

Josephus, Augustine, Sabellicus. The Duke of Norfolk's petition from the Tower of London. Kate Adcock

In 1546 King Henry VIII determined to destroy the Duke of Norfolk and his son, the Earl of Surrey. Norfolk was a successful general and Henry's long-serving councillor. Norfolk and Surrey were imprisoned in the Tower of London and treason charges devised against them. While Surrey awaited execution paraphrasing the Psalms in English, Norfolk petitioned the Lords. First, he asked for any of his own books to be brought to him, as he cannot get to sleep without reading. Secondly, he asks for permission to have bought for him Josephus' *De Antiquitatibus*, along with Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* and the works of the Venetian historian Sabellicus (d. 1506).

In this paper I propose to put Norfolk's petition into the context of the developing reception of Josephus in England during his lifetime (1473-1554) and of his own reading and active use of historical texts. I will start with a brief historical outline of Norfolk's life, then give an account of the versions of Josephus available to him: the French and Latin manuscripts and the English adaptation of Book 6 of *De Bello Iudaico*. I will then describe some of the works Norfolk might have read which draw on Josephus, either for amusing anecdotes or as a historical source, and conclude with some thoughts about his attitude towards historical texts and significance for Josephan studies.

My contention is that Norfolk was an enthusiastic antiquarian who used his considerable, if intermittent, influence with king Henry the eighth to advance historical studies at court. He encouraged Henry to think of ancient texts as directly relevant to the advancing of the king's policies. By doing so he aided Henry in his establishment of authority over the church in England. His stress on the relevance of history to the present and the authority of historical texts can have only been beneficial when Henry, on the dissolution of the monasteries, had many historical manuscripts, including Josephus, brought to his library from the dismantled religious houses.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk's life was long and, by any standards, eventful. Born in the reign of Edward IV near the thriving mercantile centre of Norwich, he was the eldest son of Thomas Howard, sole surviving son and heir of Sir John Howard, and Elizabeth, the wealthy widow of lord Berners. The Howards were a noble family, claiming descent from Thomas Brotherton, a younger son of king Edward I, and Thomas Mowbray, first duke of Norfolk. Both John and Thomas Howard served king Edward IV at court.

Norfolk was around ten in 1483 when king Edward IV died, and Richard III took the throne. John and Thomas Howard supported Richard's coup against king Edward's young sons. Richard appointed John Howard Marshal of England and duke of Norfolk, with the intention that his heirs should inherit both positions. Richard's rule did not last long, however, and ended in disaster for the Howards. In 1485, Henry Tudor, a rival claimant to the English throne, invaded and defeated Richard at the battle of Bosworth. King Richard perished, as did John Howard. Thomas Howard was imprisoned, deprived of all titles and possessions. After three years, the king released him from jail, and restored him to military command. He was to prove loyal to king Henry VII and his son Henry VIII, under whom he and his eldest son won a famous victory over the Scots at Flodden (1513), as a reward for which he was restored to the title of duke of Norfolk. On Thomas Howard's death in 1524, his son inherited his title of duke of Norfolk and continued to serve Henry VIII both as a military commander and a member of the government.

Norfolk has achieved notoriety as the uncle of two of Henry VIII's six wives: Ann Boleyn and Katherine Howard. Henry, convinced that his first marriage to Katherine of Aragon was unlawful, sought an annulment from the Pope. Henry's main agent in seeking the annulment was Cardinal Wolsey, lord Chancellor, archbishop of York and the most powerful man in England (after the king). The Pope's representative procrastinated, satisfying neither Henry nor Katherine, then ruled

that the case had to be heard in Rome. The king of England could be summoned to appear before the Pope.

This humiliation had to be avoided at all costs. Wolsey was deprived of the chancellorship, and Norfolk became Henry's chief advisor. The king's authority over his own kingdom had to be clarified. An unprecedented appeal was made to historical precedent. Chronicles and patristic texts in England and abroad were scoured in a quest for evidence for the authority of the king of England over the church in his own country. The results of this feverish historical research can be found in a manuscript on the authority of the king over various sectors of the church. This was prepared for Henry, who annotated it. Part of this manuscript was published in 1533, the year in which Henry married Ann Boleyn and elevated Norfolk to the post held by his grandfather, John Howard under Richard III: Marshal of England. Henry was declared supreme head of the church in England, and by 1535 had the English Bible available to the laity.

By August 1536, Norfolk was in deep trouble. Ann Boleyn was executed, his son-in-law, king Henry's acknowledged illegitimate son, died, and his brother, also Thomas Howard, was imprisoned for marrying the king's niece without royal permission. With Henry so angered against him, Norfolk was convinced he too would be imprisoned. But he returned to favour with his successful suppression of a rebellion in the north of England, and in 1537 became the future king Edward's godfather. He reached the pinnacle of royal favour with Henry's marriage to Katherine Howard. The indefatigable Norfolk persuaded Henry to visit the north of England for the only time in his life, organising a royal visit to York.

Disaster struck on the king's return south and Katherine Howard was executed. Norfolk avoided imprisonment, and was given military command again by Henry. But in 1546, the ailing king imprisoned Norfolk and his eldest son, the earl of Surrey, and actively sought charges against them. The charges which were eventually made to stick were absurd, based on Norfolk and Surrey's coats of arms. Surrey was tried, found guilty and executed. Norfolk was found guilty of treason by an act of Parliament. Henry wished Norfolk to be executed, but the king died before the sentence was carried out.

Henry was succeeded by his son, the Edward VI, Norfolk's godson under whose rule the church in England became more protestant. Edward died in 1553, and was succeeded by his sister, the catholic Mary.

Norfolk spent the entirety of Edward's reign a prisoner in the Tower of London. He was released in his eightieth year by Mary on her accession, restored as Marshal and played a full part in government. He died in 1554 in his main residence of Kenninghall, which had been restored to him by the queen.

The main sources for Norfolk's life are his letters, many hundreds of which survive and the reports of foreign ambassadors.

JOSEPHUS IN ENGLAND FROM THE TIME OF EDWARD IV TO HENRY VIII

Edward IV and the royal library.

England had lacked stable government for many years before Norfolk's birth, with supporters of rival claimants to the throne clashing in battle. Rulers on the Continent were more than willing to support pretenders to the English throne, a potentially profitable way of weakening England. Preoccupied with rebellion at home, the kings of England posed no threat to their neighbours. Pretenders and their supporters who fled with them overseas were thus exposed to foreign influences, military and cultural. One of the results of this influence can be seen in the establishment by Edward IV of the Royal Library. Edward spent his time in exile at the court of Louis de Gruuthuyse of Bruges, a highly cultured man. Edward evidently coveted his library for when he returned to England and seized the throne from his rival, Henry VI, he ordered a series of at least 30 manuscripts to be produced for him and his son, the ill-fated Edward V. This marked the establishment of a royal library in England, a collection of secular texts in French, beautifully copied and lavishly illustrated with pictures of familiar contemporary life.

Most of the manuscripts have stayed together, and are now in the British Library; however, the manuscript of the second part of Josephus *De Antiquitatibus* is now at Sir John Soane's Museum in London.

The Soane Josephus.¹

Contents.

This manuscript is the second of a pair of two volumes of Josephus. It starts with a detailed list of the contents in the same hand as the rest of the manuscript. The text begins with book 15 of the Antiquities, continues to book 20 (the traditional end of the Antiquities) then continues with what it terms books 21 to 26 of the Antiquities. This is in fact the text of *De bello Iudaico* (there is no break where we would expect book 27 to start). So, for example, the first book of *De Bello Iudaico* ends on folio 193r

Icy fine le premier livre de la bataille que les Juifs eurent contre les rommanis qui est le xxie livre des antiquites des Juifs selon Josephus.

Here concludes the first book of the campaign which the Jews waged against the Romans which is the 21st book of the Antiquities of the Jews according to Josephus.

The first volume, which presumably contained the first 14 books of the Antiquities, is lost, and may never have made it to England. The manuscript was originally intended for Louis de Gruuthuyse, Edward's host when he was exiled from England. The second and fourth quarters of Louis' coat of arms are visible under king Edward's on folio 150r. For the most part, however, the arms painted in the borders of the illustrations are those of king Edward or his son.

Each book starts with a lavish full-page illustration, some quite gruesome, depicting strangling or stabbing. The figures are dressed in contemporary fashion; a reader looking at the pictures would have no clues that Josephus' narrative is set in the classical period. So on folio 232v, the emperor Nero is seated under a cloth of estate, his coat of arms, the double-headed black eagle of the Holy Roman Emperor, displayed above his head. Titus kneels before the emperor to accept his commission, encased in modern fifteenth-century armour. Each book concludes with a calligraphic pen drawing.

The text begins beneath the first illustration:

Icy commence le quinziesme livre de Josephus de l'anciennete de Juifs. Et monstre on premier chapitre Comme[n]t herode occist antigon. Et comment il deposa hircan de leveschie Et fit mourir aristobule.

Here begins the fifteenth book of Josephus concerning the antiquities of the Jews. And shows in the first chapter how Herod killed Antigonus. And how he deposed Hircanus from the *eveschie* And brought about the death of Aristobulus.

Testamentum Flavianum.

The Testamentum Flavianum, in which Josephus bears witness to Christ, is one of the key passages for medieval ecclesiastical copyists, and for Renaissance and Tudor readers of the Antiquities. Its importance is enhanced in the Latin manuscript of Josephus from St Alban's abbey (described below). The Soane Josephus, while containing the words of the Testamentum in book 18 of the Antiquities, does nothing to draw attention to it.

1 Margaret Kekewich, "Edward IV, William Caxton and Literary Patronage in Yorkist England" *Modern Language Review*, July 1971 vol. 66 pp. 481-487; Scot McKendrick "*La Grande Histoire Cesar* and the manuscripts of Edward IV" ; British library exhibition catalogue for image

Description.

The manuscript has not been trimmed, unlike the manuscript of William of Nangis and the Latin manuscript of Josephus described below. We can thus be confident that it has not been annotated apart from the folio numbers added to the list of contents, or defaced, apart from what looks like a blood stain on the contents pages.

The French text was presumably translated from Latin, there is no hint in the manuscript as to who translated it. The text of the translation has not been published. It may be profitable to compare it to the French translation of *De bello Iudaico* published after 1492 by A Verad (Bodleian library).

Readership.

This luxurious manuscript was intended for the library of the king of England, whose arms adorn many of the illustrations. It has been suggested that king Edward intended his manuscript collection to have an educational purpose for his sons, hence the presence of the arms of his young heir on the borders. But Edward's main intention in commissioning the manuscripts must have been to impress visitors with the lavish illustrations, rather than necessarily reading the text.

The illustrations depict a world in which the reader would have been comfortable. Dress, architecture, manners, conventions (such as sitting at various tables around a medieval hall according to degree), food, all these would have been familiar to the reader. The manuscript was clearly intended for the secular readers. If the choice of illustration reflects the readers' interest, they were primarily interested in Josephus as a military text (most of the illustrations are on a military theme). The readership may have been similar to the men who commissioned the Slavonic translation of Josephus.

Royal manuscript 13 D VI-VII

Another pair of manuscripts of Josephus found its way into the Royal collection during the reign of Henry VIII. Royal 13 D VI contains a Latin translation of *De Antiquitatibus* books 1-14; Royal D VII contains the rest of *De Antiquitatibus* and *De Bello Iudaico*. The translation is that ascribed to Rufinus.

The provenance of each manuscript is made clear on the first folio of each volume:

Hic est liber sancti Albani quem qui ei abstulerit aut titulu[m] delevit anathema sit. (Royal 13 D VI)

Hic est liber sti Albani quem qui ei abstulerit ut fraudem committeret aut titulum deleverit anathema sit. (Royal 13 D VII)

This is a book of Saint Alban which whoever removes it or deletes the title be excommunicated. (Royal 13 D VI)

This is a book of St. Alban which whoever removes it to commit a crime or deletes the title be excommunicated. (Royal 13 D VII)

Despite the curse, the manuscripts were removed from St Alban's abbey, presumably when the abbey was dissolved in 1539. They have been securely identified as the manuscripts of Josephus listed in the inventory of Henry VIII's library at Westminster of 1542.

The first manuscript begins with a short biographical notice about Josephus, almost word for word that of Jerome's translation of Eusebius' *De Viris Illustribus* (*PL* 23, 629)

Josephus Mathie filius ex ierosolimis sacerdos a vespasiano captus. Cum tito filio ei relictus est. Hic

romam veniens. Septem libros iudaice captivitatis imperatoribus patri filioque optulit. Qui et bibliothecae publice traditi sunt. Et ob ingenii gloriam statuam quoque Romae meruit. Scripsit autem et alios viginti antiquitatum libros. Ab exordio mundi usque ad quartum decimum annum domitiani caesaris. [Here is omitted a sentence about Josephus' other writings] Hic in octavo decimo antiquitatum libro manifestissime confitetur propter magnitudinem signorum XPM a phariseis interfectum et Iohannem baptistam vere prophetam fuisse. Et propter interfectionem Jacobi apostoli ierosolimam dirutam. Scribit autem de domino in hunc modum. Eo tempore fuit IHC sapiens vir si tamen virum eum oportet dicere. Erat enim mirabilium patratore operum et doctor eorum qui libenter vera suscipiunt. Plurimos quoque tam de iudeis quam de gentibus sui habuit sectatores et credebatur esse XPC. Cumque invidia nostrorum principum cruci eum pilatus addiderit nichilominus qui primum dilexerit perseveraverit. Apparuit enim eis tertia die vivens. Multa haec et alia mirabilia carminibus prophetarum de eo vaticinantibus et usque hodie christianorum gens ab hoc sortita vocabulum non deficit.

Josephus the son of Matthias a priest from Jerusalem was captured by Vespasian. He remained behind with Titus. Coming to Rome, he brought to the emperors, father and son, seven books on the captivity of the Jews, which were handed over to the public library. And for his honour, he also merited a statue in Rome. He also wrote twenty books of antiquities from the beginning of the world to the fourteenth year of the emperor Domitian. He in the eighteenth book of the antiquities confesses most plainly that Christ, by reason of the greatness of the signs, was killed by the Pharisees, and John the Baptist was a true prophet. And that after the death of Jacob the apostle Jerusalem was destroyed. He writes about the Lord in this way: (then follows the Testamentum Flavianum).

The beginning of each book is marked with an intricate full-page green or red initial letter, as is the Testamentum Flavianum in book XVIII. The Testamentum Flavianum is also highlighted by the marginal note “de XPO” in red. On folio 150v we find “de iohanne baptista” in the margin, also in red. Other than this, the manuscripts are not decorated.

The manuscripts are written in a neat twelfth-century hand. The scribe seems to have been copying from a text in which many words are abbreviated. Certainly he uses abbreviations liberally, and in some cases seems to have expanded abbreviated words incorrectly. A second scribe has systematically gone through *De bello Iudaico*, neatly correcting the text. I did not have time to see if this corrector was working from a second manuscript, or if his corrections were an attempt to emend the original scribe's inept expansion of abbreviations.

Later readers have added few annotations. On folio 36r of VI, a hand in the margin marks a comment about a council, and on 36v “Sinai” is similarly marked.

Readership.

The manuscripts were originally intended as sacred texts, presumably for the monks of the abbey of St Alban's. From 1542 the secular readers with access to the royal library could presumably have looked at it. Some of the few annotations in it seem to be sixteenth-century, similar to those found in Norfolk's manuscript of William of Nangis. Would this manuscript have had any greater value to its secular owner than a printed book of the Rufinus' translation?

Printed texts

In his prison in 1546, Norfolk envisaged that someone would be allowed to bring him, not manuscripts, but printed books. There were many editions of Josephus to choose from. Josephus was one of the earliest texts to be printed. By 1480, *De Antiquitatibus* had appeared in Verona, Venice, Rome, Florence, Lubeck and Augsburg. It does not seem to have been printed in England by 1546, however, nor was it translated at this stage into English, with the exception of a romanticised version of book 6 of *De Bello Iudaico*, published in 1510.

The Destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian and Titus.

This book is the earliest English version of a portion of Josephus' writings. Published in London 1510 by Wynkyn de Worde, it must have enjoyed some popularity, and was reprinted by Richard Pynson in 1513. There is no clue in the text as to whether it was translated from French or Latin or was an original English composition. The text is illustrated with Wynkyn's woodcuts of key scenes. This romantic tale combines book 6 of *De Bello Iudaico* with various legends of the early Church, such as the origin of the cloth which miraculously preserved the image of the face of Christ, the Vernacle. The authors are Jafet, Jacob and Joseph of Arimetheia, who, like the original Josephus, are asked by the emperor Titus to write an account of the destruction of Jerusalem on the grounds that they were eyewitnesses.

When the emperor hear that he made Jafet, Jacob and Joseph of Artmatye to write the destruction and vengeance of Jerusalem for they knew it well. And also the death and Justice of Pilate as you have heard word by word. (*Destruction*, final page of text)

The inclusion of Joseph of Arimetheia is interesting, as he it is who according to legend, brought Christianity to England in apostolic times. But if we look for any consistency in the Joseph of Arimetheia legend, we are doomed to disappointment. A year after the publication of the *Destruction*, in 1511, Wynkyn de Worde published another English text ostensibly based on the writings of Joseph of Arimetheia: *A treatise taken out of a book which sometime Theodosius the Emperor found in Jerusalem in the prelatory of Pilate of Joseph of Artmatye*.

In this treatise there is no mention of Titus. In fact, according to this text, Joseph of Arimetheia dies before the destruction of Jerusalem, and thus could not have been the author of the *Destruction*. Even the most rudimentary historical consistency was not Wynkyn de Worde's concern.

The approach of Wynkyn's text to Josephus is in many ways akin to that of the Soane Josephus; the author brings a narrative of the classical past into a chivalric present. The text is copiously illustrated with woodcuts reminiscent of the pictures in the Soane Josephus: the frontispiece shows late fifteenth-century knights besieging Jerusalem. The text is full of anachronisms: men are given modern, quite un-Roman offices such as seneschal. One example will suffice to give an idea as to how the original tale was adapted.

One of the most moving passages in Josephus' works, the emotional climax of his account of the siege of Jerusalem, is his description of a mother, reduced to despair by the famine in Jerusalem, killing her own child and eating it. Josephus deploys all his rhetorical skills in his depiction of the woman's dreadful situation.

Among the residents of the region beyond Jordan was a woman named Mary, daughter if Eleazar, of the village of Bethezuba (the name means "House of Hyssop"), eminent by reason of her family and fortune, ho had fled with the rest of the people to Jerusalem and there become involved in the siege. The bulk of her property, which she had packed up and brought with her from Peraea to the city, had been plundered by the tyrants: while the relics of her treasure, with whatever food she had managed to procure, were being carried off by their satellites in their dailt raids. With deep indignation in her heart, the poor woman constantly abused and cursed these extortioners and so incensed them against her. But when no one either out of exasperation or pity put her to death, weary of finding for others food, which indeed it was now impossible from any quarter to procure, while famine coursed through her intestines and marrow and the fire of rage was more consuming even than the famine, impelled by the promptings alike of fury and necessity. She proceeded to an act of outrage upon nature. Seizing her child, an infant at the breast, "Poor babe," she cried, "amidst war, famine, and sedition, to what end should I preserve thee? With the Romans slavery awaits us,

should we live till they come; but famine is forestalling slavery, and more cruel than both are the rebels. Come, be thou food for me, to the rebels an avenging fury, and to the world a tale such as alone is wanting to the calamities of the Jews.” With these words she slew her son, and then, having roasted the body and devoured half of it, she covered up and stored the remainder. At once the rebels were upon her and, scenting the unholy odour, threatened her with instant death unless she produced what she had prepared. Replying that she had reserved a goodly portion for them also, she discoloured the remnants of her child. Seized with instant horror and stupefaction, they stood paralysed by the sight. She, however, said, “This is my own child, and this my handiwork. Eat, for too have eaten. Show yourselves not weaker than a woman or more compassionate than a mother. But if you have pious scruples and shrink from my sacrifice, then let what I have eaten be your portion and the remainder also be left for me.” At that they departed trembling, in this one instance cowards, though scarcely yielding even this food to the mother. The while city instantly rang with the abomination, and each, picturing the horror of it, shuddered as though it had been perpetrated by himself. The starving folk longed for death, and felicitated those who had gone to their rest ere they had heard or beheld such evils. (Josephus *Jewish War* VI 201-213, translated into English by Thackeray)

This passage is adapted in Wynkyn de Worde's the 1510 version thus.

Now there happened that a lady that had to name Marye, the whiche had ben wyfe of the kynge of Affrycke. The which deyed in the tyme that Jhesu cryste was crucefyed. That same ladye wylled not to be maryed ony more and she had a doughter and a noble lady that was her felowe the which was called claryce and she had a sone. These two ladyes came into Jherusalem and were converted to the fayth of Jhesu cryste and was baptysed. And these two ladyes was well garnysshed of vytaylles so as it apperteyned unto a quene unto the tyme that the men of Pylate dyd stele it from them. And they were ever in orayson towardes Jhesu cryst for they had strongly theyr fayth And as it is sayd before the Jewes had stolen theyr vytaylles excepte herbes that they had in a gardyne that was within theyr hous and of these herbes they lyved. Whan al theyr herbes was eten the doughter of the quene of Affryke was moche feble for hongre and deyed without any other sekenes whereof the quene had right grete sorowe and wepte moche strongly. And also the sone of the felawe of the quene deyed for grete hongre for the whiche his moder made ryght grete dole. And also for that they had grete hongre also wel as for theyr chyltren that were deed. Whan the felawe of the quene sawe and consydered theyr grete sorowe she sayd unto the quene. Lady leve we this sorowe in peas and take we my chylde and cut a quarter and roste we it sith that we have none other thyng for to ete and that all is gone. And whan the quene herde that of grete sorowe and hysdour that she hadde she fell downe to the erth in a swowne.

Now as the two ladyes were in counsayll and the quene in swowne an aungell badde the quene roste and ete her chylde.

And then as the queen Marye laye swounyng an aungell came that toke her up and confortd her and sayd to her. Lady god sendeth you worde by me that you ete the chylde to the ende that that which he hathe sayd shall be accomplysshed and done. For Ihesu Chrit spoke it with his propre mouth in this cyte the day of Palmsondaye when he entered mounted upon an asse. And in that generation there sholde be pestilence and famine so grete in Jerusalem that the moder sholde ete her chylde. ...

The ladies roast and eat the child. Pilate sends “sergeants” to find out what the smell might be.

Josephus' text has clearly been adapted; the lady is a baptised Christian, the wife of the king of Africa, rather than from some obscure village.

Socially, too, the tale is updated. The queen is given a “fellow”, perhaps because it was

unimaginable for a late fifteenth-century lady of such high status not to have a servant. Claryce shares the queen's sufferings and supports her. They both pray to Jesus. Nevertheless, their children die. Claryce suggests that they should eat her dead child, but even this is too horrific a suggestion for the devout queen. She faints, and has a vision of an angel encouraging her to eat the child, in fulfilment of God's word.

The introduction of Claryce dilutes the horror of Josephus' picture of an isolated woman driven to distraction by hunger. Above all, the moral dilemma confronting the starving woman is neatly resolved in Wynkyn's version by the appearance of the angel, who reassures her that eating the child is morally acceptable. The act of eating the child is set in the context of God's plan for the world.

So in 1546 Norfolk would have had available a printed text of Josephus in Latin. If he had access to the royal library, he would have been able to read the Soane Josephus. *De bello Iudaico* had been printed in French. He would not, however, have had access to *De Antiquitatibus* in Greek or translated into English.

Josephus the Man

Norfolk may have had a clear picture of Josephus the man, drawn from Jerome's rendition of Eusebius' short biography, copied at the commencement of the St Alban's manuscript above. He might also have had a more up-to-date view of the Jewish historian, such as that found in Thomas Elyot's *Bibliotheca*, a reference book published in 1542 (coincidentally the same year that the inventory of the royal library at Westminster was written)

Josephus, the son of Mattathias, a priest of Hierusalem, which wrate in greeke the battayl of the Iewes and the dustruction of the citie by Vespasian and Titus, wherat he hym selfe was present. He wrate also of the antiquities of the Iewes, in ii sundry arguments. He was among the Romans had in such reverence and honour that his image was set up in the city. He had the spirit of prophecye and bring prisoner told unto Vespasian that he shuld be emperor of Rome. Also in his book of antiquities he writeth in this wise: At this time was Jesus a wise man, if it be leful to call him a man, he was a doer of wonderful works and a teacher of those men, which willingly do here things that be true, he joined unto him many Jewe and also Gentiles, this man was Christ. Hen Pilate by the envy of the chief men of our nation had judged him to be put upon the cross, he forsook not them, whom from the beginning he loved, but appeared to them the third day, eftsones alyve, according as the prophets by divine inspiration spake before of hym, and that innumerable miracles should be done by him. Hitherto wrote Josephus. Wherby appereth his excellent wisdom and specyall grace which he had receved and it repugneth not moche, that in his heart he imbraced the faith of Christ. He was after the incarnation of Christ lxxvi years.

The differences between Jerome's version and Elyot's are instructive. Elyot insists that Josephus wrote in Greek, maybe an echo of the controversy mentioned by the fifteenth-century grammarian Lancelot Pasi of Ferrara, as to which languages Josephus could write in; the language in which Josephus wrote does not concern Jerome. On the other hand, Jerome states that Josephus' books were deposited in the public library, a fact omitted by Elyot. Both state that a statue, or image, was set up to Josephus. Elyot draws attention to Josephus' powers of prophecy, not mentioned at all by Jerome. Josephus accurately predicted the accession to power of Vespasian. Prophecy was taken extremely seriously in the time of Henry VIII. It was a capital offence to try to predict the king's future. Norfolk's father-in-law, the duke of Buckingham, was executed on the grounds that he consulted a monk about his own future. So Elyot's appreciation of Josephus' prophetic gifts reflects his own society's priorities.

Elyot, like Jerome, then includes the Testamentum Flavianum. Jerome concludes his biography with a sentence about the spread of the Christian race. Elyot concludes with a sentence about Josephus, drawing attention to his wisdom and the special grace by which Josephus embraced the faith of Christ.

JOSEPHUS AS A SOURCE FOR OTHER AUTHORS

Even if Norfolk had never read the whole of *De Antiquitatibus* before his incarceration, he would have had some idea of the text he was asking for. Josephus was excerpted by many authors - historians, poets and others - and Norfolk was certainly familiar with some of their works.

Jacob de Cessolis (fl. 1288-1322)

Josephus was a rich mine of anecdotes for medieval writers such as Jacob de Cessolis. Jacob de Cessolis' book on the game of chess does not condescend to explain to the uninitiated how chess is to be played. Rather, he presents chess as an allegory of society. Jacob draws on classical authors for anecdotes. He includes an anecdote from Josephus about the appointment of officials.

Josephus reherst that the frendes of tyberus meruaylled moche why he helde hys officers so longe in theyr offices wyth oute changynge. And they demanded of hym the cause to whom he answered I wold change them gladly if I wuste that his shold be good for the people. But I sawe on a tyme a man that was ruyuyous and full of sores And many flyes satte upon the soores and souked his blood that hit was a mervaylle to see wherefore I ... chased them away. And he than said to me why chacest tand smyttest taway these flyes that ben full of my blood And now shallt then late come other that ben hongrye which shall oon to me double payne more than the other dide for the prikke of the hongrye is more poygnant the half than of the fulle. And therfore sayde he I leue the officers in the offices for they ben all riche and doo not so moche euyl and harme as the newe shold doo and were poure yf I should sette hem in her places.

Jacob recounts how Josephus, who was a physician, managed to cure Titus' impotence.

And also we rede that Titus the sone of Vespasian when he had conquered Ierusalem and abode in the contrees by he herde yt his fader vaspasian was chosen by alle the senate for to governe the empire of rome wherefore he had so right grete Ioye that sodaynly he loste the strength of all his members And he cam all impoten. And whan Iosephus that made the history of the romayns ayenst the Iewis whiche was a ryght wyse phisicien sawe and knewe the cause of this sickness of the said Titus he enquiryed of his folk yf he had in hate any man gretly so moche that he myght not here speke of hym ner well see him.

Josephus tells this man to come and be served by butlers cooks and officers, like an emperor, reverently. Titus gets very angry, and his potency returns.

Norfolk may well have come across Jacob de Cessolis' book on chess in his grandfather's house: listed among the books John Howard took on his military expedition to Scotland in 1482 is one on the game of chess. It is most likely that this was Jacob de Cessolis' book, printed eight years previously by Caxton.

John Skelton (d. 1526)

John Skelton had a long association with Norfolk's household. Skelton was no mean classical scholar and an important early translator of classical texts into English (he translated the histories of Diodorus Siculus). He also wrote poems, panegyrics (of Norfolk, among others), and humorous satires. In a light-hearted poem, loosely based on Catullus' ode to his mistress' dead sparrow, "Lugete o veneres cupidinesque", the maid whose sparrow, Phillip, has expired, protests that, though well versed in history old and new, she is utterly unable to write poetry in rude English. She lists the classical authors with whom she is familiar (the following is but a short fragment of her list).

Though I remember the fable
Of Penelope most stable

To her husband most trew
Yet long time she ne knew
Whether he were on live or ded
Her wit stood her in sted
That she was true and iuste
For anye bodelye luste
To Ulixes her make
And never wold him forsake.
Of Marcus Marcellus
A prosses I could tell us
And of Anteocus
And of Josephus
De Antiquitatibus
And of Mardocheus
And of great Assuerus...

Despite the poor maid's alarmingly wide-ranging knowledge of history, she is utterly unable to write poetry to rival Petrarch and Vergil. Any reader of Skelton's poem would probably concur.

Giovanni Boccaccio

Another poet popular among the nobility in England was Giovanni Boccaccio, whose book on the Fall of Princes was translated from Italian into English by Lydgate, a monk of Bury St Edmund's and published in London in 1494. Boccaccio expects his readers to have access to copies of Josephus and encourages them to read the text for themselves.

In Iosephus his story ye may rede
Of his children borne in right lyne ...

Thus Roboam for his transgressions
In Iosephus as it is devysed
and for his frowarde fals opineons ...

And to reherce it is a great dole
Howe Roboam as Iosephus doth declare
Was inly proud and therwithall a fole
And of all wisdom destitute and bare

And Iosephus remembreth by scriptures
That this Tubal could forge well-known
First ymaged makynge of armure

Ranulph Higden

Josephus was, of course, primarily quoted by historians. Ranulph Higden (d. 1364), in his Polychronicon, the first history to be printed in English by Caxton in 1482 (it was also the first history translated into English) quotes Josephus extensively. In his preface to his history, Higden lists his sources.

This chronicle is special gedred and drawn from [among others] Iosephus Iudeorum historicus in signis qui ab inicio seculi us(que) ad xiiii domiciani libros antiquitatum viginti nec non et de subversione civitatis Iherosolime gentis (que) sue captivitate septem conscripsit ... Historia Ecclesiastica tripartita cuius tres sunt Auctores Eusebius Ieronimus et Theodorus Episcopus/Augustinus de civitate dei potissime etc.

It is interesting to note that Higden views Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, one of the other books Norfolk is keen to read in the Tower, as a historical source.

As a historical enthusiast, Norfolk probably knew Higden's work. He certainly knew the writings of two other chroniclers: Sabellicus and William of Nangis.

Sabellicus

Apart from Josephus and Augustine, Norfolk in prison asks for the works of Sabellicus, an author whose works he explicitly states he has already read. Marcus Antonius Cocceius Sabellicus (d. 1506) was a professional historian from the Sabine hills near Rome. He settled in Venice where he wrote his histories and works of grammar. His writings include a history of Venice, one of Aquileia, extracts from the philosophers and a history of the Jews, in which he draws heavily on Josephus. His most famous work is his universal history written in the style of Livy, for which he drew on many sources.

Norfolk has evidently already read this history, for he says in his letter from the Tower that of all the writers he has read, Sabellicus is the one who shows best how the bishop of Rome (the Pope) has usurped the power of princes. What impression would Norfolk have got of Josephus from reading Sabellicus' works?

Sabellicus was a conscientious historian, keen not only to establish the truth but also to understand his sources reasons for not writing the truth. Like earlier chroniclers, he draws on the Latin translation of Josephus. He points out where Josephus' account conflicts with other sources (Timagenes and Josephus, Eusebius and Josephus). He prefers Josephus as a source to Eusebius, but is not uncritical of the Jewish historian. Josephus, Sabellicus notes, says that many men were killed, as a result of civil strife. "Sed ille causam caedis aut nescivit, aut certe dissimulavit" - "but he was either unaware of the reason for the massacre, or clearly lied" (page 323). Sometimes the historian cannot explain his source, merely register surprise. On page 341 he says "Tranquillus signum unum ait Romanis fuisse ademptum, quod miror Josephum in suorum laudem pronum non posuisse" - Tranquillus (Suetonius) says that one standard was captured from the Romans, which I am surprised Josephus, who inclined to praise his own people, has not recorded. Sabellicus is aware of Josephus' value as a source. On page 355, he is reluctant to disagree with Josephus "Pudet a Josepho dissantire, qui hunc numerum in historia posuit, et qui Hebraeus fit" - I am embarrassed to disagree with Josephus, who put this number in his history, and who was a Hebrew. As to the Testamentum Flavianum, Sabellicus is in no doubt it is authentic. On page 332 he acknowledges that some scholars have questioned its authenticity, but, he says, it must be genuine as it is referred to by Eusebius and Egesippus.

Sabellicus was quite widely read in Henry VIII's time. He is quoted by reformers such as John Bale, for example for his account of John Huss, the Bohemian condemned to death for translating the Bible into the vernacular without the church's permission, and Latimer in his second sermon, as well as conservatives such as William Peryn. During the reign of Edward VI, Sabellicus became increasingly viewed as a papist writer. Antony Gilby dismisses him as one of Stephen Gardiner's "own men" (and thus utterly unreliable) on the grounds of his conservative eucharistic theology. When Gardiner wrote his defence of the catholic eucharistic teaching, in opposition to Cranmer, he chose the pen name "Marcus Antonius". Might this have been in honour of Marcus Antonius Cocceius Sabellicus?

Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and Norfolk were close allies who enjoyed each other's company. Two years into Edward VI's reign, Gardiner was imprisoned in the Tower, on no charge at all. He fought for a trial, which he was eventually granted. Found guilty of treason, he was returned to the Tower. With characteristic meanness, the privy council decreed that Norfolk and Gardiner should not be allowed to meet each other. Gardiner was released along with Norfolk by queen Mary in 1553, and became her Lord Chancellor, the first churchman to hold this post since the fall of Cardinal Wolsey in 1528.

William of Nangis (d. 1301) Chronicle.

Of all the histories Norfolk read, pride of place must go to the Chronicle of William of Nangis, the only book we know Norfolk actually owned (Royal manuscript 13 EIV). This elegant, rather severe fourteenth-century manuscript was copied soon after the death of the author. It is written in a clear hand, with a minimum of decoration (vertical red lines are ruled down each outer margin). Its historical significance lies not only in the text of the chronicle itself, but also in the annotations, of which there are at least two sets. The earlier annotations are hard to make out as they have been systematically erased. The manuscript was subsequently annotated by Henry VIII. It is quite conceivable that the earlier annotations were erased so that the margins would be clean for the king to write in.

On the flyleaf facing the first folio is inscribed in a hand unsteadily imitating that of the manuscript:

Liber illustrissimi principis Thomae *gratia dei* ducis Norfolciae

A book of the most illustrious prince Thomas *by the grace of God* duke of Norfolk

The N of Norfolciae is ineptly decorated in imitation of a capital N on the facing page. Curiously, the words *Gratia Dei* have been messily erased and can only be made out under ultra-violet light.

On the final folio, under the last few words of text, is Norfolk's signature, in a form he was using from January 1528 to 1531. Norfolk's signature has a different function to the statement of ownership at the start of the book. It comes at the end of the text, where donor's names are generally inscribed. Norfolk thus seems to have signed his copy of William of Nangis when he gave it away, presumably to king Henry, for it is listed in the 1542 inventory of the royal library at Westminster.

Contents

William of Nangis was a monk at the monastery of St Denis near Paris. He states in his introduction that his chronicle is based on several sources: Eusebius (translated by Jerome), Bede, Gilbert of etc. He himself continued the chronicle from where Gilbert left off. In turn his chronicle was continued by three independent chroniclers. His continuation and the works of his successors have been published. The earlier section, containing classical history, has not, presumably on the assumption that it is merely a copy of Jerome's translation of Eusebius (as William states in his preface).

Josephus features in William's chronicle.

Quotation from Josephus.

We have some evidence that Norfolk read the chronicle, in a possible allusion he made to the fate of Hircanus in 1529.

The fall of Cardinal Wolsey from favour was a long draw-out affair. King Henry kept his options open as to whether to make the Cardinal's disgrace permanent, or to recall him to favour. On the failure of Wolsey's attempts to get Henry's annulment heard in England, he was deprived of his secular office. He was, nevertheless, still archbishop of York. Norfolk, aware that Henry could change his mind about Wolsey, was intent to have him sent as far away from court as possible, and suggested to the king that Wolsey should visit his see in York. Wolsey, however, was in no hurry to set out to the wild North of England, where he knew the king would never set foot. Norfolk and the other lords were perturbed at this delay. Norfolk told a messenger, the Cardinal's servant Thomas Cromwell

“Master Cromwell, me thinkes the Cardinall thy Master makes no haste to goe northwards, tell him, if hee go not away, I will tear him with my teeth...

The threat to “tear him with my teeth” was not exceptionally violent for the time. For example, in a letter Norfolk wishes himself to be torn into a million pieces if he is proved untrue to the king, and, in a forceful statement of economic policy, says that he would rather see all his children buried than England become bankrupt. Nevertheless, Norfolk's apparent threat to eat the Cardinal made an impression on contemporaries, such as the Spanish ambassador, Chapuys.

I think, however, that Norfolk was making a threat of a different kind. He might here be alluding to the fate of Hircanus, as told in *De Bello Iudaico*, and recounted by William of Nangis. Prince and high priest, Hircanus held uniquely high positions in the Jewish state. He was deprived of his secular office and taken prisoner along with his brother Phaselus by the Parthians, who had taken Jerusalem.

Royal 13 EIV fol. 162r

Parthi vero non solum antigonum restituerunt in regnum. Verum etiam hircanum et phaselum vinctos ei dederunt verberandos. At ille hircani auriculas dentibus truncavit ne quando mutatis rebus solutus pontificatum reciperet. Ab integris enim celebrari sacra oportet.

The Parthians indeed did not only restore Antigonus to the throne. They even gave him Hircanus and Phaselus in chains for torture. But he tore Hircanus' ears with his teeth, lest at some time freed [from captivity] with a change of fortune, he [Hircanus] should regain the priesthood. For the sacred mysteries must be celebrated by men without defect.

Seeing an allusion to this story in Norfolk's message to Wolsey may be wishful thinking. But the phrase “tear with teeth” became widespread only in the 1550s, when Cranmer adopted it to pour scorn on the “papists” who would believe that the bread which they eat at Mass has become the body of Christ. Surely they do not believe that this bit of bread, which they tear with their teeth and digest in their bellies, really is the body of the Lord? I have only come across one use of it earlier than Norfolk's.

The parallels between Wolsey's case and Hircanus' are quite close. In both cases what is feared is a return to favour. Norfolk fears Wolsey will somehow inveigle himself back into Henry's good books. Antigonus fears that unless he disfigures him, Hircanus will be able to resume the priesthood.

It is possible that Norfolk would have been alive to any parallels. The Soane Josephus and the English Destruction of Jerusalem, all bring Josephus into a contemporary setting. Norfolk would have found Josephus' accounts of the political strife within Herod's court very familiar. Any broad similarities in the situation of Wolsey and Hircanus would have surely been reinforced by the way in which he read Josephus. A clue to this lies in the work of Thomas Elyot. In his *Bibliotheca*, he mentions Hircanus (grandfather of the Hircanus whose ears were torn off by Antigonus). He too was high priest.

Aristobulus was the son of Hircanus, captayne and chief bushop of the Iewes 92 yeres afor the coming of Christ. This man attempted to translate the dignitie of a bishop unto the dignity of a king, and was the first which after the returning from the captivity of Babylon took on him to wear a crown.

According to Elyot, Hircanus, like Wolsey, was a “chief bishop”. This interpretation of the office of

high priest can be found also in the Soane Josephus, where Hircanus is deprived of the “eveschie”. Elyot's reading makes any parallels between Hircanus, the “chief bishop”, and Wolsey, archbishop, much more obvious than they would be to a modern historian.

The main thrust of Norfolk's threat is thus not that he will eat Wolsey. Rather, he would, like Antigonus “tear him with his teeth” ie. do everything in his power to render him ineligible for religious as well as secular office, for ever. As Wolsey was at this point still enjoying a handsome income from the church, and probably hoped to return to favour with Henry, this would have been no idle threat.

Poem from Tottel's Miscellany (printed 1554).

It is reasonable to assume that Wynkyn de Worde, as a printer, knew what would sell. His English version of the *Destruction of Jerusalem* proved popular, and was reprinted in 1513 by Richard Pynson. An emotive response to the passage of Josephus quoted above was written some decades later, intended not for publication but for appreciation in courtly circles. The poem was printed decades later by Richard Tottel during the reign of queen Mary. Tottel gathered together as many poems as he could by Norfolk's son, the earl of Surrey, Thomas Wyatt and others. Unfortunately he was unable to ascribe authorship to many poems, so the best we can say of the following poem is that the author is not known, but was possibly Thomas Wyatt, a courtier imprisoned at the fall of Anne Boleyn, and close friend of Surrey's. The poem's title may have been added by Tottel.

(Of the mother that eat her childe at the seige of Ierusalem.)

In doubtfull breast whiles motherly pity
With furious famine standeth at debate,
The mother sayth: O chyld unhappy
Returne thy bloud where thou hadst milke of late
Yeld me those limmes that I made unto thee,
And enter there where thou were generate.
For one of body against all nature,
To an other must I make sepulture.

This is an altogether different world from Wynkyn's *Destruction*, a world much closer to that of the horror portrayed by Josephus. God, if not absent, gives the woman no moral direction and sends her no reassuring message.

The poet's words are, however, very different from Josephus'. Josephus' woman despairs. She can see nothing for her child but slavery; her child has no reason to live. She has analysed the political situation and can see no way forward. The poet, on the other hand, concentrates on universal themes. The mother is neither Christian nor Jew; her religion is irrelevant. Her body, in which a child was created, becomes a tomb for the same child, “against all nature”.

Although this poem was not published until after the poet's death, it and other poems like it were intended for a circle of poetically-inclined friends at Henry's court. These included Norfolk's son, the earl of Surrey, his daughter, the duchess of Richmond, his brother, Thomas Howard, and others. Norfolk appreciated the efforts of the younger members of his family. He certainly encouraged his son's writing, bringing a sample of Surrey's translation of the Aeneid to court, expecting everyone to admire it.

It goes without saying that for the poem to work, the poet's audience must have known the historical context for the woman's speech, especially if it originally had no title. They must have had at least a passing acquaintance with the Latin Josephus' account of the capture of Jerusalem (rather than the romanticised English version published by Wynkyn).

HISTORY IN THE COURT OF HENRY VIII

Norfolk's family and the study of history.

Norfolk clearly had a close interest in history. The three texts he asked for in the Tower were all histories. Josephus' *De Antiquitatibus* and Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* both describe the fall of mighty cities. Both try to reconcile the passing of worldly glory with God's purpose in the world as revealed by the events of history. Both would doubtless have had particular resonance for a man who had fallen from one of the highest offices in the land to less than nothing.

Norfolk himself was primarily a soldier and administrator, and thus had little time for writing anything other than letters. Nevertheless literary achievements were held in high esteem by his family. It was men such as Norfolk and his father and grandfather, who encouraged historical research, either directly, by accepting dedications of historical texts (and presumably rewarding the authors or translators) or indirectly by employing historians as tutors. The antiquary Leland, for example, was employed by Thomas Howard as a tutor for his youngest son.

In 1482 John Howard, Norfolk's grandfather, took copies of an account of Trojan history and the Destruction of Troy (both in French) on campaign.² Unfortunately, John Howard's household accounts, fascinating though they are, give little clue as to the extent of his library, other than a short list of French books. That he was familiar with at least one major classical text is apparent from the name of one of his many ships, the "Trygo Howard". Given the prevalence of piracy, the "Trygo Howard" sported a gun. Its unusual name can be traced to Pliny's Natural History. Pliny concludes his book on fish with a description of the "trygon", or stingray.

But there is nothing more execrable than the sting which projects above the tail of the sting ray (trygonis). It ... kills trees when driven into the root and penetrates armour like a missile, with the force of steel and with deadly poison. (Pliny Natural History IX 155)

The apt naming of the "Trygo Howard" suggests an easy familiarity with Pliny's work. It would in any case have been surprising had John Howard, a courtier of Edward IV, not appreciated the importance of classical studies. King Edward encouraged the culture of antiquity, and modelled his court on that ancient Rome, portraying himself as the new Augustus. Classical studies and the translation of classical texts into English was of paramount importance to the king. Although historical texts were already available in French and Latin, many were translated into English. Some of these English translations may not have survived. John Skelton's monumental translation of the works of Diodorus Siculus, survives only in a single manuscript. It is possible that some or all of Josephus' works, were translated into English in the late fifteenth century and the translation simply has not survived.

That John Howard appreciated the importance of history can be inferred by the attitude of his son-in-law, Norfolk's uterine brother, John Bouchier, lord Berners, who lived in his household from 1473 to 1485 and whose education John Howard was responsible for. Berners grew up to be one of the foremost translators of Henry VIII's time, and one of the most passionate advocates of historical studies of all time. Berners' views on history are well worth quoting. He started to translate a text which promised much: Arthur of Little Britain.³ As he explains in his preface, "For as moche as it is delectable to all human nature to read to here these ancient noble histories of the chivalrous feats and martial prowess of the victorious Knights of times past, whose triumphant deeds, if writing were not, should be had clean out of remembrance ..."

2 Crawford, A. Howard household Books II 277

3 Undated. Published by Robert Copland, then Robert Redborne.

Berners started his translation. But to his horror, he realised that he was translating “feigned matter” - a pack of lies. He thought of giving up his work, “for I thought it should have been reputed but a folly in me to translated such a feigned matter, wherein seems to be so many impossibilities”. Berners, a serious scholar, is sensitive to being laughed at for presenting Arthur of Little Britain as history, but continues after a while, reassuring himself that “I had read and seen many a sundry volume of diverse noble histories wherein were contained the redoubted deeds of the ancient conquerors and of other right famous knights who achieved many a strange and wonderful adventures, the which by plain letter, as to our understanding should seem in a manner to be supernatural”.

Berners comforts himself in the knowledge that other histories contained as many improbabilities as “Arthur of Little Britain”, so “I thought that this present treatise might as well be reputed for truth as some of those: and also I doubted not but that the first author of the book devised it not without some manner of truth or virtuous intent.” In the end, the author's honourable intentions outweigh the absurdities of the text.

Berners is more careful in his next choice of history to translate. The Chronicle of Froissart, starting in the reign of Edward the first and ending with the accession of Henry IV, is of breathtaking scope. It covers not only England but the whole of northern Europe. Berners dedicated this work to Henry VIII. In the preface, he states his belief in the importance of history in almost fanatical terms.

“What condign graces and thanks ought men to give to the writers of histories who with their great labours have done so much profit to the human life? They show, open and manifest to the reader by example of old antiquity what we should eschew, avoid and utterly fly, for when we read the ancient acts...they teach us how we may lead forth our lives and albeit that mortal folk are marvellously situated... yet are their acts (done peradventure by the space of a thousand year) compact together by the historiographer as it were the deeds of one ... city and of one man's life. History may well be called a divine providence. For as the celestial bodies above complect all and at every time the universal world, the creatures therein contained and all their deeds, sembably so doth history.”

Berners comments that it is a noble thing for us to emend our life with reference to the faults of other. The sage counsels of two or three old fathers whom long age has made wise, discreet, prudent is praised more than that of young men. How much more should history be praised? And, in one of the most extravagant claims any enthusiast has ever made for his subject: “The most profitable thing in this world for the institution of human life is history.” Continual reading of history makes young men equal in prudence to the old, to old fathers, stricken in age, it ministreth experience of things. It makes private persons worthy of dignity, compels high rulers to do noble deeds, moves hardy warriors for the laud they will have after they are dead and stops mischievous deeds for fear of infamy. History is the keeper of things that have been virtuously done, and a witness to evil deeds.

It is impossible to ascertain precisely what influence John Howard had on Berners' view of history. But if Norfolk was brought up to have the same attitude towards history as his half-brother, he must have valued historical studies above all others.

Thomas Howard, Norfolk's father, continued the family interest in history, possibly stimulated by his two-year stay as a young man at the court of Charles the Bold of Burgundy. The poet Alexander Barclay dedicated his translation of Sallust's history of the Jugurthine War to Howard. The edition of his translation is remarkable, as it prints the Latin in parallel with the English translation.

Barclay's aim was thus to help the reader to read the original text.

Barclay also translated poetic works for Howard, notably the Eclogues of Ennius Silivius, Pope Pius II. He added to them a poem in honour of Howard's younger son, Edward, who was killed leading an assault on the French navy.

The most remarkable evidence of Howard's awareness of his place in history is his epitaph. Howard's tomb in the priory church at Thetford in Norfolk was dismantled along with the church when the priory was dissolved in the mid sixteenth century, but his biographical epitaph was copied and published. Its author is unknown, possibly Howard himself or Berners, or the antiquary John Leland, whom Howard employed as a tutor to his youngest son.

Whoever wrote the epitaph, its text must have been approved by Howard's heir, Norfolk. Norfolk himself was the dedicatee of a notable verse history, the *Chronicle of John Hardyng*. Hardyng lived in the time of Edward IV and may well have known John Howard. His chronicle documents the rights of England over Scotland, ending with the expedition of Richard duke of Gloucester (the future Richard III) and John Howard against the Scots. Hardyng is full of praise for this effort, in which Berwick was won back for the English and Howard's ships ravaged Edinburgh. The publisher, Grafton, who dedicated his book to Norfolk, brings the chronicle up to date (1542). He prefaces it with a fulsome dedication to Norfolk and his family. After enumerating all the commissions Norfolk and his father received, Grafton states that Norfolk's family have been ordained by God to be a scourge to the Scots. "It hath pleased almighty God ... to use your stocke as an iron rod wherewith to scourge the falsehood of Scotland". The Howards are assured of their unique place in God's plan for English history.

The authority of the historical text

History could, according to Berners, be a diversion for ladies and gentlemen. It taught valuable lesson; it was entertaining and edifying. But Norfolk and his king seem to have viewed history with a respect hard for the modern reader to comprehend.

In 1536, Henry faced the gravest military crisis of his reign. Thousands of Northerners rebelled in protest against the new religion and the dissolution of the monasteries.

Norfolk had suffered disgrace and failure earlier on in that year: the execution of Ann Boleyn, the death of his son-in-law, the duke of Richmond and the attendant problems of his burial, the imprisonment of his brother, Thomas Howard, for marrying the king's niece without the king's permission. Nevertheless, he could scarcely believe it when Henry ordered him to stay at home in Norfolk while sending his son, the earl of Surrey, to lead the king's forces. Norfolk keenly felt the disgrace and asked Cromwell to intercede with the king on his behalf. He points out that the king has appointed him Marshal of England, and that, as such, he should "have the vanguard as my ancestors did".

It is hard to credit that this argument, on a point of precedence, was being put by Henry's most successful military commander. Norfolk had himself led the vanguard at the battle of Flodden in 1513, when the king of Scots had been killed and the Scottish nobility annihilated. Again, when drawing up the order for battle in 1523 against the Scots, he felt that he was the only man with sufficient authority to lead the vanguard of the English army. Yet in 1536 he nowhere mentions his own effectiveness as a military leader. He prefers to appeal to history.

It has been suggested that Norfolk is here referring to a specific text, written by Gilbert de Strogil, marshal of England. This tract on the duties, rights and privileges of the earl marshal does indeed mention that "the marshal should have the van". Norfolk may have had this text in mind but would Henry have understood such a vague reference? More to the point, would Norfolk have wanted Henry to be reminded of his distant ancestors, one of whom was unreliable, the other, downright treacherous? Thomas of Brotherton was dismissed by Froissart in Berners' translation as "right wild and diverse of condition". The death of his great grandson, Thomas Mowbray (d. 1399), also Marshal of England, concludes Froissart's book. Mowbray plots against king Richard the second, is sent on a prolonged pilgrimage, effective exile. While in Venice, he hears of the accession of king Henry, sits down on his bed, falls into a frenzy, and expires.

Norfolk clearly felt a strong affinity towards these two ancestors. He tried to arrange for Thomas Mowbray's bones to be brought back from Venice to England to be buried in Thetford. Thomas Brotherton was key to Norfolk's identity as it was through him that Norfolk could claim legitimate descent from a king of England, Edward the first. The ancestors he was referring to in his letter to

Cromwell were, however, probably more recent. His father had been Marshal of England during the Flodden campaign, and had delegated the command of the vanguard to Norfolk. Most ambiguous was John Howard, Norfolk's grandfather, who as Marshal of England had led the vanguard of Richard III's army against Henry VIII's father, Henry Tudor at the battle of Bosworth. At any rate, Cromwell presumably put Norfolk's case to Henry, and was successful, for Norfolk was allowed to leave home and lead the royal army to meet the rebels.

The supremacy of the king over the church in England

In 1528 after the fall of Wolsey, historical texts – ancient chronicles, such as, the chronicle of William of Nangis - provided the precedents for Henry VIII claiming that the Pope had no right to summon him to Rome. The logic of this policy led directly to Henry's claim of supremacy over the church in England.

There is little doubt that Norfolk played a key part in this phase of Henry's reign. After the fall of Wolsey, he had most influence in government. He kept in touch with scholars such as Richard Croke who were sent abroad to search out Greek texts supporting Henry's position in Italian libraries. It was while Norfolk's influence with Henry was greatest that the Jewish scholar, Mark Raphael, was brought to England from Italy to pronounce on the lawfulness or otherwise of Henry's marriage to Katherine of Aragon. It was also at this time that Norfolk gave Henry his Chronicle of William of Nangis, possibly already annotated. In the Tower in 1546, Norfolk clearly wished his captors to remember his contribution this policy. He knows, he says, from reading history that the bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction in England. Perhaps his request for three histories to read in the Tower, Josephus, Augustine and Sabellicus, was intended as a subtle reminder of his expertise and effectiveness in this area of policy.

Norfolk's enthusiasm for history as proof of a king's jurisdiction over his own kingdom may have met with with king Henry's approval, but it did not impress the Spanish ambassador, Chapuys. Chapuys, newly arrived in England in 1528, supported Katherine of Aragon and was to prove her firm ally. He was, quite frankly, bemused by the value Norfolk placed on history. Norfolk invited Chapuys to a conversation, and treated him to a talk on such irrelevances as the fact that the emperor Constantine had been a king of Britain, and his mother had come from Colchester. Norfolk was here trying to explain to Chapuys that the king of England had historic rights to *imperium* within his own kingdom, but Chapuys either did not understand or found the argument completely nonsensical. In the end, Norfolk pulled out of his purse a piece of paper he has had copied for Chapuys: the titles of Arthur, king of Britain, copied from Arthur's seal, newly discovered in a casket at the tomb of king Edward the first. Norfolk has already shown the French ambassadors the original seal. Chapuys is positively incredulous. He cannot remember all of Norfolk's arguments, and dismisses them as ridiculous, completely missing the point that Norfolk was trying to make, that the king of England has *imperium* over his own country, and thus is not subject to foreign jurisdiction such as that of the papacy. Chapuys was later that year treated to another historical lecture by Norfolk, at the conclusion of which he quipped to Norfolk that he had clearly become a “doctor” of history. Norfolk was not reticent about showing off his historical expertise.

The results of all this scholarly effort can be seen in the manuscript now in the British library, Cotton Cleopatra VI, a systematic laying down of the king's authority over the church on the basis of ancient chronicles. The manuscript was annotated by Henry VIII, and part of it was published in 1533.

Norfolk's rather uncritical enthusiasm may appear to have no direct relevance for Josephan scholarship. He was most concerned with British and English history. His somewhat naïve respect for ancient texts was to have a lasting influence, however, even on studies of Josephus. By 1540, every monastery in England had been dissolved, the monks pensioned off, if they had been compliant, executed if they put up a fight. Among other ecclesiastical treasures, monasteries had been repositories for manuscripts. Most fortunately, these ancient books were valued and many, including the Royal manuscript of Josephus from St Alban's abbey, were brought to the swollen

library at Westminster. In 1528 or so, Norfolk had supported this library with a donation of his manuscript of William of Nangis. He had also elevated history to the highest level of authority in his monarch's eyes. An appeal to history could establish the king of England's independence of the Pope. History could literally turn the world upside down. Surely historical manuscripts were worth preserving.

Norfolk, Henry VIII and the College of Heralds.

It is easy now to be complacent about the survival of monastic manuscripts in the Royal collection. But King Henry, unlike Richard III had no natural inclination to found libraries or allow people access to texts. And here we have another intriguing parallel between John Howard and his grandson, Norfolk: the establishment of a library for the college of heralds.

Richard III appointed John Howard Earl Marshal in 1483. As well as being leader of the English army, the Earl Marshal had an antiquarian role. He was the superior of the heralds, a group of men who between them were responsible for regulating the use of coats of arms among the nobility. As the use of coats of arms depended on precedent, the heralds had to have some antiquarian expertise. In later centuries, many notable historians and antiquaries were heralds. Richard III understood that the heralds, and the Earl Marshal, whose role was to resolve any dispute in the court of chivalry, needed access to all relevant documents to be able to perform their duties. He granted the heralds a building, Coldharbour, for their offices and their library. He encouraged the nobility to bring their family documents to Coldharbour, to form a historical archive. John Howard, as Earl Marshal, would have been involved in this forward-thinking arrangement.

Henry Tudor, when he took Richard's throne, proved to have a completely different attitude. He granted the building of Coldharbour to his mother. The heralds were homeless for nearly 70 years. Worse still, the library was given to one man, Garter herald. He and his successors jealously guarded access to the documents leading to spectacular corruption. The other heralds, through the Earls Marshal, petitioned Henry VIII at least twice to set up a library once more, but he was not interested. Had Norfolk known that he and his son would be condemned of treason on charges which could only have been refuted by access to the herald's documents, he would have surely made more strenuous efforts to have a heralds' library established.

The lack of access to the heralds' documents suited Henry as he tried to find a charge against Norfolk that would bear some semblance of plausibility. In the end, Henry signed Norfolk's death warrant on the grounds that he had committed high treason by putting the arms of his Brotherton ancestors, rather than the Howards, in the first quarter of his shield. Norfolk had been using these arms for over twenty years during the course of which nobody, the king included, had noticed that he had been committing high treason.

On his release from prison by queen Mary, Norfolk was restored to the position of Earl Marshal. In imitation of his grandfather, the earl Marshal John Howard, he probably petitioned Mary for a building for the heralds. Mary granted them new premises, Derby House. Mary's refounding of the College of Arms took place soon after Norfolk's death. His part in the grant was commemorated by the heralds who stated that the queen granted them Derby House by the endeavours of the most noble Howards, Earls Marshal and Dukes of Norfolk. It may be relevant that Derby House was adjacent to Mountjoy House, where Norfolk lived after his release from the Tower of London.

CONCLUSION

We do not know whether Norfolk's request for Josephus was granted, indeed whether he had access to any books at all during his long imprisonment. Such matters were in the hands of the privy council. Given the humiliating terms on which he was imprisoned it is unlikely his captors granted him this indulgence. Status was demonstrated by the number of attendants a man was allowed, even in prison. So, in the Tower the duke of Somerset and the duke of Northumberland were allowed three servants each, an imprisoned earl and even a knight was allowed two. Norfolk, though the highest status prisoner in the Tower (his name always heads the list of prisoners in the accounts of

the lieutenants of the Tower) was only allowed a single servant to wait on him, a calculated insult. He was confined to his cell for two years, after which he was granted permission to walk in the Tower garden. His daughter, the duchess of Richmond, was allowed to visit him shortly afterwards. She was shocked at the conditions her father was being kept in and hastily arranged for the windows in his cell to be glazed (it was the middle of winter). It was only after five years in prison that Norfolk was allowed a single visit from his surviving son. Nevertheless, the terms of his imprisonment could have been much worse. After a year in prison he was granted a bed and some bedding, as was his solitary servant, the use of clothing (the clothing would not belong to him) in a warrant signed by the privy council and king Edward himself. He thus fared better than the unfortunate John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, who when in prison, had no change of clothes and went to his execution in rags. Perhaps young king Edward had some concern for the welfare of the man who was, after all, his godfather, and father to his (illegitimate) brother's wife, the duchess of Richmond, who was prominent at his court. The succession of lieutenants of the Tower, Norfolk's jailers, had robust reason for ensuring the survival of their noble prisoner, being paid the vast sum of five pounds a week to provide for his "diet" (how much of this was actually spent on the prisoner is open to debate). One lieutenant, John Markham, was even granted eighty pounds annually as long as Norfolk should remain his prisoner. But we simply do not know whether the lieutenants' efforts to keep Norfolk alive included giving him books. We cannot, in the end, be certain that Norfolk ever read *De Antiquitatibus*.

The case of Norfolk's petition for Josephus draws attention to the limitations of attempting to establish the readership of any text. It is relatively easy to focus on readers who made changes to texts they were working on: translators, annotators, copyists, men who adapted a text in their own writings, chroniclers like William of Nangis, or responded to a text in their own individual way, like the poet in Tottel's Miscellany. Yet these readers are atypical, and must represent a tiny fraction of the total number of people who have read a text. Norfolk is a paradigm for the vast majority of readers, on whom a book may have made an impression, perhaps lasting, but whose reading has left no trace on the book itself. Their interest in the book may, however, have had a profound implication for that book's preservation from generation to generation.