty victims who bleed
gold and silver. The ensuing slaughter is “so grete,” that in its aftermath “no man might
go by the streetes in Jherusalem but on dead bodies, so grete a number there was” (sig. F
vii.). In Titus and Vespasian, Vespasian incites what amounts to a pogrom by urging that
that even after the last bit of “tresour” has been retrieved they should

Hange hem, brenne hem, doo hem drawe,
Flee hem, bore hem, and doo hem sawe,
Roost hem, scalde hem, bete hem, and put,
And all to peces her limes kut,
And þus fordoon hem lif and lyme;
Soo shull we qwenchen her venym.
And Goddes blessyng þei have ay,
That serveth hem [so], til domesday.

Josephus’ account of desperate refugees caught between their own rebellious tyrants and murderous mercenaries becomes a sadistic ideological fantasy illuminated by a horror show spectacle of exuberant retributive violence rendered in vivid poetry and prose.

The logic that organizes this fantasy entails a series of poetic inversions and ironic reversals, expressing an extreme anti-Jewish polemic that impedes any ideological identification with Jerusalem’s citizens. Private wealth ingested in an attempt to secure future sustenance becomes the public wealth of a corrupt and obsessively carnal religion that is ingested purely out of spite and becomes the rationale for a massacre. As the Jews forty years prior to this resisted Christ’s attempts to purge the Temple of mercantile activity, their monetary fetish leads to their undoing. Far from desiring to escape the tyrannical leaders of a Jewish rebellion, Jerusalem’s citizens appear unified under the Roman official who condemned Christ. Pilate becomes a grotesque parody of Moses, who in Exodus 32:20 grinds up the golden calf and mixes it with water, then commands the Israelites to drink their sin. The stock Christian fantasy of Jewish avarice enables the imagination of a Jewish capacity to ingest large quantities of material wealth to the point that their bodies appear to bleed gold and silver. Instead of a Roman soldier under Pilate’s command spearing Christ, a Roman “knyghte” follows the prompt of a Christian emperor and spears a Jew. Finally, where Christ sacrifices his single life in atonement for all humanity, a Jew sacrifices all of his compatriots to spare his single life.

The likely ideological motivations of these texts and their appeal to various medieval communities, which extend beyond simple anti-Judaism, render them fundamentally unsuited for feeding the English national aspirations. Ralph Hanna has
suggested that in some sense, the Jews in the alliterative *Siege of Jerusalem* symbolize heretics more generally, and perhaps lollards in particular. Christine Chism argues that this poem “translates provincial rivalries into imperial consolidations, reconfiguring the historical preoccupations of late medieval Augustinian clergy in a period of economic depression and playing them out on an international field” and does so in “an era when royal subsidies of crusade were dwindling.” Wright notes the concentration on depiction of warfare, especially in romance versions, and argues that “the chief concern of such episodes is not with the causes of war, but rather the sheer adventure and glory of knightly combat” and sees them accordingly as “catering to aristocratic tastes.”

Malcolm Hebron likewise emphasizes the prominence of “long and vivid set-piece descriptions of Roman chivalry” in the alliterative *Siege of Jerusalem*. Clearly analyzing these texts exclusively through the lens of anti-Jewish polemic and violence misses a great deal of context and content. Yet none of these readings, whether suggesting allusions to intra-national sectarian controversy, imperial consolidations focused on a Roman Empire and/or Church, or chivalric narratives aimed at the tastes of aristocratic audiences, suggest a tradition that could support the associations of London and Jerusalem, associations that fed the English national imagination by orienting it toward a capital that in the Protestant-dominated Elizabethan period was often perceived as besieged, if less literally or immediately, by Rome.

* * * * *
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Morwen’s Josippon

Whereas in early sixteenth-century England, the development of print capitalism helped disseminate these traditions, it ultimately contributed to undermining them. Print increased the availability of histories and the antiquarian tracts, texts that sped the extended emergence of a critical historical consciousness. Figures such as Polydore Vergil helped expose the anachronisms upon which their credibility depended by establishing, for instance, that Titus and Vespasian were brother and father to Domitian, an emperor considered infamous for persecuting Christians nearly two centuries before Constantine converted the Empire.\textsuperscript{82} Indeed, the anachronistic conversions of Titus, Vespasian, and Tiberius stood in tension with early modern thinkers who imagined Constantine’s alleged British derivation as a point of national pride. In Reading History in Early Modern England (2000), D.R. Woolf describes the shift in historiographic perspectives as an exceedingly gradual one that predates previous scholarly consensus:

The true historical revolution in England was not the late Elizabethan and early Stuart working-out of proper historical method…. Rather, the revolution, which was a slow one, lay in the much longer-lasting change in sensibility, taste, and manners that turned history first from a minor pastime of a small number of monastic chroniclers and civic officials into a major area of study and leisurely

\textsuperscript{82} See for instance: An abridgement of the notable worke of Polidore Vergile conteignyng the deuisers and firste finders out as well of artes ministeries, feactes & ciuill ordinaunces, as of rites, and ceremonies, commo[n]ly used in the churche: and the original beginning of the same. Co[m]pendiously gathered by Thomas Langley. London : Richard Grafton, 1546. Clv. Also Carion’s Chronicle notes that “John the evangelist was driven out by Domitian.” The thre bokes of cronicles, whyche John Carion (a man syngularly well sene in the mathematycall sciences) gathered wyth great diligence of the beste authours that haue written in Hebrue, Greke or Latine Whervnto is added an appendix, conteynyng all such notable thynges as be mentyoned in cronicles to haue chaunced in sundry partes of the worlde from the yeare of Christ. 1532. to thyis present yeare of. 1550. Gathered by John Funcke of Nurenborough. Whyche was never afore prynted in Englysh. 1550. xciiij. Though Domitian was the third Flavian emperor, such mentions of his persecuting Christians do not mention any religious difference with his father and brother who preceded him.
pursuit of university students, lawyers, aspiring courtiers, and ordinary readers, and thence into a much more broadly appealing literary genre that straddled the worlds of scholarship and literary culture.\textsuperscript{83}

While he casts doubt on the degree to which early in the sixteenth century humanist histories unseated chronicle histories, with their radical inclusiveness that belies a lack of critical historical perspective and organization, he argues that “by the 1570s the chronicle had begun a final and precipitate fall from grace.”\textsuperscript{84}

The Reformation was both influenced by and participated in these emergent trends in historiographic perspectives. As it took hold in the institutions of the Church and universities it contributed to shaping tastes and beliefs among consumers of print. Protestant readers became less positively disposed to a narrative that depended centrally on the conceit of a Catholic saint who could perform intercessional magic through a relic.\textsuperscript{85} Furthermore, their increased predilection for Hebrew scripture and antipathy toward contemporary Rome made the partisan orientation of \textit{vindicta salvatoris} with Rome against Jerusalem less attractive. In the epistle dedicatory to his 1550 \textit{Floure of Godly Praiers}, Thomas Becon laments:

\begin{quote}
Verely no man, excepte he be flynte hearted can rede the historye of the destruccyon of Hierusalem, as Iosephus do the dyscribe it, wythoute moste large teares. Woulde God it were translated into our Englyshe tonge, that all men myght rede it and Learne to feare God. For if God spared not the natural olyue tree for
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{83} Reading History in Early Modern England 7.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid. 8.
\textsuperscript{85} For a full discussion of the “Strange News” pamphlets, see Alexandra Walsham’s Providence in Early Modern England. 181-203.
theyr vnfaythfulnes & disobedyence, I mean the Iewes, neyther wil he spare the
wilde oliue tree, I meane vs that are gentiles, if we commit the like offences. 86

Becon addresses a crisis point in the Edwardian Reformation brought about by the
deposition of the ardently Protestant Duke of Somerset as Lord Protector to his nephew
Edward VI. With Edward’s devoutly Catholic sister Mary looming as an all too possible
successor to the throne, Becon employs the ancient Jews as a cautionary example for
English Protestants, which requires a certain degree of sympathy with Jerusalem, the
destruction of which he situates as a historical tragedy as opposed to a retributive
theological triumph. He maintains the Jewish privilege that Paul articulates in Romans
11 by contrasting natural and wild olive trees to argue that English Protestants are even
more vulnerable to divine punishments. His complaint about the lack of an English
translation of Josephus indicates that either the vindicta salvatoris traditions had become
unfamiliar, or that he recognizes that they do not represent reliable media for Josephus’
historical account of Jerusalem’s siege and destruction. Either way, he expresses the
importance of direct access to an authoritative account.

Becon’s perspective on Jerusalem’s destruction situates it as a historical precedent
to be avoided, an attitude with a medieval precedent that had been more or less enshrined
in the Catholic calendar. This alternative tradition of allegoresis employs Josephus’
account as a cautionary moral exemplum directed primarily at individual Christians.
Medieval lectionaries had assigned the pericope of Luke 19:41-44, where Christ weeps
over the city and prophesies its destruction, to the tenth Sunday after Pentecost since the
fourth century. Preachers did not primarily take their expositional cues from Eusebius’
inter-textual reading of Josephus as historical proof of its fulfillment. Rather they

86 Sig. A ii.
emphasized a perspective communicated in a homily delivered by Pope Gregory I, known as Gregory the Great. Gregory indeed links this passage of scripture to the events that Josephus details, stating: “No one who has read the story of the destruction of Jerusalem brought about by the Roman rulers Vespasian and Titus is ignorant that it occasioned the Lord’s weeping.” The particulars of Jerusalem’s fall thus seem to have been widely enough known to be of use in the popular medium of a homily and Gregory concurs with Eusebius that Christ’s speech represents an emotional prophetic response to a future event. But beyond historical proof of Christian truth, he seeks to employ this even in the service of more immediately applicable pedagogical goals:

I have completed the literal explanation of these things, going over them briefly. But we know that Jerusalem has already been overthrown, and transformed into something better by its overthrow; we know that the robbers have been banished from the temple, and the temple itself torn down. Since this is so, we must extract some inner similitude from these external events; these overthrown buildings must cause us to fear for the ruin of our lives.\(^{87}\)

He then proceeds to warn the “errant soul which rejoices in fleeting time” against over-valuing “temporal affairs,” as well as against becoming “overwhelmed with honors,” and against enjoyment of “physical pleasure” without feeling “dread of coming punishment” (360). Any “happiness to be derived from the present time” must be enjoyed in such a manner “that the severity of the judgment to follow may never be far from our memories” (ibid.). Instead of aligning his audience with anachronistically converted Romans, who embrace their roles as instruments of divine justice, Gregory positions his addressees as Jerusalem’s citizens. He transforms the historical Jerusalem into “something better,” not

\(^{87}\) *Forty Gospel Homilies* 359.
in the sense of a future apocalyptic New Jerusalem, but into a paradigmatic figure of warning to encourage anagogical salvation. Whereas Gregory and the preachers who followed his lead focus primarily on the eschatological fates of individual members of the Church, Becon seeks Josephus’ account to establish a cautionary precedent for England as a historically specific national community.

Becon’s 1550 plea for an English translation of Josephus’ account of Jerusalem’s destruction would go unanswered for another half century, until Thomas Lodge’s 1602 rendition, yet the year of Elizabeth’s accession saw the publication of A compendious and most marueilous history of the latter tymes of the Iewes communeweale (1558), that provided an alternative to vindicta salvatoris narratives. Ultimately based on Josephus as well, but minus the legendary accretions of the anachronistic conversions of Roman emperors and the hagiographic narrative of St. Veronica, it purports to be a translation of the Hebrew Sefer Josippon, which in turn bears the claim of being an epitome of The Jewish War that Josephus addressed “unto his cuntrimen Jewes” in their native tongue. The text, commissioned by Richard Jugge, is the work of Peter Morwen, a former fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, who had been expelled by Bishop Stephen Gardiner in 1553 for his zeal as a reformer. Morwen spent the years of Mary’s reign in Germany and was among the first of the Marian exiles to return. Jugge, a freeman in the Stationers Company since 1547 and an original member at its incorporation in 1557, had received license to produce an edition of Tyndale’s New Testament in 1550/1. Yet despite the Protestant orientation of his professional history, under Mary’s regime he received a seven-year patent to print all books of common law. He was already a pivotal figure in the growing book trade ringing St. Paul’s churchyard in 1558, the year of Elizabeth’s
accession and Morwen’s return. Jugge produced a proclamation at Elizabeth’s succession and was named Queen’s Printer conjointly with John Cawood, who had held the position under Mary. Operating at the sign of the Bible, he would eventually receive the exclusive patent to print the Bishops’ Bible in 1568. But his status was already significant when he commissioned Morwen to translate *Josippon*.

As Morwen’s text lacks the legendary additions and emendations of *vindicta salvatoris*, it suggests a closer relationship to Josephus’ account, but this may owes more to the particular complications of its own textual history and to the sympathies of its Jewish author. According to his “Epistle to the reader,” he undertook his translation on Jugge’s initiative, being “moved and requested of a certayne honest man printer of London studiousse in his vocation of the commoditie of this our cuntrey,” indicating that Jugge and/or Morwen shared Becon’s view that knowing “this part of the history of ye Jewes” would benefit the English, both individually and as a nation. We can assume that Jugge in particular had gauged potential popular demand and its many subsequent editions prove his commercial astuteness. Acknowledging access to vernacular English Bibles that presented “in our native tong, the originall beginninge of that nacion & the continuance also for a long space,” Morwen seeks to provide “likewise an understanding and declaration to al men in the English tong…of the destruction of so famous a commune weale” (XXX). He thus reads it as the political history of a national entity that would serve his own “cuntrey.” But there is some question as to whether Morwen was in fact translating primarily from the Hebrew. Several scholars have concluded that Morwen relied, at least to some extent, on Sebastian Münster’s 1541 Latin edition, which
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88 Jugge is named explicitly in an emendation of this passage in editions that were published in 1561, 1567, and 1575.
was based on a Hebrew abstract of *Josippon* that was prepared by Abraham ibn Daud, the eminent 12th-century Spanish-Jewish astronomer, philosopher, and historian. If so, Morwen presents an English translation of a Latin translation of a Hebrew abridgement of an abridging Hebrew translation of an abridging Latin translation of Josephus’ Greek text. Far from interpolating legendary material from apocryphal sources and theological polemics, Morwen’s text is the latest stage in a tradition of abridgement that indeed makes it an epitome of its source, though not by the original author.

On the other hand, Morwen himself acknowledges taking certain liberties in his translation due to linguistic issues. Whether working from a Hebrew version of *Josippon*, from an edition of the early Latin translation of Josephus, or Münster’s Latin edition of ibn Daud’s Hebrew abridgement, or from all three, Morwen claims that he restored “not only diverse wordes that were depraved and corrupted in the latin text” but also “some whole members of sentences left out which were expressly in the Hebrew” and to render intelligible certain “Hebraicall formes of speech” that are “so discrepant from our phrase & accustomed maner of speaking….” (XX). Whichever Latin source Morwen used, it seems to have vexed his efforts as much as the Hebrew, and he uses these difficulties to justify his liberties as a translator.

The Hebrew *Sefer Josippon* that in some form lies behind Morwen’s work has a complicated textual history of its own. Its reception as a Hebrew Josephus may have benefited from the preface of his Greek text, where the historian presents it as the translation of an earlier work in his native language. Yet that text, if it indeed existed, would likely have been in Aramaic, which along with Greek served as the *lingua franca* in first-century Judea. Aramaic was the dominant Jewish literary tongue until the ninth

---

and tenth centuries CE, when literary Hebrew saw a rebirth in Palestine, Greece, and southern Italy. The core of Sefer Josippon is the work of a participant in the Italian revival, who wrote in a style that mimics biblical Hebrew, as opposed to the mishnaic Hebrew employed by the writers of the Mishnah and midrashic compendia. David Flusser, who prepared the critical edition of the Hebrew text, dates the original composition precisely, according to its author’s statement that he prepared his text 885 years after the destruction of the Second Temple. As that event that was formerly understood to have occurred in 68 CE, as opposed to contemporary consensus that dates it in 70 CE, it was composed in 953 CE. Though ultimately dependent upon Josephus, the author never explicitly claims that his work is an ancient Hebrew version. Flusser records two editia princeps, Mantua (1480) and Constantinople (1510), which are based on significantly different manuscripts. He characterizes the source for the Mantuan text as a “carelessly restyled and, at times, even abbreviated” (388) text that features Josephus as a dramatis persona but contains no mention of him as an author. The Constantinople edition, published thirty years later, is based on a manuscript that was “expanded and revised” (ibid.) sometime before 1160 CE. Like the vindicta salvatoris traditions, it adds fictitious material that reflects contemporary interests, most conspicuously a coronation of Vespasian that seems to evoke coronations of early medieval emperors. The author

90 The Mishnah, a legal code edited in early second century Galilee that contains the teachings of the first generations of rabbinic sages, and the homiletiically-oriented classical midrashic compilations that were redacted in the following centuries represent the only significant literary production in Hebrew in late antiquity and into the early medieval period. The early piyyut, a genre of Hebrew liturgical poetry first composed in Palestine and Syria suggests the potential of some continuity. Eleazar Kalir, the earliest significant figure of the genre was traditionally associated with Rabbis of the mishnaic period. Later scholars date his life within a broad period, ranging from the 6th to the 10th centuries. His work draws heavily on classical midrash. It’s possible that more continuity existed in oral transmission.

who expanded the original in this later manuscript, likely cognizant of Josephus’ claim of an earlier version in an indigenous Judean language, is responsible for positioning the medieval Hebrew text as a *pseudepigraphon* of Josephus’ own hand. According to Flusser, in addition to the early Latin Josephus, *Josippon* draws upon pseudo-Hegesippus, as well as a Latin translation of the Apocrypha, several unknown early-medieval historical sources, an account of Cyrus’ death ultimately from Orosius but transmitted through Jerome’s *Chronicle*, Titus Livy as transmitted through an unknown source, and the legend of Caesar’s caesarian birth as related by the 6th-century Byzantine writer Johannes Malalas, all of which the author translated into medieval neo-biblical Hebrew.

Though *Josippon* draws upon pseudo-Hegesippus’ *De excidio Hierosolymitano*, a pivotal source for the *vindicta salvatoris* traditions, it eschews the anti-Jewish polemic and legends that its author injected into Josephus’ account. This is certainly due to its author’s own ideological context, but also may reflect a critical impulse to doubt the credibility of obvious accretions and anachronisms. Despite the fact that his lack of Greek made his work entirely dependent on Latin traditions, Flusser considers him “an excellent historian with a sound judgment who is a realist in connection with historical developments” and who only incorporates “dubious early medieval sources in his narrative in order to inform the reader about important events that had not found a place in his main sources” (391). While he cites Josephus’ *Antiquities*, his direct familiarity with *The Jewish War* remains less certain. Yet he clearly considered pseudo-Hegesippus’ text as authentically authored by Josephus and apparently discounted its explicitly Christian content as later interpolation.
Yet in spite of bearing a textual history whose complications rival those of the *vindicta salvatoris* traditions, Morwen’s text presents as more historically credible, and his prefatory epistle labors to situate it as such. The title page presents the work as an eyewitness account authored by Josephus in Hebrew, stressing that the author “sawe the most thinges him selfe, and was auctour and doer of a great part of the same” (XX). In his “Epistle to the reader,” Morwen explains that this is not “the great historye of *Flauius Iosephus*,” but an epitome that is the “worke of the same Josephus… although he name him self in thys, *Ben Gorion*, that is the sonne of Gorion, and in the other the Sonne of mattathias” (IV). The conflict in patronyms emanates from the fact that the Latin adheres to the name of Josephus’ father as it appears in the Greek, as Mattathias, while pseudo-Hegesippus confuses him with a different Joseph who was among the revolt’s leaders and whose father’s name is given as Gorion or Gurion.. This may be the source of the attribution to Hegesippus, which is a corruption of Joseph, and ultimately both the source of the title of the Hebrew text as *Josippon* and the misidentification of its author as Josephus. Regardless, the author of *Josippon* has often been rendered in the Greek form of Gorionides. Morwen seeks to align his sources and enhance the credibility of his translation for readers who had access to the Latin Josephus by suggesting a resolution to this conflict. He argues that it is “commune in the Jewes genealogies…for one man to deduct his discente from divers names of father, grandfather, or greate grandfather, of the fathers side or of the mothers side, now taking the name of the next, now of the most notable of his kindred” (ibid.). As a Jew may be known in one place by the patronym of his father and in another by that of a more distant ancestor, the two Josephs may be considered the same figure.
While Morwen acknowledges the theological context of the events in question, noting the “mani prophecies...in scriptures of the destruction not onely of the citie Jerusalem but also of the whole country” (III), he repeatedly emphasizes its historical focus, bidding his readers “diligently peruse and read this historye” (VIII). The text indeed adheres more closely to Josephus’ account than the *vindicta salvatoris* narratives, particularly with regard to its emphasis on internal strife and division that Morwen foregrounds in his “Epistle to the reader”:

…yea there was no such cruelty exercised upon them by their external enemies, as they used amongst themselues one upon an other, subjectes against their princes, and subiectes against subiectes: in so muche ye't nothing hastened their destruction so greatye as their own doggidnesse & intestine hatred. Be thou warned by their harmes, & take hede that thou maist auoid ye'c like. (X-XI)

The pedagogical point that Morwen underscores here does not have to do with theology, but with political function. As a result, he maintains the heterogeneity with which Josephus depicts the Jews, so that they do not appear as monolithic targets of righteous Christian vengeance. In transmitting the realistic social complexity of Josephus’ account, Morwen’s text opens the door for identification with the Jews in a way that the *vindicta salvatoris* traditions preclude.

The English translation of the Hebrew *Josippon* produces an account of Jerusalem’s downfall with significantly more national utility than Latin traditions and their popular elaborations. Eusebius uses Josephus to validate scriptural prophecy in a text that transfers the privilege of biblical Israel to a Roman Church and Empire. The *vindicta salvatoris* texts also employ Jerusalem’s destruction as evidence of Christian
triumph and truth, employing it to encourage allegiance to medieval Rome and enthusiasm for the crusades, and use it as source material for chivalric romances that provide a theological justification for spectacular violence. The homiletic tradition begun by Gregory the Great situates Jerusalem’s destruction as a reminder of God’s inexorable retribution, and as an allegory to caution individuals against taking too much pleasure in temporal things without regard for the eschatological fate of their souls. This same sentiment moved Becon to call for an English Josephus, though the fear he seeks to engender regards the collective fate of England in the face of a faltering Reformation.

But Morwen bids his readers to approach it in the same manner as a secular history, “bothe for the pleasauntnesse of the matter, and also for the inestimable profite that [they] maiest take thereby” (VIII). Its pleasure resides in its readers being “delited and desierous to understande the ende, and what became at lengthe upon suche a people, that he hathe hearde so muche of,” given that “euerye man hathe redde & hearde of the Jewes in the Bible” (ibid.). Beyond satisfying readerly curiosity by providing a narrative closure of sorts, it also offers a more general “delectation, in perceiuynge thinges of so great antiquitie” (ibid.). Morwen further underscores its appeal to antiquarians, noting how people “deliteth to behold the pictures of auncient persons, as of Hercules, Hector, Iulius Cesar, Arthur” and the pedagogical utility of considering “the liuely images of their mindes which appeare in theyr actes and dedes whyle thei were here in this life,” which helps one “learne to knowe good from euil” and to apply “their dedes unto our maners” so that “we maye take ether an example or som admonicion, or occasion to amend our lifes, wherein besides pleasure, is also profit” (IX). If so with profane histories, then a fortiori “when thou seeest y’s Jewes here afflicted with diuers kinds of misery, because they
fell from God: then maist thou be admonished hereby to see the better to thine owne waies, least the like calamities light upon thee” (IX-X). The difference between profane and sacred history appears here to be more of degree than of kind.

At the end of his preface Morwen invokes theology, but not to demonize Jerusalem’s citizens as radical others or to allegorize them into ahistorical figures for temporal fixations, instead it serves to situate them as historical precedents. Like Becon, he paraphrases Paul’s admonition in Romans 11 to caution his readers that they should not respond to the account of Jerusalem’s destruction with arrogance, thinking that “God will more spare [them], which art but a wild Olive & but into ye stock of faith…than he did the naturall branches” (X). Jerusalem’s destruction serves as a tragic example of historical folly. In closing, Morwen bids readers “marke well, the Iewes were counted Gods people, the Romaines contrary his ennemies, as without all doubt, hauing no knowledge of God, & being Idolaters as they were at that time, they could not be gods people” (XI). Rather than anachronistically converting pre-Christian Romans to create a clear conflict between theological communities, he insists on Israel’s election to demonstrate “how greatly God is insensed against iniquitie, in so much that he will rather bring in vpon his own children a nation more wicked: then to leaue them vnpunished, to run forward in their wicked race” (ibid.). He thus ultimately melds history and theology. He looks to history to support theological assertions, as does for Eusebius and others among the early fathers who strove to separate an emerging gentile church from the Judean source of its claims, but without undermining them in the process. But in reciprocal fashion, theology serves history by supplying the same rationale from the Hebrew prophets that Josephus engages apologetically, to explain how and why pagan
idolaters could destroy a city and a people that scripture represents as peculiar
beneficiaries of divine affections.

The citizens of Jerusalem do not appear as avaricious and spiteful, but as realistic
inhabitants of a city torn apart by historical forces. The refugees who arrive in the
Roman camp as starving victims of a cruel siege are depicted as occasionally dying when
they shock their deprived systems with Roman largesse. Adhering fairly closely to
Josephus’ original tale of mercenaries murdering refugees for the gold they had
swallowed, this narrative amplifies the original’s depiction of Titus’ efforts address this
abuse. When reports of the murders reach him, he declares them capital crimes, but
promises that all who confess will be pardoned. Yet when over 200 Roman soldiers
come forward, he commands that they be “cast into hoate Ouens, and to be burned,” after
which “the Iewes were more safe euer after in the Romaynes Campe without all
ieopardye, no manne hurtyng them either in word or dede” (ccxxvi). Instead of the
homogenous remnant and descendents of the mob that condemned Christ and turned him
over to Pilate, they include individuals worthy of protection. Lest the city’s destruction
appear cause for celebration, Morwen invokes Paul’s figure of the olive tree in his
preface, a passage that looks forward to the restorative grafting in of the “natural
branches” at the end of history. Jerusalem’s destruction creates a historical opening for
England without functioning as abrogation of scriptural assurances and divine decrees of
its election. It becomes a cautionary precedent for London and for England, but also an
alternative to Catholic Rome.

Morwen’s text threads a historiographic needle, enabling sufficient identification
with Jerusalem while maintaining sufficient distinction so that its privilege becomes
available for appropriation without degradation. As in Book I of Spenser’s Faerie Queene, identification requires the threading of a historiographic needle. In the vindicta salvatoris narratives, Jerusalem becomes the sign of a degraded national and religious polity that is replaced by a Roman imperial power that stands in tension with scriptural assurances of Israel’s covenant and eternal divine favor as well as with a Christian ethic of love and forgiveness. The Christian deity becomes significantly less forgiving and compassionate than the God of the “Old Testament” as traditionally depicted in Christian polemic. As Stephen Wright points out, in contradistinction to medieval martyrological and passion narratives, readers and audiences of vindicta salvatoris are “invited to approve of protagonists who are the instruments of religious persecution, not its passive victims” and that these narratives present “nothing less than a complete reversal of the traditional passio of the saint’s play” so that “the cruelties inflicted on the Jews by Titus, Vespasian, and the Christianized armies of Rome are virtually indistinguishable from the torments suffered by steadfast believers at the hands of pagan emperors in the martyr plays” (16). Morwen’s text maintains Christian claims to historical righteousness and theological truth, but restores the nuances of Josephus that enable the establishment of sympathetic continuity. Israel’s privilege becomes available as its historical role reaches a conclusion that preserves the opportunity for post-historical redemption. Accordingly, the hazards that attend the privilege that it abdicates appear survivable and threats to principles of integrity of scriptural authority and divine compassion are circumscribed by projecting a redemptive future. Morwen’s text creates historical precedent and opportunity for Elizabethan London, a city both politically and religiously opposed to Rome.
The publication history of Morwen’s text suggests significant popularity. Louis H. Feldman’s bibliography lists no fewer than thirteen Elizabethan editions between 1558 and 1602, with four separate editions in 1579 alone. Richard Jugge was directly involved with four editions between the editio princeps and his death in 1577. Although no editions were printed in the 1580s, perhaps due to a glut created by the multiple editions in the last year of the preceding decade, one appeared in 1593 and two in 1596. Two editions were printed by Thomas Adams in 1602, the penultimate year of Elizabeth’s reign, one with John Wallie and another for Adams by V. Sims. Adams also collaborated with each of these two partners to print Jacobean editions in 1608 and 1615. Perhaps due in part to Thomas Lodge’s 1602 translation of Josephus’ major works, Morwen’s text seems to have fallen out of fashion for the first half of the seventeenth century, with no printings between 1615 and 1652, when a new edition appeared with a significantly more anti-Jewish frame aimed at those advocating for the official readmission of the Jews to England. Lodge’s The Famous and Memorable Workes of Josephus, the first direct English translation of Josephus, a work primarily based on Latin and French editions, was printed eight times before 1640. Neither Lodge’s nor Morwen’s text was produced during the decade of civil war.

---


In 1652, a new edition revived Morwen’s text and its specific application demonstrates the continued rhetorical malleability of the narrative of Jerusalem’s destruction. Its publishers, John Stafford and James Howell, sought to use it to contest efforts to secure the legal readmission of Jews to England. Though the pivotal but ultimately inconclusive Whitehall Conference on the subject of readmission was held in 1655, the question had already begun to attract debate. In 1649, the year of the regicide, Johanna Cartwright and her son Ebenezer, Baptists residing in Amsterdam, published “The Petition of the Jews for the Repealing of the Act of Parliament for Their Banishment out of England.” In 1651, Oliver Cromwell dispatched Oliver St. John to Amsterdam, where he made contacts with members the Sephardic Portuguese community with whom Cromwell sought to establish trade relations. The following year, Stafford and Howell responded to the growing possibility of readmission with their first edition of Morwen’s text, now entitled The Wonderful and Most Deplorable History of the Latter Times of the Jews: with the destruction of the City of Jerusalem. In place of Morwen’s preface, Howell dedicates the work “To England’s Imperial Chamber, the Renowned City of London,” to its Lord Mayor, its sheriffs, Recorder, aldermen and Common Council” (A3). He asserts “a resemblance, and a kind of affinity among Cities” (ibid.), pairing Carthagenia with its forbear Carthage, Leyden with Lyons, Saragosa as daughter of Syracuse and London with Troy. But given that “of all the Cities upon the earthly Globe, Hierusalem deserves most reverence,” as the location of Christ’s “grand Propitiatory Sacrifice for humane souls” he holds it “not improper to dedicate the Historie of this once so famous Metropolis to the flourishing city of London” (A3-4). Acknowledging the myth of settlement, which sidelines Rome to link London with the
Homeric city that Virgil enshrined as Rome’s forbear, he highlights the special parallel between London and Jerusalem.

Howell’s dedicatory preface frames Morwen’s work as evidence of the undesirability and seditiousness of contemporary Jews, revealed by the brutality and fractiousness of their rebellious ancestors, and alters the translator’s presentation of the text as a history with antiquarian and pedagogical value. Instead, this new preface is dominated by an extended and rather cliché anti-Jewish polemic. He refers to Jews as “Runagates and Landlopers” and as “straglers” who subsequent to Jerusalem’s destruction “could never since grow to such an unity and coalition as might form the species of any settled Government; but...still shuffle and prog up and down, being no better then slaves wherever they take footing” (ibid.). Impugning their occupations as “Brokers for the pettiest things” and “Gabeliers and Tollmen, having some inferior places in the Custom-houses, a profession so undervalued, and held famous by their Ancestours,” he also seeks to highlight their untrustworthiness as “spies and panders for intelligence” (ibid.). He derides rabbinic Judaism, arguing against circumcision, rabbinic hermeneutics and law, and praises those countries that saw fit to exclude Jews, noting that the “first Christian Prince that expelled the Iews out of his Territories, was that heroik King Edward the first” (A6). Repeating stock accusations of ritual murder and well poisoning, he alleges a physical “curse upon their bodies,” evident in their “uncouth looks and odd cast of eye” and their “rankish kinde of sent no better indeed then stinck, which is observed to be inherent, and inseparable from them above all other Nations” and expresses a wish “that England may not be troubled with that sent again” (A7). Severing urbs from civitas, he suggests that just as Jerusalem could not survive its seditious Jews,
England may not survive their descendents. The framings of these two generations of Morwen’s translation differ radically, yet both bring the narrative of Jerusalem’s fall to bear, albeit in different ways, upon contemporary realities of London and England.

Morwen’s work also encourages the association of London with Jerusalem through texts that draw upon its content. John Stockwood’s *A very fruitfull and necessary Sermon of the moste lamentable destruction of Ierusalem* (1584) opens with the pericope of Luke 19:41-44 that figures centrally in Eusebius and the sermon of Gregory the Great. Stressing that Christ wept not for himself during his passion, but only out of “pities and compassion, when as he wayed in his minde the auncient dignitie of this Citie, and the destruccion that very shouldy shoulde fall uppon it,” and argues that “there neuer happened a more miserable, woeful and lamentable sight” (A6). While he accepts the allegorizing treatment of Jerusalem as an image of the Church, he also reinforces its historicity: “For if historiographers may be believed, if we dare trvst suche as haue wrytten Chronicles, and amongst them Plinie, Jerusalem was the moste noble and famousest, and strongest Citie in all the East” (ibid.). After paraphrasing key events in the narrative of Jerusalem’s siege and sack, Stockwood assures his readers that his account relies on solid sources of “approued Chronicles” and “approued writers,” but “especially out of Iosephus of the wars of the Iewes, which book is in English” (B8). Eighteen years before Thomas Lodge would produce the translation that Becon had longed for, Stockwood asserts its existence. The only available text that resembled an English Josephus at this point was Morwen’s translation of *Josippon*. In the middle of the only decade of Elizabeth’s reign that new editions did not appear, Stockwood urges
its purchase, expressing that he “wold wish euery man to buie” a copy (ibid.). He thus confirms its continued commercial availability.

Stockwood closes the dedication of his sermon to Sir John Sackville by explaining that he seeks to employ Jerusalem’s destruction to address contemporary religious and moral lapses which threaten to provoke collective consequences:

And as this was my purpose in publishinge heereof, so my hartie praier vnto God is, that in these dangerous times, wherein we see virtue and godlines so greatly to decaye, and vice and vngodlines so freshly to flourish, it may at the least stir vp some by earnest repentance to flye vnto God, which by so many fearful tokens he hath threatened vnto vs. (A3)

At several points, Stockwood emphasizes the tokens foretelling divine retribution that Jerusalem received, to strengthen the parallel with subjects of Elizabethan England that he asserts on the title page when he encourages them to avoid “the like plagues for their rebellion and vnrepentance, not knowing with the willful inhabitants of Ierusalem, the daye of their visitation.” Yet his conclusion, which lists four points of doctrine, seeks to restrict this parallel by clarifying that Jerusalem’s destruction demonstrates that “Christes kingdome is spirituall and not of this worlde” (C6). After aligning Jerusalem and England through the collective ramifications of “vice and vngodlines” and through the threat of similar, if not identical retribution, he feels it necessary to exclude the privilege of becoming “Christes kingdome.” This represents a standard point of doctrine in Christian narrative. Before the Crucifixion and Jerusalem’s destruction, understood as its just punishment, election had resided in a particular historical nation and city. These events both universalized the availability of that election and delocalized it, making it
available to all people everywhere as potential citizens of an eschatological polity.

Stockwood’s compulsion to reassert this basic point suggests that his insistence upon Jerusalem’s glory found particular purchase in England due to London’s emergence, just as James Howell later cited the superlative status of each to draw a parallel in the next century. It also reflects a context in which London and Jerusalem were becoming increasingly associated in English imaginations, as we see in John Stubbes’ *Gaping Gulfe* pamphlet that appeared a mere five years prior to this. In the end, the association appears more permissible in the negative than the positive.

* * * * *

*Nashe’s “Teares” and the plea for regenerative violence*

In *Christes Teares over Jerusalem*, Nashe employs Morwen’s narrative and focuses it specifically on London to embraces what Achsah Guibbory aptly calls “the counterstrains in the association of England with Jewish Israel.”

According to Charles Nicholl, Nashe’s text, in which he abandons his preferred genre of satire to compose a sermon, draws upon both Morwen’s and Stockwood’s use of the *Josippon* narrative of Jerusalem’s destruction to warn England it stands to suffer the same fate.

Nicholl devotes a chapter to this work entitled “The Crack-Up,” describing it as a “brooding, apocalyptic, religious lament” (166), and reads it as the product of a nervous breakdown the Nashe endured as plague ravaged London between 1592 and 1594. But whatever Nashe’s state of mind at the time of its composition, it engages the implications of associating London and Jerusalem more comprehensively than its predecessors. This comprehensiveness depends directly on Morwen’s translation of *Josippon*. *Vindicta*
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94 Christian Identity: Jews & Israel in Seventeenth-Century England. 37
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salvatoris, with its simple divisions between the righteous violence of Roman Christians on one side and the stubborn depravity of Jerusalem’s Jewish rebels on the other could never have provided London with a model for the imagination of such rarefied historical privilege.

Josippon had not completely replaced vindicta salvatoris in the Elizabethan period, though the popularity of Morwen’s text made its account more available than iterations of its medieval predecessor. For instance, John Barker’s 1569 ballad, “Of the horyble and woful destruccion of Ierusalem and of the sygnes and tokens that were seene before it was destroied: which distruccion was after Christes assension. xlii. yeares,” intended to be sung to the cheery tune of the “Queene’s Alamayne,” preserves a key element of vindicta salvatoris though it seems to cite Morwen’s putative English Josephus as the source of its authority. Barker names Josephus twice, the first time indentifying him as a “prudent Iewe… / Who did not wryte in vayne, / That he was present in those dayes / And sawe this mortall payne.” The second mentions his “booke” and his “Chronicles” urging all “who liste to looke,” for “On truth they do depend.” Like Morwen, Barker emphasizes Josephus’ reliability as an eye-witness who produced a reliable document. Given that this ballad precedes Lodge’s translation by several decades, and that as a popular genre it likely intends an English Josephus and not a Latin text, it must refer to Morwen’s English rendition of Josippon. But after the verses describing Jerusalem’s capitulation, it relates a key episode from vindicta salvatoris.

Then Titus gaue this sentence blieue

Which Romayns lykyd well,

As many as you fynd a lyue,
After this Rate them sell,
As Crist was sold for thyrtye pence,
By Iudas and his false pretence,
So Titus made their recompence
The storie thys doth tell,
XXX. Iewes for a penie bougt,
As manie more were solde for nought
Ther owne confusion thus was wrought
Because they did rebell. (XX)

By inserting this episode into a ballad that implicitly claims Morwen’s text as its source, Barker conflates two radically different accounts of Jerusalem’s destruction and their respective attitudes toward ancient Israel. Barker’s insertion of the episode wherein Titus sells captive Jews, thirty for a penny, is evidence for the circulation of *vindicta salvatoris* in the period. In addition to this, Stephen Wright has identified four English dramatizations of *vindicta salvatoris* between 1580 and 1622, none of which survive. These include:

- an academic set piece, a civic processional cycle in the manner of the recently suppressed Corpus Christi plays, a lucrative commercial entertainment presented by a London theatre company, and a new or extensively revised version approved for performance at the court of James I. (190)

The variety of genres suggests the endurance of both popular and elite interest in the subject of Jerusalem’s fall. The only dramatic representation of this subject matter relies either on the *Josippon* tradition transmitted by Morwen. William Hemings, third son of
John Hemings, the editor of Shakespeare’s first folio. Entitled The Jewes tragedy, or, Their fatal and final overthrow by Vespatian and Titus, his son agreeable to the authentick and famous history of Josephus was published in 1662, over a decade after the author’s death in 1649 and there are no conclusive records of its performance. Yet its failure cannot be attributed to its content, for it is riddled with passages lifted inelegantly from Shakespeare’s plays. At one point Eleazar, the rebel leader whom Josephus depicts more sympathetically than the two “tyrants,” muses: “To be, or not to be, I there's the doubt” (III.2).

In Christes Teares, Nashe aligns London with Jerusalem through shared negative characteristics, in a manner that recalls Stockwood’s sermon, but he employs this paradigm to offer London as a historical second chance for God and his beloved city. Nashe’s text can be read as both conventional and idiosyncratic. It certainly represents a stark generic departure in Nashe’s career as a pre-eminent rhetorician and polemicist, exchanging satire for sermon. But if this work seems strange in the context of Nashe’s oeuvre, it fits popular homiletic conventions. Debora Shuger reads Christes Teares in the context of a popular genre of the period, “thematically and structurally very close to Calvinist passions,” which depict the Crucifixion and the events leading up to it as a crime rather than a sacrifice. In a sense, these passions employ the same retributive logic that structures the vindicta salvatoris traditions. But instead of aligning auditors and readers with Rome, something that is easier to accomplish when the sufferers are stubborn Jews than when it is Christ, they position their addressees as Jews in order elicit repentance. John Donne’s Holy Sonnet xi demonstrates this logic when it shifts from an opening demand to suffer like Christ at Jewish hands to a confession that his own sins
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surpass theirs: “But by my death can not be satisfied / My sins, which pass the Jews' impiety. / They kill'd once an inglorious man, but I / Crucify him daily, now Glorified” (5-8) and then expresses an admiration of divine grace. Where Becon and Stockwood place readers between the options of calamity and apotheosis, urging them to reform themselves so as to avoid the former and merit the latter, Nashe positions readers similarly to the speaker of Donne’s sonnet and embraces the precedent of Jewish iniquity. Ultimately, he identifies London with Jerusalem’s iniquity and with its suffering to appropriate Israel’s election in the fullest possible manner.

Nashe’s sermon exhibits a tripartite structure of prophecy, historiographic narrative, and admonition that links a plague-ravaged London with besieged Jerusalem, suggesting that both merit comparable divine attention, no matter how potentially unwelcome. In the first section, Nashe adopts the persona of Christ gazing upon Jerusalem in Luke 19 and weeping at its future downfall. The second section paraphrases Morwen’s translation of the Josippon account of Jerusalem’s destruction. The third section elaborates upon London’s sins in the allegorical guise of various sons. Here Nashe forges specific connections between London’s citizens and ancient Jerusalemites. He locates much commonality in commercial activity: “O intolerable usury! Not the Jews (whose peculiar sin it is) have ever committed the like” (50). Whereas the ancient Jewish priests refused Judas’ efforts to return the money with which they purchased his betrayal of Christ, Nashe accuses London’s wealthy: “into your treasuries you put the price of blood, which the Jews that killed Christ feared to do” (53). He also switches the designation of “Jew” with “Londoner” in a common expression: “Let us leave off the

97 For the Calvinist influence on Donne’s Holy Sonnets, see John Stachniewski’s John Donne: The Despair of the ‘Holy Sonnets.’”
proverb which we use to a cruel dealer, saying, Go thy ways, thou art a Jew, and say, Go thy ways, thou art a Londoner. For than Londoners are none more hardhearted and cruel” (86). Decrying the ambition of Londoners, he points out that as “the Israelites were ten times led into captivity, so seven times hast thou been overrun and conquered” (61). Noting the discontent of Londoners, he exclaims that “Nothing so much provoketh God to judgement as discontent” and gestures to the pentateuchal narratives of Israel’s wandering in the desert: “He destroyed the children of Israel whiles the meat was in their mouths, in the wilderness, for murmuring or being discontent” (70). He also accuses London of a contentiousness that marked ancient Israel, because it has been overly tolerant of “snarling schismatics”:

The Israelites, for they rooted not out the remnant of the gentile nations from amongst them, they were as goads in their sides and thorns in their nostrils; so if we root not out these remnants of schisms from amongst us, they will be as goads in our sides and thorns in our nostrils. *Melius est ut pereat unus, quam ut pereat unitas*, It is better that some few perish, than unity perish. (72)\(^98\)

Yet negative resemblance is still resemblance and can, in the hands of a skilled rhetorician, facilitate the appropriation of privilege.

In the long-running debate over the question of whether a model of biblical election operated in Elizabethan England, scholars have questioned how to read the rhetorical parallels early modern rhetors created between England’s and Israel’s
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\(^{98}\) Half a decade later, John Milton would advocate for the freedom of “schismaticks and sectaries” in his *Areopagitica* through a metaphor suggesting their capacity to increase London’s emulation of Jerusalem in a positive sense as well. He compares their detractors to men who “while the Temple of the Lord was building, some cutting, some squaring the marble, others hewing the cedars…could not consider there must be many schisms and many dissections made in the quarry and in the timber, ere the house of God can be built.”
transgressions. In her study of “The Paul’s Cross Jeremiad,” Mary Morrissey argues against the idea that such comparisons were intended to communicate election in the Jacobean period and suggests that this perspective emanates from confusing the use of such tropes in England with how they were deployed in New England. Distinguishing between two different forms of analogy in early modern rhetoric, Morrissey insists that such comparisons do not function typologically in conveying a promise or possibility that the later phenomenon will fulfill its predecessor as an anti-type. According to her research, in these Jacobean sermons Israel functions as a type for the elect members of the invisible true church. With regard to social and national identities, they function merely as examples, “a far looser form of comparison with obvious hortatory uses” (51). Accordingly, London and England do not fulfill Jerusalem. Rather, early modern preachers employ Jerusalem for the sake of “rhetorical proofs and, consequently, as means of persuasion” (ibid.). Furthermore, she emphasizes that “it is not Israel’s chosenness but her sinfulness, especially her ingratitude in prosperity, that is the basis of the comparison with England used in prophetic sermons” (53). Morrissey undoubtedly reads many of these texts correctly, but her analyses beg three questions: were preachers consistent in maintaining these distinctions between rhetorical devices?; were these distinctions apprehended with the same precision as she reads them by early modern audiences and readers?; were the “chosenness” and “sinfulness,” both so central to the imagination of ancient Israel in early modern England, absolutely separable? Nashe’s peroration, as part of the context that lies behind Jacobean sermons, suggests that the theological and rhetorical niceties of theologians and preachers could not restrain national implications of their parallels, even if unintended.
Nashe does not urge his readers to choose between divine favor and violence. While urging repentance, he ultimately turns to God in an appeal to apply but moderate the latter, positioning London as a second chance to favor the city of his affection. He positions the violence as inevitable, for England lacks a “Moses, to stand betwixt life & death for us” and “to offer himself to die for the people, that the plague may cease” (94). Moses successfully intercedes after the sin of the golden calf on behalf of a people threatened with destruction. Yet even though Christ died for the city, his death “couldst not drive back the plagues destinate to Jerusalem” (ibid.). Even if London were to be blessed with an intercessor like Moses, its urban resemblance to Jerusalem, as opposed to a nomadic wilderness community, fits the paradigm of the passion and subsequent destruction more than that of the idolatry of the freed slaves that is ultimately forgiven. Furthermore, if intercession were to succeed, it would undermine the parallel with Jerusalem. Nashe then aligns the two cities so completely that “[n]o image or likeness of [God’s] Jerusalem on earth is there left, but London” and begs for London to be spared “for London is like the city that thou loved’st,” but not completely: “Rage not so far against Jerusalem, as not only to desolate her, but to wreak thyself on her likeness also” (ibid.). After devoting the previous section to aligning London with Jerusalem in terms of shared transgressions, Nashe asks that God deepen the bond between the cities by extending providential attention to London in the same degree as he visited it upon Jerusalem. He thus solicits divine retribution. Yet he also asks that God qualify the resemblance between the two capitals by modulating his violence and assigning it a regenerative, as opposed to a retributive function. Nashe thus casts divine violence as a mechanism with a dual function. It further imprints Jerusalem’s likeness on London
while at the same time distinguishing London from Jerusalem with regard to its ultimate result, both authorizing and redeeming the English capital with the same blow.

Asserting likeness to play on divine affections, Nashe embraces both chosenness and sinfulness in a manner that functions as an apologetic for London’s suffering. In suggesting that the plague may increase the resemblance between the cities, he provides a counter argument to those who would use the plague as evidence that God is abandoning England, just as he did Israel. Nashe then returns to the paradigm of Exodus, where Moses pleads: “Wherefore shall the Egyptians speake, and say, He hath brought them out maliciously for to slay them in the mountaines, and to consume them from the earth? turne from thy fearce wrath, and change thy minde from this euill towarde thy people” (32:12). Nashe similarly argues for God to refrain from turning London into evidence of divine caprice:

All the honour of thy miracles thou losest, which thou hast showed so many and sundry times in rescuing us with a strong hand from our enemies, if now thou becomest our enemy. Let not worldings judge thee inconstant, or undeliberate in thy choice, in so soon rejecting the nation thou hast chosen. (ibid.)

London and England become identified as a “nation” that has been “chosen” like Jerusalem and Israel, because London has similarly sinned and similarly requires both divine punishment and mercy. Thus even though London has no “reason to pray to thee to spare us” it also has “no reason to spare from prayer, since thou hast willed us,” and since death is deserved, “let it kill sin in us, and reserve us to praise thee” (ibid.).

Punishment for sinfulness becomes central to the analogy between London and Jerusalem
and Nashe’s text separates them only in the potential pedagogical success of that violence and in God’s mercy finding a second opportunity to spare his original city of favor.

Nashe’s ascription of regenerative capacities to divine violence in response to a manifest plague demonstrates how God’s relationship to corporate and individual entities, to material and to spiritual subjects, can function with similar logics. In “Good-Friday, 1613, Riding Westward,” composed two decades later, John Donne pleads for God to reform his soul through violent means:

O Saviour, as Thou hang'st upon the tree.
I turn my back to thee but to receive
Corrections till Thy mercies bid Thee leave.
O think me worth Thine anger, punish me,
Burn off my rust, and my deformity;
Restore Thine image, so much, by Thy grace,
That Thou mayst know me, and I'll turn my face. (36-42).

Both works suggest that divine displeasure simultaneously represents evidence of “worth” and may reform and restore resemblance between the human and the divine. Shuger’s link between Calvinist passions and narratives of Jerusalem’s destruction creates a shared context for these works, which place the ancient biblical capital prominently in their background. The major difference between Nashe’s sermon and Donne’s poem inheres less in any distinction between modes of analogy, but in a collective versus an individual context. The graphic physicality of Christ’s Passion has frequently led to passionate devotions that include mortification of the flesh in the attempt to increase affinity between a spiritual deity and a human soul. It is this impulse
that Donne translates into his lyric, suggesting once again the permeable border between physical and spiritual experience. Similarly, the graphic violence of Jerusalem’s destruction, established firmly in the minds of late Elizabethan readers and framed in a manner that enables sympathy without demonization by Morwen’s Josippon, enables the imagination of likeness between Jerusalem and another material city that lies at the center of a historical nation featuring a national church. Nashe’s text demonstrates that London’s sinfulness and its suffering functioned as central components in the construction of a potent model of English national privilege. The agonistic physical experiences of London’s socio-economic operations and of the eruptions of plague that thrived in them drove the development of an exclusive identification between England and Israel more forcefully than positive analogies of religious function.

Considering Nashe’s text in the context of Donne’s poem suggests a way past the apparent conflict between affiliation with a transnational Church and a nation state. Whereas Spenser justifies the nation by describing its particular vocation as serving of that church, Nashe justifies it by suggesting that it functions as a macrocosm of the relationship between God and the individual soul. Gregory the Great’s sermon interprets Luke 19 so that Jerusalem’s fate becomes a cautionary tale for individual Christians, finding private utility for an unambiguously national narrative. In Augustinian terms, anyone who is godly will be a member of the City of God, even if far removed from an urban environment. But in an urban environment that is repeatedly compared to Jerusalem, one need not exchange the collective paradigm for one that situates the individual in spiritual fellowship with other believers. Stockwood may scruple against the implications of his own parallel between Jerusalem and London, but Jerusalem can
function as a paradigm for both individuals and the community simultaneously. English Protestants emphasize the inwardness and the individual model of salvation that structures affiliation with an invisible church unbound by national borders. At the same time they may see themselves as members of a nation that resembles Israel collectively, by drawing as full a parallel as possible between their capital cities. National and individual election co-exist. How one relates to the other with regard to soteriological mechanics remains a topic of disputation, but in a fundamentally technical as opposed to ontological sense.
Chapter 4

“To avoide that fowle blot of unthankefullnesse”: Jerusalem’s Destruction and English Nationhood in Spenser’s The Ruines of Time

In dedicating The Ruines of Time to Mary Sidney Herbert, Edmund Spenser frames the poem that opens his 1591 Complaints as an attempt to redress an episode of personal ingratitude. According to the dedication, after returning from a nine-year absence in Ireland, “some frends…knowing with howe straight bandes of duetie” he had been bound to Herbert’s brother, Sir Philip Sidney, and to other recently deceased members of their circle, had subsequently reproved him for failing to express “anie thankefull remembrance” towards his erstwhile benefactors. Yet Spenser responds in a poem that embeds his elegies in a meditation on England’s position in history and its prospects as a nation. His extensive treatment of these corporate themes refashions material drawn from his French source, Joachim du Bellay’s Antiquités de Rome, through the lens of an early modern rhetorical tradition that employed the accusation of “unthankefullnesse” to link private sentiment and public concerns. This tradition organizes a historiographic paradigm around the destruction of ancient Jerusalem and structures the central images in Spenser’s complaint: the female figure of an ancient ruined city that recalls the feminine depiction of Jerusalem in Lamentations and a Christological rendering of Sidney’s spectacular London funeral. In fact, Spenser telegraphs his poem’s engagement of this national-historical paradigm in the same
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99 The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser. 230. All references to Spenser’s Complaints are taken from this edition.
dedicatory note that stresses its interpersonal context, explaining its conception as either an attempt to assuage his critics “or els to avoide that fowle blot of unthankefullnesse.”

Early modern preachers and pamphleteers held that the “unthankefullnesse” of Jerusalem’s citizens precipitated their failure to recognize Christ, which in turn led to the destruction of their city and their displacement as the protagonists of salvation history. These writers adapted a narrative that positioned Rome’s siege and sack of Jerusalem in 70 CE as the fulfillment of Christ’s prophesy in Luke, where he tearfully pronounces that “they shal not leaue in thee a stone vpon a stone, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation” (19:44). English reformers often extended Christ’s narrative so that its dénouement incorporates Jerusalem’s destruction as a final act, revealing the influence of medieval accounts of Jerusalem’s destruction that circulated in print and Peter Morwen’s oft-reprinted abridgment and translation of the Hebrew Sefer Josippon, entitled The wonderful and most deplorable history of the latter times of the Jews: with the destruction of the city of Jerusalem: which history begins where the Holy Scriptures end (1558). This framing affects the tenor and the message of Christianity’s foundational myth. In The Renaissance Bible (1998), Debora Shuger analyzes a group of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Passion texts influenced by Calvin’s Harmony of the three Evangelists that similarly extend Christ’s narrative so that “a causal trajectory from the Crucifixion to the fall of Jerusalem partially or wholly replaces the biblical plot, which moves from the Crucifixion to the Resurrection.” Consequently, Christ’s narrative
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100 All biblical quotations from the Geneva Bible (1587) unless otherwise noted.
101 For the continental dramatic vindicta salvatoris and its comparatively late appearance in England, see The Vengeance of Our Lord: Medieval Dramatizations of the Destruction of Jerusalem. (1989.)
functions according to a logic of “crime and punishment, not redemptive sacrifice.”

Spenser’s poem resonates with a specific version of this tradition that focuses on Christ’s prophecy in Luke just before he enters the city as the pivotal moment of Israel’s downfall, locating its doom in an act of misrecognition. Israel’s betrayal of Christ and participation in his deicide become the tragic consequences of this misrecognition. Yet while the term “unthankefullnesse” appears nowhere in Christ’s prophecy, early modern writers frequently insert it into their paraphrases, commentaries, and homilies.

The insertion of “unthankefullnesse” in references to Luke 19 serves exegetical, theological, and rhetorical ends. Christ’s prophecy promises a level of devastation that requires something more than epistemological inadequacy to establish Jerusalem’s culpability. It frames Israel’s failure to know its king and savior less as a mistake than a refusal for which they are accountable. The question of culpability, begged by Luke, was amplified by popular narratives of the city’s destruction that describe the putative fulfillment of Christ’s prophecy in excruciating, even sadistic detail. Early reformers committed to the consistency and authority of scripture, the commitment that motivated Calvin to compose his *Harmony*, needed to square Jerusalem’s destruction and the repudiation of Israel that it allegedly demonstrated, with unequivocal scriptural assurances of the eternity of Israel’s covenantal status. Reconciling this apparent
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103 Shuger lists a number of representative Calvinist passion narratives. Thomas Wilson’s *Christis farewell to Jerusalem, and last prophesie* (1614), a sermon preached at Canterbury in the preceding year, employs “unthankefullnesse” to underscore the trajectory from crucifixion to Jerusalem’s destruction: “The cause of all these terrible Judgements were, amongst other sinnes of the Iewes, as their infidelitie, hypocrisie, contempt of the word, hardnesse of heart, yet especially the extreame sauage *vnthankefullnesse*, and barbarous crueltie in putting causlesse to a shamefull death the innocent man Iesus: hauing had Prophets and iust men sent vnto them, some they reuiled, others they beat and ill entreated, God at last sending his owne and onely Sonne, him they cast out of the Vineyard and slew: therefore the Lord of the Vineyard waxed hot with indignation, and whetting his sword, came against those Husband-men in his fierce wrath, and destroyed them with a wonderfull destruction, some fortie yeeres after the Passion of our Lord.” I cite it here only because of its later date. Though Shuger’s chapter focuses on Calvinist texts, my research indicates a significantly broader trend that in large part predates the texts she analyzes.
contradiction facilitates the post-biblical gentile church’s claim to inherit the biblical nation’s privilege by making it available for appropriation. Justifying this appropriation thus also corroborates Christianity’s theological truth claims. The insertion of “unthankefulnesse” into Christ’s prophecy thus supplies a moral etiology for Israel’s spiritual blindness that justifies the abrogation of scriptural assurances of its perpetual covenant and supports Christianity’s assertions regarding its place in salvation history. Accordingly, though theologians read a variety of biblical texts through the commonplace of Jewish “unthankefulnesse,” Jerusalem’s destruction represented the epitome of its wages, an emblematic precedent with which they threatened their readers and audiences.

English reformers employed the emblem of Jerusalem’s “unthankefulnesse” and destruction to address a variety of historical situations throughout the 16th century. Late Henrician and Edwardian theologians, such as Henry Brinkelow, Hugh Latimer, and Thomas Becon, employed it to promote reform; Marian exiles such as Becon and his contemporary John Knox employed it as an apology for the Romanist restoration and to bolster resistance; Elizabethan churchmen including John Jewel and Thomas Cooper employed it to interpellate national-religious subjects in the context of the Elizabethan settlement, which sought to consolidate a Protestant English Church and State against rebellions by Catholic nobles that Rome and its continental allies encouraged.

104 Paul uses a similar logic in his Epistle to the Romans to establish the culpability of those who never had access to scripture when he argues that although “the inuisible things of [God], that is, his eternal power & Godhead, are seene by þe creation of the worlde, being considered in his workes, to the intent that they should be without excuse: Because that when they knewe God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankefull, but became vaine in their thoughtes, and their foolish heart was full of darkenesse” (I:20-21). Here knowledge of God is interrupted by subsequent lack of thankfulness and both are tied directly to faith, the central theme of this chapter that proved so pivotal to early Christianity and Reformation history. The early modern tradition emphasizes that the moral deficiency of “unthankefulnesse” inhibits knowledge. This passage may indeed represent a primary influence, for the epitome of this chapter in the Geneva Bible highlights its subject as those who “were guiltie of wicked unthankfulnesse to God.”
Throughout these shifts and reversals, the popularity of Jerusalem’s destruction as an emblem of historical calamity both profited from and contributed to the concurrent growth of London, a comparably dominant urban capital, as a national center and symbol.

Spenser’s poem mentions neither London nor Jerusalem explicitly, in part due to generic exigencies, triggering metonymic association with the former through the speaker’s position “beside the shore / Of siluer streaming Thamess” (1-2), and metaphoric resonance with the latter through the poem’s multivalent iconography. The resulting allusiveness functions as an example of “that high flying libertie of conceit propper to the Poet,” which Sidney associates with the vatic “Oracles of Delphos and Sybillas” in his Defense of Poesy. Spenser was certainly no stranger to didactic poetry. He frequently engages straightforward argument, satire, and doctrinal controversy throughout his oeuvre. Yet his juxtaposition of clerical and poetic figures in his Shepheardes Calendar, dedicated to Sidney, suggests sympathy with Sidney’s argument in his Defense for the pedagogical advantages of poetic form over that of the treatise. In this view, the “fashioned Image of Poetrie” can surpass “the regular instruction of Philosophie” with regard to “force in teaching.” Even if a Philosopher’s “methodical proceeding” through his treatise enables him to “teach more perfectly then the poet,” none can “compare the philosopher in mooving with the Poet.” Accordingly, “the Poet…doth draw the mind more effectually then any other Art doth.” Or, as Verlame instructs the poet-speaker in The Ruines of Time:

For deeds doe die, however noblie done,
And thoughts of men do as themselves decay,
But wise wordes taught in numbers for to runne,

Recorded by the Muses, live for ay; (400-404)

Yet poetry must be more than the rendering of homiletic tropes in rhyme and meter. Spenser’s “high flying libertie of conceit” frees his poem from the strictures of doctrinal argument and enables the imagination of a proto-millenarian historiographic paradigm decades prior to its formulation by influential theologians and its adoption by their adherents. His poetic effort to avoid “unthankfullnesse,” featuring an encounter with the bereaved female figure of an ancient ruined city, reworks the rhetorical pairing of England with Israel through their respective capitals of London and Jerusalem, a paradigm that was popular enough to render explicit rehearsal unnecessary.

The resulting work channels the power of an inherently pessimistic paradigm of Jerusalem’s “unthankfullnesse” and destruction toward a more optimistic national-historic vision. A variation of the jeremiad, the “unthankfullnesse” paradigm amplifies its consequences exponentially. Like the jeremiad, it feeds national imagination by connecting individual behavior with public repercussions. It suggests that God is paying particular attention to the behavior of its target audiences, engendering a concept of acute and precarious providential privilege. Yet jeremiads threaten a form of divine violence drawn from the Hebrew prophets, sources that perpetually impart assurances of future reconciliation and reparation. When writers compare England to biblical Israel through their “unthankfullnesse,” they activate a specifically Christian prophecy that describes an unrecoverable loss of divine favor. It represents the exhaustion of repeated cycles of transgression-punishment-repentance-restoration that mark the prophetic narratives and theology of the Hebrew Bible. Polemicists focusing on Luke 19, as opposed to texts
drawn from Hebrew Scriptures, create a distinct form of address, threatening England with the irrevocable historical repudiation incurred by the ancient Jews, a divine violence that forecloses possibility of recovery.\textsuperscript{105}

_The Ruines of Time_ confronts this threat of irrevocable violence by projecting England beyond the historical pivot that Christ prophesies in Luke 19. When Spenser’s antecedents imagine successive junctures in the intertwined political and religious history of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century through this scriptural prism, they suggest a peculiar relationship between England and ancient Israel, positioning England as its foremost, if not exclusive, successor. Yet their repetition of this threat undermines its currency by eroding the uniqueness and urgency of its pivotal predicament, which lowers its stakes. Spenser’s poem maximizes the power of this paradigm without contributing to its atrophy through repetition. Instead of threatening England once again with Jerusalem’s fate, Spenser positions England beyond it. Alluding to Philip Sidney’s spectacular London funeral, Spenser celebrates the Protestant poet-knight as an _imitatio Christi_. London and England consequently assume the unprecedented position of an earthly Jerusalem that has successfully apprehended the figure of its salvation as reflected in an English Protestant hero.

Even as Spenser’s poem participates in the growing cult surrounding the aristocratic Sidney, it reaches for a new historiographic possibility that would root England’s unique status in more popular and thus more durable grounds that do not depend exclusively on signal individuals. The Christological rendering of Sidney’s

\textsuperscript{105} In the most generous of Christian historiographies, the Jews will be saved at history’s end. But even in this scheme, Israel’s active role and privilege in salvation history has long since been exhausted. Their function in any eschatological narrative is reduced to something emblematic. Their reappearance on stage in the final act resolves a conflict they have long ceased to participate in with any efficacy. At most, it signals the approaching apocalyptic climax. Other than that, it simply ties up the narrative’s loose ends.
aristocratic excellence in the poem’s closing pageant supplies the opportunity for its popular recognition, which the work promotes. It thus establishes England’s historical privilege more broadly, through the epistemological superiority of London, which celebrated Sidney’s sacrifice, where its biblical predecessor Jerusalem refused and condemned Christ. Yet millennial apocalyptic historiography, which enables the vision of a triumphant earthly period prior to history’s apocalyptic closure, only gains popular currency in England several decades into the seventeenth century. Spenser’s poem thus articulates a vision of national-historical possibility according to an historiographic perspective prior to its popular establishment in doctrinal texts. It suggests a model of English nationhood that defuses the binary threats of either national doom or historical closure.

* * * * *

Rome and Jerusalem

Verlame, the female figure whose complaint dominates The Ruines of Time, melds
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106 I employ epistemology here broadly to emphasize not just a particular perception but a general mode of perception. Christian writers, at least since Augustine, fault Jews for excessive attachment to material phenomena and a blindness with regard to spirit. As I discuss later in this chapter, the distinction between Jerusalem and London appears stark given that the former city could not perceive its spiritual king when his incarnation arrived in the flesh, while the latter recognized and celebrated his reflection in a man in whom his spirit was not even incarnated.

107 According to Richard Bauckham: “Seventeenth century millenarians looked forward to the millennium described in Rev. 20 as a period of future bliss for the church on earth. The vast majority of Tudor Protestant writers were unable to embrace such a hope because their exegesis of Rev. 20 differed. They interpreted the millennium of that chapter as a period in the past history of the church. In doing so they stood to some extent in the tradition of interpretation originated by Tyconius and Augustine, who understood the millennium to symbolize the whole period of the church’s history from the Incarnation to the End. This Tyconian interpretation prevailed throughout the middle ages in almost all commentators, with the single significant exception of those in the Joachimist tradition.” Although Bauckham reads an optimism in late Elizabethan exegesis, he sees it as “focussed entirely on the destruction of Antichrist, not on a golden age to follow that event.” They envisioned scant time between Antichrist’s defeat and the Last Judgment. Nevertheless, their optimism “must have helped to promote a postmillennial outlook [that] presupposed (what much earlier Protestant theology had distinctly denied) the overthrow of Antichrist before the Second Advent.” Tudor Apocalypse: Sixteenth-Century Apocalypticism, Millenarianism and the English Reformation (1978) 209, 224-5.
biblical and humanist historiographic paradigms, each of which feeds as well as vexes the imagination of early modern English nationhood. A figure for the ruined Romano-British city Verulamium, Verlame combines humanist discourses and nativist fantasies in a bipartite syncretism that offers glory, but emphasizes its essential temporariness. As such, Verlame represents a particularly pessimistic version of a Virgilian *translatio imperii*. Even when we exclude, for the moment, consideration of any biblical resonance in her iconography and speech, she embodies a national vision that falls well short of triumphalism, a privileged classical inheritance embedded in a specter of inevitable ruin and loss. When Spenser’s poet-speaker encounters her on the banks of the “siluer streaming *Thamesis,…*/Nigh where the goodly *Verlame* stood of yore” (2-3), he wonders if he has stumbled upon “th' auncient *Genius* of that Citie brent” (19). She immediately confirms his suspicion:

I was that Citie, which the garland wore

Of *Britaines* pride, deliuer'd vnto me

By *Romane* Victors, which it wonne of yore;

Though nought at all but ruines now I bee,

And lye in mine owne ashes, as ye see:

*Verlame* I was; what bootes it that I was,

Sith now I am but weedes and wastfull gras? (36-42)

The italicized terms in this stanza suggest a process through which “*Verlame*” was recognized by her “*Romane*” conquerors as “*Britaines* pride.” Their order suggests a simple equation: Britain + Rome = Verlame. While Verlame appears geographically and historically British, she asserts herself as an effaced conduit of classical Roman culture.
Spenser thus unites imperial Roman glory with a native British heritage in a ruined past and situates its figure on the banks of the Thames, where England’s early modern capital stands. As such, Verlame offers terms for conceptualizing the early modern present within a privileged line of cultural inheritance. But she also underscores the ephemerality of that inheritance when she laments that she has been subsequently reduced to “weedes and wastfull gras.” National achievement appears fatally constrained to the status of a temporary stage in an eternal cycle of generation and corruption, of ascendance and decline.

When Spenser translates du Bellay’s female figure of Rome into an ancient British context, he employs the feminine civic iconography common to both classical and biblical traditions, so that his syncretism comprises these three components. Gail Kern Paster notes that “[c]lassical personifications of the city as a noble woman wearing a turreted crown carry over into Christian iconography, with the virgin assuming the functions of the classical city goddess.” Yet similar biblical models can be found as well. Isaiah 3:16-24 rebukes the unchaste “daughters of Zion,” who are “hautie, and walke with stretched out neckes, and with wandering eyes, walking and minsing as they goe, and making a tinkeling with their feete.” The text then describes how God will accordingly strip them of “the ornament of the slippers, and the calles, and the round tyres, / The sweete balles, and the brasselets, and the bonnets, / The tyres of the head, and the sloppes, and the head bandes, and the tablets, and the earings, / The rings and the mufflers, / The costly apparell and the vailes, and the wimples” which he will replace with “baldnesse, and…a girding of sackecloth, and burning in steade of beautie.”

Yet the final verse in the chapter depicts Jerusalem itself, like its daughters, disgraced and

aggrieved: “Then shall her gates mourn and lament, and she, being desolate, shall sit upon the ground.” While the passage at first seems to attribute the city’s coming defeat to the sexual immorality of its women, the final verse suggests that the stripping of their garments operates on a figurative level as well, depicting the destruction of the city’s opulent architecture and the overthrow of its vain fortifications. Jeremiah 14:16 likewise laments Jerusalem’s destruction: “Let mine eyes drop downe teares night & day without ceasing: for the virgine daughter of my people is destroyed with a great destruction, and with a sore grievous plague.”

Lamentations represents a concentration of such figures—Jerusalem as virgin, princess, harlot, mother, and widow—but proves far from unique.

Analogies to Jerusalem situate London and England against a precedent that contains two diametrically opposed possibilities, one more glorious and one more threatening than that suggested by ancient Rome. Rome’s imperial and cultural privilege, based on its mythic claim as the heir of Troy, describes a superlative but transitory stage in history’s eternal cycle. Accordingly, Virgil’s fourth Eclogue envisions Achilles sailing once more to Troy with enthusiasm, even as it contributes to the myth of his own civilization’s descent from the very same city Achilles sets out to destroy. As inexorable motion of ascendance and decline in the classical cycle functions with the inexorable character of natural law, the latter does not necessarily represent a judgment that undermines the significance of the former. But Jerusalem’s dichotomous significances

---

109 Hebrew Scriptures develop the trope of depicting fortified Jerusalem as a woman to the point that Song of Songs can reverse the tenor and vehicle of the figure. The male speaker praises his female counterpart as a fortified city whose “necke is as the tower of Daud built for defence: a thousand shieldes hang therein, and all the targates of the strong men” (4:4) and declares her as “beautifull...as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem, terrible as an army with banners” (6:4). In the final chapter, the female speaker figures herself as her lover’s fortified city of refuge: “I am a wall, and my breasts are as towers” (8:10).
represent divine judgments. Jerusalem represents the city of King David’s glory built upon Mount Zion, the “joy of the whole earth, and the City of the great King,” the “perfection of beauty” out of which “hath God shined,” the sacred location whose privilege “can not be remoued, but remaineth for euer” (Ps. 48:1, 50:2, 125:1). But for Christians, it also functions as the location of Christ’s betrayal and crucifixion. Jerusalem as a paradigm and precedent thus holds out a binary of mutually exclusive national options: transcendent apotheosis or divine repudiation. Neither of these extends significant opportunity for national-historical achievement. The former option, interpreted typologically through the lens of Revelation, promises apocalyptic closure; the latter interprets Lamentations and prophecies of destruction in Jeremiah and Isaiah through Christ’s prophecies in Luke 19, as well as Mark 13, and thus promises national calamity and corporate damnation.

Despite the status of Lamentations among early modern readers and its popularity among poets as material for metrical paraphrase, the most famous being John Donne’s *The Lamentations of Jeremy, for the most part according to Tremellius*, its echoes in this poem have been largely neglected in favor of other biblical allusions.¹¹⁰ Carl J. Rasmussen notes that Verlaine is not “a simple mouthpiece for the poet,” but turning to Revelation deems her an “unreliable” narrator who displays “affinities with the Roman

¹¹⁰ According to John Klause, Donne’s rendition was “written not in the quiet afternoon of his Anglican faith but in the troubled morning or midday of religious crisis—either in the late 1580s or early 1590s…or in 1596-97, when, as the third Satyre indicates, he was probing the grounds for belief in the several institutionalized forms of Christianity.” Though Klause’s reading situates Donne’s paraphrase in the context of recusant employments of Lamentations, it places its composition, particularly if begun at the earliest date, in a relevant time period for Spenser’s poem. Klause, John. “The Two Occasions of Donne’s ‘Lamentations of Jeremy.’” *Modern Philology* 90, No. 3 (Feb., 1993) : 338. Portions of Lamentations were commonly set to ceremonial music, most notably by Thomas Tallis, Robert White, and William Byrd. See *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, s.v. “Lamentations.” It was also included in the annual lectionary of scriptural readings in the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer*. See Brightman, F. E. *The English Rite* (1915) 1:58-59, 108.
Stressing Verlame’s explicit affiliation with Rome, Rasmussen reads her as “a miniature Babylon, a miniature Great Whore, on England’s shores.” Deborah Cartmell aligns Verlame instead with the figure of exiled Israel weeping over Jerusalem’s destruction by the waters of Babylon, arguing that “Spenser’s main inspiration comes from the 137th Psalm; and rather than a lament for the fallen Rome, the poem is a celebration of the Elizabethan break with Rome.”

Rome certainly bore conflicting connotations in Reformation England. It represented the pinnacle of classical civilization but also the authority by which Christ was crucified. It had functioned as the instrument of God’s revenge against Israel but also the site of Nero’s and Diocletian’s persecution of the early Christians whom early Protestants often looked to as exempla. More recently, Rome had been a center of Renaissance humanism and art, but it had become the seat of the Pope, often identified as Anti-Christ, who actively fomented both continental and domestic opposition to the English Queen and her church. Given this complexity, it seems plausible to read Verlame as both an embodiment of Rome and as a symbol of resistance, though these are diametrically opposed. Indeed, it seems difficult to imagine that any positive reference to Rome could fail to trigger an anxiety regarding the city’s negative associations, and vice versa. In this sense, Rome resembles Jerusalem as a city that, as Paster expresses so aptly, “contains its own anti-type.”

Richard Schell’s apparatus in the *Yale Edition* accordingly notes both reference to du Bellay’s “Genius of Rome” and the allusion to

---

113 Paster argues that “the city” should not be read only in opposition to “the country” in literature of this period, but also according to “other polarities—between the city of man and the city of God, between the earthly city and the heavenly city, Rome and Jerusalem, whore of Babylon and bride of the Lamb, real and ideal.” Ibid. p. 2.
“the Psalmist weeping by the rivers of Babylon” that organizes Cartmell’s reading. But he also notes Verlaine’s resemblance to the figure of “fallen Jerusalem as a weeping widow in Lamentations 1-2.”

Closer analysis of Verlaine’s resemblance to the figure of Jerusalem in Lamentations reveals an organizing principle that gives significant conceptual coherence to a work that has often been read as a mix of under-integrated components. Against this background, the poet-speaker’s closing pageant works to establish England’s historical status and significance, in addition to redeeming Spenser from his failure to compose an elegy for Sidney and to perform, as Richard Danson Brown argues, an “exploration of the literary immortality offered by humanist poetry and the conflict which arises between this and apocalyptic world-contempt.”

---

114 This perspective follows W.R. Renwick’s characterization of the poem in his edition of Spenser’s Complaints as “ingenious carpentry” as opposed to a fully developed poem. See Spenser, Edmund. Complaints, ed. W. R. Renwick. (London: Scholaris, 1928), p. 190. Others who have followed this perspective include: Bradbrook, M. C. “No Room at the Top: Spenser’s Pursuit of Fame.” Elizabethan Poetry, ed. J. R. Brown and Bernard Harris. Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies 2. (London: Edmund Arnold, 1960), pp. 91-110; Satterthwaite, Alfred W. Spenser, Ronsard and Du Bellay: a Renaissance Comparison. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960); MacLure, Millar. Spenser and the ruins of time. In A Theatre for Spenserians, ed. Judith M. Kennedy and James A. Reither. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), pp. 1-16.; DeNeef, A. Leigh. Spenser and the Motives of Metaphor. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1982). Richard Danson Brown presents one of the most rigorous counter-perspectives, to which I am indebted, focused on questions of the status of poetry and its constituent genres. According to Brown, “The Ruines of Time uses the complaint mode” to construct “a transitional blend of traditional genres and tropes, best understood as a meeting point between tradition and novelty.” The New Poet. (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1999), p.99. Brown reads this poem as “a bridge between humanist ideas of literary 'eternizing' and Christian eschatology” that transforms the genre of complaint and thus “bridges Spenser's practice as a translator and his practice as an original poet, for whom the values and forms of the past must be reinterpreted and written anew if they are to remain viable.” Ibid. p. 100. He argues compellingly that the fact that “this work uses a variety of genres and tropes does not preclude it from having an overall coherence” and he seeks to provide “a systematic description—in the absence of an authorial recipe—of the different poetic ingredients which Spenser blends into a unity.” Ibid. p. 102. I seek to extend Brown’s interests in genre and place them in a religious and political rhetorical context. Doing so enables us to see a wider range of ideological pressures on Spenser’s aesthetics, crucial concerns for a poet with a vocation that situated literary activity in service of a state, a nation, and a range of religious sensibilities, as well as vice versa.
Verlame’s abject despair, her excessive attachment to earthly things, suggests an insufficient degree of world-contempt. In this, she appears overly carnal, a central tenet of Christian anti-Jewish polemics, at least since Augustine. Accordingly, she resembles the female figure of Lamentations as read by Christians. Jerusalem’s misery is ameliorated by the promises of consolation with which the text closes, promises that were read as directed at the Church and not the city and nation whose destruction the book laments. Insofar as she represents the city, and not the Church, this figure weeps for an earthly, temporal, and historical loss.

Verlame also echoes Lamentations in her speech. When she complains that her “happines the heauens enuying./ From highest staire to lowest step me draue (24-5),” she resembles the “daughter of Zion” in Lamentations who complains that “[t]he Lord…cast me downe from heauen vnto the earthe (2:1).” When she describes herself as become “of all Nations… forlorne,/The worlds sad spectacle, and fortunes scorne” (27-8), she suggests Lamentations’ depiction of Jerusalem as “a widow” who was formerly “greate among the nacions (and) princesse among the prouinces” but who has now been “made tributarie” (1:1). Indeed, Spenser’s Verlame bewails a very similar loss of prominence as a Roman provincial center when she claims to have formerly been “of this small Northerne world was Princesse” (83-84). Both “princess” cities, Verulamium and Jerusalem, offer England a precedent of temporary glory that blazes momentarily before inevitable ruin.

115 While Lamentations depicts Jerusalem’s conquest by Babylon in 586 BCE, both Jewish and Christian theologians have read this text as a prophetic vision of its siege and sack by Rome in 70 CE as well. Accordingly, both biblical and Spenserian employments of “princess” suggest the ruin of a former Roman provincial capital. Neither depiction is born out by critical history. Verulamium was never more than the third largest settlement in Roman Britain and Pliny’s famous description of Second Temple Jerusalem as “the most illustrious city in the East” does not account for Alexandria, the dominant urban center of the eastern reach of the empire in the late and immediate post-biblical period.
Spenser elaborates upon prior treatments of du Bellay’s bereaved Roman nymph in *The Ruines of Time*. In addition to translating her geographically, he depicts her more through a Christian than a neo-classical lens, creating allusions to Jerusalem. Spenser first employs this female figure for civic ruin in a sonnet appended to his translation of Jan van der Noost’s *Theatre of Worldlings* (1569), his earliest published work. An almost identical version appears in his *Visions of Bellay*, included as the next to last poem in his *Complaints*. In these works, Spenser situates his figure not “by a riuers side” (*Theatre of Worldlings* 1; *Visions of Bellay* 1). While the river remains unnamed, both works reference the Roman emperors Nero and Caligula, suggesting that she dwells by the Tiber (*Theatre of Worldlings* 13; *Visions of Bellay* 14). Unlike Verlame, whom the poet-speaker encounters along the Thames, she bears no geographic connection to ancient Britain. In *The Ruines of Time*, in addition to revising this figure’s geographical location and explicitly establishing her referent as a Romano-British city, Spenser also alters her appearance to amplify Verlame’s allusions to Jerusalem’s ruin. While in both of the other versions, he depicts his figure “[f]olding her armes” (*Theatre of Worldlings* 2; *Visions of Bellay* 2), here he unfolds them and places “[i]n her right hand a broken rod” (13). This modification creates a resemblance to Synagoga, an icon influenced in part by Lamentations that depicts Israel in defeat as a downcast woman holding a broken staff or spear.

Although the balance between biblical and classical influences throughout the *Complaints* as tips overwhelmingly toward the classical, Spenser’s target audiences were almost certainly more attuned to the poem’s biblical resonances than contemporary readers. Most members of the elite Sidney circle shared Mary Sidney Herbert’s Calvinist
leanings and attendant focus on scripture. The rest were at least conversant with the religious controversies of the day and thus versed in both biblical texts and theological polemic. But if *The Ruines of Time* was composed primarily for its dedicatee and her familiars, William Ponsonby’s edition of the *Complaints* aimed at a commercial readership organized around a central religious venue. According to the title page, Ponsonby’s shop was located “in Paules Churchyard at the signe of the *Bishops head,*” across from the Cathedral’s Great North Door, just east of Canon Alley, at one of the entrances to the Cross Yard. The *Complaints* were thus designed to be marketed at the center of England’s emergent commercial print industry and in view of Paul’s Cross, one of the most important pulpits of the land and a pivotal institution for promoting the Reformation. Alexandra Walsham describes the congregations who gathered to hear sermons at Paul’s Cross as “notoriously mongrel and ‘mixt’, a conglomeration of the ‘better’, ‘middling’, and ‘meaner sorts’ of people, of sightseeing foreigners, Londoners, and passing visitors from the country.” The heterogeneous nature of the auditors suggests that Ponsonby’s customers, no matter the range of their personal piety, were cognizant of popular scriptural rhetoric as well as familiar with printed homilies and pamphlets marketed in the same space. Verlame’s echoes of Lamentations and the similarity of her “broken rod” to Synagoga’s identifying accoutrement would have resonated for them without hermeneutic exertions.

Whether due to commercial or religious interests, or to their combination, Ponsonby sought to highlight Spenser’s biblicism through his edition’s paratexts. The
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118 *The Ruines of Rome: by Bellay, and The Visions of Bellay draw upon Les Antiquités de Rome* by the French Catholic humanist Joachim du Bellay, as does *The Ruines of Time,* albeit with significantly less
plate that frames the title page of the *Complaints*, as well as that of each individual poem in the collection, features the unmistakable figure of David, holding his harp on the left, while Moses holds the tablets of God’s revelation on the right. These two biblical figures, more than any others, suggest poetry’s capacity to forestall catastrophe, to elicit divine protection and turn back punishment. Both the emancipator-legislator-poet Moses and the warrior-king-poet David seek God’s favor and forgiveness by gesturing to a divine need for the production of sacred texts. After the sin of the golden calf, Moses presents God with an ultimatum: “Therefore now if thou pardone their sinne, thy mercie shal appeare : but if thou wilt not, I pray thee, rase me out of thy boke, which thou hast written.” 119 All three major Elizabethan bibles—the Geneva Bible, the Great Bible, and the Bishops’ Bible—entitle the first five books “of Moses.” Moses’s rhetorical strategy in interceding with God after the sin of the calf demands that God choose between retributive justice and the eventuality of a defective Pentateuch that lacks its central and most compelling figure. David’s argument in Psalm 30 employs a similar logic. Pleading for God’s merciful protection against his enemies, David asks: “What profit is there in my blood, when I go downe to the pit? shal the dust give thankes unto thee? shal it declare thy trueth?”120 God’s requirement of praise and of theological testimony exceeds any displeasure with David’s flaws and sins that might otherwise lead to his abandonment. Accordingly, both of the biblical figures who flank the titles of Spenser’s

---

119 See Exodus 32:32. More commonly associated with legislation, Moses is also closely associated with poeisis. Examples of verse attributed to him include the “Song of the Sea” in Exodus 15 and Deuteronomy 32. The Geneva Bible refers to the latter as “Moses song” in the page header and glosses it in the epitome to Chapter 32 with the description: “The Song of Moses conteining Gods benefits toward the people.”
120 Psalm 30:9.
*Complaints* evoke a deity whose wrath may be mitigated by the production of texts that praise him, express gratitude, and testify to his power.

Ponsonby’s prefatory “The Printer to the *Gentle Reader,*” which opens the *Complaints,* reinforces his iconographic outreach to readers interested in purchasing religious material. He notes other works by Spenser, “all complaints and meditations of the worlds vanitie” that are not included in this edition. Many of these, such as “*Ecclesiastes,* and *Canticum Canticorum* translated… *The howers of the Lord, The sacrifice of a sinner, The seven Psalms,* &c.,” feature explicit biblical content and devotional material. Ponsonby’s preface seems at pains to highlight the largely oblique religiosity of the poems he ultimately included in the *Complaints.* Together with the iconography of the title pages, these paratexts sensitize readers to allusive biblical references, particularly those tropes popular with the preachers and pamphleteers whose efforts animated the scene in which Ponsonby’s edition was marketed.

Verlame can be read to emphasize both positive and negative attitudes toward England’s past. In highlighting Verlame’s negative Roman aspects, Rasmussen, for instance, suggests a muting or elision of Rome’s positive connotations and casts Verlame as an antagonist whose orientation must be utterly disavowed. Meanwhile, Cartmell’s emphasis on the allusion to Psalm 137 positions Verlame as a tragic figure for biblical history, a heritage that must be redeemed, perfected, and fulfilled. Although Rasmussen simplifies Verlame into a polemical figure suited to doctrinal pedagogy, as opposed to an allusively poetic one that evokes a complex range of cultural and historical associations, his claim that Verlame functions as an unreliable narrator remains particularly pertinent. Yet unreliability often entails ambiguity, not the clear or unadulterated error that
characterizes the Protestant polemic against Catholic Rome as the seat of the papal Anti-
Christ and his Church, often figured as the Whore of Babylon. Unreliability need not
arise from malevolence and cynicism proper to an antagonist. Rather it can position a narrator as neither invariably correct nor dependably incorrect, as the speaker of a potentially puzzling admixture of truth and untruth. It can be a sign of the partial or preliminary apprehension associated with ancient Israel, as in Cartmell’s psalm-oriented reading of Verlame.

Verlame’s Roman and Jewish references both trigger ambivalence regarding Protestant England’s antecedents. Insofar as Verlame represents the Romano-British city of Verulamium, a pivotal mid-point for the *translatio imperii* from ancient Rome to early modern England, she suggests dual imperatives of continuity and discontinuity, of appropriation and disavowal. A Catholic humanist poet such as du Bellay, following Dante’s and Petrarch’s efforts to resuscitate the cultural vigor of Virgil’s Rome, can avail himself of the syncretism devised by Eusebius. This syncretism situated Christian Rome as unifying classical and biblical achievements, each of which constituted a necessary *preparatio*. In this scheme, while the classical heritage provided a political groundwork for an eventual Christian Roman Empire, the moral heritage of ancient Israel and its historical role in producing Christ engendered the Roman Church. Thus Dante describes Aeneas as “chosen father of Mother Rome / and of her Empire by God’s will and token,” emphasizing that both institutions “were founded and foreknown / as the established Seat of Holiness / for the successors of Great Peter’s Throne.”

---

122 Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy*. (1985) 10. In this same canto, *Inferno* 2, Beatrice suggests that the completion of a full synthesis between biblical and classical historical trajectories is only temporarily
Protestant poet, however, must disavow both the Roman Church and the Roman Empire, as both institutions ultimately became corrupt antagonists in Christian history. An early modern English poet with national and Protestant commitments such as Spenser would face an even greater conflict, as the Pope and Holy Roman Emperor represented major contemporary threats to his monarch and her church. Yet any form of Christian history necessarily involves the histories of both Rome and Jerusalem and cannot be conceived without them, whether viewed as malevolent and corrupt, or as preliminary, immature, and incomplete. When Spenser combines references to ancient Rome and Jerusalem in the British figure of Verlame, he bends the arc of history toward fulfillment in his own national setting. Her privileged yet flawed perspective provides Spenser with a model that must be correctly apprehended and improved upon in a double obligation to emulate and emend.

This double obligation bears structural similarity to the hermeneutic imperatives that organize Christian readings of the Hebrew Bible. Indeed, Verlame displays her flaws as a reader of history in a telling passage that brings a classical perspective to bear upon biblical material when she laments the decline of four ancient national powers:

“What nowe is of th' Assyrian Lyonesse,…What of the Persian Beares outrageousnesse,…Who of the Grecian Libbard now ought heares,…And where is that deferred. In order to encourage Virgil to guide the beleaguered Dante through hell and purgatory, she pledges to address the former’s predicament of relegation to Limbo, the first circle of Hell where virtuous pagans remain incarcerated, to repay his efforts by interceding on his behalf: “When amid Seraphim/I stand again before my Lord, your praises/shall sound in Heaven” (73-74). The effect of these praises remains obscure. Rome’s pre-Christian foundation myth might be imputed to providence, but generative tensions remain between classical and Christian traditions. Dante’s own piety appears confused and perhaps impaired when he addresses Virgil as “that fountain/of purest speech” and claims him as “my true master and first author,/the sole maker from whom I drew the breath/of that sweet style whose measures have brought me honor” (Inferno 1.77, 82-84). Only the qualification linking Virgil’s influence specifically to poetic style mitigates the potential scandal of employing descriptors that seem otherwise uniquely appropriate to God (“fountain of purest speech,” “true master,” “first author,” “sole maker”) instead to a pagan poet.
same great seuen headded beast….‖ (64, 66, 68, 71). The last is a reference to Rome from Revelation 13:1: “And I sawe a beast rise out of the sea, hauing seuen heads.” The passage echoes a prophecy in Daniel 7:3-7, read by both Jewish and Christian exegetes as describing the succession of four kingdoms that will precede either the appearance of the Jewish messiah or the establishment of Christ’s kingdom. But Verlame reads this prophecy neither as Jew nor Christian, both of whom understand it as describing a linear progression toward history’s consummation. Instead, Verlame employs the ubi sunt qui ante nos fuerunt trope common to Medieval Latin complaints, which underscores the ephemerality of worldly things by asking “where are those who came before us?” In the Medieval tradition, it expresses a contemptus mundi that cautions readers regarding the vanity of temporal things. But when Verlame applies this trope to the biblical figuration of a progression of civilizations toward history’s end, she expresses the classical emphasis on the inexorable constant of ascent and decline. She cites each kingdom as additional evidence of how all things pass within a history that always circles back upon itself. She then perversely employs this cycle as a rationale for the eternizing properties of poetry that can transcend each successive period of decline. Finally, though she paraphrases Revelation, in which Rome appears wholly negative, she grieves for it: “O Rome thy ruine I lament and rue, / And in thy fall my fatall ouerthrowe” (78-9). She remains suspended between her own pre-Christian history and a Christian perspective she glimpses, but does not comprehend.

In order to create Verlame as a figure that represents England’s flawed antecedents in Rome and Jerusalem, Spenser conspicuously elides the Christian significance that fifteenth- and sixteenth-century English historiographic traditions
accorded the city of Verulamium. As it was never more than the third largest settlement in Roman Britain, these texts stress Verulamium’s place in Ecclesiastical history through its association with St. Alban, often referred to as England’s proto-martyr, who remains altogether absent from Spenser’s poem. Spenser places Verlame’s praise of the antiquarian William Camden, the “nourice of antiquitie” (170) early in her speech, suggesting that Camden’s Britannia (1586) was his primary historical source. But he omits Camden’s claim that Verulamium was “famous for nothing so much as bringing forth Alban a citizen of singular holinesse and faith in Christ, who…was the first in Britain that with invincible constancy and resolution suffered death for Christ his sake.” Huw Griffiths argues that Spenser omitted the “transformation of Roman Verulamium into British St. Albans” because it offered “too easy a way out for Spenser's uneasy relationship with the nation.” Alban’s inclusion would indeed have suggested the city’s familiar role in England’s religious history. It would have undercut the conflict Spenser requires as context for the corrective moves of his closing pageants. Too much continuity with Verulamium would also create a threatening proximity to the ruined past and its ephemeral fate. Spenser’s omission of these traditions from Verlame’s speech instead defamiliarizes the city, stressing Verulamium’s pre-Christian Roman identity to amplify historical discontinuity. It distinguishes England’s Christian present from its pre-Christian Romano-British past in order to disassociate early modern England from repeating the fate of its ancient predecessors.

123 Texts such as John Lydgate’s late 15th century verse Life of Saint Alban and Saint Amphibal, William Camden’s historiographic Britannia (which appeared in Latin in 1586 and in an abridged English translation in 1607) and Michael Drayton’s chorographic poem Poly-Olbion (1612) all stress the significance of St. Alban to Verulamium’s place in history.
Neither Rome nor Jerusalem offer stable precedents for the imagination of an English nation. Christian historiography offers Spenser an escape from classical cycles of civic rise and fall and the inherent ephemerality of national privilege. Yet the image of Jerusalem suggests two unsatisfactory alternatives: divine repudiation or apocalyptic closure. In the seventeenth century, millenarian historiography would enable conception of an era that defers the apocalypse. *The Ruines of Time* explores a possibility for breaking out of this conundrum. By projecting London and England beyond the paradigmatic juncture of historical Jerusalem’s ultimate doom while simultaneously holding apocalyptic expectation at bay, it avoids repetition of its predecessor’s folly without bringing history to an imminent close. Furthermore, it does so several decades before millennialism comes to play a significant role in English national thought. Yet this possibility depends upon England successfully negotiating the pivot of Jerusalem’s failure as no nation before has done, fulfilling and perfecting its paradigm by avoiding its “unthankefullnesse.”

* * * * *

*The rhetoric of “unthankefullnesse”*

Though early modern preachers and pamphleteers invoke a variety of biblical and post-biblical Jerusalems, when Spenser frames his conception of *The Ruines of Time* as an endeavor to “avoide that fowle blot of unthankefullnesse,” he orients his poem toward a particular tradition that focused on the image of the biblical capital in the forty-year period extending from the Christ’s passion through the city’s destruction in 70 CE. The works that constitute this 16th-century tradition feature a dichotomous and often dialectical emphasis on immediate peril and national privilege. One of the earliest
examples can be found in John Bale’s first published work, Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe (1543). Bale evinces disappointment in the largely jurisdictional and insufficiently doctrinal and ritual focus of the Henrician Reformation, praying that God “be mercy full” to the English “and holde from them the promysed plage for soche vthankefullnesse.” Bale then asserts a general historical precedent, for “neuer was the worde of the lorde yet sent to anye nacion and so blasphemouslie ordred, but wonderfull destruccyons hath folowed thervpon.” “Unthankefullnesse” manifests in neglect or blasphemous employment of “the worde of the lorde,” which leads invariably to national “destruccyons.” Bale then particularizes his precedent of “unthankefullnesse” and its wages by invoking “Hierusalem…whom owr sauer Iesus Christ in his owne persone called vnto repentauence” as its epitome and references the “afflyccions most terryble and fearfull” that accompanied its destruction by Rome. The title of Bale’s text names Rome as England’s contemporary antagonist. England and Hierusalem share in the unthankful neglect and misapplication of the word, as well as the threat of Roman violence. But England yet stands before its Roman destruction, which it might avert through proper attention to its Reformation.

The pairing of England with Jerusalem in this tradition benefits from London’s emergence as a centralizing focus of national life. Some texts align Jerusalem with England generally, while others reference London as an analogous capital at the center of its religious, economic, political, and cultural life. Given that biblical representations of ancient Jewish civilization frequently focus on the city that stands at its center, the parallel between Israel and England is fed by London’s growing dominance. Henry

126 Bale, John, and Alexander Seton. Yet a Course At the Romyshe Foxe (1543).
127 The same argument appears in Brinkelow’s The complaint of Roderyck Mors (1542).
Brinkelow’s satire, *The lamentacyon of a Christen against the citye of London* (1542), which applies to England’s capital the name of the biblical book that depicts Jerusalem’s destruction, argues that “the gospell was n euer more sincerelye preached in the tyme of the Apostles, then it hath bene of late in London” and that “the same sprete euene the very holye Ghoste whych spake in the Apostles, hath spoken in men now to vs.”

By comparing London to Jerusalem in the time of the Apostles Brinkelow highlights the relationship between theological benefit and national culpability. It also particularizes an aspect of historical resemblance between Reformation London and the nascent Jerusalem church in the period that preceded that city’s destruction.

The continuity of this tradition into Spenser’s lifetime depends in large part on Hugh Latimer and Thomas Becon. In 1549, Latimer famously preached his first sermon before the young King Edward VI. Grateful for a Protestant monarch with authentic doctrinal commitments, Latimer notes that if Edward’s “systers, my Ladye Marye, and my Lady Elizabeth…should marye with straungers,” he might be succeeded by a foreigner of Romanist persuasion. He thus urges:

Make haste, make haste, and let vs learne to conuerte, to repente, and amende our lyues. If we do not, I feare, I feare, lest for our synnes and vnthankfulnes, an Hipocrit shall raigne ouer vs…. God hath geuen vs a deliuerer, a naturall kyng. Let vs seke no straunger of another nacion, no Hypocrisie whych shall brynge in agayne al papistrie, hipocrisie, and Idolatrye.⁴

---

⁵ Latimer, Hugh. *The fyrste sermon of Mayster Hughe Latimer, whiche he preached before the Kinges Maiestie within his graces palayce at Westminster.* (1549). sig. C.
The prospect of the fervently Catholic Mary, with her Hapsburg ties to Spain and the Holy Roman Empire succeeding Edward provoked intense anxiety among reformers. Latimer’s concerns proved prescient when Edward died and Mary ascended the thrown, restoring Romanist clergy and rituals. Her regime was marked by the persecution of Reformers, resulting in Latimer’s martyrdom in 1555.

Latimer’s influential formulation continued to circulate after his death. *The Lamentacion of England* (1557), an anonymous tract printed in Germany whose title, like that of Brinkelow’s satire, recalls the biblical book that depicts Jerusalem’s destruction, quotes this passage in full. Developing its logic, it implores England to recognize the offences for which God has sent foreign rulers to “plage England, for there vnthankfullnes, and for not knowing the time off ther visitacion.” Its author then urges his “dear brethren” to repentance: “sease not to lament, and bewaile our sinnes, and the state and misery off our countre, that is come apon vs for our vnthankfulnes and for not knowlegyng the time of our visytacyon.” This represents one of the earliest insertions of “unthankfulness” into a paraphrase of Christ’s prophecy in Luke, where he proclaims Jerusalem’s doom “because [it] knewest not the time of [its] visitation” (19:44).

Latimer’s influence extended well into the Elizabethan period. A year before John Day published John Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments* (1563), he produced a compilation of Latimer’s addresses with prefatory material by Augustine Bernher, who had served as Latimer’s clerk. Bernher attributes Mary’s reign and persecutions to the same sin that his mentor had feared: “After the whiche tyme, by the reason ofoure vnthankefulnes, he

---

130 Anon. *The lamentsation of England* (1558). “Make hast make hast, and lett vs lern to convert to repente and amend our lyues, yf we do not I fere I fear least for our sinnes, & vnthankfullnes an hipocrity shall raigh over vs, Long time we haue bene seruan[t]s and in bondage, seruing the pope in Egipt, god hath geuen vs a deliueret, a naturall king, A naturall King. Lett vs not seke no stranger of another nacion, no hipocrite which shall bring in a gain all papistry, ypocrisie, & ydolatry...” 5.
most plagued vs, and toke the same away agayne, and caused by the deuils hangmen (the papists I meane) darknes, blindnes, and most pestiferous doctrine to be brought into the churche.”

Foxe’s depiction of Latimer’s martyrdom in the 1583 edition of *Actes and Monuments* culminates in an appeal that England not “so slenderlye and vntthankfully considereth…her own misery past,” with a marginal gloss that highlights his concern with “The vnthankefulnes of England.”

Thomas Becon presents the most elaborate early iteration of the “unthankefullnesse” tradition, explicitly emphasizing the urban parallel between London and Jerusalem in the dedicatory epistle of his liturgical compendium, *A Flour of Godly Prayers* (1550/1). He had first engaged it almost a decade earlier in one of his first publications, *A comfortable epistle, too Goddes faythfull people in Englande wherein is declared the cause of takynge awaye the true Christen religion from them, & howe it maye be recouered and obtayned agayne* (1542), which in the same year as Brinkelow’s Henrician satire and the year before Bale’s text. In this early text, Becon joins those reformers dissatisfied with Henry’s regime and complains that “Gods blessing was offered vnto vs but we thorow our wicked and vntthankful lyfe refused it” and asks “[w]hat realme synce the Apostles tyme was euer so abundantly replenished with the knowledge of Christes Gospel,” positioning England as almost on par with Israel in the period between the crucifixion and the destruction of Jerusalem.

He refers to contemporary struggles as “this condemnation, this darkness, this blindness,” all three of

---

131 27 sermons preached by the ryght Reuerende father in God and constant matir [sic] of lesus Christe, Maister Hugh Latimer. (1563) A.4.
133 Becon, Thomas. *A comfortable epistle, too Goddes faythfull people in Englande wherein is declared the cause of takynge awaye the true Christen religion from them, & howe it maye be recouered and obtained agayne.* (1542). Imprint false. A.iii.
which often refer to the Jews who rejected Christ, and likewise identifies their cause as
“the hating of the light of Gods worde, our vnthankefulnes for the benefites of Christes Gospel.”\textsuperscript{134} To warn his readers of the coming calamity, he reminds them of the fate of
“the Iewes,” who despite the wide publication of the Gospel in the decades following the
crucifixion “for their vnthankfulnes and disobedie~ce after certayne yeares with their
countrye utterly perished and came to noughte.”\textsuperscript{135} Eight years later, Becon returns to
this theme in response to the 1549 deposition of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset,
Edward VI’s uncle and Lord Protector, and a chief proponent of the Edwardian
Reformation. Accordingly, Becon dedicates his volume of devotional materials to
Somerset’s wife, Katherine.

Becon’s dedication to the Duchess of Somerset reworks and elaborates the
material in his earlier \textit{Epistle}. He complains that despite the blessings and benefits
England has enjoyed the people’s “ingratitude, our vnthankfulnes” have distressed him
and he attributes the recent turn of events to “bothe vntowardenes
and vnthankfulnes.”\textsuperscript{136} He warns that “with out al doubt except we repent and amend,
Goddes word for our vnthankfulnes shal not onely betaken away from vs, but…we maye
be sure to feele most bytter and greuous plages.”\textsuperscript{137} The historical precedent of Israel’s
refusal and/or loss of “Goddes word,” which led to its “greuous plages,” reinforces the
connection between theological and political calamities. Becon then narrates how “God

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid. A.vii, viii.
\textsuperscript{135} Ibid. C.iii-iv.
\textsuperscript{136} Becon, Thomas. \textit{The Flour of Godly Praiers.} (1550) V.r., VIIr.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid. VIIr.
seyng [the Jews’] ingratitude and unthankfulnes vexed them, besydes other plages, wyth continual warres, and brought them vnder the dominion of the Romaynes…”

Becon emphasizes the urban topography of his biblical vehicle, employing images that recall the English capital, just as Verlame describes her own past glory in *The Ruines of Time* in terms eminently recognizable to the poet-speaker and to the poem’s readers. Early modern readers would have found Becon’s description of Jerusalem’s destruction uncomfortably familiar:

The famous temple, the princely palaces, the high towers, the strong castles, the gorgeous building, the pleasant houses, the thick walls, the mighty fortresses, and all that ever there was, they threw down and brent. All things lost their old beauty. A destruction and very desolation of all things was made. Whatsoever was within the city, it went to havock.¹³⁹

Verlame’s description of Verulamium’s early modern status in Spenser’s *The Ruines of Time* bears a striking resemblance to this passage:

High towers, faire temples, goodly theaters,

Strong walls, rich porches, princelie pallaces,

Large streetes, braue houses, sacred sepulchers,

Sure gates, sweete gardens, stately galleries,

Wrought with faire pillours and fine imageries

---

¹³⁸ Ibid. A.i.r.
¹³⁹ Ibid. A.ii.r.
All those (ô pitie) now are turnd to dust,

And ouergrowen with black obliuions rust. (92-8)\(^\text{140}\)

Whether this echo indicates influence may be impossible to ascertain, though I have found no other texts that employ the terms “famous temple” / “faire temples,” “princelye palaces” / “princelie palaces,” and “hyghe towers” / “High towers” in proximity to one another. But what seems certain is that both Becon’s description of Jerusalem’s destruction and Verlame’s description of her own lost glory gain rhetorical resonance as they play on their readers’ familiarity with the city on the Thames that Spenser’s poet-speaker has undoubtedly left behind for a respite.\(^\text{141}\) In Becon’s text, London provides a reference point for the analogy between biblical Jerusalem and Reformation England, while his text also contributes to London’s emergence as a national symbol through this parallel with the biblical capital. England, conceived more and more frequently in this century through London as its synecdoche, faces a theological and political threat from Rome as did ancient Israel before, so often represented synecdochically through the figure of Jerusalem.

Moving from implicit suggestion to explicit comparison, Becon closes his preface with two iterations of the term that closes Christ’s prophecy in Luke 19. He warns England of repeating Jerusalem’s fate: “God yet once agayne is come on visytacyon to thys churche of England yea and that more louingly and beneficially then euer he dyd afore.”\(^\text{142}\) Indeed, England’s Edwardian visitation had already proven more effective

---

\(^{140}\) Though Becon is perhaps more well-known for his 1565 *The Sick Man’s Salve*, reprinted twice more in Spenser’s lifetime in 1579 and 1580, his 1551 *The Flower of Godly Prayers* was reprinted twice as well, in 1561 and 1570.

\(^{141}\) In Spenser’s *Prothalamion*, his final publication, his poet-speaker similarly leaves the city in which he was born and spent his childhood for a meditative stroll along the *Thamesis*.

\(^{142}\) Ibid. A.v.v.
than Jerusalem’s: “[F]or in this his visitacion he hathe redressed many abuses and clensed this his church of much vngodlynes and superstycyon.” Jerusalem had repelled Christ’s attempts to reform the Temple cult, but Edwardian Reformers had succeeded for a time in rectifying what they saw as analogous “abuses,…ungodliness and superstition” of Catholicism, rendering England’s potential relapse an even more egregious transgression than its predecessor’s failure to heed Christ.

The dual destructions of Jerusalem by Babylon and Rome carry different implications when employed as exempla. Marian exiles often identified with the Babylonian exiles of 586 BCE, whom Psalm 137 depicts weeping “by the waters of Babylon.” These exiles were restored and rebuilt their Temple. For instance, James Pilkington’s first publication upon returning to England is his highly polemical commentary *Aggeus and Abdias prophetes the one corrected, the other newly added, and both at large declared* (1562). The first of these prophetic books, Haggai, addresses the period of Israel’s restoration from Babylonian exile. But later texts begin to flirt more frequently with the irreversible scenario of the Roman destruction in 70 CE, read as fulfilling Christ’s prophecy in Luke. An anonymous pamphlet published by Marian exiles in Germany, *The Lamentation of England* (1557 and 1558) designates the Catholic Queen “a scourge and rood to plague England for our vnthankfulnes.” It associates the “manyfesf treasons, and practyses” of those endeavoring “to geue away and betray this noble realme off England, in to the hands off the king off spayne and his spaynyerds”

143 Ibid. A.v.r.
144 Pilkington, James. *Aggeus and Abdias prophetes the one corrected, the other newly added, and both at large declared.* (1562).
145 *The Lamentation of England* (1558). A.4.r. The first edition is attributed to Thomas Cranmer, who was executed by Mary in 1556, the year prior to its publication. The second edition adds a note on the loss of Calais, England’s last possession in France.
with “the prophecye off that blessyd marter off god mayster hugh latymer, preaching before the most vertues prynce K.E. 6. in his palays at westmynster 1549” when he foretold “that thes plages shold com apon vs for our vnthankfullnes” and “which now is come to passe in dede” (italics mine in all quotes from this text). Yet instead of looking forward to Elizabeth’s succession, the likeliest hope of English Protestants, it declares the current state “but the beginning off sorows & plages that shall follow…for our in gratitude and great vnthankfullnes” and envisions an even darker future through a paraphrase of Luke 19:44, foreseeing “a very rood of god apointid…to plage England, for ther vnthankfullnes, and for not knowing the time off ther visitacion.” The marginal gloss does not identify this verse as it does others, yet its deployment cannot be deemed accidental, for the same tract later repeats it, urging readers to “lament, and bewaile… the state and misery off our countre, that is come apon vs for our vnthankfulnes and for not knowlegyng the time of our visytacyon.”

Yet the finality of Christ’s verdict over Jerusalem proves too much for reformers to embrace and they thus turn from this late moment in Israel’s biblical narrative to the earlier episode of Judges 10, which describes idolatry followed by successful repentance, imploring its readers “to folow the example off the childern off Israell, who were gods electe and chosen people what time as they had offendid god by worshipping ydols.” After God “ponisshid them by sending strangers & tirants to Rule & rain ouer them who oppressid them (as our rulers do now vs)… they turnid to god, humhlid them selues with

146 Ibid. A.1.r.
147 Ibid. A.5.v
148 Ibid. A.5.v.
149 Ibid. B.2.v.
praier and fasting, & confessyd ther sinnes and vnthankfullnes.”150 The passage stresses the possibility of repair, recounting how God first refuses their plea and reminds them how he rescued them before only to watch them relapse into idolatry, but after “they put away ther ydols and seruid the lord…the lord had pite apon ther misery, and deliuerid them out off ther henemies hands &c.”151 Despite the two evocations of Luke 19, the tract ensures its readers that “god is good mercifull, pacient and long suffering” and “that he will not geue vs ouer in to the hands of strangers and tyrants, his and our henemies, for our sinnes and vnthankfullnes.”152

After Mary’s death and Elizabeth’s accession, John Knox employed this same tradition to warn English Protestants about their new queen’s overly moderate positions on religious reform, augmenting the prominence of Luke 19. In The copie of an epistle sent [from Geneva] (1559), Knox adopts the persona of Christ and references the verses just prior to his prophecy, where Christ tells a group of Pharisees who bid him silence the disciples who have begun to proclaim his kingship that “if these should holde their peace, the stones would crie” (19:40). Foreseeing that the city will spurn him, Christ joins the function of Jerusalem’s citizens, the human community of a civitas, with its material context as an urbs, implying that the Jews forfeit their privileged collective identity under the sign of Jerusalem when they refuse to acknowledge their king. In his paraphrase, Knox claims to glean no pleasure from threatening England with “plages” and “Gods seuere iudgmentes,” but given its “horrible defection frome God and frome his veritie knowne and professed” he justifies the bleakness of his message by arguing that “althogh

150 Ibid. B.2.r.
151 Ibid. B.2.r.
152 Ibid. B.v.
Early texts in this tradition cite “unthankfulness” as the grounds for Jerusalem’s destruction in a general sense. By the time of Spenser’s childhood, the same “fowle blot” he would later seek to avoid by composing _The Ruines of Time_ was becoming more proximately and specifically associated with Christ’s prophecy in Luke.

Knox’s insertion of the term “unthankfulness” into the scriptural context of Christ’s prophecy highlights its relevance to the Calvinist context for which Spenser conceived _The Ruines of Time_. Carol Kaske and John N. King have led scholars to treat the complexity of Spenser’s theological positions cautiously. But both the dedicatee of the work and the figures that Spenser commemorates in the course of the poem all bore clear Calvinist sympathies. Calvinist discourses indeed display particular affinity for the term “unthankfulness,” due to Calvin’s own conception of the intimate tie between ingratitude and sin. The term is widely attested in English translations of Calvin’s works. Mary Sidney Herbert, a learned translator and poet, would not have needed to

155 The 1561 edition of _The institution of Christian religion_ contains 47 attestations and the 1584 _A harmonie vpon the three Euangelists_ contains 94. Arthur Golding’s translations of Calvin’s sermons are literally studded with the term. His 1574 translation of the sermons on Job features 117, the 1577 edition of sermons on Ephesians features 38, and his 1583 edition of sermons on Deuteronomy, published with a preface of “ministers of the church of Geneva,” contains 220. Golding was a familiar of the Dudley-Sidney circle, and posthumously completed Philip Sidney’s translation of Philippe de Mornay’s _A Worke concerning the Trewnesse of the Christian Religion_ (1604). His particular affinity for the term may have influenced its popularity, as it appears frequently in his translation of the Danish Lutheran Niels Hemmingsen’s _A Postill, or, Exposition of the Gospels that are usually red in the churches of God, vpon the Sundayses and feast dayes of Saintes_ (1569) as well. While these texts often invoke “unthankfulness” as a sin afflicting all humanity, they stress its particular association with the ancient Jews and especially with regard to their failure to recognize and accept Christ. The 1584 translation of Calvin’s _Harmonie_ refers to the Jews as a “nation which was now miserably decayed, deserved through their vnthankfulness rather twice to perish for dispising the grace offered” (gloss on Matthew 10:1). He then glosses Matthew 11:20 in the context of Luke 10:13 as highlighting Christ’s frustration when “co[n]sidering their vnthankfulnes amo[n]gst whom he had laboured as a prophet long time, & had wrought manye miracles, and they not profiting thereby.” Perhaps the most emphatic among many other similar statements in Calvin’s _Harmonie_ can be found in his gloss to Matthew 14:34, where he emphasizes that “the glory of
read Calvin’s works in translation, nor would most of the members of her circle. But they all would certainly have been familiar with the prominent place of “unthankfullnesse” in Calvinist rhetoric from its attestation in vernacular sermons and theological discussions.

Spenser was not alone in employing “unthankfullnesse” to commemorate a member of the Sidney circle. The opening prose piece in *The phoenix nest* (1593), an important late Elizabethan poetic miscellany, entitled “The dead mans Right,” condemns the posthumous libels against Sidney’s maternal uncle, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and closes with the supplication: “Beseeching God this Realme feele not the want of him alreadie dead, and greater iudgements insue for our vnthankfulness.” Three elegies to Sidney follow. Commemorating the same Calvinist-leaning uncle and nephew as Spenser’s poem, this text attributes Leicester’s death itself to collective “unthankfullnesse” and ominously suggests that England may yet incur “greater judgements.” According to this logic, “unthankfullnesse” threatens the lives of national heroes and leaders, and along with them England as a whole.

John Jewel’s *Second Tome of Homilees* (1563) contains what is perhaps the most far reaching and influential Elizabethan iteration of the “unthankfullnesse” tradition. Its “Homilee for the dayes of rogation weeke, in three parts” was marshaled to bolster the Elizabethan settlement a decade after its institution at the outset of Elizabeth’s reign. In

---

156 *The phoenix nest* Built vp with the most rare and refined workes of noble men, worthy knights, gallant gentlemen, masters of arts, and braue schollers. (1593) A.7.
1569, the year in which Spenser left London for Cambridge, Catholic nobles in the north of England and in Ireland rebelled. After both the “Northern” and “Desmond” uprisings were defeated, Pius V responded with the papal bull, *Regnans in Excelsis* (1570), which declared Elizabeth a pretender and a heretic in an attempt to encourage further Catholic opposition. Elizabeth’s attempt to create an inclusive Protestant church, headed by a Protestant monarch, was under attack. Elizabeth’s clergy attempted to shore up their authority and impose general conformity, while maintaining the inclusiveness that William Laud would destroy in the next century with disastrous national results.

Rogationtide observances offered an obvious site of contest.

Rogation rituals had occupied a central place in the ritual calendar, particularly in rural parishes, since the medieval period. These observances marked the three days preceding Ascension Day, which celebrates the risen Christ’s heavenly installation. Eamon Duffy calls these rites “with the exception of the annual Easter communion, the most explicitly parochial ritual events of the year.” Yet their forms were difficult to assimilate to Protestant principles. Rogation observances were dominated by processionals wherein priests in ceremonial garb would lead parishioners to “beat the bounds” of their parishes, circumnavigating local borders with crucifixes and Eucharistic hosts, banners, and hand bells. While Edward had effectively abolished these rites, Mary had actively promoted their revival. Elizabeth’s stance was characteristically more moderate. Her 1559 *Injunctions for Religion* retains them while restricting their ritual accoutrements, stressing instead the recitation of Psalms and expressions of thanksgiving “to God in beholding of God’s benefits for the increase and abundance of his fruits upon

---

the face of the earth.”

But according to Duffy, a large contingent of the clergy continued to wear a surplice, that persistent sartorial site of religious controversy, throughout the 1560s and 1570s. As the threats to Elizabeth’s regime emanated from the rural periphery, and as attachments to Romanist traditions were often strongest in rural parishes, Elizabeth’s bishops renewed their attention to Rogation customs, which struck many of them as vestiges of an idolatrous form of prophylactic magic.

The “Homilee for the days of rogation weeke, in three parts” suggests the growing role of London in national rhetoric at a juncture in which resistance to the centralization of national political and religious institutions in England’s rapidly expanding capital emanated from the rural periphery of the realm. Like many of the addresses included in the Seconde Tome of Homilees it was likely authored by Jewel himself. First published anonymously in 1562, and then in Jewel’s addendum to Cranmer’s Book of Homilees, it was reissued in 1570 and 1571 in response to the reinvigorated Romanist threat. In 1569 and 1571, edicts were issued to reinforce the restrictions by prelates of Salisbury, York, and Lincoln. Yet London’s near monopoly on print ensured that these edicts bore the name of the capital, attesting to the city’s position as the doctrinal well-spring of the nation.

159 Ibid. 589.
160 Efforts to reform Rogation observances date back to Richard Taverner’s 1540 sermon, which railed against “those uplandish processions and gangynges about, which be spent in ryotying and in belychere,” during which “the banners and badges of the crosse be so unreverently handled and abused, that it is merveyle God destroye us not all in one daye.” Epistles and Gospelles wwyth a brief Postill...from Easter tyll Advent, 1540. For a discussion of Edwardian repression of these rituals and Marian restoration efforts, see Ronald Hutton’s The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year 1400-1700 New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. Rogation is addressed in Elizabeth’s 1559 Injunctions for Religion, nos. 18 and 19. Tudor Royal Proclamations, ed. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin. New Haven: Yale UP, 1969 II no. 460. For the attempts to institute Elizabeth’s restrictions at this particular historical juncture, see John Jewel’s Inunctions giuen by the Reuerend Father in Christ John by Gods prouidence, Bishop of Sarisburie (1569); Edmund Grindal’s Inunctions giuen by the most reuerende father in Christ, Edmonde by the
While the first part of the “Homilee” employs Jerusalem’s unthankful urban citizens as an exemplum for early modern English parishioners clinging to Romanism, the third part invokes Christ’s prophecy from Luke to amplify the analogy and add a more acute pedagogical threat. The first day’s segment warns parishioners that the “ende of suche as draweth nygh to God by knowledge, and yet depart from him in vnthankfulnes” can be nothing other than “vtter destruction.”\textsuperscript{161} It invokes the precedent of the “Jewes whiche were Gods elect people,” explaining that since Christ “was not receaued in their heartes by fayth, nor thanked for his benefites bestowed vpon them, their vnthankfulnes was the cause of their destruction.”\textsuperscript{162} The third part of the homily, intended to close Rogationtide, places England explicitly in the position of Jerusalem in Luke 19. It adjures the English to “ponder the tyme of Gods mercifull visitation, which is shewed thee from day to day, & yet wylt not regarde it….“\textsuperscript{163} Having introduced the term “unthankefullnesse” in the opening part of the homily and “visitation” in the third, the text proceeds to link them in a paraphrase of Luke 19. Refusal to “regarde” a divine visitation underscores both the moral and epistemological aspects of Israel’s folly. Just as Christ opens his lament, “O if thou haddest even the[n] knowē at the least in this thy day those things which belong vnto thy peace” (19:42), so the homily continues: “If thou knewest what may fal vpon thee for thine vnthankfulnesse, thou wouldest prouide for thy peace.”\textsuperscript{164}

\textsuperscript{161} The seconde tome of homelyes of such matters as were promised and intituled in the former part of homelyes. (1563) 436.
\textsuperscript{162} Ibid. 437.
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid. 464.
\textsuperscript{164} 464.
This three part homily directs parishioners toward an urban image of destruction. As parishioners prepared to reenact the historical confirmation of Christ’s divinity, these addresses thrust them into that earlier episode in the biblical narrative when he pronounces Jerusalem’s doom. Situated in the position of Jerusalem’s unthankful citizens, English worshippers faced an analogous sentence. Yet their calendar did not provide an occasion for reenacting Jerusalem’s destruction. For them, the sentence remained deferred. This homily in three segments thus confronts participants in the liturgical reenactment of an annual narrative cycle with the opportunity to repent their own “unthankfulness” for the benefits of the Elizabethan settlement. Instead of illustrating Christ’s heavenly apotheosis, it gestures to the urban frame of Christ’s prophecy in Luke and its fulfillment four decades later. Its pedagogy emphasizes transgression and retribution over the redemptive atonement of Christ’s sacrifice and the transcendence of mortality demonstrated by his ascension. Rural parishioners had previously focused their ritual observance of Christ’s resurrection and ascension on the topographies of local parishes, expressing hopes for a prosperous agricultural cycle and for their ultimate ascent from the environs in which they labored and lived to a heavenly afterlife. Elizabethan observances maintain the former focus. Yet they de-emphasize the vertical trajectory from parish to heaven in favor of reinforcing the national imperative of loyal affiliation with religious and political institutions centralized in urban London as the only avenue to avoid the calamity represented in the emblem of a doomed and degraded ancient capital.

As unprecedented percentages of local populations in this period visited London, some residing there temporarily, increasing numbers of rural parishioners gained
familiarity with London and shared their experiences with their local communities. The analogy between England and Jerusalem would have gained affective power from the increased availability of these images of urban life. Linking early modern England with biblical Israel through Jerusalem’s “unthankfulness,” these texts attempt to unify Elizabethan subjects in a national-religious community increasingly dominated by its own capital city.

Spenser’s invocation of “unthankfulness” in his dedication of *The Ruines of Time* positions his poem to respond to this well-established tradition. Its ubiquity and surprising durability through the radical political and religious alternations that mark the Tudor period suggest that by the time Spenser composed his poem, the term “unthankfulness” in and of itself had acquired the capacity to suggest Jerusalem’s folly, Christ’s prophecy of its destruction, and its fulfillment by Rome. In a sense, “unthankfulness” began to function comparably to Jean Leclerq’s concept of “hook words” that metonymically suggested entire scriptural passages to monastic readers and audiences. In a study of the hermeneutic culture of medieval monasteries, Leclerq describes how “[v]erbal echoes so excite the memory that a mere allusion will spontaneously evoke whole quotations and, in turn, a scriptural phrase will suggest, quite naturally, allusions elsewhere in sacred books.”

He compares such terms to hooks that catch “hold of one or several others which become linked together and make up the fabric….” These “‘hook-words,’ group themselves together…like variations on the same theme.” Frequent attestations of “unthankfulness” in close proximity to “visitation,” or in conjunction with iconography recalling Lamentations, as in *The Ruines of Time*, make up such a fabric. Leclerq’s description of how these “hook-words” operated in the

---

relatively elite and ideologically regimented environments of medieval monasteries suggests an even more dynamic function for terms like “unthankfulnesse” in more popular and less controlled hermeneutic contexts, such as the audiences of St Paul’s churchyard and the consumers of its printed wares where William Ponsonby sought to attract buyers for Spenser’s *Complaints.*

Christ’s prophecy in Luke 19 provided Elizabethans a text through which they negotiated the potentially conflicting affiliations with a visible national English church and an immaterial transnational Protestant church. It anticipates a reciprocal doom between a king and his city that releases both of them from the temporal bonds of history. The dismemberments of Christ’s flesh and of Jerusalem’s stones represent a symmetrical parturitive violence, yet one that never quite dispenses with the materiality of either figure. When Jerusalem’s citizens fail—or refuse—to recognize their king, their human citizens forfeit their identity, which is transferred to the city’s stones that Christ invests with the capacity to acclaim him. But this represents only a preliminary to Jerusalem’s release from its material context four decades later. Just as the spiritual king is disincarnated by a process that sees his skin rent, his hands and feet nailed, his side pierced, and then ascends to heaven; so the dismantling of Jerusalem’s stones disincarnates its privilege and enables the imagination of the spiritual Jerusalem.

Subsequent texts reveal a vacillation between material and spiritual Jerusalems. The Epistle to the Galatians invokes a Jerusalem “which is aboue” and declares it “the mother of vs all,” a heavenly metropolis (4:26). Hebrews declares that “here haue we no

---

166 While the more controlled environment of the monastery may have enabled these “hook words” by concentrating the monks around a limited body of texts, the more diverse environments in which early modern Protestants heard and read homilies and pamphlets may have enabled more extravagant textual links.
continuing citie: but we seke one to come” (13:14) at the end of history. Revelation presents a more complex Jerusalem when it urges readers toward a heavenly city that represents both individual salvation, as in Galatians, and the consummation of history itself, as in Hebrews, which will descend to earth to crown its finale and potentially reincarnate in a perfected material state. Augustine stresses a spiritual civitas over any material urbs as an apology for the sack of Christian Rome in his Civita dei. John Bale employs Augustine’s model of a godly civitas to articulate his conception of an invisible and transnational true church in his Image of Both Churches (1547). Yet Christianity’s founding narrative, vividly set in an historical Jerusalem, feeds a potentially irreducible desire for visible contact with the sacred. Iconoclastic theologians may seek to disembody Jerusalem, but just as they never fully dispense with the physical image of Christ, the urban image of Jerusalem continues to inspire believers. The desire to reconcretize God’s city on earth resists repression. Efforts to sever privilege from place, to make it available to all believers everywhere and at all times, inadvertently facilitate the aspirations of particular communities to re-embody the sacred in their own societies.

Christ’s prophecy sets these vacillations between material and spiritual communities in motion and constitutes the scriptural moment that enables imagination of both. It may seem to invite an attitude of contemptus mundi, but Christ’s tears infuse his prophecy with tragedy and grief. His grief mitigates any sense of unambiguous triumph and/or exuberant vengeance. It emphasizes the loss that inheres in the elevations of king and city from the temporal to the spiritual realm. As such, the “unthankefullnesse” tradition, whether explicitly invoking Luke 19, allusively triggering it through subtle paraphrase, or simply triggering an association as a “hook word,” serves both the
nationally oriented pedagogy of the Elizabethan church and the transnational pedagogy of an invisible and true Protestant church.

If early texts in this tradition measure the “unthankefullnesse” of London and England as equal to Jerusalem’s, Elizabethan iterations often assert that England has surpassed its predecessor in both benefit and culpability to imply a more peculiar relationship between the two capitals. A 1585 sermon Edwin Sandys delivered at St Paul’s Cross invokes the “great vnthankfulnesse” of Jerusalem and relates how God cast its citizens into “exile and miserable bondage, he burnt vp their holie citie, he destroied their glorious temple, he left them to be deuoured….“167 The threat in his exemplum does not reside in mere equivalence. Though God “hath visited [the English] in mercie as he visited them,” he suggests that his audience and readers “haue tasted perhaps more abundantly of his goodnes than euer they did.”168 England’s “benefittes…doe at the least equall theirs, so their vnthankfulnesse is much behinde” England’s.169 Thomas Cooper’s 1589 response to the anti-Ecclesiastical Martin Marprelate pamphlets on behalf of his fellow bishops likewise warns that God’s benefits to the Israelites and Iewes were neuer greater, then they now these many yeeres haue bene toward vs: they were neuer more earnestl, eyther by Gods blessings allured, or by preaching called to repentance then we haue bene. And yet our vnthankefulnesse, in some respectes is greater then theirs.170

168 Ibid. p. 310.
169 Ibid. p. 310.
170 *An admonition to the people of England wherein are answered, not onely the slaunderous vntruethes, reprochfully yttered by Martin the libeler, but also many other crimes by some of his broode.* (1589). (2011) 3.
Surpassing Jerusalem’s “unthankefullnesse” suggests a more peculiar relationship than the one implied in the invocation of a general paradigm. These texts thus amplify a comparative trope that promotes the imagination of early modern London’s unique opportunity to correct Jerusalem’s failure.

* * * * *

_Sidney’s funeral: from elite patronage to popular recognition_

Preachers and pamphleteers address early modern England as Christ addresses Jerusalem in Luke 19 to interpellate Protestant English subjects with a cautionary threat, but Spenser’s poet-speaker imagines London as already having successfully negotiated this juncture, thus surpassing its predecessor. Verlame’s complaint provides a premise that enables the poet-speaker’s revision. She links the historical status of nations to reciprocal obligations between poets and aristocratic patrons, asserting the responsibility of poets to eternize aristocratic national heroes and the corresponding imperative of aristocratic patrons to support them. As these relationships depend upon mutual recognition and gratitude, “unthankefullnesse” threatens both poets’ and aristocrats’ performance of their obligations. If poets and their aristocratic patrons fail to perform these obligations, they ensure the nation’s historical effacement, endangering England’s present and future place in history. But Verlame’s own experience as the genius of an effaced city suggests that even performance of these obligations will not forestall the power of time to reduce all things to ruin. When Verlame Christologizes Sidney’s death as a “sacrifice,” she intimates a solution that she cannot quite grasp. She misses the historiographic significance of the monarchies from Daniel and bewails their passing as evidence of irreducible ephemerality failing to recognize their significance as elements of a prophecy.
that describes a providentially ordained teleological trajectory of history. In both cases, she cannot see the way forward. As Israel’s “unthankesfullnesse” binds epistemological failure to moral folly, England must establish its moral superiority and attendant historical worthiness by performing its epistemological aptitude. The poet-speaker demonstrates this aptitude by extending the logic of Verlame’s Christological depiction of Sidney’s death to his spectacular London funeral in the poem’s closing pageant, placing the production of both poetry and national significance in the hands of a more popular constituency.

When Verlame contrasts the posthumous treatments of Leicester and Sidney, she underscores the unreliability of the aristocratic patron-poet economy to produce national-historical privilege. She describes Leicester as “[a] mightie Prince, of most renowned race,” who had held such a lofty position in life that the “greatest ones did serue to gaine his grace” (184, 186). Her affirmation of his “race” responds to the stigma that the Dudleys still bore to some extent for being of relatively recent nobility. Yet Leicester’s status depended less upon his birth than on the uniquely intimate bond he shared with his queen: “Of greatest ones he greatest in his place, / Sate in the bosome of his Soueraine, / And Right and loyall did his worde maintaine” (187-9). The italics emphasize his fidelity, called into question by his enemies, who sought to extend the shadow of Leicester’s grandfather’s, father’s, and brother’s executions for treason to the earl who played a central role in confronting the threat of the Armada just prior to his death. Verlame then laments that despite his status, character, and generous patronage, Leicester’s detractors went largely unanswered at his death.
I saw him die, I saw him die, as one
Of the meane people, and brought foorth on beare,
I saw him die, and no man left to mone
His dolefull fate, that late him loued deare:
Scarse anie left to close his eylids neare;
Scarse anie left vpon his lips to laie
The sacred sod, or Requiem to saie. (190-6)

The dearth of public recognition and private attention at Leicester’s death, like Verlame’s own effacement, prompts her to decry the “trustlesse state of miserable men, / That builde your blis on hope of earthly thing” (197-8) and declare that “[a]ll is but fained” and “after death all friendship doth decaie” (204, 207). Leicester’s efforts on behalf of queen and country earned him no public affection. Nor did those poets whom he supported make sufficient efforts to “avoide that fowle blot of unthankefullnesse,” a situation that the anonymous author of “The dead man’s Right,” the prose tract that opens The phoenix nest, suggests leaves England vulnerable to “greater judgements.”

If Leicester’s death failed to prompt an appropriate response, Sidney’s demise occasioned a multi-faceted campaign to mythologize him into a national Protestant hero, an effort in which both Verlame and Spenser’s poet-speaker participate. Their attitudes toward Sidney are both Christological, though with a subtle difference regarding the balance of temporal and spiritual concerns. Verlame attributes Sidney’s early death to his piety:

His blessed spirite full of power diuine
And influence of all celestiall grace,
Loathing this sinfull earth and earthlie slime,
Fled backe too soone vnto his natiue place. (288-291)

Yet before fleeing from Earth to heaven, he devised

Vnto his heauenlie maker to present
His bodie, as a spotles sacrifice;
And chose, that guilte hands of enemies
Should powre forth th' offring of his guiltles blood:

So life exchanging for his countries good. (297-301)

Verlame alludes here to the story of how Sidney gave his thigh armor to a soldier at the outset of the battle of Zutphen in Flanders, which led to him incurring his fatal wound. She turns this act of generosity, or perhaps cavalier over-confidence, into a “sacrifice” akin to Christ’s, his “spotless” body and “guiltles blood” spilled by the “guilte hands of enemies” as an “offring” on behalf of his “countries good.” In *Chosen Peoples* (2003), Anthony D. Smith’s study of the relationship between religion and nationalism, Smith analyzes the “role of patriot-heroes and prophets in inspiring and mobilizing ‘the people,’” emphasizing “the readiness of heroes and prophets alike to sacrifice themselves for the community” not as “an act of noble renunciation” but “on the contrary, a fervent affirmation of life and love for the community to which they belong and which they cherish.” Though Smith focuses on later phenomena, Sidney’s death as related by Verlame corresponds to this pattern. Initially depicted as a pious renunciation of “sinfull earth and earthlie slime,” it becomes a national sacrifice, a voluntary transactional exchange of his single life for national benefit.

---

When Verlame depicts Sidney’s death as a Christological sacrifice on behalf of a particular country, she inverts the historical logic of the narrative that links the crucifixion to Jerusalem’s destruction. Christ offers himself as a sacrifice on behalf of his believers, not his country, which betrays him and faces calamity instead of benefit. Jerusalem’s unthankful misrecognition and rejection of Christ occasions the city’s destruction, God’s repudiation of his nation, and the extension of its election to a transnational community of faith. Verlame positions Sidney at the center of two matrices: devotion to the world and to heaven, and devotion to a national community and a transnational faith community. His advocacy of a more activist English foreign policy on behalf of continental Protestants, and his death in pursuit of that mission, both pious and patriotic, enables this positioning. Sidney’s ability to inhabit this space between temporal and spiritual commitments, and between national and transnational affiliations, bolsters his resemblance to Christ, who was both human and divine, both King of the Jews and savior of his transnational community of believers. Yet Verlame reveals her excessive attachment to temporal and geographic particularity when she describes his heroic death as “exchanging life for his countries good,” as opposed to Protestant truth. She bids the fallen Sidney live in heaven “euer blessed, / The worlds late wonder, and the heauens new ioy, / Liue euer there, and leaue me here distressed / With mortall cares, and cumbrous worlds anoy” (302-5), and pleads: “[b]id me, ô bid me quicklie come to thee, / That happie there I maie thee alwaies see” (307-8). Yet the riddle of what prevents her from ascending after him remains. Why does she remain encumbered with “mortall cares” and “worlds anoy” when her city lies long-buried in antiquity?
Verlame’s treatment of Sidney’s death completes an arc that demonstrates her epistemological inadequacy, which the poet-speaker extends toward mature fulfillment. Her treatment of Daniel’s monarchies reveals an incomplete understanding of providential history and her omission of St. Alban from her own history, despite her praise of Camden’s work, reveals her misapprehension of her own religious significance. These incomplete apprehensions align her with Jerusalem, the capital and symbol of a nation that received divine revelation but failed to recognize its fulfillment. Indeed, her attachment to material phenomena, even those that have long since passed, also echoes a classic Augustinian critique of Israel. In his Tractatus adversos Judaeos, Augustine glosses 1 Corinthians 10:18: “Behold Israel according to the flesh. This we know to be carnal Israel; but the Jews do not grasp this meaning and as a result they prove themselves indisputably carnal.” Augustine thus links Israel’s excessive attachment to its particular ethnic or national election to its hermeneutic and epistemological emphasis of flesh over spirit. One possible answer to why Verlame remains on the banks of the Thames is that her own quasi-Jewish epistemological inadequacy, with its attendant attachment to temporal and material particularities, prevents her from ascending after Sidney, despite the fact that her time has passed. Instead, she lingers to complain to a poet wandering out from London about poets and aristocrats failing their national-historical obligations. Considered from the perspective of modernity, Verlame’s problem is that she is either too archaic or too modern. Her aristocratic orientation and neglect of anything but a passive popular role in the production of national-historical significance appears distinctly archaic. Yet her attachment to a particular place and people both recalls Israel’s carnality and anticipates modern nationalist employments of religious
forms of self-sacrificing heroes. In his discussion of nationalist cults of self-sacrificing heroes, Smith notes that “in the religious heritage, text and image were more important than place” (222). If Christ’s narrative culminates in the dissolution of a particular people’s significance and that of its geographic context, a logic central to foundational theologians such as Paul and Augustine as well as early modern reformers including Bale and Foxe, nationalism reasserts the importance of a particular people and place. Verlame depicts Sidney as either an archaically carnal or proto-modern national figure of particular national significance who has ascended to heaven after service to his country. Though she employs Christological terms to express his “sacrifice,” she seems not to grasp their broader significance.

The poet-speaker responds to Verlame’s complaint by composing two “tragick pageants” (309), the first of which eternizes great monuments of ancient civilizations, the second of which focuses on Sidney’s triumphant apotheosis with allusions to a funeral event that was widely attended and publicized. While the first pageant seems to embrace Verlame’s advocacy of the eternizing properties of poetry, at its close a mysterious voice reminds the poet-speaker that “all is vanitie and griefe of minde, / Ne other comfort in this world can be, / But hope of heauen, and heart to God inclined” (583-5). Where Verlame falls into despair, this voice urges the poet-speaker to take consolation in “hope of heaven.” Instead of closing here and fully embracing an attitude of contemptus mundi, a total disregard of the world, it bids the speaker look across the river to “other sights” (588), and the opening of the final pageant devoted to Sidney.

Sidney’s pageant expresses his virtues and deeds through six emblems that defy any clear narrative sequence, five of which are installed in heaven. It opens with a swan,
who sings “the prophecie / Of his owne death” (594-5), a conventional image that acquires particular resonance given Verlame’s prior depiction of Sidney’s self-sacrifice. The swan is followed by an orphic harp, representing Sidney’s immortal poetic gifts. Following the harp, a “Coffer made of Heben wood” (618) represents Sidney’s coffin, carried off by two angels. Next comes a bridal bed with a sleeping virgin. In an allusion to Song of Songs, a biblical text with a long history of eschatological and apocalyptic interpretations, the speaker-poet hears “a voyce that called farre away / And her awaking bad her quickly dight, / For lo her Bridegrome was in readie ray / To come to her, and seeke her loues delight” (638-641).  Yet consummation is abruptly forestalled when “suddainly both bed and all was gone” (643). The pageant closes with a mortally wounded knight that imagines Sidney’s heroic demise and a second allusion to his funeral in an “Arke of purest golde…Which th’ ashes seem’d of some great Prince to hold” (660, 662). In this final emblem, the poet-speaker echoes Verlame’s description of Sidney as “[t]he worlds late wonder, and the heauens new ioy,” (303) calling Sidney “him, whom all the world did glorifie” and musing that “[s]eemed the heauens with the earth did disagree, / Whether should of those ashes keeper bee” (663-5).

The poet-speaker’s pageant is less overtly Christological than Verlame’s elegy for Sidney, but it gains significance when read as a direct response that extends the logic of the prior section. Despite the emblematic structure of the pageant, its allusions to his funeral and the image of the knight depict Sidney as more distinctly historical than does

172 Compare with “It is the voyce of my welbeloued: beholde, hee commeth leaping by the mountaines, and skipping by the hilles…. My welbeloued spake and said vnto me, Arise, my loue, my faire one, and come thy way” and the interchange “I am come into my garden, my sister, my spouse…. it is the voyce of my welbeloued that knocketh, saying, Open vnto mee, my sister, my loue, my doue, my vndefiled…. ” (Song of Songs 2:8, 10; 5:1,2).
Verlame’s elegy, yet he remains an extension of her rendering of him as an *imitatio Christi*. Like Christ, who was both divine and human, Sidney represents competing claims of heaven and earth on mortal beings, each side claiming custodianship of his remains. This explains, to some extent, the ambiguous bridal bed and the enigmatic interruption of marital consummation between the virgin and bridegroom. It echoes interpretations of the lovers in Song of Songs as representations of Christ and his church, wherein consummation suggests apocalyptic closure. Just as the contest over Sidney’s remains maintains his historical presence to some degree, so the emblem of the bridal bed impedes his transformation into an apocalyptic emblem that forecloses historical and national possibility.

The allusions to Sidney’s funeral play a crucial role in the poet-speaker’s response to Verlame and the poem’s endeavor to avoid “unthankefullnesse.” Spenser, of course, was not present at that spectacular event, as it took place during his extended service in Ireland. Spenser crafted the poet-speaker’s pageant to extend opportunities to participate in the event. Five of the six emblems employ the lyric ‘I’ to engage readers in visualizing images of a man and a funeral event that both belong in the past. Emblems 2, 3, 4, and 6 are introduced with “I saw,” while emblem 2 contains an additional “I looked” and emblem 3 includes an additional “looking aside.” Emblem 5 opens with “Still as I gazed, I beheld.” The pageant does not depict any spectators, the funeral’s massive attendance being common knowledge. Instead, it creates its readers as spectators to join in revering “him, whom all the world did glorifie.” Though this turn of phrase may evoke the widespread adoration of Christ in early modern Europe, it does not correspond to Christ’s level of recognition at his death by his countrymen. Where Jerusalem rejected and
disregarded Christ, London celebrated his reflection in Sidney, an act of recognition and gratitude that Spenser’s text continues to promote. Spenser thus employs Verlame to establish Sidney’s *imitatio Christi* and the poet-speaker’s pageant to demonstrate London’s epistemological superiority over Jerusalem. Accordingly, the pageant employs Sidney to transform London into a launching pad for “heauenlie signe[s],” a specific geographical point of contact between earth and heaven. Where Verlame despairs of the world, because her perspective depends too much upon it, the poet-speaker minds the voice that directs him toward “hope of heaven” and, through Sidney and the popular recognition he received, envisions a productive role for London in providential history. His response broadens Verlame’s paradigm, enshrining London’s popular recognition of Sidney, which stands in contrast to Jerusalem’s failure to apprehend and celebrate Christ.

When Spenser employs terms and images drawn from popular civic pageantry, he situates London as superior to Jerusalem. In addition to spectacular aristocratic funerals, early modern London was known for elaborate pageants marking royal entries and annual Lord Mayor’s shows. According to David M. Bergeron:

> Typically, the honored person was met outside the city, perhaps by the mayor or aldermen, escorted into the city by them, given a purse of money (or some other gift) and a speech by the Recorder; and in the ones that qualify to be designated pageants, dramatic tableaux occurred at various points in the city.¹⁷³

Indeed, Luke 19, which represented the epitome of “unthankefullnesse,” can be read as a failed royal entry. As Christ approaches Jerusalem, his disciples spred their clothes in the way. And when he was nowe come neere to the going downe of the mount of Oliues, the whole multitude of the disciples began to

reioyce, and to prayse God with a loude voyce, for all the great workes that they
had seene, Saying, Blessed be the King that commeth in the Name of the Lord:
peace in heauen, and glory in the highest places. (19:36-8)

Mark 11, Matthew 21, and John 12 all describe Christ’s entry into Jerusalem as
celebrated by crowds of citizens with palm fronds. But in Luke, the disciples’
proclamation of Christ’s kingship is interrupted by Pharisees, leading Christ to weep and
prophesy the city’s destruction. At the close of his prophecy, he proceeds directly to the
conflict with the money changers in the Temple. He is not greeted by Mayor or
aldermen, given no welcoming gift, nor is he celebrated with an official speech and
dramatic performances. By contrast, London not only recognized and celebrated the slain
Sidney, it had at its disposal well practiced mechanisms to perform recognition of
royalty. Spenser’s rendering of Sidney’s apotheosis through emblems that allude to his
famous funeral also evoke the tableaux associated with such celebratory pageants.

London’s pageants, even when directed toward the aristocracy, presented
opportunities for qualified expression of popular will and agency. Richard Mulcaster,
Spenser’s schoolmaster at the Merchant Taylors’ School, famously staged Elizabeth’s
coronation pageant. Though Spenser was undoubtedly too young to have participated,
Mulcaster published a famous account of the event that Spenser would have known.
Furthermore, Bergeron claims that this event “epitomizes characteristics to be found in
all royal entries,” later instances of which Spenser surely witnessed in his childhood.
Given his school and schoolmaster, it seems likely that he participated in several of them.
Regardless, Mulcaster’s account of Elizabeth’s entry remains the most studied. Far from
a simple communal performance of an oath of allegiance to a new sovereign, the
interchanges between performers, spectators, and queen at each station as she progressed through the city entailed a great deal of reciprocity. As Clifford Geertz notes: “The symbolism of the progress was...admonitory and covenantal: the subjects warned, and the Queen promised.” The popular subjectivity represented here is active, not passive, with the people performing both acceptance of the monarch’s authority and instructing her on the functions she must perform in order to promote a virtuous and prosperous commonwealth. Accordingly, such occasions both reinforced social hierarchies and structured opportunities for the expression of popular will and values, which to some extent bound elites. Jerusalem as depicted in Luke lacks precisely this active popular subjectivity, and this lack dooms the ancient city and nation.

The poet-speaker’s allusions to the popular recognition of Sidney’s *imitatio Christi* counter Verlame’s emphasis on the elite context of patron-poet relations. It projects London beyond the “unthankefulness” that doomed Jerusalem, while forestalling the apocalyptic closure that should accompany establishment of Christ’s kingship through the emblem of the disrupted bridal bed. This move also suggests a turn to a popular economy for the poetic production of national-historical significance, particularly given the context of Ponsonby’s publication of the *Complaints*, rooting it in popular apprehension and commercial consumption. Where Verlame’s aristocratic economy promotes a national pedagogy that positions the people as passive, the poet-speaker’s response suggests a more active popular component. In Verlame’s scheme, the people imbibe elegies generated by the relationships between aristocrats and poets, verses that focus them on aristocratic representatives of national significance. When we read
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Spenser’s poem as a response to Jerusalem’s “unthankefullnesse” and attend to the poet-speaker’s allusions to Sidney’s London funeral, an implicit alternative arises. The eternizing treatment that Sidney received sprang from popular recognition inspired by national-religious piety, not private patronage relations based on self-interest. Sidney’s posthumous cult depended more on his heroic Protestant conduct than on his birth and station. Like Spenser’s Redcrosse Knight, the figure of Sidney engages both aristocratic and popular discourses of English nationhood and mediates between national and transnational imperatives to secure England’s role in salvation history as a source of “signe[s] of victoree.”

When Spenser moves from concentrating on aristocratic sources of patronage to more popular possibilities for both support and audience, conceptual and biographical contexts converge. As he wrestles with the historiographic conundrum engendered by both biblical and humanist models, and complicated by their interaction, he confronts the mortality of those figures he saw as his nation’s signal representatives. Returning to England after an extended absence, Spenser notes the demise of Sidney and other central members of his circle, whom he commemorates in this poem. His aging queen appears ever more dependent upon Lord Burleigh and his son, Robert Cecil, the Sidney circle’s primary political opponents. Spenser had hoped that his presentation of the first installment of *The Faerie Queene* would result in his installment as a court poet and advisor, similar to Ronsard’s role in the court of Charles IX in France earlier in the century. Elizabeth’s eventual overriding Burleigh’s resistance to grant Spenser an annuity of £50, though not the place at court he sought, demonstrates that Spenser vastly overestimated his queen’s eagerness to heed even her most trusted male advisors.
According to William Oram, Spenser had at this point “fulfilled the Virgilian promise of *The Shepheardes Calender* by producing an epic, gained the queen’s attention, and received what was surely the largest reward she was ever to give for a poem. Yet…Spenser saw his stay [in England] as a failure….”

Given that Spenser only received his annuity after Ponsonby’s publication of his *Complaints*, his frustration at having been rebuffed would have been at its height when he composed *The Ruines of Time*. Oram argues that “in 1589 Spenser saw the queen and her court as his audience; by 1591 he had begun to look elsewhere” (516). *The Ruines of Time* represents a pivotal moment in that search. In this context, Spenser employs Verlame to accuse “the unthankefullnesse” of poets, but also of the potential aristocratic patrons now dominating the scene. He sees the thankful ones passing away, enshrines them in an act of poetic gratitude and dedicates his poem to the female figure that remains at the center of their dwindling circle. After taking stock of the shift in the personnel and policies dominating at court and the disappointment of his own courtly ambitions, he broadens his primary target audience from an elite cohort to include a more popular context by recalling the popular thankfulness that London demonstrated at Sidney’s funeral. The resulting poem represents a response to his own situation, the predicament of English national poetry in general, and the threats to England’s national-historical possibility suggested by both neo-classical humanist historiography and the biblical paradigm represented by Jerusalem’s “fowle blot of unthankefullnesse.”

At the juncture in Spenser’s career when he conceived *The Ruines of Time*, he was discovering a new context for his poetic career. Though many of his previous benefactors had passed from the scene and his courtly aspirations had met with
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disappointment, his economic and occupational position in Ireland and his acquaintance with Walter Raleigh diminished his personal need for patronage. Finally, the commercial success of Ponsonby’s publication of the 1590 *Faerie Queene* suggested a new avenue of support and a wider, more nationally representative audience. Just as Spenser was beginning to find support through popular commercial avenues, he composes a poem that situates England’s national-historical significance as dependent upon popular recognition. Jerusalem’s popular epistemological failure is thus countered by London’s emergence as both a national stage for the performance of piety and as a center for producing and disseminating nationally-oriented Protestant English poetic texts.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

On April 29th, 2011, a coincidence of events on both sides of the Atlantic demonstrated how the parallel that early modern writers promoted between London and Jerusalem continues to shape the imagination of nationhood and its performance. Amid multiple wars, political upheavals, and economic uncertainty without precedent in more than a generation, an astonishing number of people across the globe turned their attention to Westminster for a wedding. No nuptial celebrations in history could boast of more spectators. The bridegroom was the man who is second in line to the throne of the United Kingdom; the bride was his former university flat mate, daughter of successful entrepreneurs and great-granddaughter of a Durham coal miner. The lavish pomp and pageantry, firmly rooted in Anglican ritual and traditional performances of the monarchy, was broadcast live by orbiting satellites to televisions, computers, and hand-held devices. It was therefore unprecedented in content and mode of publication, but its formal rituals were thoroughly archaic. As the bride entered Westminster Abbey, the choir sang an introit, or opening hymn. The song chosen for this occasion was Charles Hubert Hastings Parry’s Coronation Anthem, “I was glad,” traditionally used in services anointing British monarchs in this same church. Parry’s work updates an earlier version composed by Westminster native Henry Purcell for the 1685 coronation of James II, the text of which is drawn from Psalm 122:
I was glad when they said unto me: We will go into the house of the Lord.

Our feet shall stand in thy gates: O Jerusalem.

Jerusalem is builded as a city: that is at unity in itself. (1-3)

O pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee.

Peace be within thy walls: and plenteousness within thy palaces. (6-7)

Bracketing the service was another of Parry’s works, his setting of William Blake’s “Jerusalem,” which was sung as a closing hymn just prior to the closing blessing and the national anthem that prays for the salvation of the bridegroom’s grandmother. Here, in the borough that may have served as the template for Bernard Lens’ illustration of “The New Jerusalem” that appears in Richard Blome’s The History of the Old Testament (1688), the image with which I opened this dissertation, the wedding of a future English king was celebrated amid two choral invocations of Jerusalem. While these rituals may have employed dessicated and residual forms of national performance whose energy is largely spent, they nonetheless structured an even of massively popular national significance that was watched around the world.

On this same day, on the other side of the Atlantic, an influential right-wing media company called Citizens United premiered a polemical film entitled A City Upon A Hill: The Spirit of American Exceptionalism, narrated by former Speaker of the House of Representatives and presidential candidate Newt Gingrich. The title refers to Ronald Reagan’s signature vision of America as “a city upon a hill,” the central image of the speech he gave in accepting the 1984 Republican nomination for President. The president’s son, Michael Reagan, later published a book entitled The City on a Hill: Fulfilling Ronald Reagan's Vision for America (1997), which helped to cement the
association of this image with the man who has become the central touchstone for American conservatives. It would seem from these phenomena that the idea of Jerusalem still animates conservative conceptions of nationhood. However, Blake’s rhetorical question, “And was Jerusalem builded here, / Among these dark Satanic Mills?” reminds us that it has not always been a trope of the right. Indeed, Reagan ultimately took this image from a famous 1630 sermon by John Winthrop, founding Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Winthrop’s vision of New England as a city upon a hill, in a place that in 1630 boasted no settlements that could properly be called cities, draws upon the popular use of Jerusalem as a model for England in the decades prior to his crossing the Atlantic, a phenomenon driven by London’s emergence at the center of English national life. But his usage diverges from its biblical source. In the Sermon on the Mount, Christ reassures his dejected and persecuted followers, marginalized and impoverished on the northern periphery of their civilization, by declaring: “Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid” (Matt. 5:14). His consolation stresses civitas over urbs. Christ positions his addressees in the Galilean countryside as the sacred city of God, possessing the privilege of the true Jerusalem, as opposed to the metropolitan capital in the Judean Mountains with its Temple, walls, markets, and palaces. He assures them that though they may feel lowly and invisible, they will be proven more elevated and shining than the city that dominated their religious culture, political life, and that stands at the center of their national narrative. He thus urges them: “Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven”
Accordingly, it would make sense that Winthrop would employ this image to console religious refugees from the Stuart Church and its Archbishop William Laud, who had increased the authority of his episcopacy, demanded strict conformity, and driven dissenters across the Atlantic.

Taken out of context, Winthrop might be understood as instructing these colonists that they, and not London, the city at the center of England’s religious and political life, are the source of the world’s illumination. But Winthrop refracts this scriptural image through Elizabethan conventions that held Jerusalem up to London so that it functions as much as an imputation of responsibility as it does a transfer of privilege from a central city to a marginalized community:

Consider that wee shall be as a Citty upon a Hill, the eies of all people are upon us; soe that if wee shall deale falsely with our god in this worke wee have undertaken and soe cause him to withdrawe his present help from us, wee shall be made a story and a byword through the world, wee shall open the mouthes of enemies to speake evill of the wayes of god and all professours for Gods sake…

Visibility does not function here as a community’s apotheosis, as an ascription of privilege and an expression of favor. Rather, it is also a burden, an obligation that if failed will doom both the community and the mission that defines it. Winthrop’s city may falter, just as London and Jerusalem failed God and the demonstration of truth. His invocation of Matthew and its allusion to Jerusalem adheres to the Elizabethan hortatory traditions that stressed both the privileges and the hazards of their capital and the nation they organized around it.

---
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It was not Reagan, but John F. Kennedy who reintroduced Winthrop’s image of America as a city upon a hill into recent American political rhetoric. In a speech delivered to the Massachusetts General Court as President-elect, Kennedy drew a parallel between his own moment and that of Winthrop:

“We must always consider,” [Winthrop] said, “that we shall be as a city upon a hill—the eyes of all people are upon us.” Today the eyes of all people are truly upon us—and our governments, in every branch, at every level, national, state and local, must be as a city upon a hill—constructed and inhabited by men aware of their great trust and their great responsibilities. For we are setting out upon a voyage in 1961 no less hazardous than that undertaken by the Arbella in 1630. Kennedy then encapsulated the interweaving of favor and obligation by summing up:

“For of those to whom much is given, much is required.” Just as God had granted Jerusalem unique favor and held it to the highest standards, just as English writers in the sixteenth century had employed this model to imagine London and England, and just as Winthrop had charged his colonists with a warning of the costs of their failure to build an ideal community, so Kennedy faced the project of his cold war presidency in a similar fashion. In all these cases, exceptionalism appears, at least in part, as a duty to strive to be exceptional, not an unconditional prerogative and an a priori justification of national power.

Whereas Winthrop, his Elizabethan forebears, and the mid twentieth-century President from the commonwealth that grew out of Winthrop’s colony all seek to embrace the hazardous contingency faced by biblical Jerusalem, Reagan and his

---

followers have used his image to communicate a privilege that is inherent and accomplished, awaiting embrace and revival. In 1984, seeking reelection, Reagan declared: “Four years ago we raised a banner of bold colors—no pale pastels. We proclaimed a dream of an America that would be ‘a shining city on a hill.’” After reciting the core elements of his economic policies, Reagan claimed victory and willed America to continue pursuit of national power and material prosperity: “We bring to the American citizens in this election year a record of accomplishment and the promise of continuation. We came together in a national crusade to make America great again, and to make a new beginning. Well, now it’s all coming together.” In his farewell speech as President in 1989, Reagan invoked this image once again: “I’ve spoken of the shining city all my political life, but I don’t know if I ever quite communicated what I saw when I said it. But in my mind it was a tall proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, wind-swept, God-blessed….” The challenge Reagan imagines is the fulfillment of a special destiny, a privilege to be renewed time and again, not a challenge that must be met and might meet with failure. It is not Christ’s consolation of his marginalized disciples that he evokes, but an unambiguous claim of chauvinistic prerogative. Claimants to Reagan’s legacy follow this national vision.

In sixteenth-century England, the political world was not yet organized around modern nation states as we understand them. Romantic nationalisms with their conceptions of language, ethnicity, and popular sovereignty were not yet current. On the other hand, if those phenomena clearly belong to a later period, they did not emerge whole cloth out of nowhere and nothing. London’s emergence as England’s dominant
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city enabled a particularly potent form of national consciousness and an idea of national mission. London provided the stage for the expansion of literacy, engendered by the intertwined developments of print capitalism and the inculcation of a Protestant emphasis on unmediated vernacular encounters with the Bible. The texts that were printed and sold in St. Paul’s churchyard in the center of London register the excitement and anxieties that both attended and helped drive its rapid expansion. Developing rhetorical habits of addressing London through the figure of Jerusalem shaped English formulations of apocalyptic and millenarian historiographies, which in turn helped to define the general contours of what would eventually become recognizable to us as concepts of historical progress. As an important caveat, I would emphasize here that I do not see these dynamics as communicating a simplistic process of secularization. Indeed, in the aftermath of Britain’s empire, we can identify at least two particular international phenomena that remain influential: the Anglican Communion and the status of English as a dominant lingua franca. While the first is fundamentally religious, the second is decidedly secular. Nonetheless, the idea of national mission and the powerful iconography that drove it lie behind the national exceptionalisms that continue to shape national imaginations in English speaking states on both sides of the Atlantic.

Even as we critique nationalism, it continues to be a fundamental reality of our political world. Whether or not economic and cultural globalization will lead to a more transnational cosmopolitanism, a new reality with its own ethical and political challenges, remains undetermined. In the mean time, one might hope that that the legacy of the parallel of London and Jerusalem would offer us a range of options. An exceptionalism conceived as a duty to aspire to a more just polity that serves the world as an example
among others appeals more than one that asserts an inherent privilege and conceives other nations as obligated to follow. Both are certainly forms of elitism. The former, however, at least on its surface, appears ethical in that it entails an obligation to serve other nations by striving for exemplarity. But the question of whether it is possible to inoculate our national communities against anti-ethical chauvinism remains far from settled. We seem caught in the same contradiction in which we often place our children when we seek to imbue them with a sense of their absolute uniqueness and to encourage them to strive to excel, while simultaneously demanding that they be humble, that they understand that they are no better than anyone else. It is the same conflict writ large.

Nowhere does this conflict seem so clear as in the twin aims of political Zionism, the national ideology that restored national functions to contemporary Jerusalem in the wake of the British Empire’s fragmentation. For Zionism seeks to create an enfranchised Jewish nation as an am k’khol ha’amim and simultaneously an or l’goyim, a nation like all the nations and simultaneously a light to the nations. In the course of the last one hundred years, Zionism has also shaped Palestinian nationalism, which is no less focused on the same Jerusalem. Neither nationalism has brought its people peace or prosperity, but a series of ironies and perversities that perhaps can only be truly grasped when we consider that those who insist on Jerusalem as the eternal and undivided capital of one nation state have erected concrete walls between its neighborhoods and populations, while those who want to divide the city so that it may serve as the capital of two nation states want those same barriers torn down.

Yet Jerusalem continues to provide aspirational images for our current urbanized and nationalized form of modernity. The hymns that framed the royal wedding suggest
just such laudable aspirations. Psalm 122 describes a harmonious city from which justice is dispensed and where it is revered, a city where individual prosperity is tied to communitarian devotion. Blake’s lyrics look backward into the disappointments of history, but place Jerusalem as a future goal. They also posit Jerusalem as a model for a future balance between urban accomplishment and natural and rural fertility. Indeed, the plate from Blome’s text also participates in the vision of a city in harmonious juxtaposition with the country. Lense’s “New Jerusalem” frames London as a model of geometrical precision, without sterility. But instead of being hemmed in by the sprawl of the liberties and suburbs, its lines sit comfortably within the less regimented topography of a flowing countryside, setting human art and culture in an unprecedented easy relationship with nature. This, too, is the legacy of the iconography of Jerusalem. The Christian canon may begin with a garden and end with a city, but both Ezekiel and Revelation imagine a restored or renewed Jerusalem as a garden city. Whereas images of Jerusalem have not yet engendered just and harmonious communities, neither have they led to the balance between human endeavor and the natural world. But perhaps they can still point us to those aspirations as we look both backward into history and forward to push the limits of human possibility.
Bibliography


Bale, John, and Alexander Seton. *Yet a Course at the Romshe Foste*. Zurich, 1543.


Barker, John. *Of the Horyble and Woful Destruccyon of Ierusalem: and of the Sygnes and Tokens that Were Seene before It Was Destroied: Which Distruccion Was after*


Brinkelow, Henry. The Complaint of Roderyck Mors. Strasbourg, 1542.

---. The Lamentacion of a Christian, against the Citie of London Made by Roderigo Mors. Jericho [i.e. Bonn], 1542.


Carion, Johannes, and Johann Funck. The Thre Bokes of Cronicles, Whyche Iohn Carion (a Man Syngularly Well Sene in the Mathematycall Sciences) Gathered Wyth
Great Diligence of the Beste Authours that Haue Written in Hebrue, Greke or Latine. London, 1550.


Cooper, Thomas. An Admonition to the People of England: Wherein Are Answered, Not Onely the Slanderous Vntruethes, Reprochfully Uttered by Martin the Libeller, but Also Many Other Crimes by Some of His Broode, Objected Generally Against All Bishops, and the Chiefe of the Cleargie, Purposely to Deface And Discredite the Present State of the Church. Seene And Allowed by Authoritie. London, 1589.

---. Articles to Be Inquired of the Clergie. London, 1571.


Pilkington, James. *Aggeus and Abdias Prophetes The One Corrected, The Other Newly Added, and Both at Large Declared.* London, 1562.


Reagan, Ronald. “Farewell Address to the Nation, delivered 11 January 1989.”

---. “Remarks Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Republican National Convention in Dallas, Texas August 23, 1984.”


Wilson, Thomas. *Christs Farevvell to Jerusalem, and Last Prophesie: A Sermon Preached in The Quier of The Cathedrall Church of Canterburie, at The Funerall*

