

Sensing the visual (mis)representation of William Laud

Autor(en): **Willie, Rachel**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **SPELL : Swiss papers in English language and literature**

Band (Jahr): **34 (2017)**

PDF erstellt am: **22.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-737581>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Sensing the Visual (Mis)representation of William Laud

Rachel Willie

When William Laud (1573-1645) was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, he and his associate clergy defended episcopal authority by citing apostolic inheritance, but apostolic succession, with its appeal to history and lineage, was problematic. In parliamentary debates in 1640, both those sympathetic to the episcopacy and its detractors observed that appeals to apostolic antiquity presented bishops in ways that might be construed as popish. These parallels between episcopacy and the papacy were made more apparent in anti-Laudian pamphlets. In the early 1640s, a series of satirical attacks on Laud were printed and these texts comprise numerous woodcuts. Visual culture flirts with Laud's image to present a negative iconography. This essay will focus upon *Canterburie His Change of Diot* (1641) to address some of the difficulties in interpreting the relationship between church and state in mid-seventeenth century pamphlets and how visual imagery connects these representations with ideas of popery, regicide and the body politic.

In 1633, William Laud was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury. His actions as one of Charles I's chief advisers became a cause of tension within church and state. These tensions continued after Laud's impeachment in 1640 and execution for treason in 1645.¹ His reforms in ecclesiastical worship reenergised disputes that had never been fully laid to rest by the Elizabethan Church Settlement. Central to these discussions were questions regarding the role and prerogative of bishops. In

¹ The two main biographies of Laud remain Trevor-Roper and Carlton.

What Is an Image in Medieval and Early Modern England? SPELL: Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature 34. Ed. Antoinina Bevan Zlatar and Olga Timofeeva. Tübingen: Narr, 2017. 183-210.

the late sixteenth century, these debates led to the Marprelate controversy where a series of scurrilous pamphlets attacking the bishops were printed by an illegal press (Black, *The Martin Marprelate Tracts*; Raymond, esp. 27-44). In 1641, two of the Marprelate tracts were reissued, suggesting that invective from the 1590s was also pertinent to anxieties regarding godly governance in the 1640s (Hill; Pierce 836). Print proved a fertile space for questioning whether or not there was a place for bishops in church governance.

Critics of episcopacy viewed bishops as a relic of popery and a threat to the reformed church; they sought the removal of bishops as part of further reforms in ecclesiastical governance. Yet others argued that, in England, royal supremacy formed the basis of church hierarchy and in so doing became a means of endorsing episcopacy. Erastianism, which asserted that the State ruled over the church (even in ecclesiastical matters) meant that church and state became inextricably linked and the power of the bishops was limited by royal prerogative. Laud's reforms in ecclesiastical worship and his perceived Arminian leanings were censured because it was believed Laud was overreaching; this became a contributory factor in parliament's decision to execute him. Laudian reforms thus drew attention to tensions that had plagued the reformed church in England since its beginnings and, as Tim Harris asserts, recent research highlights that "there was never a Jacobean consensus in the Church" that was destroyed by Laud (625). While some appreciated Laudian reforms, others believed Laud might as well have been a Catholic. Indeed, representations of Laud that circulated in cheap print alluded to his purported papal pretensions. In this essay, I survey a representative sample of anti-Laudian pamphlets, focusing specifically on a 1641 play pamphlet, *Canterburie His Change of Diot*, to show how textual political protest connected to visual culture and the body in mid-seventeenth-century England. As a corollary, this essay addresses some of the difficulties in understanding the relationship between church and state in mid-seventeenth-century pamphleteering.

Canterburie His Change of Diot, which has been attributed to the Leveler Richard Overton (Wiseman, *Drama and Politics* 28),² is of particular note as it engages with debates, politics and poetics that arose as a consequence of the Reformation and were never fully laid to rest by the Elizabethan Settlement or by Jacobean ecclesiology. It is also unrelenting in the way in which it recasts previous, positive visual representa-

² For discussions on how Overton resurrected the persona of Martin Marprelate, see Black, "The Rhetoric of Reaction"; Smith.

tions of Laud – especially those produced by Anthony van Dyck (discussed below) – and transforms the iconography of authority into an iconography of protest. As Helen Pierce has argued, Laud was not the first authority figure to be satirised in pictorial form, but he was the first to be the subject of such sustained visual satire (813). The pictorial attacks in *Canterburie His Change of Diot* are not unique, but the sheer number of specially-commissioned woodcuts used to narrate the text's satire is remarkable. Printers tended to recycle woodcuts and/or to use images sparingly. Woodcuts were expensive to make and images took up valuable space on the page: since paper and the production of woodcuts would make up a publisher-printer's biggest outlay, each illustration was used judiciously. The pamphlet amounts to a title page, followed by a blank page and a further six quarto pages that comprise dialogue split into four acts. The first three acts are accompanied by a woodcut and the woodcut that illustrates the third act is replicated on the title page. The images thus present a sense of circularity and deserved punishment as the text narrates how Laud feasts upon the ears of a divine, a lawyer and a physician before he is locked in a birdcage as punishment for his vicious deeds. The woodcuts not only imply a circularity to the narrative, but also present pictorial representations that enact the dialogue upon the paper stage and make the narrative of the play pamphlet comprehensible to consumers with varying levels of literacy.³

Canterburie His Change of Diot appears to have circulated widely and it is important to situate this and other pamphlets in the context of the visual culture of the church and ecclesiastical office in the 1630s and early 1640s. Laud himself knew about the attack when incarcerated in the Tower of London and complained about his ill-usage at being represented as locked in a cage (Laud sigs. Aa3r-Aa3v; Pierce 811). Laud was well-versed in visual ceremony and the deliberately facile imagery in the woodcuts combines with the biting satire of the texts to undermine official representations of the archbishop and the visual culture of the Laudian church.

Visualising Office

Laud's reforms sought a more uniform style of church worship and the extent to which they marked a move away from Calvinist doctrine to

³ For a fuller discussion of how drama is enacted upon the paper stage through text and through image, see my "Viewing the Paper Stage."

Arminianism continues to be debated (Walsham). Even Pope Urban VIII appears to have been confused by Laud's spiritual leanings: on 4 August and again on 17 August 1633, Laud was offered (but refused) a cardinal's cap (Laud sig. Gggg4^v). Yet Laud's reforms not only affected the modes of worship, but also impacted the very fabric of the church. The positioning of the altar – table-wise or altar-wise – and the addition of an altar rail changed how worshippers moved around the church: church décor not only altered the layout of the church, but also transformed the visual culture of devotion (Fincham, "The Restoration of the Altars"; Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*). These physical changes to the church, coupled with the official portrait of Laud painted by Anthony van Dyck in 1636 (Figure 1), demonstrate that Laudian reforms were invested in visual imagery and the iconography of office.⁴ In representing Laud, the anti-Laudian satire in the anonymous and scurrilous pamphlets amalgamates the visual culture of the church as underpinned by the State with the visual culture of cheap print to enact political protest.⁵

Central to pictorial attacks on Laud is a recognition of his official portrait as a symbol of ecclesiastical office. Van Dyck's portrait of Laud was copied and distributed widely; there are fifty-five extant painted copies of the portrait and Wenceslaus Hollar was commissioned to produce an etching of the painting in 1640 (Pierce 817). Hollar's etching made van Dyck's portrait more readily available and, following Laud's impeachment in December 1640, the image was replicated in anti-Laudian satire. Pierce has argued that Laud perceived the commissioning of this portrait "as both an obligation and an extravagance," as implied by his only reference to the painting being an observation regarding van Dyck's high fees; this complaint, coupled with Laud briefly alluding to the portrait in his will as being an addition to the Lambeth Palace collection, suggests that the continuity of episcopal office takes precedence over the subject of the portrait (814). Laud thus plays a minor role within the portrait, despite it being of him; instead the picture

⁴ For a study that seeks to unearth Laudianism's distinctive artistic characteristics, see Parry. Marsh has explored how worshippers inhabited sacred space.

⁵ As numerous scholars have observed, the apparatus of drama was used as a form of protest in pamphlets throughout the 1640s, particularly in play pamphlets. This has been connected to the closure of the theatres at the outbreak of civil war in 1642. Thus, at a time when performance was banned, the theatre was reenergised as a form of political protest on the paper stage. However, many of the anti-Laudian play pamphlets predate this ordinance for theatre closure. See Butler; Willie; Wiseman, *Drama and Politics* and "Pamphlet Plays."

asserts the power and authority invested in the role of the Archbishop. At the Restoration, William Juxon then built upon this iconography by commissioning a portrait that echoed van Dyck's in posture, costume and organisation (Harmes 184-85).

The notion of the portrait as a visual and material manifestation of episcopal authority runs parallel to van Dyck's innovations in presenting the visual image of the king. According to Kevin Sharpe, van Dyck transformed pictorial representations of monarchy, conjoining the body natural more closely to the body politic as a way to assert the authority of the monarch. At the same time, van Dyck's innovations in portraiture crossed political divides. Yet, while van Dyck's monarchical portraits asserted the power of the monarch, conditions within church and State raised questions about the king's authority. This culminated in the severing of links between the body natural and the body politic that enabled the regicide to take place in 1649. Furthermore, after Oliver Cromwell was made Lord Protector in 1653, the stances in van Dyck's monarchical portraits were imitated by artists keen to legitimise the authority of the new regime; Protectorate authority was both undermined and endorsed by unofficial representations and royalist satire (Knoppers 3-8 and *passim*). This ongoing appropriation of visual imagery demonstrates the fragility of the visual image as an inscriber of authority even as it is used as a means to assert power. Laud's posture in the van Dyck portrait paradoxically exudes a sense of unease and discomfort as well as nonchalance, which, arguably, makes the instability of the visual image particularly apparent.⁶

Van Dyck's portrait of Laud has been described by Sharpe as "almost uniquely austere" in comparison to other portraits that used objects to minimise visually the political and confessional differences held by the subjects of the portraits (Sharpe, *Reading Authority* 150). The use of objects created the appearance of unity amongst the nobility, but this practice came under increasing pressure as Charles' personal rule led to more vocal opposition as the 1630s progressed. Laud, however, has no properties to denote his office, which not only contrasts with the idealised landscapes of portraits of royalty and the nobility, but also with previous portraits of Archbishops (Sharpe, *Reading Authority* 142-51). The gloom of the plain background is punctuated by a rich, sumptuous fabric, but Laud is leaning, almost casually, against some furniture and is dressed in cassock, ruff, surplice, chimere and Canterbury cap. Without

⁶ On the influence of van Dyck's earlier portrait of the Abbé Cesare Scaglia on the composition of the Laud portrait and Titian's influence on the paintings, see Pierce 816; Jaffé 600; Brown 272-74.

a cross by way of ornament, or a Bible or Book of Common Prayer in the painting, Laud gazes nonchalantly at the viewer. In previous portraits of archbishops in the reformed English church, the properties of piety were prominent; most noticeably, prayer books and bibles were often clutched by the Archbishop sitting for the portrait, emphasising the importance of *sola scriptura* to the Protestant tradition. However, in the van Dyck portrait, clothing becomes the one means by which Laud's worldly position is asserted (Pierce 815-16). This demonstrates how religious office within the Laudian church was bound up with garments.⁷



Figure 1: Anthony van Dyck, *Archbishop Laud*, c.1635-1637 © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. Reproduced by kind permission.

⁷ Bevan Zlatar has explored in detail Elizabethan criticism of religious “uniform” and its perceived connection to popery (chapter 6). For a study on the centrality of clothing to early modern culture, see Stallybrass and Jones.

Van Dyck's visual representation of Laud thus places the authority of the church on the Archbishop of Canterbury through his apparently austere clothing. However, for those in opposition to Laud's reforms in church worship, ecclesiastical costume – perhaps particularly the more ornate vestments worn during church services – became representative of what they perceived to be the corrupt ceremonial practices of the Church of England.⁸ In a text that was reissued in 1637, the Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer and Marian exile, Thomas Becon attacked “Masse-mongers” (sigs. A5r-v). Becon also condemned the “fooles cat [*sic.*] which is called a Vestment, lacking nothing but a coxcomb,” partly because of how vestments were decorated:

Some have Angels, some the blasphemous Image of the Trinity, some flowers, some Pecoaks, some Owles, some cats, some dogs, some hares, some one thing, some another, and some nothing at all but a crosse upon the backe to fray away spirits. (sigs. C12v-D1r)

The reissuing of his attack on the mass in 1637 demonstrates how spiritual and ideological tensions did not disappear as the ecclesiology and the liturgy of the Elizabethan Church Settlement gained acceptance. Instead, these disputes re-emerged in the 1630s (Collinson; Morrissey). By reprinting Becon's text in 1637 when Laudian reforms were the subject of increasing criticism for their apparently papal leanings, the visual imagery of Laudian church worship is implicitly drawn into Becon's criticisms. As Antoinina Bevan Zlatar has noted, for Elizabethan reformists, even the apparently austere cap and surplice was construed as the “popes liuerie,” especially when compared to the plain black cassock worn by continental Protestant clergy: in this interpretation of ecclesiastical costume, bishops in the Church of England become almost indistinguishable from Roman bishops (esp. 134-50). In this wider context, Laud's portrait is no longer representative of a plain style and a mind focused upon spiritual affairs: it instead becomes a site of discord.

Cheap Print and Visual Protest

Anti-Laudian pamphlets replicated van Dyck's image, and in so doing re-ascribed its meaning from being an assertion of authority to weakening that authority through the use of satire, invective and parody. Some

⁸ Kirby has drawn attention the importance of the political theology of Heinrich Bullinger and Peter Martyr Vermigli to the Vestiarian controversy in England (chapter 5).

texts took the basic poise of the primate and embellished it. For example, one woodcut that appears on the pamphlet *Rome for Canterbury* and also on the ballad *Canterburies Conscience Convicted* (both dated 1641; Figures 2 and 3) uses the image as a way to assert Laud's alleged papal pretensions





Figure 2: RB.31.b.1.(4.). *Rome for Canterbury, or a true Relation of the Birth, and Life, of William Laud, Arch-bishop of Canterbury*. 1641. Title page. © British Library Board. Reproduced by kind permission.

Canterburies Conscience convicted:
 OR, 1475 C. 18
 His dangerous projects, and evill intents, tending to the subversion of Religion detected: as also some particulars of those Treasons whereof he is now attainted, lying prisoner in the Tower this present. 1641.
 To the tune of *All ye that cry O bone, O bone: or, The wandering Soldier.*



As by faire Londons Tower I waikt,
 I heard, a Prisoner make great moane,
 And thus unto himselfe he talkt,
 Good God from me all sayes are gone.
 I lookt about and there I found
 Lord Canterbury in distresse,
 With folded armes he trac'd the ground,
 And these sad words he did expresse.
 O England England I confesse,
 That on all Shepheards I have hate,
 I sought to bring thee in distresse,
 Lord Iesus Christ forgiue my sin.
 'Twas I that lately made a way
 For Popish wordes to suck thy blood,
 'Twas I that should have bene thy say,
 But ever did more harme then good.
 'Twas I that mov'd the King of late
 To take up armes against the Scots,
 I hebbs offended King and State,
 But the Parliament found out my plots.
 And now I find an honest heart
 No better then a coasing tongue,
 Such honest men as I did thwart,
 I now repent I did them wrong.
 My wisedome and my scholler ship
 Advauced me to high renoune,
 But justice gabs me such a trip,
 That fully brought my honour downe.
 Ambitious thoughts my minde did sway,
 As I did sway faire Englands lawes,
 Which made the people daily say
 I favour'd not an honest cause.
 Like Icharus I sozed high,
 And with the wings of fame I flew,
 But in the twinkling of an eye,
 My honours bid me all adieu.
 Greatnesse with godnesse seldom meet,
 He is not alwaies good that's great:
 Where lust and grace each other meet,
 That makes a gentleman compleat.

Figure 3: 1475.c.8. *Canterburies Conscience convicted: or, His dangerous projects, and evill intents, tending to the subversion of Religion detected, etc.* 1641. © British Library Board. Reproduced by kind permission.

The texts purport to be a true narrative of the rise and fall of Laud, the circumstances of his life and his imprisonment in the Tower of London for treason. In the woodcut, we are presented with the image of Laud wearing a Canterbury cap. However, he is no longer able to lean on the table next to him as a bishop's mitre has been placed on it. In the background, the curtain has been replaced by two cityscapes connected by a wide but crooked road. Two men ride on horseback from Canterbury to Rome. Here, the bishop's mitre is presented as both a symbol of Catholicism and a prized object owned by Laud. The ready and easy way between Canterbury and Rome becomes a means by which Laud's reforms in church worship are thus presented as leading to a reconciliation between England and Rome and the restoration of Catholicism as the legitimate mode of Christianity in the British Isles.

The woodcut was used again in 1643 in *The Copy of the Petition* (Figure 4). Although the woodcut has had the words "Canterbury" and "Rome" removed, the text develops the theme of Laud seeking greater accommodation with Rome. This time, however, it is asserted that the motive is to make the Church of England more palatable to Charles I's Catholic wife, Henrietta Maria, and to persuade her to convert. Monarchy is thus brought into dialogue with Laudian reforms to present church and state as working against the religious interests of a Protestant people.

Van Dyck's image became a template that was redefined and embellished by Laud's detractors repeatedly in the months following his impeachment. However, the very lack of ornamentation in van Dyck's portrait and Laud's appearance in his robes of office ascribes a very particular kind of authority; an authority located within the physical body of the Archbishop and inherited through an unbroken line that extends back to Christ. When Laud was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, he and his associate clergy looked to *jure divino* theories as a means of asserting episcopal authority. Rather than deriving their authority from the magistracy and royal supremacy as Erastianism asserted, *jure divino* theories claimed that bishops were established through apostolic inheritance (Harmes 175-76). These theories were relatively uncontroversial in the early Stuart church, but Laud's reformist programme went further (Tyacke in Fincham 57-58). Laud's reforms focused upon doctrine and worship, looking to Elizabethan precedent to return the church to its "first Reformation" (Fincham in Fincham 77). This placed pressure on *jure divino* theories: apostolic succession, with its appeal to history and lineage, was not without its problems. In parliamentary debates in 1640, both those sympathetic to the episcopacy and its detractors observed that appealing to apostolic antiquity presented the bishops




Figure 4: E.100.(29.). *The copy of the Petition presented to the Honourable Houses of Parliament by the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, &c., wherein the said Archbishop desires that he may not be transported beyond the Seas into New England with Master Peters, in regard of his extraordinary age and weaknesse.* 1643. Title page. © British Library Board. Reproduced by kind permission.

in ways that might be construed as popish (Harmes 181-82). These parallels were even more apparent in anti-Laudian pamphlets in the early 1640s, like *Canterburie His Change of Diot*, the text to which I would now like to return.

Sensing Bodies and Spiritual Emotion

The pamphlet opens with Laud negatively commenting on the meal he is to share with a doctor, a divine, and a lawyer. After he dismisses the dishes in favour of some nourishment “after the Italian fashion” (sig. A2^v), Laud’s band of fully-armed bishops enter and assist Laud in relieving the divine, the lawyer and the doctor of their ears. Dismembering combines with cannibalism as Laud awaits the ears to be prepared for his consumption. This cannibalistic feast represents mutilation of both the physical bodies of a divine, a doctor and a lawyer and the offices that they represent. Laud’s reforms in church worship lead to the divine’s ears becoming muffled, thereby preventing the Word of God from being received clearly through oratory. This might allude to a frequent complaint amongst the godly that Laud controlled preaching, the number of sermons that could be heard in a week, the length of the sermon and its content (Woolrych 76-83). Unable to elaborate upon scripture and provide their own glosses, the godly lamented that they could not adequately serve their flocks.

Whereas Harris has queried whether there was a “Jacobean consensus,” Anthony Milton has argued that the Jacobean ecclesiastical consensus was an efficient, if conflicting, compromise between different theological traditions, which came under pressure from Laudian reforms (Milton in Fincham 188). In this configuration, it was not so much the Church of Rome, but Papal religion as initiated by the Council of Trent (1545-63) that was deemed corrupt: rather than dismissing the Roman Church, the Church of England returned the church to its pre-Council of Trent status (Milton in Fincham 194-97). Despite looking to Elizabethan precedent, Laudian reforms effectively marginalised some tenets of the Elizabethan Settlement and attacked Jacobean sermon culture.

As Peter Lake has demonstrated, Laud’s control of preaching re-focused worship towards liturgy and ceremony. As noted previously, the very fabric of the church reorientated the godly to worship God with soul and body (Lake in Fincham 165). For Laud, the divine Word, coupled with divine presence amplified through the visual culture of the church was paramount: prayer and preaching prepared people for the sacraments and the sermon played a lesser role in devotion (Lake in Fincham 170). This desire to curb the cult of the sermon was not well-received by the godly, who believed the sermon was the most important part of the service. This cropping of ears in *Canteburie his Change of Diot* thus connects to debates regarding the status of sermons and how to listen to scripture. The cropping of ears metaphorically enacts the crop-

ping of sermon culture; disfiguring hearing prevents the body of the believer from receiving spiritual nourishment through listening to the service. Yet, in a period where many could not read and so had access to scripture through listening to texts being read aloud to them, muffling the sense of hearing would also prove a serious impediment to receiving the divine Word.⁹

Laud's reforms in church worship are thus presented as mutilating divine office, but he is also presented as corrupting medicine and the law. These references had very specific cultural resonances in the early 1640s, which connect to the trial of William Prynne, Henry Burton and John Bastwick in 1637. The trial and the offences that led to it centre around the importance of print as a platform from which to articulate and perform discontent and voice political protest. In 1637, the three men were accused of "Writing and publishing seditious, schismatical and libellous Books against the Hierarchy" (Rushworth sig. T1^r). These texts attacked the role of bishops within the Church of England, claiming that they operated beyond their divine jurisdiction and were a threat to the royal prerogative. Although the three presented themselves as defenders of church and state against the arbitrary governance of the Bishops, the very attack on ecclesiastical authority was received as a potential threat to the authority of the king. After a protracted court case in the Star Chamber, the trio were duly found guilty, fined 5,000 pounds each and sentenced to life imprisonment. They were also to have their ears cropped. Prynne, who had already had his ears lightly cropped, been banned from practising law, and sentenced to life imprisonment following a previous libel conviction, had his ears cropped further and SL ("seditious libeller") branded onto his cheeks (Rushworth sigs. T1^r-V3^v; Woolrych 81). Prynne's body in particular thus became a statement of punitive justice: word and image conjoin by inscribing letters upon the mutilated body to present a physical memento of both crime and punishment. The three launched a spirited defence, and, at the pillory, vigorously contested the severity of the punishment meted out to them. The brutality of the punishment, coupled with accounts of the ineptitude of the hangman leading to greater violence against the bodies of the condemned, fostered public sympathy for the men.¹⁰

⁹ Hunt's groundbreaking scholarship on sermon culture stresses its aural/oral nature.

¹⁰ For a contemporary account, see Rushworth Vol. II sigs. V3^r-V3^v

In 1641, the Star Chamber was abolished, and with it press censorship collapsed.¹¹ It was therefore possible to publish seditious texts and attention was refocused on Prynne, Bastwick and Burton. As Joad Raymond has observed, at their trial, the trio made much of the wrongs of Caroline censorship (189). However, they also alluded to their professions: at the pillory, Prynne allegedly stated that “no degree or profession was exempted from [. . . Laud’s] malice; here is a divine for the soul, a physician for the body, and a lawyer for the estates” (Rushworth Vol. II sig. V3^r). The focus is upon the men’s professions – Prynne the lawyer, Burton the divine and Bastwick the physician – and the trio are presented as attending to the legal, spiritual and physical ailments of the nation and as being severely punished for their pains. This idea is appropriated in anti-Laudian tracts: by presenting Laud as feasting upon the ears of a divine, a doctor and a lawyer, the author of *Canterburie His Change of Diot* directly invokes remembrance of the 1637 trial. In the play pamphlet, the bishops assisting Laud to relieve the three men of their ears is symbolic of the criticism that Prynne, Burton and Bastwick levied against the episcopacy and how perceived ecclesiastical overreaching infringed upon kingly authority.

However, Laud’s eating of the ears also exposes tensions between seventeenth-century medical theories and the eating of human flesh. Beginning with the addition of the remains of mummies to cordials and expanding to accommodate ground up bones and the blood of the condemned, human remains were believed to cure a variety of ailments in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe. Working on the premise that like cured like, the vital spirits present in the blood and the ground up remains of other parts of the body were believed to possess healing qualities; corpse medicine was judged to heal by transferring the strength of the deceased to the unwell (Noble; Sugg). In eating the ears of a doctor, a divine and a lawyer, Laud gains physical nourishment from medicine, the law and the church; Laud cannibalises civil, spiritual and anatomical authority and while this may strengthen his body, it weakens the body politic. The act of eating the ears thus becomes emblematic of the perception that Laud seeks power beyond his jurisdiction, and gains it through oppressive measures. The illegality and popish overtones of the action are affirmed by the assertion that the meal is prepared “after the Italian fashion.” Despite the prevalence of corpse medicine in early

¹¹ Even though censorship effectively collapsed, many of these pamphlets were printed by anonymous publishers, or under pseudonyms such as “the Man in the Moon.” For a thorough exploration of early modern pamphlet cultures, see Raymond.

modern Europe, cannibalism was viewed with disdain: for Protestant polemicists, it was considered a barbaric act practiced by Catholics through the belief in transubstantiation transforming Holy Communion into the body and blood of Christ (Noble 95). Consuming human ears thus becomes a means by which Laud is presented as a Catholic: in following “the Italian fashion,” Laud eschews royal supremacy as the basis of episcopal worship and instead ensures that divinity, law and medicine become muffled and deformed.

The specific body parts that the pamphlet highlights are also significant as it focuses upon the sensory organs of the ears and the nose. The second act of the play pamphlet opens with Laud needing to sharpen his knife. A carpenter refuses to sharpen it, lest Laud removes his ears as well and instead he puts Laud’s nose to the grindstone. While, in the seventeenth century, the semiotics of putting the nose to the grindstone have clear political and ecclesiological resonances focused upon the subversion of authority, here I am most interested in how this image evokes the senses.¹² When Laud laments the carpenter’s cruelty, the carpenter asks: “Were not their eares to them, as pretious as your nostrils can be to you” (sig. A3r). As punishment for mutilating the hearing of his dinner guests, Laud has his sense of smell dulled. This is significant in relation to medieval ideas regarding the senses and religion that continued to hold sway within early modern culture. As Matthew Milner states, although controversial with some reformists, fasting and spiritual exercises were believed to lead to a tighter bond with God through sharpening the senses (*The Senses* 76, 122-23, 319-21). Giving into the senses could impede spiritual progress, but holding in check sensual appetites and partaking of physical mortification was believed by some to lead to greater unity with God.

In her analysis of Olfaction in the *Life of St Francis of Assisi* by the eleventh-century Franciscan Friar, St Bonaventure, Ann W. Astell draws attention to spiritual and physical sensory activity and how the senses are spiritualised through grace:

Even as all of the corporeal senses of the glorified body are fundamentally and habitually spiritual, touched as they are from within by the soul’s constant bliss, its contact with God, so too all the physical senses of the still

¹² In *Boanerges* Thomas Scott references a now lost woodcut depicting James VI/I putting the Pope’s nose to the grindstone (sig. D2r) and the satirical print, *The Protestant Grindstone* (c. 1690) presents William III as putting the Pope’s nose to the grindstone (British Museum 1868,0808.3331). Around 1650, satirical images of Charles II with his nose pressed to the grindstone by Scottish Presbyterians circulated (Norbrook 220).

mortal body can be spiritualized through grace, not habitually, but in individual acts of perception. (100)

The potential for the senses to be glorified along with the body in the afterlife means that grace may move from the soul and affect the senses: spiritual and physical conjoin. By the early modern period, thoughts regarding human anatomy, mind, body and soul had been redefined, but residues of earlier epistemologies still had currency, perhaps particularly in cheap print. Following Pseudo-Dionysius, some medieval and early modern divines associated the sense of smell with the discernment of good or evil, though the Aristotelean hierarchy of sensory experience ranked touch, smell and taste as baser senses.¹³ Invisible yet palpable, olfactory experience could make the individual aware of divine or demonic presence and the ability to discern good and bad smells revealed hidden truths regarding identity, morality and godliness.¹⁴ This is taken up in *The Papists politicke projects discovered. Or a dialogue betwixt crucifix and holy-water* (1641) where bad smells are associated with the breath of Catholic priests. In considering the breath of priests, the crucifix and the holy water assert that priestly breath is more pestilent than “*anhelitu oris enecant homines*” – the breath that kills humans (sig. A3v).

The brutal physical humour of pushing the primate’s nose to the grindstone therefore has wider cultural resonances: in being held responsible for dulling the sense of hearing and the ability of legal, divine and medicinal authority to receive God’s word, Laud has transgressed the boundaries of his political and ecclesiastical authority. In punishment for this lack of discernment, Laud has his ability to discern sensually dulled and his lack of discernment is made visible. The senses thus become a site of conflict and of conflict resolution through the carpenter restoring order and meting out punishments. Grinding Laud’s nose metaphorically dismisses apostolic grounds for endorsing episcopacy and reaffirms the notion that Laud’s reforms covertly reintroduce Catholicism. Laud’s associates might have appealed to apostolic inheritance to legitimise the role of bishops, but the carpenter as inheritor of Christ’s trade denies the episcopacy any such authority. Yet putting

¹³ Gavrilyuk and Coakley 8; Ashbrook Harvey esp. 169-80. Milner has highlighted how Luther and Calvin in particular “distrusted the senses” (“The Senses in Religion” 91) as they could deceive.

¹⁴ Jonathan Gil Harris has shown how bad smells were put to devilish use on the Jacobean stage as the noxious smell of sulphur had long been associated with Satan and hell (esp. 476).

Laud's nose to the grindstone also draws attention to Calvinist teachings.

In discussing confession and repentance, Calvin makes the following observation:

For we shall see many that will neuer sticke to say that God hath done rightly in punishing them & that their faults are as grieuous and grosse as any mens: but yet they will fall to their old byasse againe straight wayes. If God hold their nozes to the grindstone by some sicknesse or by some other crosse: then they make fayre promises. But assone as Gods hand is withdrawn from them: they shewe plainly how there was nothing but dissimulation in them. Therefore whereas wee are here commaunded to confesse our faults: let vs marke well, that wee must haue the sayd pureness and vprightness, which is to condemne the euill, in reconciling our selues vnto God. (sigs. K6^{r-v})

Whereas Calvin envisages God putting the ungodly's nose to the grindstone as a way to reveal those who truly repent, *Canterburie His Change of Diot* translates the metaphor into a representation of a physical punishment meted out to the false repentor. The play pamphlet ends with Laud's Jesuit confessor binding up his wounds and sprinkling them with holy water. The suggestion that Laud has a Jesuit confessor gestures to complaints that the Jesuits misused confession as a way to interfere in politics (Bireley 3). Laud is thus presented as enmeshed in a web of political intrigue and further distanced from apostolic tradition through having dealings with the Jesuits. To show both Laud and his Jesuit confessor as having erred, in the final act, we witness the carpenter putting Laud and the confessor into a birdcage.

Locking Laud in a birdcage distances Laud from the reformed church through allusion to devotional practice and to emblems. In 1635, Francis Quarles's *Emblemes* were printed. This text would prove extremely popular; it went into multiple editions and even influenced domestic interiors (Adlington, Hamling and Griffith 541; Horden). If we consider *Canterburie His Change of Diot* in relation to Quarles's text, we see that the woodcuts in the play pamphlet not only enact and illustrate the drama presented in the text, but also gesture towards the morally didactic quality of emblems: by reading word and image together, the reader of the play pamphlet is presented with a narrative of just punishment for transgression. However, Quarles's text also draws attention to the varying qualities of love through using the imagery of the birdcage.

Emblem IV in Book II (Figure 5) of Quarles's text presents Divine Love as entreating the soul to be free from the follies of the material world; these follies are symbolised by Human Love being chained to a ball and smoking a pipe. The inscription reads, "Quam grave servitium est, quod levis esca parit" (how heavy slavery is that light food [tobacco] can cause), pointing to smoking as a marker of earthly vice that prevents grace.¹⁵ Divine Love clutches an open birdcage to symbolise the freedom of faith. By locking Laud in a birdcage, *Canterburie His Change of Diot* suggests that Laud is tied to the material world and cannot be freed from the follies of his crypto-Catholic beliefs. However, Quarles's *Emblemes* was developed from two Jesuit emblem books, *Pia desideria* (1624) and *Typus mundi* (1627); the inter-confessional quality of word and image combine with the intertextual resonances of these texts that are in circulation at the same time. The symbolism of locking Laud in a birdcage becomes fractured as a consequence of conflicting meanings feeding into the visual imagery: instead, the focus is drawn to the laughing jester who is outside the cage.¹⁶

The satire in the anti-Laudian pamphlets appears not to be subtle. However, the final scene (in which the king and his jester laugh at the encaged men) becomes a means through which to realign episcopacy and reassert Erastian views of the relationship between church and State. In 1638, the king's jester, Archie Armstrong, had been dismissed from the court after Laud complained that he had declared in a Westminster tavern that the Archbishop was "a monk, a rogue and a traitor" (Carlton 154-55). Drawing from Keith Thomas, Andrea Shannon notes that the fool partly served a medicinal purpose in the body politic, using wit to sooth, heal and tell truth to authority: with tensions between the Court and Scotland growing, Armstrong's words meant the fool ceased to perform this function and instead allowed the wounds within the body politic to fester (esp. 99-101 and 111-12). In this context, the representation of the jester laughing at Laud draws attention to political and ecclesiological disorder. Not only is the jester revenged on Laud, but he also contains the body of Laud: the disruptive force within the body politic is locked away and the king's authority is reinstated. But the very act of laughter focuses attention on the passions and how laughing is an articulation of emotion.

¹⁵ I am grateful to Matthew Steggle for helping me to translate this inscription.

¹⁶ Quarles's engagement with Catholic texts was far from unique. Anthony Milton has shown how Protestant divines read Catholic texts and how the early Stuart Church developed a confessional identity that sat somewhere between Geneva and Rome. See Milton.




Figure 5: STC 20540. Francis Quarles, *Emblemes*. 1635. sig. F2v. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

As Indira Ghose observes, in his *Treatise on Laughter* (1579), Laurent Joubert pinpoints joy and sorrow as being at the root of laughter:

laughable matter gives us pleasure and sadness: pleasure in that we find it unworthy of pity . . . sadness, because all laughable matter comes from ugliness and impropriety: the heart, upset over such unseemliness, and as if feeling pain, shrinks and tightens. (Joubert 44; Ghose 21)

Joubert's view that laughter stems from joy and sadness constricting the heart runs parallel with the sense of physical justice being meted out to Laud. The "ugly" actions of Laud in eating the ears of a divine, a lawyer and a physician has led to disorder within church and State that can only

be purged through the releasing of passions elicited by laughter. Yet, as Robert Burton, in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* noted, laughter not only cures melancholy, but can induce it if the mirth is sustained beyond the point at which the subject of the satire is aware of their absurdity (Shannon 111-12). The emotions in the body and in the body politic are thus tenuously balanced and can easily become imbalanced through words. Emotions, then, can inhibit reasoning and expose flawed judgement.

For Thomas Hobbes, the emotions can prove obstructive to right reasoning, leading people to act against their own interests, or to bring long-term misfortune upon themselves for short-term gain, or to mistake their passions for right reason (esp. chapter 5). The state of nature, Hobbes asserts, is one of war but this conflict can be mediated by subjects accepting the authority of a sovereign and entering into a covenant whereby they accept the rule of the sovereign. Central to this covenant is trust. Trust is a civic virtue, but strength of passion in the state of nature means that contracts alone cannot succeed as “the bonds of words are too weak to bridle men’s ambition, avarice, anger and other passions without the fear of some coercive power” (84; see also Baumgold). Only when words and the passions align can a contract be upheld. Trusting the institution of sovereignty – in whatever form it takes – enables a contract of trust and trustworthiness that accommodates everyone. Trust thus becomes a moral and a civic virtue that underpins the passions, enabling beneficent emotions to be nurtured.

Trust, therefore, lies at the heart of an ecology of ethics, but so too does the sovereign. Undermining the institution of sovereignty destroys the generous passions and encourages the breakdown of civil society. In being perceived as overreaching his authority, Laud could be construed as undermining the authority of the king and pushing the kingdoms ever closer to civil war. Whereas van Dyck ascribed authority onto the monarch’s body through portraiture, in *Canterburie His Change of Diot* authority is asserted through laughter; in presenting the king and his jester as laughing at Laud’s fate, the bond between the king’s two bodies is strengthened. The laughter purges the king’s body of an excess of passion, thereby restoring order in the body politic and re-establishing the bond of trust between sovereign and subject.

The Politics of Woodcuts

Canterburie His Change of Diot exemplifies a mode of political writing that imagines elaborate and brutal punishments for the beleaguered Arch-

bishop. But the number of woodcuts that adorn this short pamphlet is striking. Taylor Clement has discussed the ways in which woodcuts in cheap print were recycled across texts, becoming “unstable signifiers” that relied upon the text and other paratexts to be cues to their meaning and interpretation (406 and *passim*). However, in *Canterburie His Change of Diot*, each woodcut specifically addresses an episode in the narrative: the first depicts Laud and his confessor imprisoned in the birdcage, the second represents Laud dining with the lawyer, the doctor and the divine, and the third comprises the carpenter putting Laud’s nose to the grindstone (Figures 6, 7 and 8). The visual image punctuates the words and enables the drama to be enacted on the paper stage. Yet the prominence of the jester in the woodcut on the title page and at the start of act three is particularly noteworthy. Dismissed as Popish, Laudian reforms become contained through laughter and the king’s complicity in this laughter becomes a means by which royal supremacy is reasserted.

The relationship between church and state and the body politic would be revisited throughout the 1640s and 50s. These texts point to the complex ways in which people viewed the relationship between church and State in the mid-seventeenth century and how word and image was used as a form of religious and political protest. In appealing to tradition as a way of asserting a mode of Christianity that was separate from Rome, divines in England did not negate Rome’s influence, but rather brought into focus the difficulties in presenting an independent episcopacy stripped of papal inflections. *Canterburie His Change of Diot* and similar pamphlets demonstrate an anxiety to reaffirm the status of the monarch as defender of the faith and upholder of order within the body politic (regardless of his shortcomings) as a means of offering protection from the perceived evils of popery.




Figure 6: By38a L364 641n. [Richard Overton], *A New Play Called Canterburie His Change of Diot.* 1641. Title page. Used by permission of Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.




Figure 7: By38a L364 641n. [Richard Overton], *A New Play Called Canterburie His Change of Diot*. 1641. Sig. A2^r. Used by permission of Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.




Figure 8: By38a L364 641n. [Richard Overton], *A New Play Called Canterburie His Change of Diot*. 1641. Sig. A3r. Used by permission of Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for SPELL 34, Antoinina Bevan Zlatar, Emma Depledge, and Alison Searle for their comments on an earlier draft of this essay.

References

- Adlington, Hugh, Tara Hamling and David Griffith. "Beyond the Page: Quarles's *Emblemes*, Wall-Paintings, and Godly Interiors in Seventeenth-Century York." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 78.3 (2015): 521-50.
- Anon. *Rome for Canterbury, or a true Relation of the Birth, and Life, of William Laud, Arch-bishop of Canterbury*. 1641.
- . *Canterburies Conscience Convicted: or, his dangerous projects, and evill intents, tending to the subversion of Religion detected: as also some particulars of those Treasons wereof he is now attainted, lying prinsoner in the Tower this present*. 1641.
- . *The Copy of the Petition presented to the Honourable Houses of Parliament, by the Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, &c.* London: Printed for Io. Smith, 1643.
- . *The Papists politicke projects discovered. Or a dialogue betwixt crucifix and holy-water*. 1641.
- . *The Protestant Grindstone* (c. 1690) (British Museum 1868,0808.-3331).
- Ashbrook Harvey, Susan. *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2006.
- Astell, Ann W. "A Discerning Smell: Olfaction amongst the Senses in St. Bonaventure's *Long Life of St. Francis*." *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 91-131.
- Baumgold, Deborah. "'Trust' in Hobbes's Political Thought." *Political Theory* 41.6 (2013): 838-55.
- Becon, Thomas. *The displaying of the Popish masse vvherein thou shalt see, what a wicked idoll the masse is, and what great difference there is between the Lords Supper and the Popes Masse*. London: A. G. for the Company of Stationers, 1637.
- Bevan Zlatar, Antoinina. *Reformation Fictions: Polemical Protestant Dialogues in Elizabethan England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Bireley, Robert. *The Jesuits and the Thirty Years War: Kings, Courts and Confessors*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Black, Joseph. "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89), Anti-Martinism, and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28.3 (1997): 707-25.
- , ed. *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: a Modernised and Annotated Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

- Brown, Christopher. *Van Dyck, 1599-1641*. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1999.
- Butler, Martin. *Theatre and Crisis, 1632-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Calvin, John. "The xxxi Sermon, which is the seconde vpon the eight Chapter." *Sermons of Master Iohn Calvin, vpon the booke of Iob*. Trans. Arthur Golding. 1574.
- Carlton, Charles. *Archbishop William Laud*. London: Routledge, 1987.
- Clement, Taylor. "Moveable Types: the De-individuated Portrait in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Renaissance Studies* 31.3 (2017): 383-406.
- Collinson, Patrick. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. London: Methuen, 1967.
- Fincham, Kenneth. "The restoration of altars in the 1630s." *The Historical Journal* 44.4 (2001): 919-40.
- and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars restored: the changing face of English religious worship, 1547-c.1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- , ed. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993.
- Gavriilyuk, Paul L., and Sarah Coakley, eds. *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Ghose, Indira. "The Paradoxes of Early Modern Laughter: Laurent Joubert's *Traité du ris*." *SPELL: Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature* 28 (2013): 19-31.
- Harmes, Marcus. "Protestant Bishops in Restoration England." *Paragon* 26.1 (2009): 175-96.
- Harris, Jonathan Gil. "The Smell of *Macbeth*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58.4 (2007): 465-86.
- Harris, Tim. "Revisiting the Causes of the English Civil War." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 78.4 (2015): 615-35.
- Hill, Christopher. "Radical Prose in 17th Century England: From Marprelate to the Levellers." *Essays in Criticism* 32.2 (1982): 95-118.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan: with selected variants from the Latin edition of 1668*. Ed. Edwin Curley. Indiana: Hackett Publishing Ltd, 1994.
- Horden, John. "The Publication of the Early Editions of Francis Quarles's *Emblemes* (1635) and *Hieroglyphikes* (1638)." *The Library* 8.1 (2007): 25-32.
- Hunt, Arnold. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences 1590-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

- Jaffé, Michael. "Van Dyck Studies I: the portrait of Archbishop Laud." *The Burlington Magazine*. 124 (1982): 600-07.
- Joubert, Laurent. *Treatise on Laughter*. Trans. and annotated by Gregory David de Rocher. Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1980.
- Kirby, W. J. Torrance. *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print 1645-1661*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Laud, William. *The history of the troubles and tryal of the Most Reverend Father in God and blessed martyr, William Laud, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury wrote by himself during his imprisonment in the Tower ; to which is prefixed the diary of his own life*. London: Printed for Ri. Chiswell, 1695.
- Marsh, Christopher. "Sacred Space in England, 1560-1640: The View from the Pew." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53.2 (2002): 286-311.
- Milner, Matthew. *The Senses and the English Reformation*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011.
- . "The Senses in Religion." *A Cultural History of the Senses: the Renaissance*. Eds. Constance Classen and Herman Roodenburg. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. 87-106.
- Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Morrissey, Mary. *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558-1642*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Noble, Louise. *Medicinal Cannibalism in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Norbrook, David. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [Overton, Richard]. *A New Play Called Canterburie His Change of Diot*. 1641.
- Parry, Graham. *The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation: Glory, Laud and Honour*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2006.
- Pierce, Helen. "Anti-Episcopacy and Graphic Satire in England, 1640-1645." *The Historical Journal* 47.4 (2004): 809-48.
- Quarles, Francis. *Emblemes*. London, 1635.
- Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections From The Year 1628 to the Year 1638 Abrid'd and Improv'd*. Vol. 2. London: 1706.
- Scott, Thomas. *Boanerges: Or the Humble Supplication of the Ministers of Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1624.

- Shanon, Andrea. "‘Uncouth language to a Princes ears:’ Archibald Armstrong, Court Jester, and Early Stuart Politics." *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 41.1 (2011): 99-112.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010.
- . *Reading Authority and Representing Rule in Early Modern England*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Smith, Nigel. "Richard Overton’s Marpriest Tracts: Towards a History of Leveller Style." *The Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategy from Milton to Junius*. Ed. Thomas N. Corns. London: Frank Cass, 1987. 39-66.
- Stallybrass, Peter and Ann Rosalind Jones. *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Sugg, Richard. *Mummies, Cannibals and Vampires: The History of Corpse Medicine from the Renaissance to the Victorians*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. *Archbishop Laud*. 3rd edn. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988.
- Walsham, Alexandra. "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and ‘Parish Anglicans’ in Early Stuart England." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49.4 (1998): 620-51.
- Willie, Rachel. "Viewing the Paper Stage: Civil War, Print, Theatre and the Public Sphere." *Making Space Public in Early Modern Europe: Performance, Potentiality, Privacy*. Eds. Angela Vanhaelen and Joseph Ward. New York and London: Routledge, 2013. 54-75.
- Wiseman, Susan. *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . "Pamphlet Plays in the Civil War News Market: Genre, Politics and ‘Context.’" *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain*. Ed. Joad Raymond. London: Frank Cass, 1999. 66-83.
- Woolrych, Austin. *Britain in Revolution: 1625-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.