

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Faculty Publications -- Department of English

English, Department of

---

9-2022

## William Shakespeare's All Is True, Lord Chamberlain's "Truth," and Civil Religion

Paul Olson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishfacpubs>



Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Modern Literature Commons](#), and the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

---

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications -- Department of English by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# William Shakespeare's *All Is True*, Lord Chamberlain's "Truth," and Civil Religion

Paul A. Olson

*Paul A. Olson* is Kate Foster Professor of English Emeritus at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and has written works on Chaucer, medieval literature, Shakespearean comedy and, recently, on Shakespeare's history plays.

## Abstract

The first title for Shakespeare's *Henry VIII—All Is True*—may reflect standard early modern usage signifying that all is an aspect of 'troth' or loyalty, all is common understanding, or all is received from a divine source. In the play, the Lord Chamberlain, Shakespeare's only character so named, serves the Henrician monarchy's "truth" by serving Henry's religious and monarchic goals as the Jacobean Lord Chamberlain similarly served James I's goals, assuring audiences of the integrity, truth, and legitimacy of the monarchy and its faith. The play shows the Lord Chamberlain working to strengthen the loyalty of Henry's realm to the putatively divinely sanctioned sovereignty flowing through the monarch. He does so to create a legitimate image of the Tudor regime pivotal to the Jacobean monarchy's need for support for its 1613 religious goals and the "troth" inherent in English civil religion.

**Keywords:** Shakespeare, Lord Chamberlain, civil religion, *Henry VIII*, Jacobean

Shakespeare's, or Shakespeare's and Fletcher's, only play explicitly concerned with sixteenth-century history, *Henry VIII*, is largely an apology for Jacobean civil religion as this essay will argue. For the purposes of this essay, a civil religion is one where the tools of religion and culture are primarily employed to support the current regime and culture. A state religion is the reverse: the tools of the state and culture are employed to reach toward the divine. *Henry VIII* was also titled *All is True* at its inception (hereinafter *All is True*),<sup>1</sup> but, though classified as a history play in the First Folio, it is not true in any modern historical sense. It fails most criteria for historical accuracy. It fails to represent accurately Shakespeare's sources, Holinshed and Foxe. It distorts what was commonplace knowledge in Shakespeare's age. Henry, historically quite an active king throughout his reign, does little in the play until near the end, seeing no significant action until Act 5, Scene 1, when he protects Cranmer. For that scene, the playwright moves Cranmer's trial twelve years earlier into Henrician times to give the king the opportunity to gift his Protestant archbishop with the royal signet that saves both archbishop and Reformation. The divorce story manipulates Katherine's and Wolsey's narratives to soften Henry's role, and eliminates most Protestant-Catholic doctrinal quarrels, putting the blame for the split on a Rome-oriented Wolsey.<sup>2</sup> Since most of the play satisfies neither modern nor early modern criteria for good history, we must ask what its title means and what end it serves.

In order to address the issue of the title meaningfully, however, we must address the play's contested authorship. Though the work was published as Shakespeare's in the First Folio of 1623 and so attributed in all editions until the middle of the nineteenth century, in 1850 James Spedding, Francis Bacon's editor, raised the possibility that the play was jointly written by Shakespeare and John Fletcher, Shakespeare's successor as chief playwright with the King's Men. Since then, several stylistic analysts using putative distinctive authorial locutions, notably Cyrus Hoy and Jonathan Hope, have divided the play into Shakespearean and Fletcherian scenes.<sup>3</sup> This supposed dual authorship has sometimes been said to have a bearing on the religious/political features—the "truth" of the play—that I shall discuss presently. While Fletcher may well have worked with Shakespeare on the play, any division of its authorship does not imply that the work has

a divided content. It was not so seen by the earliest observer who recorded reactions to it.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, the most Catholic scene in the play, that where Katherine of Aragon receives the coronation of a blessed troop of angels, has been attributed by Hope, the most definitive of the recent stylistic analysts, to Fletcher, supposedly a firm Protestant, and Musa Gurnis, in an excellent critical study, has demonstrated that Fletcher worked comfortably and seamlessly with writers having very different religious persuasion from his own.<sup>5</sup> If one takes a common-sense approach to the experience of the play when staged, one does not experience subtle differences in religious perspective from scene to scene that indicate changed authorship and philosophy, even if one knows that the work has joint authorship.<sup>6</sup>

This essay assumes that, though one cannot claim historical accuracy for *All is True*, one can argue that it is an “all is true” creation as Shakespeare’s age may have understood the phrase and that the play’s Lord Chamberlain has the job of promoting this truth.<sup>7</sup> Helen Bromhead’s *The Reign of Truth and Faith*, an examination of epistemic expressions in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English, explains the difference sources of “truth” to which such expressions might refer:

The earlier medieval sense of the term suggests that what can be known resides inside a person, while what remains opaque is outside. By the end of C17, the opposite was largely true: what can be definitively known is that which can be measured with a tool rather than through mere introspection, an epistemological shift exemplified by the distance between, say, Montaigne’s *Essays* and Descartes’ *cogito*.<sup>8</sup>

In *All is True*, both significances of the word occur—that what is “true” exists outside of the integrity and loyalty of persons in accurate accounts of external things and that what is “true” exists in the internal loyalty, fidelity, or transparency of personal agents, including God. Paul Dean explains that, in Shakespeare, “true” or “truth” often has meanings attached to moral and religious norms:

The semantic kinship between “truth” and “troth” encompasses ideas which we can controversially call moral: allegiance, faithfulness, loyalty, constancy, virtue, sincerity,

integrity, honesty. “True” and “truth” can refer both to personal qualities and to conceptual norms—and, of course, to the way in which individual people succeed or fail in their efforts to square their lives by the norms they accept, to “honour [their] own truth” as Coriolanus puts it (3.2.120).<sup>9</sup>

“True” in *All is True* occasionally does carry the sense of “something accurately recorded”: The play’s Prologue asserts that “[s]uch as gieve / Their money out of hope they may beleue, / May heere finde Truth too” (Prologue, 7–9). “Truth” here almost certainly refers to the idea that the stage will present, at least some of the time (“*May* [italics mine] heere finde Truth”), what historically happened. History is part of the play and explains why it was often, in later periods, presented in the shadow of Holbein’s historical portraits of Henry’s court.

But one also finds, in the work, much usage of Bromhead’s second meaning of “true” and “truth,” these usages meaning “loyal,” “faithful,” “integrous,” “constant” being essential to the thrust of the work. For example, Buckingham, suffering the first fall of the play, says of his accusers, “Yet I am richer then my base Accusers, / That neuer knew what Truth (i.e., allegiance or ‘troth’) meant” (2.1.105–106). In 2.4.21, Katherine says to Henry, “I haue bene to you, a true and humble Wife”; Wolsey pronounces Cromwell “true” in this sense (3.2.417), and Cromwell returns the favor to Wolsey in 3.2.424. People of honest disposition are said to be of “true heart” or “true-hearted” (2.2.38; 5.1.154; 5.2.204; 5.2.207). Katherine, in 3.1.38 says that “Truth loues open dealing,” after she has proclaimed her purity of conscience and honor of action. In the Cranmer trial scene, Henry tells Cranmer, when the latter fears his enemies and imprisonment, “Thy Truth, and thy Integrity is rooted/In vs thy Friend” (5.1.114–15), a phrase that suggests that Cranmer’s integrity derives from his roots in the monarchic conduit to grace. Lord Chamberlain (hereinafter LC), himself uses “true” in both senses in one speech:

*CHAM.* Heauen keep me from such council: tis most true  
 These newes are euery where, euery tongue speaks ‘em,  
 And euery true heart weepes for’t. All that dare  
 Looke into these affaires, see this maine end,

The French Kings Sister. Heauen will one day open  
 The Kings eyes, that so long haue slept vpon  
 This bold bad man. (2.2.35-41)

“True” in line 35 refers to Wolsey’s efforts to separate the King from Katherine; “true” in line 37 refers to those inwardly honest of heart. The idea that Henry and his court for the most part act from a position of inner honesty in creating the Reformation national church—obviously Henry has his peccadilloes in flirting with Anne and some of his courtiers act cynically initially—that they become “true men” before the end of the play is, I believe, central to the play’s civil religious apologetic.

The “all-truth” toward which the play moves is the “Truth” (5.4.28) that, in Cranmer’s prophecy, will nurse Elizabeth, the truth that is part of the “Peace, Plenty, Loue, Truth” but also the “Terror” (5.4.47) that Cranmer foresees to be accouterments of James’ reign. The issue in attributing such “Truth” to a person or action is not historical accuracy or faithfulness to Foxe and Holinshed but personal faithfulness: that the members of the realm, especially those of the court, be integrous to one another and to the monarch as symbol of the realm and its religion. That truth Shakespeare represents though he may at times in this play treat its excessive temporal ceremonial expressions with mild irony.

The conception of a true church that James fostered was, as Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake argue, set forth in a series of four sermons for the Jacobean court in 1606 by the cleric, John King:

The quartet outlined James’s standing as a ruler by divine right and laid down the conceptual foundations of the Jacobean church. A godly prince, exercising his divinely ordained powers as head of church and state, advised by godly bishops, themselves occupying offices of apostolic origin and purity, would preside over a new golden age of Christian peace and unity. A genuinely catholic Christian doctrine would be promulgated and maintained; peace and order would prevail. James I [as] *rex pacificus*, a new Constantine, [would be] a truly godly prince.<sup>10</sup>

Fincham and Lake show that the conceptual foundations basic to James's ecclesiastical policy that tolerated both moderate and loyal Catholics and Calvinists in a wide tent church remained intact up until about 1618 when the stresses on James's effort to embrace both loyal Catholics and moderate Presbyterians, so long as they stayed within the national church and professed loyalty to the king, became too great for the policy to be effectual. The *mythos* of the origins of this early Jacobean policy in the Henrician reformation is what Shakespeare presents in *All is True*—how the British people, as a nation emblemized by their court, came to be true to one another and to their divinely ordained ruler.

In Shakespeare's representation of how England's religion became true and one, the Lord Chamberlain is crucial. His job historically was what the office appears to be in the play: to maintain a smoothly running household and its "public image" and to provide it with ceremonies, and entertainments. The lord chamberlain was expected to create a climate that supported the legitimacy of the monarch. *Henry VIII's* prophecies and extraordinary pageantry, its biblical and religious iconology, and its presentations of court culture bespeak a Lord Chamberlain who, as master of ceremonies and "controller" of the court process, works with divine and human forces to enable and legitimize English religion in a way that comports with Jacobean assumptions.<sup>11</sup> The play's first title, *All Is True*, known to Henry Wotton when he saw an early performance, clearly does not mean, "all can be measured with a tool" or "all is empirically verified."<sup>12</sup> The other usage of the phrase to assert inward truth dominates the motives of the principals as well as contemporary usage. It appears, for instance, in a context near to the play in one of the sermons preached for Prince Henry near his death; the preacher says, "[H]ere is nothing respected in man . . . from him that sits vpon a throne, to him that hanges vpon a tree, yea from the first man Adam, to the babe last borne, *all is true* [italics mine] of him which heere is said, Man borne of a woman, &c."<sup>13</sup> The "man borne" passage from Job 14:1 says that "man born of a woman is of few days." The assertion is not literally true but metaphorically conveys a religious commonplace about the brevity of life. The dogma that *All is True* undergirds is that the English church, working through the king and archbishop with the help of providence and the Lord Chamberlain, also through the functioning of "truth" in the inwardness of

most of the persons in the play, created a truly national religion that embraces all from pro-Catholic Gardiner to Anne, denigrated by Wolsey as a Lutheran.<sup>14</sup>

Lord Chamberlain in *All is True* is Shakespeare's only character called simply "Lord Chamberlain." Holinshed gives the names of the various lords chamberlain during *All is True's* supposed period (1520–1544)—the Earl of Worcester, the Earl of Arundel, the Lord Sandys, and the Lord St. John, but Sandys in the play is separate from its Lord Chamberlain and LC is separate from any historical holder of the office—a role and only that. Though he is a minor character from the perspective of the number of lines he is given, he is important in that he uses his role to secure "troth" from and between Henry's subordinates, to stabilize English religion, and to ratify Henry's and Cranmer's positions. LC concerns himself with outward appearances paradoxically to construct or ratify "truth" in the inward heart—to give airy nothings a local habitation and a name—sometimes by himself, sometimes with the help of an asserted providence.

Lord Chamberlain's service to Henry is different from that of Katherine or Gardiner. While they enable his actions by not asserting their rights or beliefs in the face of royal action, LC creates and sustains "truth" through action, conversation, and symbolic creations. In his early action, to protect English identity and beginning his argument for a species of English civil religion, in 1.3, he mocks all "pagan" English adoption of French fashions, dueling, and decadent manners derived from Henry's recent campaign in France (1.3.1–48). He then he tells his interlocutors that he is to be one of the masters of ceremonies ("Comptrollers," 1.3.67) at Wolsey's banquet, thus beginning his role as master of court "troth." As a controller at the banquet in 1.4, he determines the banquet's seating arrangement and speaks with a mixed majesty and bonhomie to make Wolsey's feast for the king succeed (1.4.10–40). At the same banquet, though he untruthfully feigns ignorance of the royal masquers' origins as controller of the feast, as LC he introduces the pastoral masque that his office would have prepared. It presents the king as shepherd, a pastoral cliché (1.4.50–72) that enacts the royal role as seeker of love but also anticipates the king's later shepherding religious and clerical role in the play. During the masque promoting a claimed devotion to the cult of beauty—perhaps the sixteenth-century Renaissance Platonic one, Henry meets



Anne, and LC himself seems to encourage the initial flirtation (1.4.65-72, 90-97) that creates the Reformation.

After the first flirtation, LC also assists in promoting the coming of the new Protestant queen, Anne, perhaps unknowingly or “providentially.” In 2.3, he delivers to her the notice of her advancement to Marchioness of Pembroke that makes her a possible queen. He shows his command over “troth” in general in that, while speaking to her as she is pitying Katherine, he publicly hopes that everything is going well for the latter. As the plot progresses, LC further advances “truth” by suggesting that Wolsey, who speaks for a religious power outside the realm, possesses a witchcraft that deludes the king:

CHAM. My Lords, you speake your pleasures:  
 What he deserues of you and me, I know:  
 What we can do to him (though now the time  
 Giues way to vs) I much feare. If you cannot  
 Barre his accesse to'th'King, neuer attempt  
 Any thing on him: for he hath a Witchcraft  
 Ouer the King in's Tongue. (3.2.13-19)

After learning that the king *has* discovered Wolsey's double-dealing, LC loyally asserts that Henry sees through the Cardinal's tricks and has already married Anne (3.2.38-42). He then calls for heightened royal anger against Wolsey's missing associate, Cardinal Campeius, who has fled England to support Wolsey's anti-Anne cause with the pope, exactly the indignation a “troth” protector would be expected to display.

Working with what Shakespeare represents as divine providence, LC plays a role, helped by a few other courtiers, in saving the Reformation initially created by the royal marriage to Anne. Here LC's response, as head of the royal wardrobe, to seeing that Henry's signet has been given to Cranmer is crucial. In the First Folio, though not in some more recent editions, LC is the one who, seeing Cranmer's wearing of Henry's signet, says, “This is the Kings Ring.” (5.3.126),<sup>15</sup> an identification appropriate to the LC as chief wardrobe officer. Surrey then recognizes that the ring is not a counterfeit, and Suffolk confirms that this must mean that the king values the archbishop's life more than his own signet:

SUFF. [‘Tis] the right Ring, by Heau’n: I told ye all,  
 When we first put this dangerous stone a rowling,  
 ‘Twold fall vpon our selues.

NORF. Doe you thinke my Lords  
 The King will suffer but the little finger  
 Of this man to be vex’d?

CHAM. Tis now too certaine;  
 How much more is his Life in value with him?  
 Would I were fairely out on’t. (5.2.137-43)

Only the powerful Thomas Cromwell speaks after and confirms LC’s twice-stated opinion.

Finally, in Act 5, as the head of the baptismal show designed to legitimize Elizabeth’s royal succession, LC heaps contempt on the porter trying imperfectly to control the unruly rabble witnessing the baptism (5.3.55-78). He, in his office, would have prepared the elaborate emblematic processional to Elizabeth’s baptism (5.4, 1-3) to ensure public “troth” to her. The processional includes the great temporal and spiritual lords, the Lord Mayor of London, the Master of the Garter, the Earl Marshall, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, accompanied by the powerful noble godmothers from Norfolk and Dorset lineages. Its symbolism endorses Elizabeth’s royal relationship to God before her ultimate enthronement and prefaces Cranmer’s prophecy that makes the Reformation millennialist (cf. 5.4.14-55). A Jacobean audience, knowing the traditional lord chamberlain’s role in providing masques and ceremonies, would have assumed that LC in the play controlled the sumptuous expressions endorsing royal legitimacy and designed to confirm “truth” that Sir Henry Wotton found almost ridiculous.<sup>16</sup>

“Troth” in relation to the monarchy was especially important at the time of the play’s likely first production. *All Is True* was first performed in 1613, shortly after the late 1612 death of the firmly Protestant prince Henry Frederick and at a time when “troth” was in question.<sup>17</sup> Sectarian controversy with Anabaptist and other Protestant groups seen as “extreme” was continuing; real witchcraft like that metaphorically attributed to Wolsey supposedly occurred in Northamptonshire and Lancashire. The debate over whether the English church should go in

a more Roman or Genevan direction continued as did the controversy over the individual versus the national in religion. In May, the man who had stabilized the transition from Elizabeth to James, Secretary of State Robert Cecil, died, to be replaced by Robert Carr, a less astute bureaucrat and King James's favorite (he was soon to be married into the powerful Catholic Howard family that then controlled James's administration). Assuming a 1612–1613 date, *All Is True* offers us what we should expect—the myth of a unified Reformation national church as the glue of the nation in a time when disintegration, possible Protestant new beginnings, and pacific Spanish Catholic marriages, and hurtful controversy were in the air.

This controversy centered on royal marriages and alliances. James had long tried to make peace with Catholic Europe with a marriage of Protestant Prince Henry to the Catholic Spanish infanta. During the festivities of fireworks, masques, and *Tempest* performance leading up to the arranged Spanish marriage, Prince Henry sickened and died on 6 November 1612, and with him died hopes for an early Catholic marriage alliance to complete Jacobean peacemaking. Henry IV of France's assassination and France's withdrawal from warlike gestures against Spain led to Spanish–Hapsburg domination of Europe so that the new radical imbalance between Catholic and Protestant power inspired Germany's Protestant Union in 1608 and the answering Catholic League in 1609. Though the LC's Howard family continued to support a Spanish marriage, an isolated Protestant England now required ties with the continental Protestant Union, these realized through the February 1613 marriage between Frederick V, the Palatinate leader of the Protestant Union, and James's daughter, Princess Elizabeth. *The Tempest*, almost certainly in a form revised from its 1611 original, was performed again for this 1613 event, with *The Aeneid*'s Rome appearing new made as Prospero's fictive Milan, with Prospero cast out by a civil insurrection that began with Hapsburg-controlled, explicitly Catholic Naples, populated by a civil war-seeking king and parody-Catholic ruffians.<sup>18</sup> Miranda appears as the marriageable daughter and Ferdinand as the noble beloved, each in turn answering to the historical Elizabeth and Frederick. Prospero provides the Jacobean divine ruler, supported by an Ariel-angel and familiar—from Isaiah 29:1-2, and 29:7—to reinforce the claim that a new world, new self-knowledge, and new marriage could make a wonderland out of loss. *All is True* followed shortly after.

Though everything about the 1530s Reformation events could be touchy in a fluid time like 1612–1613, *All Is True* was produced at the public Globe with the apparent approval of Thomas Howard's lord chamberlain-subordinate Revels Office headed by George Buc.<sup>19</sup> Perhaps the play was permitted because it avoided trouble and largely forwarded the Jacobean court's view of the role of an English national church and James's role in creating unity. George Buc's Revels Office's remaining two marked-up plays suggest what kinds of trouble-avoiding changes the chamberlain's Revels office could make. Buc's markings in *The Second Maid's Tragedy* object to passages appearing to criticize court figures, pointing to James's homoerotic philandering, or demeaning to women. His markings in the 1619 *John van Olden Barnavelt* suggest Revels' office concern about negative pictures "of the English troops in the Netherlands"; also with references to England's ally, the House of Orange, religious dissidence in the Dutch provinces, and Spanish matters in Barnavelt's treason.<sup>20</sup> Following this logic, Shakespeare's play respects both Spanish Catholic Katherine and English Protestant Anne, does not attribute faults to the LC's Howard ancestors or extended family (Norfolk, Buckingham, Surrey), eliminates serious monarchic sexual peccadilloes from Henry's life, and avoids anti-Spanish representations of Katherine. The latter was especially important at a time when the Howard faction at the court was still working toward a Spanish marriage.

The "truth" that *All is True* constructs for such a time is that God, the LC, and other court officials worked together in a pattern of loyalty and affection to make an English national church and civil unity come about. The new regimen, as the play presents matters, did not come because of Henry's divorce from an innocent Spanish queen or from her actions, but from Henry's concern of conscience about his marriage to his deceased brother's wife, a concern originating with the Bishop of Bayonne's speeches and later supported by the Bishop of Lincoln and Archbishop of Canterbury (2.4.151ff.).<sup>21</sup> Henry is no religious cynic. Act 2, scene 2, coming slightly before 2.4, makes that highly unlikely. There the King appears alone, according to the stage directions, "reading pensively," and, according to Suffolk and Norfolk, his silent observers, "sad" and, "much afflicted," presumably over his marriage to Katherine. Since he believes he is alone and does not see his silent observers, he cannot be feigning piety. As a public matter, the new regime comes from LC, Henry, and God, the

former two employing the words, acts, ceremonies, and symbols that make “truth” in religion possible to the Tudor and Jacobean regimes. The “truth” is that, in a playhouse representation of a cataclysm that shook Europe, the English monarch and no one loyal to him offends deeply against right rule or right religion. All is true action. Only Wolsey, among English subjects, attempts untruth by violating *prae-munire* (i.e., by appealing to Rome over the monarchy) and “troth.” Wolsey’s villainy comports with the Tudor/Stuart line that a hegemonic national church should rule and that Roman hegemony, not Romish doctrine *per se*, is the enemy, exactly as James and, incidentally, the doctrinally Catholic Howards saw matters. Even Wolsey, I shall argue, finally becomes true.

The play tells of the relation between court loyalty—truth—and the complex maneuvering required to create a civil religion. *The Tempest* represents a somewhat similar maneuvering in the figure of Gonzalo. As a loyal Neapolitan, Gonzalo supports Alonso’s and Antonio’s overthrow of Prospero but, as a decent human being, he gives Prospero the food and books—especially the magic books—he needs to survive on the island and recover his realm. Any worthy lord chamberlain was expected to do equally careful maneuvering. Polonius, who is labeled “lord chamberlain” in the *dramatis personae* list of the 1676 Quarto, published at a time when the role had changed little from Shakespeare’s day, is not so skilled at such maneuvering.<sup>22</sup> He speaks in clichés to try to make the court run smoothly and successfully spies on Laertes to assure his good behavior. He also spies on Ophelia with similar purpose but disastrously so. *Hamlet* provides an informative picture of a crude effort to construct “truth” by a lord chamberlain that goes awry. Like *All Is True*’s LC bringing in the shepherd masque, Polonius brings in the entertainment, announcing the actors’ arrival at Elsinore, listing their competencies (2.2.301ff.), and praising their acting (“Foregod my Lord well spoken, with good accent / and good discretion [2.2.371–72]). He looks after the troupe’s hospitality (2.2.425ff.) and arranges for their appearance (3.1.22ff.). But he fails in the “skillful maneuvering” part of his role that touches on his responsibilities to “troth.” He seems blind to what has gone on at court and so does not act to ensure that morally accurate mirrors are held up to its vices and their danger to the state. He does not preview the Mousetrap: Claudius must ask Hamlet

“Haue you heard the argument? / is there no offence in’t?” (3.2.212–13). When the Mousetrap is finally censored in mid-performance, King Claudius himself has to rise in protest before a late censoring Polonius cries, “Giue ore the play,” (3.2.239). By that point, no civil way to enable Claudius to face himself remains open. Furthermore, through Claudius’ and Polonius’ late censorship of Hamlet’s players, Shakespeare makes clear what a tyrant and bumbling LC would ask of the Chamberlain’s/Revels’ office in presenting history: scenes accusing the monarch would be eliminated, history remade with a superficial gloss, and any “Hecuba” would act her scenes without understanding their implication for the time.

However, Shakespeare’s monarch in *Henry VIII* is no tyrant. He is a man of conscience faced with interference from Rome and its minions, a leader who needs a competent representation of his religious *mythos*. The “good” LC of the play handles Henrician problems through competent anticipation—presenting the reflections of the “form and pressure” of the “age and body” of the time to retain legitimate loyalty and both court and citizen belief in a monarch who deserves these. The one similar master of the Revels/LC-like character who mirrors events with his shows to make all go well for his monarch is *The Tempest’s* Ariel. He, in contrast to Polonius, consciously produces the beginning initial shipwreck/tempest show that initiates the pushing aside of the disorderly political world of usurpation and begins the journey toward Milanese order with Ferdinand and Miranda. As master of the court festivities, he presents the infernal disappearing harpy banquet that drives home usurpation’s folly (3.3); as master of the wardrobe, he offers the usurpers his fine clothes allegory, interrupted by fury-dogs, to demonstrate through emblematic clothes the superficiality of their usurping tendencies when opposed by cosmic fury (4.1). He creates penitence in the guilty King Alonso. Eventually, he creates the masque of Juno (4.1) to celebrate the divine marriage and the reunification of the powerful material forces within the play prior to Prospero’s contemplating the dissolution of things material.<sup>23</sup>

LC, like Ariel, produces *All is True’s* masques and elaborately costumed events, and he does so to legitimize “truth,” as a Jacobean court would see it; also, like Ariel, he helps with a banquet—the Wolsey banquet—and makes sententious commentary on court doings that promote unity and loyalty to Henry.



(Inasmuch as *All Is True* touches on England's relations to the Hapsburgs, Protestant rebellion in Germany, violations of *praemunire*, and the story of a Spanish marriage with the English royal family, it unabashedly touches on 1612–1613 but in a way that reassures its audience that true, or honest, action is possible toward all parties.<sup>24</sup> In 1612–1613 and the periods before and after, the monarchy and the Howard faction tried to achieve détente with Spain and a political marriage with the Hapsburgs. Thus, the Spanish, but loyal Katherine's victimization by the cardinal and not by Henry is predictable. Katherine is given a role true to her "troth:" she falls from her throne for opposing Wolsey but also dies a providential death while forgiving him and honoring the king. Abjuring her ruling titles and concerning herself with the welfare of the king, she is providentially gifted by a vision of a "blessed troop" of six personages in three pairs (4.2.81ff.), clad in white and crowning her with bays of heavenly immortality as she departs from the stage (and presumably, shortly thereafter, from life). The three pairs probably represent three hierarchies of celestial personages, from the lowest to the highest in standard Renaissance writing and painting. Medieval and early modern "Coronation of the Virgin" paintings often show Mary being crowned by six celestial beings, generally in pairs of two. The three levels of heavenly beings derive from Dionysius the Areopagite and appear from Aquinas down through Hooker and Spenser's Hymn to Heavenly Love ("trinall triplicities"). The iconology of the Virgin Mary was often imported into the representations of Queen Elizabeth, but, when Shakespeare does this with Katherine, he imports Catholic iconography to bless a Spanish Catholic queen in death, perhaps promoting 1613 understanding with Spain. Holinshed assigns Katherine none of the beatific vision of Shakespeare's story.)

Since James still claimed Protestant leadership, the play's Protestant Anne Boleyn also appears innocent and full of care for Katherine (2.3), a stance required if Elizabeth, her daughter, is to be heralded as the future savior of England (5.4.14ff.). Henry, as Elizabeth I's father, must be a legitimate king and man of conscience who forms a Christian kingdom, untainted by Romish corruption.<sup>25</sup> Evil, lack of "truth," in the play must consist in Wolsey's cupidity and violation of *praemunire* and the Act of Supremacy that gave James and England their independence from Rome. Isaac Casaubon stated to Cardinal du Perron

in 1612, on behalf of James, that the most significant difference the king had with Rome was its claim to depose princes.<sup>26</sup>

Yet, if *all* is to be “true” in the sense argued by this essay, Wolsey must also be true in some sense. A modern observer will have difficulty regarding Wolsey as “true” to Henry, given his action in the play. Yet, even he thinks that he has been loyal; as he says,

O Cromwel, Cromwel,  
Had I but seru'd my God, with halfe the Zeale  
I seru'd my King: he would not in mine Age  
Haue left me naked to mine Enemies. (3.2.455–58)

Wolsey has not “seru'd [his] God” through most of the play. But even Wolsey’s fall becomes a redemptive one—leads to truth—after the king accidentally or, in Jacobean terms, providentially (as Norfolk observes, “It’s Heauens will, / Some Spirit put this paper in the Packet / To blesse your eye withall.” [3.2.129]) discovers documents evidencing the cardinal’s dealings with Rome to prevent the Henrician divorce that he has supposedly supported (3.2.30ff.). When Suffolk arrests him and seizes his titles and riches, he charges him with *praemunire* violations (i.e., crimes that weaken the national church). Then, LC, anticipating the flow of the plot, begins the process of supplying mercy for Wolsey by saying, “O my Lord, / Presse not a falling man too farre: ‘tis Vertue: / His faults lye open to the Lawes, let them / (Not you) correct him” (3.2.333–36). Wolsey eventually becomes true in that Providence allows him to die a “true” man, serving his God after a fashion, not as in Holinshed where, when he begins to fail, he receives a warning to think on Christ’s passion and asks the yeoman stand to see if he dies at exactly eight: no penance and no blessing. Holinshed says that Wolsey’s fall is that of arrogance, self-love, and haughtiness instead of “meekenes, humilitie, and charitie.”<sup>27</sup> In contrast, Shakespeare’s Griffith describes his death as an intense penitential flood that ends in peace (4.2.20–30).

The falls of Katherine and Wolsey, and their handling of them, enable the Tudor/Stuart nation to achieve what the play describes as apocalyptic/ utopian success, in union with Truth. English hegemony triumphs because of the suffering of individuals like Katherine and Wolsey. What Peter de la Primaudaye calls God’s “secret counsell”



underlies the play's curious mimetic construction, sequencing seeming "accidents" teleologically organized, accidents that are not really accidents but "counsell" producing a transcendently purposed outcome that protects Anne and Henry and the centrist Protestant hegemony of Elizabeth and James.<sup>28</sup> The first accident is King Henry's discovery of Wolsey's miscarried *praemunire* letter to the pope and his list of valuables revealing his peculation and treachery (3.2.30–36). The second accident is Henry's granting of his signet to Cranmer to protect him against vague threats from his enemies, knowing that Cranmer has enemies but not precisely how his ring will help. The scene recalls the scene in Genesis 41:42 where the Pharaoh, after releasing Joseph from prison, gives him a robe and his signet, making him ruler over Egypt. The glosses in the Geneva Bible suggest that Joseph's role represents a prophetic one contrasted to the temporal role of the Pharaoh, and Calvin, in his typological interpretations of the Old Testament, sees Joseph as a type of Christ.<sup>29</sup> The Joseph intertext may have encouraged the playwright to assign Cranmer a prophetic role found in none of his chronicle sources. The third accident is the unlikely birth of a female heir, Elizabeth, in a context where Henry has done everything to secure a male one. At the end of the Cranmer scene, the king asks his rescued Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury to be a godfather at the baptism of the newborn Elizabeth, later Elizabeth I.

Cranmer's restoration to authority and his sponsorship of Elizabeth in his role as a Protestant Canterbury gives meaning, in which the symbolisms of Lords Spiritual and Lords Temporal authority are combined, to the LC processional that accompanies the future monarch's baptism:

*Enter Trumpets sounding: Then two Aldermen, L. Maior, Garter, Cranmer, Duke of Norfolk with his Marshals Staffe, Duke of Suffolke, two Noblemen, bearing great standing Bowles for the Christening Guifts: Then foure Noblemen bearing a Canopy, vnder which the Dutchesse of Norfolk, Godmother, bearing the Childe richly habited in a Mantle, &c. Traine borne by a Lady: Then followes the Marchionesse Dorset, the other Godmother, and Ladies. (5.4.)<sup>30</sup>*

Cranmer's receipt of the signet and his empowering by the king, a prelude to his sponsorship of Elizabeth's baptism, gives prophetic authority to his vision of a messianic Tudor/Stuart age that will follow:

Which Time shall bring to ripenesse:  
 This Royall Infant [Elizabeth], Heauen still moue about her;  
 Though in her Cradle; yet now promises  
 Vpon this Land a thousand Blessings,  
 Which Time shall bring to ripenesse. (5.4.17–20)

Cranmer tells us that, in this infant's time, every man shall eat safely under his own vine, sing merry praise songs with his neighbors, know God truly, act honorably, and claim greatness apart from blood. James, the peacemaker, will equal Elizabeth: "Nor shall this peace sleepe with her: But as when / The Bird of Wonder dyes, the Mayden Phoenix, / Her Ashes new create another Heyre . . . [i.e., James]" (5.4.39–41). As the four sermons mentioned earlier in this piece argue, the Jacobean reign will be a time of "Peace, plenty, love, truth":

Where euer the bright Sunne of Heauen shall shine,  
 His Honour, and the greatnesse of his Name,  
 Shall be, and make new Nations. He shall flourish,  
 And like a Mountaine Cedar, reach his branches,  
 To all the Plaines about him: Our Childrens Children  
 Shall see this, and blesse Heauen. (5.4.17–22)

James will make new nations. The English future will replicate the peaceful time prophesied for Israel by Isaiah and Micah, celebrated echoically in a colonialist *Tempest*—a material state of peace. Similarly, the transformation of the spiritual realm in Cranmer's prophecy leads to the promise of an extended material well being for England.<sup>31</sup>

As a vehicle of the future, Elizabeth is a phoenix, reflecting her phoenix medallion in the Nicholas Hilliard portrait of her but also imaging the age-old symbolism of the monarch as a "Christ" in her public body: the phoenix is Christ, beginning with Lactantius' *De Ave Phoenix* and extending through Renaissance emblem books.<sup>32</sup> In this vision, the Tudor/Stuart monarchy creates renewal, ending in the millennium. The phoenix monarch's body never dies, not even when a

new dynasty comes to the throne. Both the Tudors and Stuarts claimed that the ruler exists as Christ's image, and the play suggests that, with Elizabeth's ascension, the divine monarchy, apparently dead in the depredations of Richard III's usurping rule, resurrects itself. Henry VIII's private peccadilloes produce miracles for the land, and his signet ring a new messianic authority.

In this happy conclusion, the historical fiction argues, providence, Henry, and the LC work together to construct a religion. The LC within the play contributes to the "all" that "is truth" to make it fit the needs of national monarchic power and religion, using his special position regarding the wardrobe, court entertainments, and court gossip to make things run smoothly without sending anyone to the Tower. Similarly, Shakespeare's response to James's policy and possibly the suggestions of the Buc/Howard apparatus—smoothing over the surfaces and making all good—serves James's monarchic designs as nationalist and *rex pacificus*.

*The Tempest* may present something of the same vision: that of a Master of the Revels/ LC Ariel who, through his shows, creates much of the action as does LC in our play. Ariel creates action through his tempest and subsequent shows to unseat the usurpers and create King Alonso's repentance; in *All is True*, LC's shows and providence's interventions stop a usurping Wolsey and create redemptive movement toward a national church. In *The Tempest*, boorish Catholic usurpation is carried ahead by the usurping Stephano and Trinculo who asking Caliban to kiss the "book" of the sacred wine source (2.2 passim);<sup>33</sup> in *All is True* boorish Catholic usurpation is carried ahead by a butcher's son and *praemunire*-defying Wolsey attempting to send secret letters to Rome to stop the marriage that creates Protestant hegemony. Finally, both *The Tempest* and *All is True* envisage a world in which the royal and the religious are one, *Tempest* through having an angel-like creature, Ariel, through his revels serve the monarch's need for restoration and usurper repentance, *All is True* by showing a LC and providence together shaping the "troth" shows and sayings enabling the monarch's form of rule and its legitimatization. Finally, in both plays, apocalyptic and utopian visions promise a world in which marriage serves a future, more ideal state.

Yet, when Henry Wotton saw the play, he noted that its unusual display of pomp and majesty made "greatness very familiar, if not

ridiculous.”<sup>34</sup> He may have seen this as an accident of the production. He may have objected to stage pomposity and overkill that made aspects of the Henrician court appear suitable for ridicule. But he may also have noticed something implicit in Shakespeare’s very design: an understanding that the tools whereby monarchy—indeed government—is legitimized and produces “truth” carry within themselves an element of their own disintegration— an artificial pomp, majesty, and distortion of the “age and body of the time” that make power appear familiar, if not ridiculous. The cloud-capped towers and gorgeous palaces dissolve in the overkill of the stage or any other apologetic.<sup>35</sup> By showing the LC bending history and by bending history himself, Shakespeare may, consciously or unconsciously, have provided a critique of the apparatus shaping “truth” more subtle even than he does even through the Polonius figure in *Hamlet*. *All is True* reminds us that the play is a gesture of solidarity—or shaped history—that confirms national regime belief and received court opinion. The title and pageantry also may suggest that such confirmation contains an element of distortion of external events and flattery of the powers that be. Given England’s tipping toward the events of the next half century, flattery, and a mythos of unity in 1613 would have been of only short-term service to the monarch.

*All Is True* does not offer us the satiric intensity of Orwell’s Ministry of Truth’s rewriting of history or Swift’s Glubbudrib contrast between the real and the rendering. However, in a time when authority’s efforts to set the terms of the inner life could be confused with what is inwardly true, the play may have achieved a Lucanian balance between panegyric and irony that does, indeed, make greatness appear “familiar if not ridiculous.” Absent a Lucanian interpretation, the play is almost purely a celebration of what H. Richard Niebuhr has called the “Christ of culture” in which the tools of religion are drawn over to legitimize present culture and rule. Aside from Katherine’s angelic vision and Henry’s anger at being interrupted during religious meditation, the play displays almost no sense of awe, the holy, or the numinous. It displays no sense of religion in the Kierkegaardian sense of “deep calling to deep” but rather what Robert Bellah, in analyzing the American past, calls civil religion.<sup>36</sup> In this form of secular “religion,” history (as represented in Henry), the tools of cultural expression (as represented in Lord Chamberlain), and Providence itself legitimize the

contemporary regime. We may do well to ask whether what are seen as Shakespearean religious expressions in his other plays, especially those set in England and Scotland, tell of more than civil religion. If we say that they do, we must say how.

## Notes

1. I am indebted throughout to editorial and substantive suggestions from Professor Kathleen Johnson. This essay assumes familiarity with discussions of Shakespeare's and Fletcher's roles in creating the work, its relationship to Foxe and Holinshed, and its stage history described in Gordon McMullan, ed., *King Henry VIII* (London: Arden, 2000), hereinafter the Arden edition. For clarity, I capitalize "lord chamberlain" and "master of the revels" when they are the name of a character in a play or part of a historical personage's title, but not when they denote an office. All quotations are from the New Oxford Shakespeare online, Critical Reference edition: <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-new-oxford-shakespeare-critical-reference-edition-9780199591879?cc=us&lang=en&>
2. Lee Bliss, "The Wheel of Fortune and the Maiden Phoenix of Shakespeare's *King Henry the Eighth*," *ELH* 42 (1975): 2–8. My argument disagrees with Donna B. Hamilton's (*Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England* [Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1992], 163–90) that Shakespeare defended a low-church Protestant view of a national church.
3. Cyrus Hoy, "The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon," *Studies in Bibliography* 15 (1962): 71–90; Jonathan Hope, *The Authorship of Shakespeare's Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 67–83; Musa Gurnis, *Mixed Faith and Shared Feeling: Theater in Post-Reformation London* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018), 71 passim.
4. The Arden Edition, 57–63.
5. The Arden Edition, 193. Cf. n3, *supra*. Some critics, especially Thomas Merriam, have explained the mixture of respect for the Reformation and for aspects of Spanish Catholic devotion in the play by regarding the "Protestant" sections as belonging to Fletcher and the "Catholic" ones as Shakespearean, but this mixture is more likely due to Jacobean policy considerations. Merriam's divisions of the play are statistically suspect: cf. M. W. A. Smith, "An Investigation of Morton's Method to Distinguish Elizabethan Playwrights," *Computers and the Humanities* 19 (1985): 3–21.
6. Cf. Jeffrey Masten, "Playwriting, Authorship and Collaboration," in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Scott and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 357–82.
7. The view that the play emphasizes historical truth's relativity (Peter L. Rudnytsky, "Henry VIII and the Deconstruction of History," *Shakespeare Survey* 43 [1991]: 43–57) deals insufficiently with historical meanings of "all is true" or with

- normative positions evident in the play (for instance, Cranmer's). For theater as counsel, see Kevin Dunn, "Representing Counsel: 'Gorboduc' and the Elizabethan Privy Council," *English Literary Renaissance* 33 (2003): 279-308.
8. Helen Bromhead, *The Reign of Truth and Faith: Epistemic Expressions in 16th and 17th Century English* (Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2009), 362-63.
  9. Paul Dean, "Shakespeare's True Tragedies," *Critical Survey* 3 (1991): 128.
  10. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James," *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985): 169; cf. 169-207 passim.
  11. For Jacobean use of Henry VIII's religious policy as a precedent, see Mark Rankin, "Henry VIII, Shakespeare, and the Jacobean Royal Court," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 51 (2011): 349-66.
  12. For the many levels of certitude as to what is "real" to be found in the play, see Anston Bosman, "Seeing Tears: Truth and Sense in *All is True*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 50 (1999) 459-76. For Wotton, see Sir Henry Wotton to Sir Edmund Bacon reproduced in *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, ed. Logan Pearsall Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), 2: 32-33.
  13. Anon, *A Paire of Sermons Successively Preacht to a paire of Peereles and succeeding princes [ . . . ] To the Late Prince Henry* (London, 1614), 6. In another usage, John Knox, asserting dogma about human fallibility, says, "The fleshe feeleth the torments, and our owne weakenesse crieth all is true, and no point can be denied." No empirical verification but resort to belief is implied. John Knox, *A fort for the afflicted* (London, 1580), sig. [B5v]. I have examined all occurrences of "all is true" in the STC section of Early English Books Online. A very common usage equates "all is true" with inwardly true Christian dogma. Polemicists assert that "all is true" in their various doctrines about God or that "all is true that comes from God" as in the sermon by Miles Moses, *Iustifying and sauving faith distinguished from the faith of the duels* (Cambridge. 1614), p. 39. None of what is called true therein is historically verified knowledge. Cf. R. A. Faces. "Epilogue: A Note on King Henry VIII," in *Shakespeare, The Dark Comedies to the Last Plays: From Satire to Celebration* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1971), 173-83. For "true relations" writing in the period as cast in a literary form, see Frances E. Dolan, *True Relations: Reading, Literature, and Evidence in Seventeenth-Century England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).
  14. Fincham and Lake argue that James's belief in the unity of Christianity expressed itself in a faith that Christian unity could be based on "core Catholic doctrines to be guarded by Christian princes in different national churches." Cf. Fincham and Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I," 186. The pacific and centrist truth espoused by *All is True* can be contrasted with the "truth" of the never performed "Masque of Truth," written to celebrate the early 1613 marriage of the Palatinate Frederick and the Princess Elizabeth as the victory of Calvinist "Truth." Cf. David Norbrook, "The Masque of Truth: Court Entertainments and International Protestant Politics in the Early Stuart Period," *The Seventeenth Century* 1 (1986): 81-110. At the same time, James retained centrist religious credentials through continuing to support the Catholic Howard family (cf. *infra*).



15. *Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies* (London, 1623), 230. Some editors who would change the First Folio's assignment of the speech to Lord Chamberlain to another speaker, but, as manager of the wardrobe, he is the appropriate speaker.
16. Sir Henry Wotton to Sir Edmund Bacon reproduced in *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, ed. Logan Pearsall Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), 2: 32-33. For later efforts to achieve historical verisimilitude in productions, see Hugh Richmond, *King Henry VIII* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).
17. For the play and Prince Henry's agenda in contrast to James's, see Marl Rankin, "Henry VIII, Shakespeare, and the Jacobean Royal Court," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 51 (2011): 349-66
18. Paul Yachnin, "Shakespeare and the Idea of Obedience: Gonzalo in "The Tempest," *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal* 24 (1991): 16-17.
19. Early 1590s master of the revels' censorship of *Sir Thomas More*, partly written by Shakespeare and using some figures also used in *All Is True*, required the suppression of an anti-immigrant scene, a London mob acting against the city's "Lombards," probably because demonstrations against immigrants was a London problem.
20. See Dutton, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (London: Macmillan, 1991), 206-17; cf. T. H. Howard-Hill, "Buc and the Censorship of *Sir John Van Olden Barnavel* in 1619," *Review of English Studies* 39 (1988): 39-63.
21. For an alternative view, see Ali Shehzad Zaidi, "Self-Contradiction in Henry VIII and 'La cima de Inghlaterra,'" *Studies in Philology* 103 (2006): 329-44. Given that Henry's concern is confirmed by three bishops, it is probably not to be taken a mere rationalization.
22. For Polonius as LC, see Josephine Waters Bennett, "Characterization in Polonius' Advice to Laertes," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 4 (1953): 3-9. For Shakespeare's continuous engagement with Jacobean court issues, see Alvin Kernan, *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright: Theater in the Stuart Court, 1603-1613* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997). Shakespeare does not represent the complex bureaucratic relationships between the LC and the Master of the Revels, his deputy and beneficiary, but in my view treats the entertaining and public relation process in one figure, either LC or Master of the Revels.
23. Paul A. Olson, *Beyond a Common Joy* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008), 130-36, 214-22, 267-68.
24. For the Revels Office, patronage, and politics, see Richard Dutton, "Patronage, Politics, and the Master of the Revels, 1622-1640: The Case of Sir John Astley," *English Literary Renaissance* 20 (1990): 312-13.
25. James I believed in a Reformation allowing private belief but maintaining national social fabric—each ruler heading the realm's church and ruling a theocracy. He generally did not suppress the Catholic devotional practices of those following the Oath of Allegiance. Sir Thomas Howard, the lord chamberlain, was "Catholic" in worship practice and observed the Oath of Allegiance, unlike Wolsey

- who violates *praemunire*. To Norfolk, Wolsey is Fortune's eldest son (2.2.19) and out-kings the king as "King-Cardinall" (2.2.17). His girth (Buckingham remarks, "That such a Keech can with his very bulke / Take vp the Rayes o'th'beneficiall Sun, / And keepe it from the Earth" [1.1.55-57]) make him a caricature in England of Rome's putative faults. For art and the meaning of Wolsey's putative weight, see Katherine Harvey, "Iconology of a Cardinal: Was Wolsey Really So Large?" *The Public Domain Review*, <https://publicdomainreview.org/essay/iconology-of-a-cardinal-was-wolsey-really-so-large>. Wolsey first appears (1.1.115) preceded by his purse. Arden Shakespeare interprets purse as covering the Great Seal (Arden Shakespeare, 122), but it is also Judas's symbol in apostolic iconology (John 12:6), a warning against ecclesiastical possessioning (Gertrud Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, trans. Janet Seligman [London: Lund Humphries, 1972], 2:190-96; Paul A. Olson, *Canterbury Tales and the Good Society* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986], 188-203).
26. Fincham and Lake, "Ecclesiastical Policy of King James," 183. The corruption of Roman ecclesiastical rule, observed from Petrarch through Erasmus, Luther, the English reformers, and Spenser, appears concentrated in Wolsey and Campeius in *All Is True*.
  27. *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (London, 1808) 3:755.
  28. Peter de la Primaudaye, *The French Academie* (London, 1586), 477. For a different interpretation of the relation between the *de casibus* falls and apparent providence, see Frank V. Cespedes, "'We are one in fortunes': The Sense of History in Henry VIII," *ELR* 10 (1980): 413-28.
  29. Calvin's Joseph as a type of Christ appears in his commentary on Genesis 37.6; John Calvin, *Commentary on Genesis*, trans. John King (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1948), 2: 223-24.
  30. For the functions of royal pageantry in the reification of royal legitimacy and power, see Roderick McKeown, "Royal Entries and the Form of Pageantry in *All is True*," *Shakespeare Survey* 67 (2014): 191-201.
  31. I owe this suggestion to my colleague, Professor Stephen Buhler. See Bliss, "Wheel of Fortune," 1-25, and Clifford Leach, "The Structure of the Last Plays," *Shakespeare Studies* 11 (1958): 11-30. Marissa Greenberg says of this processional and prophecy, "The processional mode, it would appear, ceases to enact liminality and doubt but instead corresponds to a definitive teleology" but defines the departure of the audience from the play's theater as a processional undercutting the teleology, possibly what some audience members saw but hardly Jacobean ideology (see Greenberg, "Processions and History in Shakespeare and Fletcher's Henry VIII," *ELR* 45 [2015]: 295). For the teleological functions of early modern court ritual, see Charlotte Backerra and Peter Edwards, "Introduction: Rank and Ritual in the Early Modern Court," *The Court Historian* 26 (2021): 1-10.
  32. Meryl Bailey, "'Salvatrix Mundi': Representing Queen Elizabeth as a Christ Type," *Studies in Iconography* 29 (2008): 185. Cf. Paul Dean, "Dramatic Mode and Historical Vision in Henry VIII," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37 (1986): 175-89.
  33. *Henry VIII* does not reference foreign subversion, save for the papal interference sought by Wolsey, because Katherine seeks no outside Spanish interference;



- contrast *The Tempest's* usurper's alliance with King Alonso of Naples: Paul Yachnin, "Shakespeare and the Idea of Obedience: Gonzalo in 'The Tempest,'" *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal* 24 (1991): 1-18.
34. Cf. Smith, *Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, 2: 32-33. Wotton may have been particularly sensitive to any hint of lack of full respect for the monarchic pomp in stage ceremony as he had gotten himself in trouble with James for a remark he made about ambassadors almost a decade earlier and was still trying unsuccessfully to advance his position.
35. For a somewhat parallel argument, see Janet Clare, "Beneath Pomp and Circumstance in Henry VIII," *Shakespeare Studies* (Tokyo) 21 (1982-83): 65-81.
36. Robert N. Bellah, "Civil Religion in America," *Daedalus* 96 (1967): 1-21.