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ABSTRACT

James H. Forse, Advisor

Anthony Munday (1560-1633) was one of Tudor/Stuart England’s most prolific writers. Over the course of a literary career that lasted for more than fifty years, Munday penned over eighty works, many published more than once. Scholars have over the years constructed a framework that describes Munday variously as author, playwright, "our best plotter," pamphleteer, uninspired literary hack, translator, historian, and spy. Beyond these labels, Munday has received little attention from the academic community.

A re-examination of his life and place reveals that Munday serves as a case study of an early modern author who also exemplifies the rising middling classes of early modern England. That perspective is grounded on two things. First, and most obvious, is a return to the primary sources, what they say and do not say. Conclusions about Munday’s career must reflect the sources themselves, rather than speculation spun out from those sources. Further, Munday’s stages in life and career need to be examined in totality, rather than concentrating on specific jobs, genres, or works. Munday’s life lends itself to such an examination because the clear-cut chronological delineations that are evident in his life and are united by the constant thread of writing for commercial gain. It is in that totality that a true picture of the professional writer as a member of the upwardly mobile, middling classes can be seen.
0 Showes! Showes! Mighty Showes!
The Eloquence of Masques! What need of prose
Or Verse, or Sense t’express Immortall you?
You are the Spectacles of State! Tis true
Court Hieroglyphicks! and all Artes affoord
In the mere perspective of an Inch board!
Oh, to make Boardes to speake! There is a taske
Painting and Carpentry are the Soule of Masque.
Pack with your pedling Poetry to the Stage,
This is the money-gett, Mechanick Age!
-Ben Jonson
An Expostulation with Inigo Jones

How did it get so late so soon?
It’s night before it’s afternoon.
December is here before it’s June
My goodness how the time has flewn.
How did it get so late so soon?
-Dr. Seuss
For my whole family, but most especially Mary, Lily, and Nicky.

And to the memory of Kathy Ann Lepovetsky

Requiescat in pace.
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CHAPTER ONE -- INTRODUCTION

With his victory at the Battle of Bosworth Field, on 22 August, 1485, Henry Tudor founded the dynasty that was to rule England for the next one hundred eighteen years. The reign of Tudor’s son Henry VIII and his “great matter” culminated in the Henrician reformation of the English Church which, in turn, led to the reformation under Edward VI, the restoration of Catholicism under Mary I, and the Act of Settlement under Elizabeth I.

While the Tudor dynasty ended with the death of Elizabeth I on 24 March, 1603, Tudor social, religious, and government policies started England on the path to Renaissance, Reformation, and to eventual revolution. The development of a class of “middling sort of people [who] moved closer to their immediate superiors among the gentry and urban elite in both interests and life-style,” during the period 1580 to 1680 was coincident with a new societal perception of the value of education.\(^1\) The combination of the two led to a burgeoning of literacy within that “middling class of people.” Further, while a large portion of the rural populace remained illiterate, it was to the literate segments of society that, as Norman Jones notes, was handed the job of building a new, Protestant, culture on the ruins of the old religion. The first English generation to inherit the Reformation, they invented a new intellectual culture, revamped their nation's political ideology, were forced to discover a new place for the individual in their political ideology, were forced to

discover a new place for the individual in their society, reinvent their national identity, and build a new economy.²

This jump in the literacy rate as well as need and desire for knowledge was largely fed with material from a fairly new device known as the printing press. That marvel was, in turn, fed by an increasingly large body of authors who were themselves demonstrating the fluidity of the middling classes.

Anthony Munday can be viewed as a case study of those educated and socially-aware middling classes that Jones writes about. Scholars of early modern England, however, have yet to study him within that context. When Munday is studied, it is as an author or playwright only, and in that context he is often the victim of stereotypical views based upon anachronistic (eighteenth and nineteenth century) romantic preconceptions of both the author and his literature.

Born during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I of England, most likely in 1560, he was the child of Christopher and Jane Munday, of London. Munday pere was a draper by guild association, but by trade a stationer and bookseller. As such, he exemplified the newer middling classes that kept one foot in the traditional social and economic system while putting the other into the newly emerging professions. His son, Anthony, grew up to become one of early modern England's most prolific writers.

The basic facts surrounding Munday fils’ life story are fairly easy to track down. He lived a purportedly normal childhood, in a reasonably well off tradesman’s family. After the death of his parents he was, in 1576, apprenticed to London printer and bookseller John Allde. In 1578, young Munday left his apprenticeship. Later that year, with a companion, one Thomas Nowell, he made a trip to the Continent. Early in this journey, the duo was waylaid by mercenary troops and robbed. Destitute, the travelers were taken in by the English Catholic community of Amiens. From there they made their way to Rome, ostensibly to study for the priesthood. Munday returned alone to England in 1579.

At that point, he began a career as a writer that continued until his death in 1633 and saw the publication of more than eighty works. Munday produced an especially large body of writing across several genres including political, religious, and anti-theatrical polemic, lurid news reports, poetry, plays, and civic pageants. He also edited reprintings of John Stow's *Survey of London*, a history of that city which was published and updated many times during the seventeenth century.\(^3\) Throughout his career, he translated more than twenty texts from the

\(^3\) John Stow. *The Survey of London Containing the Original, Increase, Modern Estate and Government of That City, Methodically Set Down: With a Memorial of Those Famouer Acts of Charity, Which for Publick and Pious Vses Have Been Bestowd by Many Worshipfull Citizens and Benefactors: As Also All the Ancient and Modern Monuments Erected in the Churches, Not Only of Those Two Famous Cities, London and Westminster, but (Now Newly Added) Four Miles Compass/Begun First by the Pains and Industry of John Stow, in the Year 1598; Afterwards Inlarged by the Care and Diligence of A.M. in the Year 1618; and Now Compleatly Finished by the Study &\^; Labour of A.M., H.D. and Others, This Present Year 1633; Whereunto, Besides Many Additions (As Appears by the Contents) Are Annexed Divers Alphabetical Tables, Especially Two, the First, an Index of Things, the Second, a Concordance of Names.* Early English Books, 1475-1640/1825:01. London: Printed for Nicholas Bourn, and are to be sold at his shop at the south entrance of the Royal-Exchange, 1633. Available by subscription from http://wwwlib.umi.com/eebo/image/18466. Accessed, 23 November,
French, Spanish, and Italian languages. Indeed, it is possible that his "englishing" of foreign texts is what kept bread and butter on his table although, in the last twenty years of his life, certain land grants from Elizabeth may have seen to that chore as well. While there is speculation of lost works, if we only include printings of his known works, Munday’s literary output approaches two publications a year throughout his adult life, an especially significant figure as his literary output declined in the last ten years of his life. This publication record is greater than that of those considered the literary giants of Munday’s age, William Shakespeare (twenty-four), and Ben Jonson (twenty-nine). The author that comes closest to Munday in terms of publication is Robert Greene, another lesser known writer, who has sixty-six published works to his credit, the majority of which were published after his death.

The Problem

With such a publication record, Munday represents one of the earliest literary figures who seems to have identified his primary career as that of a writer. However, in addition to his writing, he also became involved in a number

---

4 I. A. Shapiro. “Shakespeare and Mundy.” *Shakespeare Survey*, 14.1, 1961. pps. 25-33. Hereafter cited as Shapiro, 1961. Further, Shapiro notes there is no reason to assume that Mundy's extant works are examples of his best work or, for that matter, even representative of any particular facet of his work.

of less savory activities that cost a number of people their freedom or their lives.

There is evidence of his involvement in a number of major political and religious affairs during his lifetime under the auspices of both Church of England and Crown. Scholars tend to regard his printed works related to these events as “hack” work by a writer who is untalented at best, and “would do anything for money.”⁶ This perception misses that fact that Munday offers an excellent example of the early-modern English writer in search of audience and patronage. The need for both remains basic to an author, even today.

It seems to be the tendency of scholars to place the author’s life in the context of his works rather than his works in the context of his life. That, in turn, causes Munday to be overshadowed by the literary “giants” of his time such as Ben Jonson and William Shakespeare. Further, even when scholars move off to the likes of Thomas Kyd, Thomas Dekker, George Chapman, John Fletcher, and John Webster, Anthony Munday is often forgotten. It is indicative of the situation that all of the playwrights above except Munday are discussed, or at the very least mentioned, in Oscar Brockett's much used survey text *History of the Theatre*.⁷ Even the specialized *Twayne's English Authors Series* offers no volume on Anthony Munday. It does, however, include volumes on Shakespeare (seven), Jonson (two), and one each on Greene, Kyd, Dekker, Chapman, Fletcher, and Webster.

---

These others are remembered as playwrights first. Their lives are considered ancillary to their works. Munday works, if considered at all, are taken as ancillary to his life. Evaluations of his works are colored by interpretations of his actions. As such, scholars miss the opportunity to study his works as individual parts of his place as a professional writer within the context of early modern English society. It is interesting, though, that this so-called “hack” writer appears to have made at least a good part of his living at that job for about forty-five years. Further, his reputation in his own time was not so negative. In 1598, less than halfway into Munday’s career, Francis Meres compared him favorably to the likes of Shakespeare and Marlowe. Meres, in his *Palladis Tamia*, a descriptive text that is best known for containing the first references to a number of Shakespeare's plays, refers to Munday as “our best plotter” in his list of the best comedy writers in England.8

It may have been Ben Jonson who created the image of Munday as “hack” writer. In the first act of Jonson’s *The Case is Alterd*, a dialogue takes place between Peter Onion, a servant regarded by at least one of his peers as, “a plain

---

simple rascal, a true dunce; marry he hath been a notable villain in his time,” and

one Antonio Balladino.9

Ant. My name is Antonio Balladino.
Oni. Balladino! you are not pageant poet to the city of Milan, sir, are you?
Ant. I supply the place, sir, when a worse cannot be had, sir.10

The conversation continues with Onion and Balladino discussing the value of stale verbiage:

Ant. Truly a very good saying.
Oni. 'Tis somewhat stale; but that's no matter.
Ant. 'tis the better; such things ever are like bread, which the staler it is, the more wholesome.
Oni. 'Tis but a hungry comparison, in my judgment.
Ant. Why I'll tell you, master Onion, I do use as much stale stuff, though I say it myself, as any man does in that kind, I am sure. Did you see the last pageant I set forth?11

Balladino then addresses his own writing style:

Ant. Why look you, sir, I write so plain, and keep that old decorum, that you must of necessity like it: marry, you shall have some now (as for example, in plays) that will have every day new tricks, and write you nothing but humours; indeed this pleases the gentlemen, but the common sort they care not for't; they know not what to make on't; they look for good matter they, and are not edified with such toys.

10 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
Oni. You are in the right, I'll not give a halfpenny to see a thousand on 'em. I was at one the last term; but and ever I see a more roguish thing, I am a piece of cheese, and no nothing but kings and princes in it, the fool came not out a jot.

Ant. True, sir, they would have me make such plays; but as I tell 'em, and they'll give me twenty pounds a play, I'll not raise my vein.

Oni. No, it were a vain thing and you should, sir.

Ant. Tut, give me the penny, I care not for the gentlemen I; let me have a good ground, no matter for the pen, the plot shall carry it.

Oni. Indeed that's right, you are in print already for the best plotter.

Ant. I, I might as well have been put in for a dumb shew too.

Oni. I, marry, sir, I marle you were not. Stand aside, sir, a while.12

Thus Munday is upbraided by Jonson for using stale material and styles in his writing. Scholars have perpetuated that criticism, despite the fact that they give little credence to Jonson’s criticisms of Shakespeare.

Given the differing views of Meres and Jonson, the modern view of Munday as a simple “hack” writer must be questioned. Perhaps that assessment is in part based upon the fact that Munday wrote in multiple genres across his career. Most scholars miss the fact that, except for his translations of works from French, Spanish, and Italian, Munday’s work in the various literary genres falls into well defined time periods. For example, during the period 1580 to 1584, he concentrated chiefly on polemic. This was followed by the period 1584 to 1588, a time of transition that saw Munday writing both polemic and plays. By 1588 he was concentrating on writing plays, either as sole author or in collaboration with

12 Ibid.
other playwrights. By 1606 his emphasis as an author shifted to Mayoral and
guild related civic pageantry, and he began his association with Stow’s *Survey* as
editor. The latter association lasted until his death in 1633. As we shall see, a
chronology of Munday’s life reveals that these shifts in genre reflect his shifts in
status from client of the government, as revealed in his self-identification as
“messenger of her majesties chamber,” to greater independence, as revealed in
his later self-identification as “citizen and Draper of London.”

Because of Munday’s involvement in so many different literary genres
and spheres of early-modern English society, a great deal about Munday himself
requires further scrutiny. The fragmentary nature of the primary sources of
Munday’s life reveals much about the problems of placing any early modern
author’s works within the context of his whole life. And we have far more
primary source material for Munday’s life than for most other so-called authors
of his time (Kyd, Marlowe, or Greene, for example). It is this evidence that both
introduces us to the author beyond his works, and, if not carefully used, causes
scholars to draw conclusions that are not necessarily accurate.

For example, Munday was, for years, thought to have been born in 1553.
In academia, this misconception goes at least as far back as the original 1894
article on Munday in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.13 That article offers a

13 T. S. “Munday, Anthony (1553-1633).” *Dictionary of National Biography; Founded
in 1882 by George Smith. Edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. From the Earliest Times to 1900.*
that I refer to two very different versions of the same source within this dissertation. *Dictionary of National
Biography* (hereafter cited as DNB) refers to the original (1892) version of that work. *Oxford Dictionary of
birth year based upon Munday's tombstone epitaph as reported in the 1633 edition of Stow's *Survey of London*. The *Survey* gives the location of Munday's tombstone as in the church of Saint Stephen, Coleman Street in London, offers a copy of the inscription, and notes that Munday died 10 August, 1633 at the age of eighty. If he were eighty when he died, the use of simple arithmetic yields a birth year of 1553.

The problem here is simple and was first examined by Turner-Wright in 1929. She suggests that either the stone-cutter or the printer may have erred because parish records state that Munday was buried on 9 August, 1633. Further, the actual stone was destroyed in the London Fire of 1666, and therefore verification of the inscription, as printed in the Survey, is not possible. Despite this, the 1553 date based upon Stow's *Survey*, which is still today regarded as a primary source, was not questioned until Turner-Wright published her biography of Munday.

Mid-twentieth century research has determined a birth year of 1560 based upon baptismal records from the parish of Munday's birth, and various later court records. Although only a difference of seven years, this newer data has

---

*Citations*


15 Ibid.


allowed scholars to place the already known dates of Munday's apprenticeship in a context that makes considerably more sense than the earlier birth date. That date would have him entering an apprenticeship at the age when most men finished theirs. By the same token, some scholars have used the 1553 birth year as 'proof’ of Munday’s earlier acting career prior to his apprenticeship.

In addition to questions about his birth date, scholars have made interpretive leaps of faith about a number of events for which the issue of dating is uncontested. These events include his trip to Rome in 1578 through 1579 another trip to the Netherlands in 1595, the extent and nature of his involvement with the Privy Council, and possible political agendas in his plays and pageantry.

By themselves, however, the primary documents reveal little evidence to suggest that that Munday regularly followed a trade beyond that created by his pen. He was involved with the government at times, but it may be that a steady income was derived from the translation of foreign works which continued throughout his life. He turned his pen to other activities when patrons or audience, or both, presented the opportunity. For example, his anti-Catholic works of the early 1580s represent a convergence of the government’s desires to justify the hunt for Catholic “traitors” and their executions, and the broad public interest in those events.
Thesis

My aim in this dissertation is threefold. First of all, I want to create a complete chronology of Munday’s life, something not present in other scholarship about Munday. Second I want to peel away so-called “facts” about Munday’s life and works that stem from assuming that basic facts in the primary documents mean more than they actually say. Finally, I want to explore Munday’s place in the society of early modern England. Viewing Munday in that light may offer a case study for examining other early modern authors outside of the usual “life and works of…” approach.

Munday’s Place

This notion of place is intriguing because Munday’s personal advancement, that is his change of “place” within the society, seems to fit the mold of the rising middling class far better than the more often studied, canonical, writers of the age. Like many of his contemporaries, he seems to have advanced, at least in his earlier years, by attaching himself to noble or political entities such as Edward de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, or to members of the Privy Council, such as Sir Francis Walsingham. This type of advancement was not uncommon. What is different about Munday is that he continued to write for a popular audience despite his advancement within the patronage networks of early modern England. He chose to identify himself as part of the literary world, and his search for patronage should be viewed in that context.
Writing, or for that matter, any sort of association with that world had its risks to life, limb, and freedom. Make no mistake about it, those risks were considerable. In theatre, for example, by statute, unattached Elizabethan actors were, as of 1572, to be “taken adjudged and deemed Roges Vacaboundes and Sturdy Beggers,” the penalties for which included branding, imprisonment, slavery, and “paynes of Death and losse of Land and Goodes as a Felon” without “Allowance or Benefyte of Cleargye or Santuary.”

Even if the theatre person found a sponsor, the dangers were not over. Playwright and actor lived with significant risks. For instance, in July, 1597 a “lewd plaie that was plaied in one of the plaiehowses on the Bancke Side, contanynge very seditious and, scianderous matter,” ignited a firestorm of sorts. The play, *Isle of Dogs*, written by Thomas Nash and a new playwright named Ben Jonson, was suppressed so thoroughly that no copy of it remains extant today. Other actions taken by Privy Council mandate are revealed in a 15 August, 1597 letter to Richard Topcliffe:

> Uppon information given us...wee caused some of the players to be apprehended and comytted to pryson, whereof one of them was not only an actor but a maker of parte of the said plaie.

---


For as moche as yt ys thought meete that the rest of the players or actors in that matter shalbe apprehended to receave soche punyshment as theire leude and mutynous behavior doth deserve, these shalbe therefore to require you to examine those of the plaiers that are comyttted, whose names are knowne to you, Mr. Topclyfe, what ys become of the rest of theire fellowes that either had theire partes in the devysinge of that sedytious matter or that were actors or plaiers in the same, what copies they have given forth of the said playe and to whome, and soch other pointes as you shall thincke meete to be demaunded of them, wherein you shall require them to deale trulie as they will looke to receave anie favour. Wee praie you also to peruse soch papers as were fownde in Nash his lodgings, which Ferrys, a Messenger of the Chamber, shall delyver unto you, and to certyfie us th'examynacions you take.19

Thus by 15 August, the "maker of parte of the said plaie," Jonson, was in the Marshalsea jail, as were actors Gabrial Spenser and Robert Shaa. All were eventually released, but not until 8 October. Thomas Nashe, himself only recently out of prison, fled the city before he could be arrested.20

The danger was not limited exclusively to the theatre. In 1579, John Stubbs, author, and Hugh Singleton, his publisher, invoked the anger of Queen Elizabeth with The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf.21 The tract was critical of Elizabeth's proposed marriage to the French Duke of Anjou and questioned her commitment to Protestantism. At their first trial, a jury refused to convict the men. Queen Elizabeth then insisted that they be retried before the Queen’s court. There, both men were sentenced to have their right hands cut off and to

20 Forse, 1993, p. 167.
imprisonment, as was William Page, a Member of Parliament who attempted to
distribute the text.\(^{22}\) Although Singleton was pardoned because of his age,
sentence was carried out on Stubbs and Page, with the former being incarcerated
until 1581.

Given these examples, it would seem that life in the literary world of
Tudor/Stuart England was fraught with risk. With some writers being jailed for
publishing the wrong thing and some not, it becomes clear that our
contemporary Orwellian concept of some pigs being more equal than others can
be read into the time period as well. A well-placed patron could make the
difference between keeping or losing a hand. On the other hand, in certain
instances, the Tudors were not at all shy about accepting public support from
anyone, or about hiring people to create that support when necessary. For an
aspiring writer like Munday, powerful patrons could gain him entry to writing
for the state.

The increasing market for printed works in all genres also offered an
inducement to aspiring writers despite that fact that official Elizabethan and
Jacobean practices mitigated against the advancement of commoners.\(^{23}\) In
theory, status for commoners existed only within the guild structure. It was this


\(^{23}\) *Statutes*, 5 Elizabeth I c4.
paradox that produced people who belonged to one guild and practiced professions unrelated to that company.

Theatre folk such as Henslowe were guild members working in a different trade in much the same way that Drapers like Munday’s father worked in the publishing trade. As members of a guild they continued to make use of the legitimacy that came with that membership while earning money in one of the many new occupations that emerged in the early modern period. What scholars have largely overlooked to this point is that writing professionally was yet another one of these new occupations for ambitious young men with literary talents.

Review of Literature

Primary Sources

Like any author from the early modern period, the study of Munday is hampered by a scarcity of primary documents. What documentation there is seems to offer glimpses into his life, rather than explanations. Extant primary documentation of Munday's life can be divided into three categories: autobiographical, biographical, and "official" records.

Autobiographical sources consist of information gleaned from all of Munday's writings, generally in dedications or inductions within various works. The problem with this data is that it must be taken cautiously. Whether it is regarded as artistic license, or blatant dishonesty, Munday is known for skewing truth in his writing to fit a particular requirement, either of his own, or of patron
or audience. There is no reason to doubt that he did the same thing when writing
autobiographically. In fact, his longest autobiographical work, *The English
Romayne Life* (1582), contains a number of deviations from the truth that cannot
simply be chalked up to point of view.²⁴ Munday’s autobiographical data is not
t entirely superfluous; rather it must be examined with care.

The second type of extant primary data concerning Munday is anecdotal
biographical material. He is mentioned a number of times by his contemporary
authors in their works, either directly as in Meres, or thinly disguised as a
character in a book or a play such as Balladino in *The Case is Alterd*.

The final type of extant primary data regarding Munday is that contained
in governmental and non-governmental records. While official government
records of Munday’s life are scarce, they do exist. Munday testified in various
court rooms and sued or was sued several times. Other records include those of
the Livery Companies and of the Church. Baptismal, death, and other church
records exist for Munday and a number of possible relatives. His publications as
well as apprenticeship records are listed in the Stationers’ Register. He is also
mentioned many times in Henslowe’s “Diary,” an account book containing ten

Orders of the English Semininarie: the Dissention Betweene the Englishmen and the VVelsmen: the Banishing of
the Englishmen Out of Roome: the Popes Sending for Them Againe: a Reporte of Many of the Paltrie Reliques in
Roome: Ther Vautes Vnder the Grounde: Their Holy Pilgrimages: and a Number Other Matters, Worthy to Be
Read and Regarded of Every One. There Vnto Is Added, the Cruell Tiranny, Vsed on an English Man at Roome,
His Christian Suffering, and Notable Martirdome, for the Gospell of Iesus Christe, in Anno. 1581. VVritten by
A.M. Sometime the Popes Scholler in the Seminarie Among Them. Seene and Alloowed.* Early English Books,
1475-1640; 426:7. Imprinted at London: By John Charlewoode, for Nicholas Ling: dwelling in Paules
Churchyarde, at the signe of the Maremaide, 1582. Available by subscription from
three.
years of the activities of the Admiral’s Men and the Rose Theatre. These records may well be the most problematic of the data concerning Munday. They are not complete. They offer only glimpses and vignettes of his involvement with a particular theatre over a ten year period.

When scholars reach conclusions based on such incomplete data as that contained in these primary sources, it is entirely too easy to allow those conclusions to become “fact,” that is a part of the accepted information about a subject. In turn those conclusions accepted as “fact” are used to reach yet other conclusions even farther removed from the actual facts.

A very good example of this can be seen in the work of J. Thomas Looney in his 1920 “Shakespeare” Identified in Edward DeVere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford. Looney writes: “From the time Anthony Munday returned from Rome on the mission for William Cecil, in 1578, he was continuously employed by the Earl of Oxford as secretary and playwright.” Given the evidence, such a situation for Munday is possible; but Looney’s statement is representative of a hypothesis, not a proven fact. Further, it is grounded on information from a secondary source known today to be inaccurate, the 1898 Dictionary of National Biography article. Primary documents show that Munday certainly worked for Richard Topcliffe, and was thus "connected" to Cecil and the Privy Council, but there is no evidence that even suggests that Munday was directly tied to

Cecil or to the Council at any point in his career. Nor is there any direct evidence that he served as secretary to Oxford or wrote plays at his bequest. Indeed, our only knowledge of Munday as a client of Oxford comes from Monday’s own pen.

A similar problem occurs in the publication of Turner-Wright’s seminal biography of Munday. This time at issue is the meeting of Munday and Oxford. Turner-Wright describes the meeting thus:

The young Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford and Lord Great Chamberlain of England, had newly brought back from Italy a taste for belles lettres as well as for perfumed jerkins and beauty lotions. As the nephew and pupil of learned Golding, and the writer of some excellent lyrics and plays, he had an unjaded ear for literary men, the more bohemian the better. More important yet, he had not finished dissipating a goodly patrimony, and, as son-in-law of Burleigh, an excellent tilter, and a graceful dancer, he stood (for the present) high in Elizabeth’s favor.

To this noble lord, accordingly, Mundy betook himself; bowed humbly above the hands that had lately bestowd perfumed gloves on Her Majesty and thrust a sword through an impertinent cook (a plain case of suicide, as the respectful jury reported); and modestly proffered the copy of Galien. His Lordship, after the perusal, grew clement and condescending: the invention might be riper, the style pithier; but of course the author had not been abroad? No. Was he skilled in French and Italian? Well, a year in Italy would mend all and enable him to “reap some commodity.”

"Galion" refers to Munday's Galian of France, which was neither printed nor remains extant in manuscript form. In fact, Turner-Wright bases her entire account of the presentation copy of Galion solely upon Munday’s mention of the book in the dedication to his Mirrour of Mutability. Turner-Wright’s description is not an attempt to create facts or obscure the truth. She is, rather, simply keeping

27 Turner-Wright, 1929, pps. 11-12.
28 Ibid.
within the writing style that she has adopted for her book, creating probable
fictionalized scenarios when the facts are lacking. To her credit, immediately
after the description, she warns the reader, "Such, in substance, is Mundy's own
account of the conversation." What has happened, however, is that both the
Looney and Turner-Wright assumptions have been accepted as complete and
authoritative by later scholars. Alan Haynes, for example, seems to do just that
when he writes that Munday “scrambled to find a patron in a high
position…and, on Lord Oxford’s advice he had been to Rome in 1578-9, as a
convert.” The problem here is that by accepting the conclusions of Looney and
Turner-Wright about Munday’s relationship with Oxford as established fact,
Haynes then turns Munday’s trip to Rome into a spy mission for the Earl of
Oxford. The primary sources make no mention of Oxford’s role in arranging
Munday’s journey.

Turner-Wright’s work is the seminal biography of Munday and, as such, it
has affected almost everything written about him since. It is very easy to miss her
caveat, and thus, each time her conclusions are used unquestioningly as “fact,”
new arguments concerning other events in Munday’s life and career are made
based upon these unquestioned conclusions. In his *The Dark Side of Shakespeare:
An Elizabethan Courtier, Diplomat, Spymaster, & Epic Hero*, W. Ron Hess attempts
to create an argument establishing Edward de Vere and a group of his literary

clients as the authors of the plays of William Shakespeare. That argument is predicated upon an unquestioning acceptance of earlier works asserting a relationship between Munday and Oxford’s purported group of writer-clients. Such a group may or may not have existed. Primary evidence that it did is extremely circumstantial. We need to recognize when we do not have enough data for a conclusion to be reached. Therefore another goal of this study is to peel away the conclusions which began as interpretations of small bits of data in the primary documents but have become “facts” about Munday.

Secondary Sources

Munday is not addressed with the same frequency as other “minor” Elizabethan authors in secondary works. Prior to the publication of Turner-Wright's work in 1929, biographies of Munday took the form of brief articles like that in the 1898 Dictionary of National Biography. That article was preceded by John Payne Collier's introduction to the Shakespeare Society's edition of Munday's play, John a Kent and John a Cumber. A 1927 biographical essay by Eustace Conway, contained within Anthony Munday, And Other Essays, presents a fifty-three page biographical sketch lacking any documentation. Conway’s essay is a rehashing of information taken from the nineteenth century Cambridge History of English Literature and the Dictionary of National Biography, though it

---


Mid- to later-twentieth century work on Munday has been led largely by David Bergeron in his works on civic pageantry. He might be considered the
"dean" of contemporary critical studies on Munday. Bergeron has written numerous articles and books which include information about Munday, and he is the author of Munday’s biography in the new *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.34 Bergeron’s work on Munday, however, is contained within his works on civic pageantry in general, and on civic pageantry during the reign of James I specifically. It is only because of that context that he has published a critical edition of Munday’s pageants.

Works by other authors on Munday run the gamut from short biographical notes in *Notes and Queries*, to critical articles on various extant works by Munday, to the occasional reprint of one of his plays or pageants. The most recent book length studies about Munday concern his relationship to the urban culture of early modern London and a possible relationship with the English Catholics. Although both of these studies contain biographical elements, neither is a full-blown biography. In *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, Tracey Hill uses Munday to examine the broader political and cultural milieu in and around London.35 Donna Hamilton’s *Anthony Munday and the Catholics* examines Munday’s life through a sort of revisionist methodology that attempts to paint

---


him as a Catholic writing in coded terms for other English Catholics. Her book is very well researched, but the evidence she provides is equivocal. Her conclusions are largely based on deductions taken from evidence that she suggests is hidden within Munday’s writings. Her conclusions are, therefore, highly subjective. For at face value most of Munday’s own works display outwardly Protestant leanings and other primary sources give no real indication of Munday’s personal religious beliefs. What is truly encouraging about both texts, however, is that neither of the authors are content with accepting the traditional depictions of Munday.

This dissertation continues in that vein. A chronologically based examination of Munday’s place in Elizabethan/Jacobean England offers us a case study of an early modern professional playwright and author. Munday’s life provides a guide to the writer’s trade as a time when the profession was switching from avocation to vocation.

CHAPTER TWO -- 1553-1579

Introduction

The period from Munday’s birth through his childhood is the least well
documented of his life. In fact, four records, one of which is equivocal, and a single
sentence from a legal document apparently written while Munday was a late teen
constitute the entire body of known documentation concerning Anthony Munday’s
childhood. The body of primary documentation includes a possible baptismal record
from 1560, a 1570 court record pertaining to the death of Munday’s parents, a 1576 entry
in the Stationers’ Register pertaining to his apprenticeship; and the record of an
appearance by Munday before the London Court of Aldermen on 12 January 1580/81.
Of these four, the latter three are unequivocal. While Munday’s own remarks about his
life appear in some of his works, he refers to his childhood only once in all of his extant
writing. From these facts, it becomes rapidly evident that any discussion of Munday’s
childhood is heavily grounded in both assumption and speculation.

Munday’s Birth

The first issue that must be addressed in a study of Munday is that of his birth
date. Even today, there is no irrefutable evidence of the actual year of his birth, let alone
the date. Recent scholarship tends to accept a 1560 birth because of the mid-twentieth
century work of Leslie Hotson and Mark Eccles. Both authors suggested that he was
born in either January or October of that year. Prior to their work, assumptions about
the year of Munday’s birth had been based upon evidence in the 1633 edition of Stow’s
Survey of London. This was the final edition with which Munday was involved and it
contains a copy of the epitaph from Munday’s tombstone, noting “Obiit Anno Aetatis suae 80. Domini 1633. Augusti 10.”\(^{37}\) Freely translated, Munday, died 10 August, 1633 at the age of eighty. If he died at the age of eighty in 1633, then he was born in 1553. As noted, the tombstone was destroyed in the great fire of London in 1666.\(^{38}\) There is at least one error in the transcription in Stow’s *Survey* because parish records note that Munday was buried on 9 August, 1633 and thus either Church records or Stow are in error.\(^{39}\)

The primary issue with this date is simple: a birth date this early would have made him twenty-three at the time of his 1576 apprenticeship to John Allde. Questions about the epitaph first surfaced when Celeste Turner-Wright recognized the issue in her 1929 *Anthony Munday: An Elizabethan Man of Letters* in which she noted that Munday’s apparent age presented something of a dilemma to her:

> One might almost suppose (tombstone testimony notwithstanding) that he was then but a boy of sixteen, such as might enact women’s parts on the stage; for he bound himself to serve eight years instead of the minimum seven, and apprenticeships were usually calculated so as to expire in the twenty-fifth year. Such a theory certainly obviates later difficulties, for example the mention of his “tender time” in 1579, and the lateness of his literary work; but lack of positive proof prevents the substitution of a birthdate in 1560 for one in 1553.\(^{40}\)

In fact, the “Great Statute of Artificers” (1562) required that apprenticeships be of seven years duration and *be completed by age twenty-three*.\(^{41}\) Thus, in this case, Munday and

---

\(^{37}\) Stow, 1633, p. 869.  
\(^{38}\) Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 173.  
\(^{39}\) Ibid.  
\(^{40}\) Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 5.  
\(^{41}\) *Statutes*, 5 Elizabeth I c4.
Allde both would have been in violation of a law that was to become a keystone of Elizabethan and English labor practices into the nineteenth century.42

Despite the work of Turner-Wright, the question of Munday’s birth date lay fallow for about twenty years until the publication of a brief note in Notes and Queries in January, 1956 by I. A. Shapiro. He suggested that Turner-Wright was correct and posited a window “between 25 July and 24 August, 1560 and certainly not later” for Munday’s birth.43 At this point Leslie Hotson and Mark Eccles both chimed in with previously unpublished evidence. Hotson offered two additional pieces of evidence. First, the baptismal record for one “Anthoney Monday Baptized 13 Octobris 1560.”44 Second, records of Munday’s testimony in 1598 before the Consistory Court of the Bishop of London, in which Munday gave his age as “38 years or thereabouts” as of the date of the hearing.45 Based upon these documents, Hotson offered October, 1560 as the time frame for Munday’s birth.46

Eccles, in turn, posited Munday’s birth as being “on or before January 12, 1559/60” and offered October as a more remote possibility.47 Eccles’ conclusions were based upon separate research that led to some of the same data as that used by Hotson.

Additionally he uncovered records of Munday’s testimony before the London Court of

---

44 Hotson, 1959, p. 2.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
47 Eccles, 1959, p. 95.
Aldermen on 12 January 1580/81 in which he proved to the satisfaction of the examiners that he was “of full age of xxj yeares & vpwardes.” 48

The evidence cited by Shapiro, Hotson, and Eccles, suggests that a birth date of 1560 date is more likely than the earlier date of 1553. However, Munday was a man known to “adapt” the truth to a given situation when it was to his benefit to do so; such as when he was trying to redeem his portion (that is, his inheritance, perhaps before he was of age) or when he was trying to avoid legal trouble for editing a document after the fact. 49 Eccles is aware of Munday’s propensity to stretch the truth to his own ends.

In his discussion of alternatives to the January, 1560, birth date, he notes that it is possible that Munday found witnesses to testify that he had been born earlier, so that he could receive his portion sooner. 50

Additionally, Munday (Mundy, Monday, Mondie) was not an uncommon name in Tudor England. There were numerous people using some form of the Munday surname in London and its environs. Hotson notes that he did not originally publish information concerning Munday’s birth because of his concerns as to whether or not the baptismal record was actually for Munday the writer. 51 He further notes that there were at least two other persons with the same name living in England at the same time
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48 Ibid., p. 71.
49 Hotson, 1959, p. 2.
50 Ibid., p. 96.
51 Ibid.
as “our” Munday; one of whom was in Cornwall, and the other the Rector of St. Peters, Winchester in 1611.  

If Munday were born in 1553 rather than 1560, he would have been seventeen rather than ten at the time of his father’s death. In this case, the period between his father’s death and his apprenticeship becomes a lot more interesting in terms of what Munday was doing. There is some evidence suggesting that Munday may have been an actor prior to his apprenticeship. While there is no evidence of Oxford’s company during the period in question, several aristocratic troupes existed, including those of the Earls of Derby (to whom Munday dedicated in 1593), Leicester (to whom Munday dedicated in 1584), Warrick, Worcester, Sussex, and of Lords Strange, Abergevigny, Mountjoy, and Hunsden. Additionally, Oxford’s Men reappear in the records in 1579. It is possible that they were touring prior to this and records remain lost.

52 Ibid.
Given these facts (as opposed to the speculation that surrounds the question), it seems to me that a definitive birth date for Munday remains beyond contemporary academia. Although the preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise, and there remain significant problems with the date, it is possible that Munday was born in 1553. Further, it seems that interpretations tied to either birth date must give caution to the prudent scholar.

Childhood (to 1570)

Turner-Wright argues that Munday’s immediate family was prosperous as his father was a draper in an age of “extravagant dress.”55 This is an assumption that stood unchallenged until Eccles debunked it in 1959. He noted that despite the fact that Munday pere was a Draper, he is consistently referred to in official documents as a stationer.56 Eccles suggests that Munday pere, “was one of the many freemen of the Drapers’ Company who in fact earned their livings as stationers.”57 Although there is no reason given for this phenomenon, it seems likely that membership in the Drapers might have advantages as that company is number three in the order of precedence established in 1515. The Stationers, on the other hand were (and remain today) number forty-seven. Given the precedence of the former and the profit potential of the latter it
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55 Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 2. Just how extravagantly people were wont to dress can be seen in the various sumptuary statutes—attempts to regulate which people could wear what when—and their penalties that were passed during the reign of Elizabeth. See also Statutes, 4 Elizabeth I and 16 Elizabeth I.
56 A member of the The Master and Wardens and Brethren and Sisters of the Guild or Fraternity of the Blessed Mary the Virgin of the Mystery of Drapers of the City of London or The Worshipful Company of the Stationers of London.
57 Eccles, 1959, p. 97.
would have made sense for the elder and younger Munday to maintain their standing with the Drapers. They are not unique—John Hemminges, Shakespeare’s partner in the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, was a member of the Grocers’ Company, but there is no evidence that he pursued that trade.  

Membership in one of the Livery Companies offered the freedom of (full citizenship in) the City of London and privileges such as voting through the guilds for the Lord Mayor, as well as the monopolistic practices enjoyed by the guilds themselves. Membership also rendered social services to Company members. For example, the Stationers’ Company periodically gave money to poor Stationers. As we shall see, upon the death of Munday pere cloth workers, not stationers, were named as trustees for young Munday’s portion until he came of age.

Munday may or may not have been an only child. There is no evidence of siblings in Munday’s writing, but there is mention of “Anthony Mundaye one of the Children & orphans of Christofer Mundaye stacyoner” in the records of Munday’s court appearance to prove his being of age to receive his portion (inheritance). In any case, it appears that his middling class parents were able to provide young Munday with an education. In the dedication to his 1579 Mirrour of Mutability, while discussing certain “eminent daungers” that he and a companion faced in their journey on the continent, Munday speaks of the nature of his upbringing:

Thirdly, vnto all our freends, (espetially our Parents) vvhat an hart sorovve it vvould be, to heare hovv their liberall enpences bestovved on vs in our youth, in trayning vs vp in verteous educations is novv so lightly regarded: as able to cause the Father to yeeld his breath, for the sorrowve conceiued through the negligence of his Sonne, and all ingenerall lament our vnnaturall vsages.60

Turner-Wright speculates on a “good elementary education” based upon a number of indicators. First of all Munday possessed “neat penmanship, a considerable vocabulary, and the ability to marshal quotations from Marcus, Tullius, Cicero.”61 Second, she cites Munday’s “avowal” in *The English Romaine Lyfe*, “that he conversed in Latin on arriving at Rome.”62 The trip took place in 1578 and 1579 at which point Munday would have been either eighteen or twenty-five. Finally, Turner-Wright notes that the young Munday composed Latin verses to the Earl of Oxford at the end of his *Mirrour of Mutabilitie* and to Sir Francis Drake in the preface to his non-extant *Palmendos* (1653).63 All of Munday’s accomplishments suggest formal education in an Elizabethan grammar school.
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61 Turner-Wright, p. 2.
62 Ibid., p. 3.
63 Ibid., p. 7; The famous history of Palmendos son to the most renowned Palmerin D’Oliva, Emperour of Constantinople, and the heroick Queen of Tharsus. Wherein is likewise a most pleasant discourse of Prince Risarano, the son of Trineus, Emperour of Almain, and Aurecinda, sister to the Soldane of Persia. With their knightly deeds, and acts of chivalry; their famous adventures, and most worthy resolutions. Newly corrected and amended, and most profitable and delightfull for all sorts of people. Not extant.
Munday’s life changed markedly in January, 1571. From the *Repertories of the Court of Aldermen* we learn that not only was Munday an orphan, but that his mother had predeceased his father by an unknown span of time.

This document is not extraordinary in and of itself as this type of appointment is simply keeping with the legal practices of the time. What makes it fairly unique is that, with the exception of the parish records that may pertain to his birth, it provides the only documentary evidence of Munday’s youth currently known to be extant. Additionally, it is from here that we learn that Munday’s mother was deceased and had been named Jane. Further, it would appear that Munday’s father died in December of 1570.

Munday’s “Lost Years” (1571 – 1576)

Sources from the period 1570 to 1576 present an historical blank regarding Munday’s life. There is no indication of how these years were spent. There is speculation that young Munday was fostered to relatives in the parish, but no evidence has presented itself to that end. There is other speculation, grounded in later writings both by and about Munday that he spent time as an actor during this period. Scholars also suggest that during this period Munday studied with French (Huguenot) scholar Claudius Hollyband; this grounded in the inclusion of verses by Hollyband in the

---

Mirrour of Mutabilitie entitled “Claudius Hollyband, in the Commendation of his Schollers exersise.” As Hollyband had moved his school into London in 1573, such a relationship would be possible. Given the later birth date, Munday would have been about thirteen at this time, and at the late end of the age range that attended Elizabethan grammar school (seven to fourteen). A relationship with Hollyband would also help explain Munday’s career-long penchant for translating or “englishing” texts from the French and other languages.

Apprenticeship (1576 – 1578)

In 1576 Munday’s life changed again. Documentary evidence in the form of official records of the then sixteen year old Munday is limited to a single entry in the Stationers’ Register:

primo Die Octobris 1576
John Aldee./Anthonie mondaie sonne of CHRISTOFER MONDAYE late of London Draper Deceased hath put himself appntice to John Aldee stationer for Eighte yeres begynnynge at Bartholomewetyde laste paste . . . . . vj

It is during the period of Munday’s apprenticeship that we see his first attempts at publication. It is also during this period that Munday first begins making the contacts that would assist him in his endeavors for the rest of his life. Turner-Wright notes that other apprentices that worked in “the Long Shop adjoining unto St. Mildred’s Church, in the Poultry” included John Windet (later printer to the City of London) and Thomas

65 Munday, Mirrour.
Proctor (converted Catholic and later writer). Additionally, she suggests that he may have met Henry Chettle as well as Hollyband, and John Charlewood, at this time.

Munday’s Place

The question of Munday’s place through 1578 is an interesting one. At birth it might be fair to say that he inherited his place from that of his father. This would certainly be in keeping with English notions of propriety, status and anyone’s place in that society. This is problematic, however as:

Munday’s own social status is rather indeterminate since little is known about his family background for more than one previous generation. The available evidence is not altogether consistent but it does suggest that Munday, appropriately enough, held some liminal status between artisan and gentry of the kind dramatised on many a London stage.

This was not necessarily the entire story though, as the difference between gentry and commoner was becoming increasingly blurred. Despite this, it is apparent that the Kings and Queens of England were not particularly tolerant of change in contemporary notions of place. This can be seen in the various attempts throughout the years to regulate and restrict people from moving out of the trades of their fathers as well as in the sumptuary statutes. While ostensibly attempts to regulate trade, and keep people working in less-than-desirable jobs for less-than-desirable wages, these statutes can also be seen as attempts to maintain the status quo and to protect the privileges that accrued to the upper classes. In fact, though, despite these attempts, by the reign of Elizabeth I it

---

67 Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 6.
70 See the various labor and sumptuary statutes throughout the years including 5 Eliz I c.4.
had become possible for a wealthy and successful merchant to literally purchase a coat of arms and become a gentleman, thus changing his place within the society for the better. William Shakespeare’s father is the best known example of this. During the reign of James I, the creation of the title Baronet (between a knight and a Baron in precedence) made it possible to buy ones way not only into the gentry, but into the aristocracy. The act of seeking patronage and moving up the social ladder was universal in the English culture of this period. Thus the “liminal status” that Munday held was one that was insecure at best, perhaps even unrecognized by his betters, and “he sought patronage as their self-confessed inferior from wealthy city merchants but at the same time was ‘Master Munday’ to his peers.”

At the beginning of young Munday’s life, whatever status he held in Tudor society was derived from Munday pere’s freedom of the Drapers’ Company and, like all of the burgeoning middling class to which he belonged, was as a result of the prosperity inherent in his trade. He not only begins publishing, but also starts to make contacts in what appears to me to be a very deliberate manner. This culminates with his – apparently unexpected – trip to the continent in 1578.

---

CHAPTER THREE -- THE POLITICAL MUNDAY, 1577 THROUGH 1612

Introduction - Munday through 1612

Munday ended his apprenticeship with Allde in 1578. The reason behind his departure is unclear. In fact, from the time of his departure until around 1582, Munday followed a path with origins that are as unclear as his motivations. At some point after leaving Allde, Munday and his companion, Thomas Nowell, made their way to the Continent, established contact with fugitive English Catholics there and enrolled at the Venerable English College at Rome. He was expelled or resigned and returned to England, although Nowell remained behind at the College, at least for a time. Upon his return to England Munday began publishing anti-Catholic polemic as well as receiving patronage jobs involved in anti-Catholic activities. Evidence suggests that he was employed at different times during the period 1582 through 1592 by the Privy Council’s Richard Topcliffe (chief persuivant and rackmaster), Sir Thomas Heneage (Privy Councilor), John Whitgift (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1583-1587), and Richard Vaughan (Bishop of London, 1604-1607). There is evidence as well of Munday’s involvement with Edward de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, and Robert Dudley, first Earl of Leicester. Perhaps these connections account for his writings dealing with several pivotal religious issues of this period including the suppression of the Jesuit Mission, specifically the Edmund Campion affair, and the Martin Marprelate pamphlet “war.”

While Munday’s motivations for his activities during this period remain unclear, what is clear is that he is unique in those activities. Despite apparent similarities
between Munday and Stephan Gosson, the two are quite different. Both were involved in theatre and in the writing of anti-Catholic and anti-theatrical polemic. Either Gosson or Munday may be the man who toured Bristol with “my Lord of Oxfordes players” in September of 1580.\(^7\) Beyond that, however, the two do not lead any sort of parallel careers. While Gosson had bowed out of both playwriting and (published) polemic by 1598, Munday wrote until his death.\(^3\) Further, while Gosson wound up taking Anglican orders and after several parishes, became the rector of Saint Botolphs in Bishopsgate, Munday “returned home to his first vomite againe,“ (the theatre, perhaps as an actor at first) and began writing and translating as well.\(^4\) Additionally, Munday, unlike Gosson, moved in a secular direction in that his non-writing activities included membership in both the Drapers’ and in the Merchant Taylors’ guilds and royal appointments that involved spying, and hunting recusants as well as testifying (falsely) against them.

Primary Documentation

Extant primary documentation concerning Munday’s activities from 1578 to 1612 is an interesting mix of items including autobiographical and biographical anecdotes, as well as guild, church, and government records. There is more contemporary data pertaining to Munday during this period than at any other during his life. Unfortunately, these items do little more than provide tantalizing clues to his career.

---

\(^7\) REED – Bristol, p. 122.


\(^4\) Alfield, 1582; Saint Botolphs was one of the richest parishes in London. See Kinney.
Autobiographical and Biographical Documentation

Like so many other things pertaining to Munday, the autobiographical and biographical documentation that remains extant is problematic to a researcher. Some of the problems occur because Munday’s motivation in generating the details of his life is unclear. The religious issues and insecurities of the time permeate all of these documents. Neither autobiographical nor biographical publications are unbiased. Additionally, given that there is at least one case in which Munday presented false evidence in court (that of the Edmund Campion affair), one must question at the very least his objectivity, if not his veracity. Although in those terms this appears to be a small matter, the fact is that the Jesuit Edmund Campion and a number of other priests were executed based, at least in part, on Munday’s testimony.\footnote{Further, Munday’s relationship to Father Campion is unclear given the small but growing school of thought in which Munday is seen as, at the very least a Catholic sympathizer who “began his career writing on behalf of the catholic cause and subsequently negotiated for several decades the difficult terrain of an ever-changing Catholic-Protestant cultural, religious, and political landscape” See Hamilton, 2005, flyleaf.} That the testimony was patently false certainly makes one wary of accepting anything Munday has to say regarding his experiences on the Continent without a confirming source. Biographical sources include Catholic pamphlets written in reaction to Munday’s involvement with both the Campion and Marprelate affairs, as well as personal letters from the likes of Richard Topcliffe, William Allen, and Robert Persons that mention or discuss Munday.\footnote{Allen, William, later Cardinal, founded the seminaries at Douay and Rheims as well as the Venerable English College at Rome. Allen refused to accept the act of settlement and emigrated in 1561. See Gasquet, Francis Aidan, Cardinal. A History of the Venerable English College, Rome: an Account of Its}
Munday also appears in government, guild, and church records throughout this period in a number of places. The majority of guild records related to Munday are in the Stationers’ Register, which lists information largely related to his publishers and publications during this period. He is also listed in the records of other companies, mostly in relation to his work with civic pageantry later in his career. Other records include items from the Lord Chamberlain’s office, the Privy Council, the Patent Rolls of Elizabeth I, various legal sources, the Vatican, the Venerable English College at Rome, and the English College as Rheims.

**Autobiographical and Biographical Documents**

Much of what we know about Munday from this period comes from Munday himself. This data, though, can be misleading. The publication of his most notable work from this period, his *Englishe Romayne Lyfe* of 1582, was actually the culmination of a string of works dealing with and, one would assume, profiting from his trip to the Continent. It is in this work that Munday narrates his experiences during the trip to the Continent. Munday’s other writings of the period that include autobiographical information are parts of *The Mirrour of Mutability, Newes from the North, Paine of Pleasure* and his *Second and Third Blast*. He is also mentioned in several documents including

---


letters between Catholics on the Continent, as well as poems, and pamphlets by both friends and enemies.

Alfield in Munday’s body of Campion Specific Literature

One source that has been used extensively in trying to discern elements of Munday’s career and religious is Thomas Alfield’s *true reporte of the death & martyrdome of M. Campion of 1582.* As this source is cited repeatedly by Munday scholars, some introduction is in order. Issues raised in this section are discussed in more detail in later sections. Alfield wrote a Catholic response to the Protestant publications in general and Munday’s *Discovery of Campion* concerning the executions of Campion and other members of the mission. There are two parts to the document, the first in prose, the second in verse. The prose section consists of an introduction, “To the reader,” the body of the book, “A true report of the death of M. Campion Iesuite and Preist, M. Sherwin, and M. Bryan preistes,” and “A caueat to the reader touching A, M his discouery.” The verse section consists of three poems, “Vpon the death of M. Edmund Campion, one of the societie of the holy name of Iesus,” “A Dialog between a Catholike and consolation,” and “The complaynt of a Catholike for the death of M. Edmund Campion.”

---

78 Bibliographic records attribute this work to Thomas Alfield but note that it has been suggested that the book may be the work of Robert Persons and that some of the verses may be the work of Henry Walpole.
Table 1. Alfield and Munday’s Body of Campion Specific Literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entered</td>
<td>24 July, 1581</td>
<td>Munday</td>
<td>A Breefe Discourse of the Taking of Edmund Campion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published</td>
<td>29 January, 1582/3</td>
<td>Munday</td>
<td>A Discoverie of Edmund Campion.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Alfield</td>
<td>A True Reporte of the Death &amp; Martyrdom of M. Campion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Munday</td>
<td>A Breefe Answer Made Vnto Two Seditious Pamphlets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published</td>
<td>29 January, 1582/3</td>
<td>Munday</td>
<td>The English Romayne Lyfe:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verses, of course, deal with Campion and his execution. It is the “caueat to
the reader touching A, M his discouery” that most interests scholars of Munday. The
root of this interest lies in the fact that Alfield offers an uncomplimentary capsule
summary of Munday’s life. Even given the obviously hostile tone of the document,
there is still data that may be useful to the Munday scholar, if only the wheat can be
separated from the chaff.

Alfield begins with a somewhat controversial item when he suggests that it may
not have been Munday, but rather “some macheuillian in mnndayes name hath shufled
out of late a Discouery of M Campions & his confederates treasons, the same in effect &
substance with the aduertisment before rehearesed.”80 Whether this is an attempt to

79 Anthony Munday. A Discoverie of Edmund Campion, and His Confederates, Their Most Horrible and
Traiterous Practises, Against Her Maiesties Most Royall Person and the Realme: Wherein May Be Seene,
How Thorowe the Whole Course of Their Araignement: They Were Notably Convicted of Every Cause.
VWhereto Is Added, the Execution of Edmund Campion, Raph Sherwin, and Alexander Brian, Executed
at Tiborne the 1. of December. Published by A.M. Sometime the Popes Scholler, Allowed in the Seminarie
at Roome Amongst Them: a Discourse Needefull to Be Read of Euery Man, to Beware How They Deale
London: [By John Charlewood] for Edwarde VVhite, dwelling at the little north doore of Paules,
at the signe of the Gunne, 1582, p. D.i. Available by subscription from

80 Alfield.
sow discontent among the Protestant populace and writers or simply Alfield waxing poetic remains unknown, but it certainly does set the tone for the rest of the book.

Of specific interest to Munday scholars are bits of information contained within the rest of the document, in which Alfield offers the reader his assessment “of the qualities and conditions of this davus, so rayling aud rauing at uertuous and good men deseassed, that there by he may the better Iudge and value the truthe of that neiwe pamphlet.” Alfield notes that Munday was first “a stage player”, and then “an aprentise which tyme he wel semed with deceauing of his master…” The choice of words is interesting here. Aside from the fact that this suggests that Munday was involved in the theatre prior to his Rome expedition, it raises two questions. First, was the notion of Munday’s being an actor intended to imply that he was no better than “Roges Vacaboundes and Sturdy Beggers?” Second, did Munday in some way deceive Allde? The extant primary evidence does not address the first allegation. The second is addressed by Munday in his *Breefe Aunswer*, as we shall see.

Alfield then notes that Munday, “wandring towardes Italy, by his owne report became a coosener in his iourney.” The Oxford English dictionary defines Coosen (cozen) as “to cheat, defraud by deceit,” therfore a “Coosener” is a confidence man of sorts. In short, while on the Rome trip, Munday became a liar. In this statement, Alfield is no doubt referring to Munday’s assuming a false name in his travels and
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81 Ibid.  
82 Ibid.  
83 Ibid.  
using that name to gain entrance to the English College at Rome. With his arrival in Rome, “in his short abode there; [Munday] vvas charitably relieued, but neuer admitted in the seminary as he pleseth to lye in the title of his booke.” 85 This is either an error or blatant disinformation. In any case it is incorrect. Munday and Nowell were “charitably relieued” as they were invited to stay at the hospice for the traditional eight days, that much is true, and is discussed below. But, as Mark Eccles notes, Vatican records of the English College clearly state the both Munday and Nowell were enrolled as “Antonius Auleus and "Thomas Novellus," students in the humanities.”86

Alfield then notes that Munday, “being very of well doing, returned home to his first vomite again.” By emphasizing that Munday returned to England because of being “very of well doing,” Alfield offers a view of a very immature Munday, perhaps one who is too young too be involving himself in matters of Church and State.

With Munday returned to England, Alfield tells of how

this scholler new come out of Italy did play extempore, those gentlemen and others whiche were present, can best giue witnes of his dexterity, who being very of his folly, hissed him from his stage. Then being therby discouraged, he set forth a balet against playes, but yet (O constant youth) he now beginnes againe to ruffle vpon the stage.87

This passage not only places Munday in the theatre upon his return, but suggests a certain incompetence therein. Again the implications of immaturity are heavily present in the description of Munday’s reaction to the hissing. Further, Alfield continues the theme of immaturity with his commentary on Munday’s personal life.

85 Alfield.
86 Eccles, 1982, p. 98.
87 Alfield.
Alfield again offers a negative view, noting, “I omit among other places his behauior in Barbican with his good mistres, and mother…”88 This is generally taken to suggest that Munday has married and that the young couple are living with her family.

The rest of the text deals with Munday’s anti-Catholic writings. Alfield notes that in two cases, *The Araignement, and Execution of...Eualde Ducket*, and *A Breefe Discourse of the Taking of Edmund Campion*, Munday’s works were immediately and publicly challenged, proven to be inaccurate, and were written “for very lucers sake only, and not for the truthe.”89 This is the earliest suggestion that Munday would do “anything for money,” and true or not, it has attracted scholars from the start. In case Alfield’s readers missed his point, he concludes the caveat with the following:

> Therfore good reader examine this mans honesti so reported, & suspend thy iugement against these good preists, vntill by gods grace the whol maner course, and order, araignment, accnsation, condemnation, and answeres, shal come forth, which is shortly intended for thy benefite and satisfaction.90

---

**The Rome Trip**

*Dating*

The exact dates of Munday’s adventure on the Continent remain unclear. Although scholars have attempted to tie the dates down, a time frame of autumn, 1578 to July, 1579 appears to be as close as may be achieved without entering the realm of pure speculation. Turner-Wright notes:

---

88 Ibid.
89 Ibid.
90 Ibid.
The dating of Munday’s Italian journey would be no simple matter if his own statements were to pass at face value: obviously he set out in the fall, for he took Christmas dinner in Milan; but the question of the year he himself has obscured by avowing, in verses affixed to a book on the escape of John Fox from the Turks, that he was ‘at Rome in the Englishe house when Fox was there and received his letters’ from the Pope—that is, at Easter, 1577. At the Milan dinner, however, his host, Dr. Griffin, mentioned the battle of Alcazar, which took place in August, 1578. Furthermore, the records of the Roman seminary show that Dr. Maurice Clenocke became rector in 1578 and was ousted in March, 1579.\footnote{Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 16.}

\textit{Munday’s Departure}

Although his indentures to John Allde were to run into 1584, Munday left his situation with Allde sometime in 1578. The exact date is unknown. Munday’s leaving the apprenticeship was unusual but not unheard of. There are records in the Stationers’ Register of apprenticeships being cancelled both with and without prejudice. During the period of Munday’s apprenticeship there are a number of guild records that note “This pretis is neuer to be made free for he had absented him self vnlaefully,” or “This apprentice is neuer to be made free for he hathe run away iij. Tymes,” or words to that effect.\footnote{Arber, 1875, pps. 75 and 89.} Munday’s case appears to have been different, however. There is, in fact, no notice of his departure in the Stationers’ Register. Further, Munday apparently left under good circumstances. In his published response to Alfield’s commentary, he notes that, “Howe I was an Apprentice, and serued my tyme well with deceuying my Maister: I referre my selfe to the iudgement of all men, reading this which my Maister
vnrequested, hath heere set downe on my behalfe.”93 Munday then encloses a notice from Allde himself:

This is to let all men vnderstand, that Anthony Munday, for the tyme he was my Seruantaunt, dyd his duetie in all respectes, as much as I could desire, without fraude, couin or deceyte: if otherwise I should report of him, I should but say vntrueth.
By me John Allde.94

The fact that Munday was eventually free of not one but two guilds lends weight to the notion that Allde supported Munday’s departure, at least after the fact. What remains unclear is Allde’s motivation behind making the statement.

Munday’s reason for leaving Allde also remains unclear. While it is possible that the “desire to see strange countries, as also affection to learn the languages, had persuaded [him] to leave [his] native country, and not other intent or cause, God is my record,” it seems that there should be more to it.95

In terms of the departure, there are only four extant pieces of data that offer any sort of a time reference. On 28 January, 1577, Allde was fined by the Stationers for, “keeping a prentyce vnpresentyd contrary to good order.” On that same date:

William Hall sonne of WILLIAM HALL of LILLISIELD in the county of SALOP clarke. Hathe putt him selfe apprenntyce to Jhon Aldee cytizen and

---

94 Ibid.
Stationer of London for the terme of Seven yeres begynynge on the Day of the Date hereof. This seems likely. She further argues that, given the relationship between Munday and Allde, it may be that Hall was enabling Munday to leave early and amicably. If this be the case, 28 January, 1577, can be used to establish one end of the time frame for Munday’s trip.

There is additional data. On 20 August, 1578, Allde was again fined by the Stationers: this time, “At a court holden this day abouesaid. To paye Vs for printing iij ballades for Edward White and Mundaies Dreame for hym selfe without lycence.” Assuming that the fine was timely, and assuming that Munday was still with Allde at this point, this narrows the time line by about seven months and might establish late August as the time of Munday’s departure.

Finally, there is one date that is relevant to the early parts of the trip. It is, in fact, the first concrete date that Munday offers in the text. We know that the travelers were in Milan (via Amiens, Paris, and Lyon) for Christmas. Given the time frame set above, it must have been Christmas, 1578. Given that the journey of almost fifteen hundred miles was made entirely on foot, and figuring an average of 25 miles a day, it would have

---

96 Arber, 1875, v. ii, p. 73.
taken a minimum of 60 days. That places the latest departure date possible as on or about 27 October. Given the vagaries of travel at this time, it seems to me that this is a very late date of departure. But it does establish another reference point for the time frame. Given all this the closest that we can come to the departure date is a window ranging from 28 January 1577/78 to 27 October, 1578.

To the Continent

Regardless of the date, at some point after leaving Allde, Munday:

“committed the small wealth I had, into my purse, a Travelers weede on my backe,”

and he and Thomas Nowell:

crossed the Seas from England to Bulloine in Fraunce. From thence we travelled to Amiens, in no small daunger, standing to the mercie of dispoying Soldiers, who went robbing and killing thorowe the Countrey, the Campe beeing by occasion broken vp at that tyme. Little they left vs, and lesse would haue done, by the value of our liues, had not a better bootie come then we were at that time: the Soldiers preparing towards them, whome they sawe better rouided for their necessitie: offered vs the leysure too escape which we refused not, beeing left bare enough bothe of coyne and cloathes. But as then we stoode not to accoumpt on our losse, it suffised vs that we had our liues: whereof beeing not a little glad, we set the better legge before, least they should come backe againe; and robbe vs of them too.\textsuperscript{100}

The two travelers then made their way into Amiens where they were told of an English priest “whose name was Maister Woodward.”\textsuperscript{101} Father Woodward helped them secure lodging, at his own expense, all the while discoursing “unto us how beneficial the Pope was to our countrymen and how highly we might pleasure ourselves, our friends and country” and, “Beside, such horrible and vnnaturall

\textsuperscript{100} Munday, \textit{English Romayne Life}, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid., 2.
speeches, he vsed against her Maiestie, her honourable Councell, and other persons that he named: as the verie remembraunce maketh me blushe, and my heart to bleede.”

In addition to procuring them lodging and board, Woodward the next day “wrote two letters to Dr Allen at Reims,” one of which was news from England and the other a letter of introduction for the travelers. All during the meeting, the father “manifested the treason toward England,” as well as:

behaued him selfe in speeches to vs where you may perceyue the Popes determination, & our Englishmens vnnatural consent, to be Traitors to their own Princesse, to shorten her life, & ouerthrow their natuie Country, where they were borne. When he had mightily besieged vs with a multitude, as well threatninges as perswasions, to conforme our selues vnder that obedience: as well to auoide perill that might otherwise happen, as also to gayne somewhat toward our releefe, we promised him to doo as he would haue vs, & to goe whether he would appoint vs.

The next stop for Munday and Nowell was not Reims, however. After Father Woodward helped them to pawn their cloaks (“which the Soldiers against their willes,” had left to the travelers) and given them “four or five French sous out of his own purse,” the two left town and traveled towards Amiens.

Trouble of a different sort struck when, during a rest stop, Nowell’s Protestant faith apparently wavered. At this point, they were discussing the priest Woodward; and Munday was proclaiming the correctness of not “yeelding to that, which we iudged rather to be a mummerie, and derision of the true Doctrine, then otherwise.”

Munday apparently re-catechized his partner so thoroughly and “to the uttermost of

\[\text{102} \quad \text{Ibid., p. 4.}\]
\[\text{103} \quad \text{Ibid., p. 5.}\]
\[\text{104} \quad \text{Ibid., p. 6.}\]
\[\text{105} \quad \text{Ibid.}\]
my power” that Nowell agreed to accompany him to Paris, and the English Ambassador, rather than to Reims as they had intended.106

Upon arrival at Paris, they immediately sought out the English ambassador and presented him with the letters from Woodward. The ambassador “bestowd his Honourable lyberalitie” upon them and bade them return to England post haste. But upon leaving the ambassador they made acquaintance with a number of:

English Gentlemen, some of them for the knowledge they had of me in England, shewed them selues verie courteous to me, bothe in money, lodging, and other necessaries. And through them we became acquainted with a number of Englishe men more, who lay in the Cittie, some in Colledges, and some at their owne houses: where vsing dailie company among them, sometime at dinner, and sometime at supper, we heard many girdes and nippes against our Countrey of England, her Maiesty very vnreuerently handled in woords, and certayne of her honourable Counsell, vnduetifullie tearmed.107

While listening to these “English gentlemen” Munday and Nowell were convinced to proceed to Rome, despite the dangers inherent in such a trip.108 Of the “English gentlemen,” Munday notes in marginal text that, “By their perswasions and liberalitie, they win a number daylie to them.”109 Also while listening, Munday had his palm open and thus:

Uppon our agreement to vnertake the trauell, we receyued of euerie one lyberallie toward the bearing of our charges, and Letters we had to Maister Doctor Lewes in Roome, the Archdeacon of Cambra, and

106 Ibid.
107 Ibid., p. 7.
108 Ibid., p. 8.
109 Ibid.
to Doctor Morris, then the Rector of the English Hospital or Colledge in Roome, that we might there be preferred among the English Students.\textsuperscript{110}

From Paris it was onto Lyon, where at the house of “one Maister Deacon, the wordes were spoken by Henry Orton, one of them condemned, and yet liuing in the Tower, which in my other booke I haue auouched.”\textsuperscript{111}

From thence wee went to Millaine, where in the Cardinall Boromehos Pallace, we found the lodging of a Welshman, named Doctor Robert Griffin, a man there had in a good account, and Confessor to the aforesaid Cardinal. By him we were very courteouslye entertained, and sent to the house of an Englishe Prieste in the Cittie, named Maister Harries, who likewise bestowd on vs very gentle acceptaunce, as also three English Gentlemen, who lay in his house, being very lately retourned from Roome: they likewise both in cost and courtesie, behaued them selues like Gentlemen vnto vs, during the time that we made our abode in Millaine.\textsuperscript{112}

This is the first actual date offered by Munday in his text. He and Nowell, apparently now passing themselves off as relatives of Englishmen known to support the Catholics, arrived in Milan on the day before Christmas. On Christmas day they, “dyned with Doctor Griffin, where we had great cheere, and lyke welcome.”\textsuperscript{113} At this meal they also learned more of the three lodgers at the home of Father Harris. In fact, they learned that the other lodgers had come:

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid.; Lewis, Owen. Eventually Archdeacon of Cambrai, Lewis emigrated to Douai at the accession of Elizabeth I to the throne. He was instrumental in the founding of the Venerable English Collage at Rome, and responsible for the appointment of Maurice Clennock, then warden of the Hospice there, as the first Rector in 1572; Clagnog (Clenock), Maurice. Originally from Wales, Clennock emigrated in 1559 when Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity suspended his appointment as Bishop of Bangor. See Gasquet, pps. 59 and 62.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{112} Munday, \textit{English Romayne Life}, p. 9; Roberts, Griffith. A renowned Welsh scholar who emigrated to the Continent at the same time as Clennock. He had been appointed Archdeacon of Anglsey by Clennock. That appointment was suspended at the same time as that of Clennock. See Gasquet.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., p. 17.
foorth of the North partes of England, taking vpon them to goe forward with that, which Stukely had enterprised, which was, to haue the Popes Armie committed to theyr conduction, and so they would ouerrun England at their pleasure, then they would make Kings and Dukes and Earles, evry one that they thought well off.114

Munday, Nowell, and the doctor went on to speak of the proposed revolution and its support in England, as well as those engaged in gaining the support of the Pope himself. “Other talke we had, not heere to be rehearsed, but truly it would astonishe a heart of Adamant, to heare the horrible Treasons inuented againste her Maiestie and this Realme, and so greedily followed by our owne Countrye men.”115 Additionally and perhaps of more import, while in Milan and visiting with Master Doctor Parker, Munday and Nowell discovered “that Preestes were appointed from Roome & Rheimes for Englande, and that ore long they should be sent.”116 This was most likely Munday’s first indication of the mission of Edmund Campion and his followers. Munday and Nowell left Milan soon thereafter “thence, to Bologna, Florence, Scienna, and so to Roome.”117

114 Ibid., p. 18. Stucley, Thomas. (Ca.1520-1578) Stucley (or Stukely) was an English soldier of fortune during the reigns of both Mary and Elizabeth I. He may have been an illegitimate son of Henry VIII and thus Elizabeth’s half brother. He originally had Elizabeth’s favor but, after 1566, wound up on the Continent plotting an invasion of England with Spain, at first, and later with Rome. He was a popular hero in ballads and plays as well. See Peter Holmes, ‘Stucley, Thomas (c.1520–1578)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford UP, 2004. Available by subscription from http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26741. Accessed 3 February, 2006.
115 Ibid., p. 10.
116 Ibid., p. 11.
117 Ibid.
“Our entrance to Rome was upon Candlemas even”

The travelers arrived in Rome on 1 February, 1579.118 After spending the night in an “an Osteria somewhat within the Cittie,” Munday and Nowell sought out the College.119 Upon arrival at there the two youths gave their letters to the rector of the college and hospice, Doctor Maurice Clenocke.120 Clenocke offered the hospitality of the college for eight days, as was traditional.121

Those eight days turned into indeterminate period during which a number of interesting things occurred. First, Munday and Nowell were accepted into the college and registered as Antonius Auleus and Thomas Novellus, students in the humanities.122 Second, an animosity sprung up between Munday and Nowell for

118 Candlmas is technically forty days after Chri smas. Depending upon how one counts, this places it on either the second or the third. The Roman Catholic Church counts Christmas as day number one and thus celebrates Candlemas on 2 February. Thus “Candlemas even” means the eve of Candlemas, or the first. This is further substantiated in the text as Munday describes candles sent to the English college by the Pope.
120 Ibid.
121 The college was founded in 1362 as a short-term residence for English pilgrims to Rome. This use continued even after Pope Gregory XIII ordered its conversion to a seminary for the training of English priests. The college remains extant today and, through Villa Palazzola, still offers accommodations. See http://englishcollegerome.org and http://palazzola.it. See also Gasquet.

Of interest also may be the fact the College history web page today uses an example from English Roman Life in describing life there during the early years of its existence. Of Munday and the text they note:

One of the most interesting descriptions of life in the early days of the seminary comes from the pen of Anthony Munday, poet, storyteller and spy. Coming to Rome in 1578 with a friend, Thomas Nowell, he stayed at the College and later published his impressions in The English Romayne Life (1582). However, on returning to England, he turned anti-Catholic informer and helped to betray St Edmund Campion and other Jesuit priests. Nevertheless, his account provides an invaluable picture of the daily routine at the College.

reasons that remain unclear, although Munday intimates in several places in *Englishe Romayne Lyfe* that he found strong Catholic tendencies in Nowell.

Additionally Munday and Clenocke fell out. When Munday’s “froward” behavior caused Clenocke attempt to throw him out of the College, Munday refused to leave despite harsher and harsher sanctions from the Welsh doctor.\(^\text{123}\) Things got out of hand though, when Munday either fomented or was, at the very least, involved in an English students’ revolt against Clenocke and the Welsh authority over the college. Charges of Clenocke’s favoring Welshmen over the English students were leveled.

The rebellion eventually required to the intercession of Cardinal Morone, the Cardinal Protector of England. He commanded the appearance of the truculent Englishmen no fewer than three times, each time admonishing them to obey the church-appointed authority over them. This having accomplished nothing short of causing the Englishmen to pack up and leave, caused in turn the intervention of Pope Gregory XIII:

> Why (quoth he) I made the Hospitall for Englishe men, and for their sake I haue giuen so large exhibition: and not for the Welsh men. Returne to your Colledge againe, you shall haue what you will desire, and any thing I haue in the worlde to doo you good.

> Then he commaunded one of the cheefe Gentlemen of his Chamber, to goe with vs, and to certifie the Popes minde to Doctor Morris, and so giuing vs his benedicton, we all went merilie againe to the Colledge.

> The Gentleman gaue Doctour Morris to vnderstande, he must be Rector no longer, the Iesuite named Father Alfonso, whom the Schollers had chosen, must haue his office, then were the Schollers glad, that they had gotten the victorie of the Welshmen.

> On the morrowe, the Pope sent fowre hundred Crownes, to newe reparation the house, to buie the Students all needefull thinges that they

wanted, and the house must no longer be called a Colledge, but a Seminarie.

Then Cardinall Morone, because Doctor Morris should not loose all his dignitie, caused the house to be parted, and so made bothe a Seminarie for the Studientes, and an Hospitall for the entertainement of Englishe Pilgrimes when they came, whereof Doctor Morris continued Custos, by the Popes appointment.\footnote{Ibid., p. 66.}

By the time of the Pope’s intervention, the Englishmen had removed themselves to the house of an Englishman named John Creede.\footnote{Ibid., p. 66; Gasquet, p. 72.} Although the rest returned to the College, no doubt to reconcile themselves to the church as well as celebrating their victory, Munday appears to have remained at the house, availed himself of the pre-Lenten “Carne vale” (a narration of which concludes Munday’s description of the Roman portion of his trip).\footnote{Ibid., p. 68.} Perhaps in an attempt to reinforce the “evidence” (in the form of his writing) of his religious orthodoxy, Munday concludes his text with a description of the 1581 martyrdom of English Protestant Richard Atkins, who visited Rome and challenged the Catholic Church a number of times before being arrested.

\textit{Munday’s Return to London}

Munday returned to London via Naples, Venice, Padua, and Reims at some point in late summer of 1579. Closer dating is impossible. In fact, the July date cited by scholars is only based upon a discrete piece of data that is equivocal at best. We know

\footnotesize

\footnote{124 Ibid., p. 66.}
\footnote{125 Ibid., p. 66; Gasquet, p. 72.}
\footnote{126 Ibid., p. 68.}
that Munday had a number of verses included in a work entitled *Discourse of Jhon Fox* which was licensed on 23 July, 1579.\(^{127}\)

Verses in this booklet (licensed in July, 1579) testify to Mundy’s presence at Rome when Fox arrived thither in March, 1577. The inconsistency of this statement with the published facts of Mundy’s life probably explains the non-appearance of the testimony with the rest of the story in Hakluyt’s *Voyages* (1589) and in a revamping (1608) craftily entitled *The Admirable Deliverance of 266 Christians by John Reynard*. Mundy met the heroic gunner, if anywhere, in the Long Shop, where Allde printed in September a ballad on his exploit.\(^{128}\)

The published inconsistencies to which Turner-Wright refers deal with the fact that in March, 1577, Munday was still in London as an apprentice to John Allde. The publication of the verses do tell something more, however. Munday seems to have referred to his Rome trip in the past tense, suggesting that if he was not back in England at their publication he had at least had left Rome at the time of their composition. Other evidence of Munday’s departure from Rome can be found in the fact that we know he

\(^{127}\) Arber, 1875, v. ii, p.357. *An excellent Discourse of Jhon Fox an inglishman who had been prisoner 14 yeres under ye Turkes, and killing ye gaoler Delivered 266 Christians yat were also prisoner.*

was still in Rome in March, 1579. That was when, according to church records, the estimable “Dr. Morris” was relieved by the Pope of his duties with the college.\textsuperscript{129}

Table 2. The Easter Holidays in 1579.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shrovetide</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrove Sunday (Quinquagesima)</td>
<td>1 March, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrove Tuesday (Mardi Gras)</td>
<td>3 March, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Wednesday</td>
<td>4 March, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion Sunday</td>
<td>5 April, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holy Week</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Sunday</td>
<td>15 April, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maundy Thursday (Last supper)</td>
<td>16 April, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Friday</td>
<td>17 April, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Saturday</td>
<td>18 April, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>19 April, 1579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted, evidence from *English Romayne Life* strongly suggests that Munday was present and may have taken a leadership role among the students during the insurrection. Confirmation can be taken from his presence at Carnival, which places him there in early March of 1579. Further, his description of the Pope’s participation in Maundy Thursday ceremonies suggests that he was in Rome as late as 16 April, 1579.

\textsuperscript{129} See Turner-Wright, pps. 24-26.
Eccles places Munday in Rome for Easter (19 April) of that year as well, and departing in May.\textsuperscript{130}

While there is little of evidence to support this supposition, it makes sense. From the \textit{Douay Diaries}, we find that on 9 July, “a young man called Anthony (Antonius) came to the English College at Reims from Rome and Paris and after a few days traveled into England.”\textsuperscript{131} The entry further indicates that Munday arrived at the same time (“that same day, the same hour”) as Dr Askew, a Presbyter in from Paris, and a youth named Lovel who may have been in charge of “Antonius.”\textsuperscript{132} If he left Douai on 9 July, again, using an estimated twenty-five miles a day as an average, it seems likely that the one hundred eighty mile plus trip would have taken at least eight days. Thus, assuming that “a few days” was at least three, and that Munday found passage across the channel immediately, the earliest that he might have made London was 20 July. It seems likely that the journey would have taken longer.

Hamilton places Munday in London prior to 17 August of that year, basing her argument on the notion that Munday was writing pro-catholic (anti-Leicester) texts at this point. This argument is problematic for the same reason she finds it likely.

Hamilton sees the dedication of \textit{The admirable deliuerance of 266 Christians} to Lady Douglass Sheffield as complementary to Douglass Sheffield and to her father, William

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{130} Eccles, 1982, p.98. \\
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.
\end{flushleft}
Howard, first Baron of Effingham. Given the power of the Howard family, and
Munday’s need to have friends in high places after his Rome trip, this is not unlikely.
The trouble is the notion that that same dedication is implicitly intended to insult
Robert Dudley (Leicester), who broke his betrothal to Douglass Sheffield. This would be
an action Munday could under no circumstances afford. Hamilton is right to note that
Munday was playing the middle, but incorrect to see him taking sides.

*Munday and Nowell*

Munday’s traveling partner remains an enigma. Little is actually known about
Thomas Nowell. Ayres notes that the *Liber Ruber of the English College at Rome* lists him
as being from Lichfield and eighteen at the time of his arrival.133 A relationship to
Laurence Nowell, the antiquary, is possible, and would provide a connection with
Oxford (in that the older Nowell was appointed deVere’s tutor in June 1563).134 Such a
relationship is speculative at best, but Laurence Nowell had a brother named Thomas
about whom very little beyond a name is known. Munday’s companion could well have
been the right age to have been the son of that Thomas Nowell.135

*Munday At Home*

During the five year period between 1579 and 1584 there is evidence that
Munday pursued a number of situations. We know that he immediately began
publishing material that was quite diverse in nature. In the years immediately following

133 Munday and Ayres, 1980, p. 6, n. 92.
135 Ibid.
his trip thirteen works that he either authored or translated were published. These works and reactions to them yield a wealth of information about Munday’s life during this period.

Additionally, at this point he either began or continued a relationship with both and with the government. That relationship apparently lasted as late as 1612 and included participation in the persecution and execution of Edmund Campion, and in the Martin Marprelate controversy. By 1588 Munday was using the title “one of the Messengers of her Maiesties chamber” in his byline, a practice that continued until the publication of Gerileon in 1592. Additionally he was employed as a pursuivant by a number of different members of the Elizabethan hierarchy: Richard Topcliffe, Sir Thomas Heneage (in 1594, during the Lopez affair), and John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Along more personal lines, Alfield, as discussed offers indications that Munday may have been married by 1582. In his True Reporte... he speaks of Munday’s “behavior


\[\text{137} \text{ Whitgift, John (ca. 1530–1604), archbishop of Canterbury, 1583-1604. Graduated Pembroke College at Cambridge. Whitgift became known to the Queen both through his preaching and through his leadership in creating a governance structure for he Church. Whitgift was anti-Catholic, but he was also anti-Puritan. In fact he seems to have rather single mindedly supported the Elizabethan Act of Settlement, and, as such, promulgated his policies grounded upon that act. He and the Queen were apparently friendly and remained so until his being at her bedside upon her death in 1603. See William Joseph Sheils. “Whitgift, John (1530/31–1604),” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford UP, 2004; Available by subscription from http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.maurice.bgsu.edu:80/view/article/29311, accessed 1 March 2006.} \]
in Barbican with his good mistres, and mother.” Eccles suggests that as Munday’s own mother was not living, “mother” may mean “mother-in-law” and refer to the same person as his “mistres,” the wife of his master. In this case master would mean Father-in-law and indicates that he was may have been married to his first wife and living with her family in the Barbican section of London by that year. Eccles further suggests that Munday’s residence in Barbican, north of Cripplegate, may have been connected with the fact that his chief printer from the time of his first book in 1577 had been John Charlewood, who was located nearby.  

The prefatory note “to the reader” in Mirror of Mutability suggests that Munday studied formally during this time period. “Thus desiring thee to accept this till the third part of this work be finished: I leave thee, listening to the clock, to take up my books and hie me to Schoole.” Further evidence includes the items immediately following Munday’s note. The title “Claudius Hollyband, in the Commendation of his Schollers exercise,” suggests rather strongly the possibility that Munday was studying with him at that point, although Hollyband’s reference could equally apply had Munday been enrolled during his “lost” years of 1571-1576.  

Munday and Allde  

Munday’s relationship with John Allde is of interest both because of the issue of leaving his apprenticeship and because of what we know about Allde himself. While

---

138 Alfield, 1582. See the section entitled “A caueat to the reader touching A,M his discouery.”
139 Eccles, 1959, p. 98.
140 Ibid.
141 Munday, Mirrour, p. CC, “to the reader.”
142 Ibid.
not a founding member of the Stationers’ Company, Allde was one of the earlier members. In the *Stationers’ Register*, he stands number eighty-five on the list of the first ninety-six members of the guild. There is an additional entry noting that he sponsored the customary breakfast upon being made free of the guild at some point between 8 January and 6 February, 1555.

Entries ascribed to Allde in the *Stationers’ Register* indicate that he published all manner of books and ballads. Additionally scholars suggest that, due to the large number of apprentices listed in the *Stationers’ Register*, Allde carried out a lot of business. All this activity led Allde to run afoul of the government at least once in his career. In a letter to William Cecil, Roger Martyn, then Lord Mayor of London, wrote “of the committing of Alday a printer and others for printing of a booke towchinge the Duke of Alva.” In that letter he explains that on 15 October, 1568:

> John Alday prynter was comytted to the Counter in the Poultry vpou the Lord Mayour of London his commaundment/with ij Dou[t]chemen that caussed the booke to be prynted by the sayd Alday/the names of the Doutchemen are John Stell and Arnould vaukyll borne bothe in Andwerpe and stacyoners, and haue Remaned euer sence in the Dewke of NORFOLKES place, ther comynge ouer was for Relegyon.

As discussed above, Allde was also cited by the guild at least twice and both cases seem to involve Munday. The episode of Allde’s keeping an apprentice unpresented may have been instrumental in Munday’s trip abroad. The other of these for which, on 20 September, 1578, he was “fined at a court ... to pay vs” for printing a

---

143 Arber, 1875, v. ii. There are numerous registrations of new apprentices to Allde.
144 Ibid., p. 745.
145 Ibid.
three unregistered ballads “for hym self. Without lycence.”\textsuperscript{146} One of these was entitled \textit{Mondaies Dream} and may have been Munday’s non-extant \textit{The Author’s Dream}.\textsuperscript{147}

Chambers seems to suggest that Allde went out of business in 1582, and suggests a relationship between that and Munday’s trip.\textsuperscript{148} Aside from the fact that the timing is wrong, the evidence suggests that Allde’s shop did not actually go out of business at that time. He is mentioned for the last time in the \textit{Stationers’ Register} on 30 October, 1582, and must have died at some point between that date and the 1589 entry to Edward Alday giving him the services of an apprentice, John Munnes. Munnes had originally been indentured to John Aldee in 1581 for a period of ten years. There is a note attached to the entry ordering that Aldee, “gyve vnto his mother weekly Duringe the said Terme of one yere, xiiijd whiche shalbe quarterly paid.”\textsuperscript{149} This suggests that Allde \textit{fils} acquired the rights to Munnes from his mother who may well have been running Allde \textit{pere’s} shop herself. That Allde himself was deceased by this time is made clear in entries to “Margeret Aldee of the Citie of London wydowe Late wife of John aldee late citizen and Stacioner of London deceased.”\textsuperscript{150} These entries, the last of which is dated 3 March 1600, record her taking on of apprentices for terms up to eight years. This suggests that Aldee’s shop did not close, but rather continued operation under Margaret’s direction. There are in the \textit{Stationers’ Register} during this period records of at

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{146} Arber, 1875, v. ii, p. 847.
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{148} Chambers, 1965, v. iii, p. 444.
\textsuperscript{149} Arber, 1875, v. ii, p. 162.
\textsuperscript{150} Arber, 1875, v. ii, p. 243.
\end{footnotes}
least two other widows (Alice Gosson, and “Mistress Jugge”) apparently running such operations after the death of their husbands. In any case, given the elapsed time between Munday’s trip and Aldee’s death, a relationship between the two events seems unlikely.

We know that the relationship between Allde and Munday was underway with the signing of the indentures for Munday’s apprenticeship, but there are indications of a potential prior relationship. Eccles notes that although Munday’s father was a member of the Draper’s Company, he was actually a practicing stationer. Munday pere had apprenticed under two men, Thomas Pettit, a printer, and Anthony Kitson, a bookseller.151 There were not that many presses in London as the Crown limited the number of presses in London to twenty-five. It therefore seems likely that either Allde or his old master, Richard Kele would have been acquainted with Munday pere. Further, based upon their sharing of the name Anthony, Eccles goes so far as to suggest Kitson might have been Munday fils’ Godfather.152

There is also a clearer connection between Allde and the Drapers in that of Miles Jennings who, in 1578, published Gerelion of England part 1. Munday translated part two of that text, which was published in 1592. Turner-Wright notes that Jennings, another Draper apparently working in the publishing trade, “had to correct the work of a ‘hardie and venturous’ young translator,” who was most likely Munday.153 She

151 Eccles, 1959, p. 97.
152 Ibid.
153 Turner-Wright, 1959, p. 151
suggests that, as Jennings and Allde had been working together, “Jennings, a Draper, may have favored Anthony, a draper’s son—till he sampled the translation.”

Anthony Munday and the Earl of Oxford

Munday’s relationship to Edward deVere remains one of the larger unknowns in his life. In much the same way as that with Thomas Nowell, evidence is lacking. Despite that, however, the evidence that we do have, offers a pretty compelling portrait of Munday’s motivations for the relationship if not the exact nature of that relationship. The notion that Munday was Oxford’s client has a definite basis in the extant primary evidence, but that evidence is limited to the three dedications from Munday to the earl in 1579 (The Mirrour of Mutabilitie), 1580 (Zelauto, the Fountaine of Fame), and in 1588 (Palmerin D’Oliua). Additionally, included in Spencer’s Axiochus of 1591 was a “sweet speech or oration, spoken at the tryumphe at White-hall before her Maiestie, by the page to the right noble Earle of Oxenforde.” Munday has been suggested as the

154 Ibid.
156 Plato and Edmund Spenser. The Axiochus of Plato; Translated by Edmund Spenser; Edited by Frederick Morgan Padelford. Frederick Morgan Padelford ed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins press, 1934. The full title of the Spenser version is Axiochus. A most excellent dialogue, written in Greeke by Plato the phylosopher: concerning the shortnesse and uncertainty of this life, with the contrary ends of the good and wicked. Translated out of Greeke by Edw. Spenser. Heereto is annexed a sweet speech or oration, spoken at the tryumphe at White-hall before her Maiestie, by the page to the right noble Earle of Oxenforde. The “sweet speech” is not extant but is thought to have been written by Munday.
The speech does not remain extant; although the *Axiochus* has been reprinted, the addendum has not. In the dedication to *Zeluauto*, Munday addresses the earl formally:

TO THE RIGHT Honorable and his singuler good Lord & Patron, Edvvard DeVere, Earle of Oxenforde, Uicount Bulbeck, Lord of Escales and Badlesmere, and Lord great Chamberlayne of England, Antony Munday wishesh in this world a triumphant tranquilitie, with continuall increase of Honorable Dignitie, and after this life, a Crown of euerlasting felicitie, in the eternall Hierarchie.

Munday then offers a capsule summary of his trip to Rome and concludes with “And novv returned, remembring my bounden duty to your Honnor, I present you vvith these my simple labours, desiring pardon for my bolde attempt.” He ends the dedication by offering his reverence to the Earl and signs himself, “with humility, and devotion, and always your watchful vassal, and servent.” While this may represent the standard Elizabethan attempt to collect a dedication fee, it seems to be more strongly worded than necessary for that purpose. Further, within the dedication, the

---

158 Ibid.
160 Ibid.
reader learns that the relationship between Munday and Oxford in some manner extended to prior to the Rome trip:

After that I had deliuered (Right Honorable) vnto your courteous and gentle perusing, my book intituled Galien of Fraunce, vwherein, hauing not so fully comprised such pitbines of stile, as one of a more riper Inuention could cunningly haue carued: I rest Right Honorable on your Clemency, to amend my errors committed so vnskilfully But at that time beeing very desirous to attaine to some vnderstanding in the languages, considering in time to come: I might reap therby some commoditie, since as yet my vwebbe of youthfull time vvas not fully vvouen, and my vvilde oates required to be surrovved in a forreyne ground, to satisfye the trifling toyes that dayly more and more frequented my busied braine: yeelded my self to God and good Fortune, taking on the habit of a Trauler.162

Munday’s next dedication to the Earl was the following year, in 1580, in his Zelauto, the Fountaine of Fame. That dedication was again addressed formally, this time, “To the Right Honorable, his singuler good Lord and Maister, Edward deVere, Earle of Oxenford, Viscount Bulbeck, Lord Sandford, and of Badelesmere, and Lord high Chamberlaine of England.”163 Within this work Munday identifies himself no less than three times as deVere’s man. The first of these is in the opening, where Munday refers to the Earl “my verie good Lord.”164 In closing Munday signs himself as “Your Honours moste dutifull seruaunt at all assayes.”165 Finally, after the dedication, there is a section entitled “Verses written by the Author vpon his Lords Posey.” There is no question that Munday is implying that a relationship exists.

162 Ibid.  
163 Ibid.  
164 Ibid.  
165 Ibid.
Munday’s 1588 dedication to the Earl was in his *Palmerin D’Oliua The mirrour of nobilitie*, and is different than the other two. Although it is still formally addressed to, “To the right noble, learned, and worthie minded Lord, Edward de Vere, Earle of Oxenford, Viscount Bulbeck, Lord Sanford, and of Badelsmere, and Lord high Chamberlaine of England,” Munday does not proclaim his association with Oxford. Rather he, “wisheth continuall happines in this life, and in the world to come.” 166

Munday seems to be reminding de Vere of their past relationship and suggesting the he (Munday) has been derelict in not pursuing it:

> AMong [sic] the Spartanes right noble Lord, and sometime my honorable Maister, nothing was accounted more odious, then the forgetfulnes of the seruaunt towards his Maister: which made Mucronius, who had beene seruaunt to Hagarbus a poore Artesan, and for his vertues afterward called to the office of a Senatour, in all assemblies to reuerence his poore Maister, so that he would often say: It was honour to Mucronius, that he had beene seruaunt to Hagarbus. 167

Noting, “Though this example (my good Lord) be vnfit for me, in what respect, beseemes me not to speake: Yet that excellent opinion of the Spartanes, I count it religion for me to immitate,” Munday pursues the earl without mercy. He suggests that, while his work is unworthy, “right perfect shall you make them by your fauourable acceptaunce, this being added, that were I equall in ability with the best, all should be offered to my noble Maister.” Munday’s dereliction was most likely grounded in the previously discussed, 16 December, 1580, Howard/Arundel libels that De Vere precipitated. Another reason for the change can no doubt be found in the fact

167  Ibid.
that Munday was, by this point identifying himself as “one of the messengers of her Maisties chamber,” and, as we should see later, had received rewards in the form of leases from the Crown.\textsuperscript{168}

Given the evidence, it cannot be denied that there was a relationship between Munday and Oxford prior to Munday’s adventure on the Continent. Further, it is clear that Munday was formally attached to the Earl for a period of time after that trip. The 1588 dedication makes it clear that the relationship had been over for some time at the time of its publication. To me it is the language of the three dedications that is most telling for two reasons. First of all, the difference in the style used to address the earl, that is, the difference between “Lord and Patron,” “Lord and Maister,” and “noble Lord, and sometime my honorable Maister,” certainly offers a clear indicator of the status of the relationship between DeVere and Munday. Further, Munday clearly wants something and, I suspect, that something is money. It is not, however, that Munday will do anything for money. Rather, it seems more likely that this need was because between 1583 and 1588, Munday settled in Cripplegate, married, and fathered four children. One, Rose, died at the age of three months. For Munday, patronage offered links to other patrons, certainly. But it also meant that his children would be fed.

\textit{Munday and the Government: Her Majesty, Walsingham, and Topcliffe}

What understanding of Munday’s relationship with the government that we have is based upon evidence of a varied nature. The dedications in Munday’s anti-Catholic rhetoric of the early 1580s reads like a list of the senior government officials. At

\textsuperscript{168} Ibid.
various times during the period 1580 to 1582 Munday dedicated to the Queen herself; then Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas Bromley; Lord Treasurer William Cecil, Lord Burleigh; Master of the Horse and lord Steward, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and Principle Secretary; Francis Walsingham; Lord Chamberlain, Thomas Radclyffe, Earl of Sussex; Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford, as well as to “the rest of her Maiesties moste Honourable Councell.” Additionally he dedicated to the Lord Mayor of London, Thomas Pullison, and to a number of sheriffs of London, “and all the rest of their vvorshipfull Brethren.” These dedications suggest some sort of a relationship, but offer little to define what that relationship was. They offer a glimpse of the breadth of Munday’s aspirations toward clientship, but no indication of the actual depth of the relationships.

We do find an indication of the relationship in Munday’s dedication of *Gerelion* (1592). In that text, Munday writes to land holder and recusant Ralph Marshall, of Carleton, in the Countie of Nottingham, Esquier: & to the vertuous and most affable Gentlewoman, Mistres Fraunces Marshall his wife,” of being “diuers and sundrie times countermanded by her Maiesties appointment, in the place where I serue, to post from place to place on such affaires as were enioyned mee.”\(^ {169}\) This entry makes it clear that, not only is Munday working in some capacity for the queen as of 1592, but he has been for some time; and he has been busy. This dedication is interesting for another reason as well. Ralph Marshall was not only a recusant, but was a recusant that was arrested by Munday soon after the dedication.

\(^ {169}\) Munday *Gerileon*, A2.
Other indications of the relationship are sketchy and provide no more than a glimpse into Munday’s activities. Mark Eccles found record of Munday’s appearance before the Privy Council on 14 May, 1588. The charges against him were not specified but, “the lords willed him to attend until they licensed him to depart, ‘which for his indemnitye, ys entred into this Booke of Register.’” \(^{170}\) He further notes that this was not an unknown restriction as, “Lodge was summoned in the same way in 1581 and Marlowe in 1593.” \(^{171}\)

There is also evidence in an undated report from “PHS,” one of Walsingham’s agents. PHS describes Munday as having been:

> in divers places where I have passed; whose dealing hath been very rigorous, and yet done very small good, but rather much hurt; for in one place, under pretence to seek for Agnus Deis and hallowed grains, he carried from a widow 40l., the which he took out of a chest. A few of these matches will either raise a rebellion, or cause your officers to be murdered. \(^{172}\)

The clear implication is that while working as a government agent, Munday was not necessarily keeping within the law himself and was putting the government in a difficult position.

On the other hand, there is a highly complementary reference to Munday from Topcliffe himself, in a letter to Sir John Puckering on 20 September, 1592, in which he describes Munday, “a man that wants no wytte,” and, “not...of dull dispocytion

^{171}\) Ibid., p. 99.  
^{172}\) Ibid., p. 441.
towards God's true religion. Or to her majesty his Sovereign, But Rather well disposed, & dewtyfull.”

There is reference, in 1594 to Munday as a spy abroad for Sir Thomas Heneage. Eccles notes that in that year, “a Scots Catholic, George Leslie, warned a friend in Cheapside on 4 Sept. 1594 against one "Mundie" in Antwerp, a spy for Sir Thomas Heneage (who as Treasurer of the Chamber paid messengers until he died in 1595).”

We know Munday was abroad that year as Sihant has uncovered a passport allowing free passage to “Anthonie de Munday” and his servant for six months.

There are also references from outside the government in letters and writings from William Allen and Richard Barrett. The 1583 letter from Barrett to Father Alphonse Agazzari has already been discussed above in the section on Thomas Nowell. William Allen wrote of Munday at least once. In a 20 October, 1582 letter to Agazzari, he wrote of the traiter Munday (proditorem Mundeum) and who he had worked for the incarceration of three priests and their hosts. These letters make it clear that exiled English Catholics considered Munday an actual priest hunter for the government.

---


Table 3. Lands leased to Munday by the Crown in 1587.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemporary Location</th>
<th>Lease Period</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Commences</th>
<th>Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Northhampton</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 s.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>21 April 1590</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lands “late of the monastery of St James by Northampton.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Cumbria</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Shillings</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>17 March, 1606</td>
<td>1627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The collegiate house of Kirkoswold, Cumb.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Cumbria</td>
<td></td>
<td>47s</td>
<td>6s plus rents</td>
<td>12 February, 1608</td>
<td>1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“glebe lands of the rectory of Kirkoswold, with 6s a year issuing from certain temporal lands there, and a close called ‘Cherigarth Close’ (late of the said college or house of Kirkoswold).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Derbyshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>14s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>25 February, 1596</td>
<td>1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Lands in Stanford, Notts, (late of the monastery of Dale)” 178, leased to Lawrence Brodbent, inter alia, by Exchequer patent 25 Feb 17 Eliz. [1575] for 21 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a) Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5.10s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Liberty of faldage in ‘Northwoodmore’, Norf, (parcel of the manor of Wymondham, Norf, and late parcel of the possessions assigned to Lady Mary, queen of England, before her accession to the crown).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b) Suffolk</td>
<td></td>
<td>above</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>1627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the rectory of Corton, Suff.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Cambridgeshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>60s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“a barn called ‘Brownes Barne’, with a close and sheep-run in Fordham, Cambs, (parcel of the exchanged lands of Philip Parris)”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18 April, 1612</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“A fishery in the water of Tamer, Corn, (parcel of the manor of Callystocke, and late parcel of the possessions of the ancient duchy of Cornwall),” leased by Exchequer patent 16 Feb 12 Eliz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Marioneth</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5 7s 1ld</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6 April, 1590</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Lands within the commote of Penlin, Mer, (parcel of the principality of Northwall).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

177 Eccles suggests that “Cumb.” is Cumberland, but the only reference to Kirkoswold that I find is in northwest England near Carlisle and the border with Scotland.

178 Ruins from the monastery remain extant.

179 No date is given suggesting Munday’s immediate possession of the rights to the property.

180 Eccles suggests Marioneth, but I find no contemporary references to this locale.
Leases from the Crown

Elizabeth’s *Patent Rolls* seem to corroborate the Catholic concerns. On 19, July 1587, the Crown granted “Anthony Mondaye, queens servant,” a number of leases. Eccles suggests that these grants of “leases in reversion” were in consideration of Munday’s “good and faithful service” however the language used in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* simply notes the award as being “for services.” The leases were for control of a significant amount of Crown property located at eight different locations around England, as well as for two other monopolies, one fishery, and one “liberty of faldage.” The entire set of leases was offered “with reservations, including the advowson of the vicarage of Corton.” It is unclear as to whether the “reservations” included or precluded the advowson of Corton, and this is of particular interest as it was most likely worth a good bit in and of itself. Sloan notes that:

An advowson, regarded by the law as property, is termed an incorporeal hereditament, ‘a right issuing out of a thing corporate.’ It is a marketable property, which may be granted by deed or will, which passes by a grant of all lands and tenements.

Thus Munday may have been, at the very least, presented with an intangible item that he might sell to his profit. However, the advowson might have been more profitable to Munday through exploitation. There are two different types of advowson,

182 Eccles, 1982, p. 98.
either of which might apply in this situation: advowson presentative, and advowson donative. The former would have involved what was essentially a monopoly on presenting a choice to the presiding bishop for the position of Vicar of Corton. It seems likely that the selection of a candidate would involve payment of a fee to Munday. Acceptance and continuance in the position would then be on the sufferance of the bishop. The other type of advowson, donative, would have been a more profitable situation as it allowed the owner:

extraordinary privileges. His right of patronage was exercised without presentation of his nominee to the bishop. The latter had not, as in advowsons presentative, the right of institution; that is, the right of conveying or committing the cure to the incumbent; nor the right of induction; that is, of issuing a mandate inducing the incumbent into possession of the church, with its rights and profits. The patron had sole right of visitation, and sole right to deprive the incumbent, and to the patron any resignation of the charge was to be made.

Thus, if this were the case, Munday would have had the sole right to appoint, for a fee, the Vicar of Corton, who would then serve at Munday’s sufferance. Any revenues from that benefice would go to the appointee, but Munday could most likely charge an annual fee.

The “liberty of faldage” presents similar, although simpler issues. The Oxford English Dictionary notes that faldage is the right for a person to erect pens in which tenants were required to place their sheep. These pens could be moved from place to place as fertilizer was required. Munday could more or less rent his pens to anyone who

185 There is a third, the advowson collective, which pertains only to bishops. See Sloan.
186 Ibid.
wanted to pay for them, at any location within the area and thus the tenants effectively
donated manure that Munday would sell as fertilizer.

It is unclear why these leases were awarded to Munday, or who was responsible for the award. While there are a number of entries in the Patent Rolls that note that the award is “by the advice of” William Cecil and Sir Walter Mildmaye, there is no such notation on that of Munday. The absence of such a notation is not uncommon. The six entries following that of Munday have no such notation. It seems though that this sort of reward for services was a favorite of Elizabeth. The Patent Rolls have many examples of such reward, and the cost to the Queen was minimal.

The notation of Munday as Queens’ servant is interesting. While Munday was, at this time using the language “one of the messengers of her majestie’s chamber,” in his titles, and had been doing so since 1586, such a reward seems both excessive and early, considering that Munday was to use that title as late as 1609. This coupled with the timing of the award seems to imply that the “services” for which the leases were granted were performed prior to 1587. The major event that we know that Munday was involved in prior to that date was the Campion affair. Is it possible that the leases were in payment for his testimony and published works defending the governments treatment of Campion?

Munday and the Edmund Campion Affair

Munday and the Jesuits

Munday was involved with the suppression of the Jesuit mission to England, that culminated with the execution and martyrdom of Edmund Campion and two
others at Tyburn in December, 1581, as well as seven other Jesuit priests in May of the following year. Given that Munday did not know Campion, had little or nothing to do with his capture, it is interesting that he published a number of items concerning the capture: his *A breefe discourse of the taking of Edmund Campion of 1581, A Discouerie of Edmund Campion of 1582, and A Breefe Aunswer of 1582*. Added to this, he testified for the crown at the trial as well as publicly disputed with several of the condemned while they were on the scaffold at Tyburn. The whole affair is especially interesting in that the reasons behind his involvement remain unclear to this day.

Edmund Campion

Edmund Campion arrived in England on 24 June, 1580 as part of the mission under the charge of Robert Persons. The presence of Persons as the senior member of the mission would, it was hoped, act as a counterbalance to the rhetoric of Campion. Campion himself was well known not only to the English religious community, but to the queen and her government as well. Born in London in 1540, a thirteen year old

Campion was chosen by the scholars of that city to speak during a visit by Queen Mary. He attended Oxford, took his degree in 1564, and while there gained a reputation as a great public speaker and rhetorician. In 1566 he was chosen to represent the University by leading a public debate during the visit of Elizabeth herself. Campion rose to the occasion and announced that: “One thing only reconciles me to this unequal contest, which I must maintain single-handed against four pugnacious youths; that I am speaking in the name of Philosophy the princess of letters, before Elizabeth the lettered princess.”¹⁸⁸ This speech was well received by Elizabeth and her approval led to the sponsorship of both William Cecil and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and to much discussion of Campion’s future role in the Anglican Church.

Campion took religious orders as a deacon in the Anglican Church as well as the Oath of Supremacy, but by 1569 he began to have great doubts about his course. He resigned from Oxford in that year and went to Ireland, ostensibly to take part in a restoration of the University of Dublin which fell through. In truth, his growing dissatisfaction with the Anglican Church forced him into hiding despite the protection of Sir James Stanihurst, Speaker of the House of Commons of the Irish Parliament and of Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Deputy of Ireland and Father of Sir Philip Sydney. When a warrant for his arrest was issued in 1571, Campion fled to the Continent and the protection of the English University at Douai. There he was reconciled with the Catholic Church and taught while completing his own bachelor’s degree in divinity. In 1573 he

took orders with the Jesuits and was eventually sent to Prague, where he taught and wrote until his ordination in 1578. After this point, he was assigned to Robert Persons, the Jesuit priest in charge of the Mission to England.

The English Mission

Campion’s mission was part of a larger effort on the part of the Catholic Church, under the auspices of the Jesuit Order. Although Campion was one of the first, the Jesuits continued to work in England throughout the Elizabethan period. Campion’s mission entered England on 24 June, 1580. Their mission was clearly detailed in Campion’s Challenge to the Privy Council, better known as Campion’s Brag, in which he notes, “I never had mind, and am strictly forbidden by our Father that sent me, to deal in any respect with matter of state or policy of this realm, as things which appertain not to my vocation, and from which I gladly restrain and sequester my thoughts.”

Despite this pronouncement and the requirement that the mission forbade any interference with the “policy of this realm,” Campion went further than the mission’s orders. While the emphasis of the mission was in ministering to the remaining Catholics in the realms, and in assisting those straying from the flock, Campion became very active in the conversion of conforming Anglicans in addition to his other duties.

---

189 It is interesting that Campion not only wrote religious dramas while in Prague, but is yet another contender for the authorship of the works of William Shakespeare.

Further, at the behest of Persons, he wrote a formal academic treatise that was a direct assault upon the academic foundations of the Anglican Church, as well as an open invitation to debate Campion, in print or otherwise. The problems here were manifold. First, anyone choosing to debate Campion openly would not only acknowledge the legitimacy of the Catholic cause in England, but have to face a true scholar and master debater. Of more import, at that time, however, was that *Decem Rationes* was printed secretly by a press set up and run by Robert Persons. This press was, at the time, causing all sorts of problems for the government in that they no longer possessed a monopoly on the printed page. The clandestine press, moreover, was exceedingly hard to track down, as Persons would order it moved at the slightest indication of being discovered.

It was Campion’s emphasis on conversion, as well as the four hundred copies of his *Rationes Decem* that were illicitly printed and left for the commencement ceremony on the pews of St. Mary’s, Oxford on 27 June, that led to a very intense effort on the part of the English government to locate him.\(^{191}\)

The effort found fruition on 17 July, 1581 when Campion was arrested by George Eliot, a recusant hunter who, posing as a Catholic, attended a mass being said by the former. Campion was taken (literally from a priest-hole) and returned to London to be committed to the Tower where he was beaten and racked several times. He was interrogated, at least once in the presence of the queen, and was asked specifically if he

---

acknowledged her to be his sovereign. When Campion replied that he did, Elizabeth apparently offered him rank and riches to return to the Anglican fold. Campion refused. The government then tried torture again. This time the result may have been the arrest of several families that Campion had preached to. The government released the news that Campion had broken under torture and betrayed the families. Despite this, Campion refused to give in to the pressure to rejoin the Anglican Church. The government, trying to counter *Campion’s Brag* and *Decum Rationes* tried semi-public debate; without allowing Campion time or materials to prepare, or for that matter, a place to sit despite his torture. Despite his lack of preparation, historians agree that Campion stood undefeated in four separate debates in September, 1581. Finally, all else having failed, the Privy Council draw up an indictment that charged Campion with treason in that he had:

> traitorously pretend to have power to absolve the subjects of the said Queen from their natural obedience to Her Majesty, with the intention to withdraw the said subjects of the said Queen from the religion now by her supreme authority established within this realm of England to the Roman religion and to move the same subjects of the said Queen to promise obedience to the pretensed authority of the Roman See to be used within the dominions of the said Queen.\(^\text{192}\)

That indictment was deemed too vague and another was drawn up that charged all the priests then in custody with:

> at Rome on March 31 of the preceding year, at Rheims on April 30 and on other unspecified days before and after, both at Rome and Rheims, formed a conspiracy to murder Queen Elizabeth; that at Rome, on May 20 and on other dates, they had exhorted foreigners to invade the country; that they

\(^{192}\) Waugh, p. 191.
had decided to send Persons and Campion into England to stir up a rebellion in support of the invading force.\textsuperscript{193}

On 20 November, the one-day trial was held. Munday testified against Campion, practically \textit{verbatim} from \textit{English Romayne Life}. He noted that he had never before seen Campion, but that other prisoners had threatened the life of Elizabeth, attacked the supremacy of the queen, or threatened to aid an invasion from Spain. The defendants argued that the testimony was untrue, and the Munday was a known liar, and “played the devout Catholic at Rome and was now ‘manifestly forswearing himself, as one that having neither honesty nor religion, careth for neither’.”\textsuperscript{194} The protests fell on deaf ears. A verdict of guilty returned, and Campion and most of the others were sentenced to death. On 1 December, 1581 Campion was executed at Tyburn with two other priests from the mission.

\textit{Munday and Campion}

Munday became involved in the Campion affair long after the latter landed in England. In fact, there is no evidence that Munday was even involved in the search for Campion. It is possible that he was, as locating the Jesuit mission had become a high priority mission for recusant hunters after Campion issued his “brag” in 1580, and he may have been working for Topcliffe at this point. In any case, his documented involvement did not even begin until after the capture of Campion.

Since his return from the continent in 1579, Munday had published a number of diverse titles including his \textit{Mirroure of Mutability} (1579); a commendatory verse in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{193} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{194} Turner-Write, 1929, p. 57.
\end{itemize}
Francis Thynne’s *Newes from the North* (1579); *Paine of pleasure* (1580); a lost ballad that was licensed to John Charlewood on 8 March, 1580 entitled *A ballat made by Anthony Monday of th[e] encoragement of an Englishe soldior to his fellow mates; A view of sundry examples* (1580); *Zelauto* (1580); *Second and third blast...theatres* (1580); the lost *A Ringinge Retraite Couragiouslie sounded* (1580?); *True Reporte...success...in Ireland* (1581); *The araignement, and execution of ... Everalde Ducket* (1581); *Taking of Edmund Campion* (1581); *A courtly controversie between looue and learning* (1581); *A breefe and true reporte...*; another single commendation verse in Thomas Howell’s *H. his devices for his own exercise, and his friends pleasure* (1582); *breefe aunswer...* (1582); *A discouerie of Edmund Campion* (1582); and his *The English Romayne lyfe* (1582).

This is certainly an interesting mix of titles. Examined in chronological order, it becomes very apparent that as the hunt for Campion heated up, so did Munday’s rhetoric. The question is why? The answer to this question requires an examination of the sequence of publication. Given the events that have been discussed, it becomes very easy to divide the works into the following categories. First, from 1580-81, those that, through the use of the dedication, were an attempt to ingratiate himself to Oxford and other people that Munday thought might be useful. Next, in 1581, comes anti-theatrical rhetoric. And finally, in 1581-82, Munday wrote polemic. If it is true that Munday had decided his safest bet was to return to England and attempt to gain the protection

195 Anthony Munday. *The paine of pleasure. Profitable to be perused of the wise, and necessary to be followed by the wanton. Reade with regard.* The Stationers’ Register has this listed as “Compiled by N. Britten,” but the work is Munday’s. The first poem in this work is “Author’s Dreame.” This is, perhaps, the “Mondies Dreame for which publication Aldee was fined. Attributed to Munday based upon the signed dedication to Lady Douglass Sheffield. See Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 9.

196 Munday’s anti-theatrical work will be dealt with in the next chapter.
of Oxford and others, then it makes sense that Munday next began writing things that would please those people. As he was following the hallowed English practice of placing people in his debt, his specific targets are evident in the dedications. That his works at this point were non-controversial was Munday’s attempt to keep a very low profile.

Unfortunately, this tactic worked only until the Campion affair heated up. At that point, things become problematic for two reasons. First of all the obvious: not only had Munday been in Rome and “Sometime the Popes Scholler in the Seminarie Among Them,” but he knew, or was familiar with, several priests on the mission from his time on the continent. As such, he could be easily betrayed as soon as the Crown began torturing priests. Second, but of equal or greater significance is the fact that on 16 December, 1580, Edward DeVere went to the Queen with allegations he, along with Henry Howard, Charles Arundel, and Francis Southwell had been part of a Catholic conspiracy and remained practicing Catholics. Howard, of course was a member of the influential Howard family and first cousin to Oxford. Details about Southwell and Arundel are unknown, beyond the fact that they kept company with both Howard and devere.

---

198 He was the second son of John Howard (third Duke of Norfolk, attainted, tried, and executed 19 January, 1547 for usurping the arms of Henry VIII) and Lady Francis deVere (daughter of John deVere, fifteenth Earl of Oxford).
199 Little is known about Arundel, and nothing about Southwell. The latter appears to have vanished from most of the records. Arundel, on the other hand was deposed not only based upon Oxford’s accusation, but about knowledge of an “exchange of libels” between Oxford and Leicester in 1579. The depositions have been transcribed by Oxford’s biographer, Alan Nelson and are available at this writing.
Thus Munday, most likely a member of Oxford’s entourage at this point, found himself in mortal danger from both sides. He could be betrayed by the priests who knew him. Thus the Tudor government, perhaps, got their hooks into Munday. Rather than the widely accepted anti-catholic polemicist, or Hamilton’s clandestine Catholic writing a coded pro-Catholic agenda, Munday was writing Tudor propaganda. In fact everything that he wrote from 1581 and 1582 fits that category rather neatly. Such is demonstrated in his shifting perceptions and treatment of his companion, Thomas Nowell, on the Rome trip.

Shifting Perceptions of Nowell

Here we return to the relationship between Munday and Thomas Nowell for a moment. That relationship is both interesting and problematic for the same reasons. While we know of the relationship from both Munday and letters from the expatriate Catholics, the nature of the relationship is very unclear. The fact that Munday’s descriptions of his companion actually shift during the five year period in which he writes of Nowell, does not help at all for, like so much of the rest of Munday’s life, the reason behind the shift is not clear.

In 1578, when first writing about his Rome trip in the “Epistle Dedication” of his Mirrour of Mutability, Munday describes Nowell as, “my companion” and “my freend.”200 His story changes by 1583, when Nowell has become his “vtter enimie.”201

---

200 Munday, Mirrour, pps. i and ij.
201 Munday, English Romayne Life, p. 7.
Munday both supports his own case that he was acting as a spy, and manages to cast
doubt on Nowell at the same time, when he writes “I could seldome come acquainted
with all, except I had stooide by & heard it for either they had fullie perswaded him, or
he ioyned into consent with them so that he would neuer report any thing that had
passed betweene them, he lyked so well of euerie thing.”202 He goes even further,
suggesting that Nowell has been completely converted:

For in soothe, my fellow was euene all one with them, his company was
required of euerie one, & he as lewde in speeches against his Countrey as
the best: so that I was esteemed I can not tell howe, they would not
misdoubt me for my Parents sake, & yet they would giue me many
shrewd nips.203

Given this, the evidence is clear. Nowell had become a Catholic and, as such, was
a threat to the Crown. The problem is that evidence from the Catholics on the Continent
regarding Nowell is contradictory. Indeed, after Munday’s departure, he either became
or continued to be a trouble maker. Citing the Liber Ruber of the English College at Rome,
as well as Persons’ Memoirs, Ayres notes that Nowell was dismissed from the College in
1583 as “unsuitable.”204 This is supported by evidence in the Douay Diaries, in which
Nowell is named on a “list of English catholic priests and students at Rome and
elsewhere on the continent, furnished to the English government by a secret agent.”
The list is anonymous, but the timing is certainly such that Munday could have been
the agent involved in its creation and/or transmission.

202 Ibid., p. 20.
203 Ibid., 45
204 Munday and Ayres, 1980, p. 6, note 92.
Nowell is also mentioned other ways, however. There are entries in 1583 that pertain to him. On 5 June of that year, an entry lists, “Roma rediit Nowellus.” There is no indication of a reason behind his return from that city. Further, in a 1583 list of “Names of priests sent to England from Rome,” he appears as part of the list for April and is listed as “not yet [a] priest.” This implies that he was being sent to England as part of the Jesuit Mission, and not returned there as unsuitable for the priesthood.

Both Nowell and Munday are discussed in a letter from exiled Catholic Richard Barret, to Father Alphonse Agazzari, S.J. dated 13 March, 1583. Barret would have been a contemporary of Nowell at the English College and might or might not have been there at the same time as Munday. He writes to the effect that he has heard from William Allen about problems with Nowell. "O quam timeo, pater," he writes, expressing his fear and further noting Nowell’s dangerous nature and quick temper. He expresses doubts about the impending return of Nowell to England in a context that suggests that he is not only worried about Nowell’s associates in England, but that he regards it a strong possibility that Munday and Nowell will rejoin each other and cause

205  *Douay Diaries*, p. 358.
206  Ibid.; “Nowell returned from Rome.”
207  Ibid., p. 297.
208  Barret, Richard (c.1544–1599), Oxford graduate and later proctor of the University. Upon his conversion to Catholicism, he emigrated to Douai, Paris, and later Rheims. On 23 April, 1579 he was admitted to the Venerable English College at Rome and was ordained. After returning to Rheims, he began corresponding with Alfonso Agazzari, S.J. who was at that time the rector of the English College. The letter pertaining to Munday and Nowell is from this correspondence; Agazzari, Alfonso, S.J. The first permanent rector of the Venerable English College at Rome. He was most likely one of the two Jesuits originally assigned to the College at the orders of the Pope to “superintend the studies and the foundations of the new establishment.” See Gasquet, p. 66.
209  *Douay Dairyys*, p. 323.
great evil to the Catholic prospects in England.\footnote{The letter is in Latin. Hamilton has the specific line translated as, “since we have suffered so much evil from Nowell, what shall we expect from the two of them?” See Hamilton, 2005, p. 52.} With both sides looking at him in such a manner, it becomes clear that Nowell in 1583 had become neither fish, nor fowl, nor good red meat.

Once again, the motives behind Munday’s actions are unclear. It is possible, that Munday was trying to protect himself from accusations of and associations with the Catholic Church by painting a brave picture of himself surrounded by traitorous regicidal maniacs. It is equally possible that Munday was acting as a patriot, and serving his country as a recusant hunter and polemicist. In this case the whole notion of Munday’s relationship with Topcliffe or Walsingham comes into play and another possibility becomes that Munday is covering for Nowell, in order to facilitate that latter’s further infiltration into the confidences of the Catholics.

It is possible as well that, as Hamilton notes, Munday is simply spouting “the basic loyalist line, denouncing students who go to Rome to live ‘under the servile yoke of the Popes government’,” while in reality, Munday, a Catholic of some sort himself, is printing for Catholics at large in England.\footnote{Hamilton, 2005, p. 48.} It is further possible that the conventional wisdom of Turner-Wright et. al. is correct and, as Chutes notes, Munday, “would do anything for money,” regardless of the cost to others.\footnote{Chutes, p. 57.} The problem is that the evidence could point to any one, a group, or all of these reasons. There is simply not enough evidence to find Munday’s motivation. Given the evidence, and the terrible
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td><em>Mirrou of Mutability</em></td>
<td>“VVell my freend &amp; I gaue them a thousand thanks for their liberall expences, and freendly Letters, and so vve departed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td><em>Discovery of Edmund Campion</em></td>
<td>“I my selfe went ouer, accompanyed with one Thomas Nowell, whom I left at Roome, vowed to be a Preeste, and to remayne there among them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td><em>Breefe Aunswer</em></td>
<td>“12 March For my discharge I will appeale to one of their owne secte nowe, he that went with me all the way, by name Thomas Nowel, who knoweth this to be a false and malicious slander.” “albeit he nowe be my vtter enimie, I am sure he will not denie.” “I could seldome come acquainted with all, except I had stoode by &amp; heard it· for either they had fullie perswaded him, or he ioyned into consent with them· so that he would neuer report any thing that had passed betweene them, he lyked so well of euerie thing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td><em>English Roman Life</em></td>
<td>“As for my fellow, his sinceritye in their religion was such, his naturall disposition so agreeable with theirs, and euer thing hee did esteemed so well: that Doctor Morris would suffer him willingly to remain there, but he could not abide me in any case.” “For in soothe, my fellow was euen all one with them, his company was required of euerie one, &amp; he as lewd in speeches against his Countrey as the best: so that I was esteemed I can not tell howe, they would not misdoubt me for my Parents sake, &amp; yet they would giue me many shrewd nips.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consequences for the member of that mission who were taken into custody, any way the problem is examined becomes troublesome. If Munday truly would do anything for money, a mercenary, acting only for his own benefit, why run the risks of being caught? If he were a Catholic, why run the risks of returning to England, unless as a member of the mission? If he were acting for the government out of patriotism, why turn on Nowell? There is missing evidence, and any answer to these questions must await it. Anything else enters the realm of pure speculation.

The Church of England

Evidence of Munday’s involvement with the Church of England is found in his relationships with two men. He worked at least once for John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, at least once for Richard Vaughan, Bishop of London. It was under the auspices of the former that Munday was most likely involved in the Martin Marprelate
affair. In 1612, Munday testified against suspected Puritans Hugh Holland and Thomas Bell at their trials for recusancy.

*John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury and Marprelate*

In 1588 Munday was responsible for the arrest of puritan Giles Wigginton on a warrant issued by Whitgift when the Marprelate affair started. Given that his history with Whitgift was prominently featured in the first pamphlet this is no surprise, although it is now clear that he did not write it. There is also some equivocal evidence that Munday was involved in writing anti-Marprelate tracts for Whitgift. Munday is mentioned by name in at least on of the Marprelate tracts. The July 1589 *Just Censure and Reprofe* that lampooned Whitgift addressing his servant:

I thank you, Master Monday, you are a good gentleman of your word. Ah, thou Judas, thou that hast already betrayed the Papists, I think meanest to betray us also. Didst thou not assure me, without all doubt, that thou wouldest bring me in Penry, Newman, Waldegrave, press, letters, and all, before St. Andrews day last? And now thou seest we are as far to seek for them as ever we were...

Here is a young Martin hatched out of some poisoned egg of that seditious libeller, Old Martin...

And all this cometh by reason of your unfaithfulness and negligence, whom we send for them. Well, I give you warning, look better to your offices, or else let me be damned, body and soul, if I turn you not all out of your places. Therefore look to it: for now every one of you shall have warrants Poor men, you have nothing but what you get in our service, that are your Lords and Masters. And methinks, if these wayward men had any conscience in them, they would not seek our overthrow with tooth and nail, as they do, seeing so many honest poor men, yea, and many a good gentleman, too, by my troth, live only by us and our places.

---

213 Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 85; Martin Marprelate, pseud, attributed to Job Throckmorton, and John Penry. *The Iust Censure and Reprofe of Martin Iunior. Wherein the Rash and Vndiscreete Headines of the Foolish Youth, Is Sharply Mette With, and the Boy Hath His Lesson Taught Him, I Warrant You, by His Reuerend and Elder Brother, Martin Senior, Sonne and Heire Vnto the Renowmed Martin Mar-Prelate the Great. Where Also, Least the Springall Shold Be Vtterly Discouraged in His Good Meaning, You Shall Finde, That Hee Is Not*
At some point around 1590 or so, Munday’s involvement in playwriting and in the pageants seems to have begun to take precedence over his duties to Church and Crown. He was involved in the pursuit of priests only once again, in 1606, after the Gunpowder Plot; this time armed with a warrant from Richard Vaughan, Bishop of London. The last record we have of Munday’s involvement in any sort of religious suppression is his testimony against suspected Puritans Hugh Holland and Thomas Bell at their trials for recusancy in 1612.

Conclusions: Munday’s Place Through 1612

Anthony Munday’s life through 1612 continues to be puzzling to scholars. The fact is that we have a good number of individual pieces of evidence, but not enough to justify some of the conclusions that scholars have asserted. His involvement with the Catholic Church, followed by his involvement with both secular and religious English authorities provides very different snap shots of the man.

The fundamental questions remain: Why did Munday journey to Rome? Why did he return and follow the path that he did? Was he a Protestant “spy” as the Douay Diaries suggest? Was the Catholic “Judas” as the Marprelate pamphlets suggest? Perhaps his path, illustrated by the contacts that remain extant, is the primary indicator of Munday’s place in the Elizabethan society at that time. Perhaps Munday had,
through his actions in Rome, established himself as a member of a group whose loyalty to the crown was known to be questionable. The Catholic insistence upon raising Pope above sovereign was unacceptable given the Tudor mania for stability (and a clean succession) that had manifested itself during the reign of Henry VII. As the consequences of his relationship with the Catholic Church became clear, Munday found that he had several choices. First, he could follow his current path, take holy orders, and run the risk of being sent as a missionary to his death in England. Along similar lines, he could take the path that Hamilton has sketched out in her *Anthony Munday and the Catholics* (2005) and write “on behalf of the Catholic cause,” perhaps even working from within the Protestant state to bring about some sort of rapprochement. Third, he could take the path of an expatriate and simply remain in Europe, perhaps in one of the Catholic or Protestant enclaves that were then starting to establish themselves. Or fourth, he could return to England and hope that his actions could be reconciled with those of a loyal subject.

If he was a Catholic, his faith was apparently not sufficient to allow the first path. Martyrdom did not appeal to Munday. In fact, it is for this reason that I deem the second option, the one explored by Hamilton, as unlikely as well.\(^{216}\) As to the third option, that of the expatriate life, there is ample evidence in the body of his writing of an English chauvinism that would not allow Munday to pursue that option. No, for

---

\(^{216}\) Although romantic in the extreme, there is no evidence that Munday was at all interested in bringing about either the overthrow of the Tudor regime or any sort of reconciliation between the churches. One or the other of these cases would be necessary in order for Munday to have chosen this path.
better or worse, Munday was an Englishman through and through. Therefore, it was
the fourth and final option that he actually followed. Like all of his choices, this too was
a path fraught with hazard. It was also the one that could lead to the most preferment.
Had he stayed with the Catholic Church, Munday would have found himself a small
fish in a very large pond. Had he moved elsewhere in Europe, he would have simply
been another displaced Englishman. Even with his apparent education, opportunities
would have remained limited by the perception of Munday as auslander or barbarian in
an increasingly nationalist and religiously partisan world.

The problems with returning to England were manifold. First of all, there was no
way that Munday would be able to simply sneak back into the country. It is unlikely in
the extreme that the government was unaware of his presence in Rome. We know that
Cecil had lists of those affiliated with the college as early as 1581.217 While Munday
may not have appeared on those lists, or while Antony Auleus, the name under which
Munday was registered, may have escaped the attention of the English government,
Munday would have been very aware just how likely it was that the information would
have found its way to the wrong people. Although he can not have known that within a
few short years, he would be testifying against both friends and enemies from this
period, Munday would have been aware of the possibility and consequences should
anyone be forced to it. Indeed, Munday would have been intimately aware that he
needed to in some way reestablish himself as a loyal subject, or he ran the risk of
execution pour encourager les autres.

217 Knox, 1878, p. 358.
Furthermore, even if he had traveled to the Continent as a spy, he still ran the risk of losing his position as soon as Crown policies changed. There are numerous cases of this sort of double dealing on record. Perhaps the best known of these is the case of the infamous Doctor Lopez, who was executed in 1594 for supposedly conspiring with Philip II of Spain to poison Elizabeth. Lopez was convicted upon evidence which recast his activities while spying for Walsingham in the late 1500s into “proof” of his ties to the Spanish King. Walsingham was dead, and despite Lopez’s assertions that he was acting on behalf of the government, he was sent to the scaffold.218

Added to already considerable risks was the fact that even if he secured a patron, there were risks. Should a patron fall out of favor, as did Oxford, or should that patron run afoul of another member of the aristocracy, as did Oxford, the client’s fall was assured. In the case of the internecine struggles among the aristocracy, the easiest way to assault an enemy, real or supposed, was to attack his clients.

Thus the way for Munday to accomplish his return safely was to use his existing relationships in London to protect himself, while offering a barrier between his Catholic beliefs (if such existed at all) and the safety of Protestant conformity. Further, the safest way to go about using his relationships was to ensure breadth. The more patrons he had, the more patrons that were indebted to him, the safer he was. In this case, that meant Munday’s return to the warm embrace of London, and sycophantically

cultivating that man whose "happy race God graunt the woorthy wight ... To liue in
ioy, vnto his harts delight, and after death among the Saints to reign," Edward deVere.
It was to this end that Munday returned to London by August of 1580. At this point he
began (or continued) a relationship with the government that apparently lasted as late
as 1612 and included participation in the persecution and eventual murder of Edmund
Campion, in the Martin Marprelate controversy, and duties as a recusant hunter with
the royal household.

The procession of contacts with various people shows Munday’s procession
steadily upward. His abandonment of Oxford during the time of the Howard Libels, as
exemplified by the hiatus in dedications between 1580 and 1588 was more than self
preservation, although there were certainly elements of that. It was a calculated act of
abandoning a sinking ship that worked. Munday found himself further up the ladder
than he ever dreamed. Further, the award of leases from the queen ensured that
Munday would have some sort of income for the rest of his life. Those leases may well
have allowed him to pursue other writing projects that were to come. Perhaps the best
way to describe Munday during this period is that of rising socialite. Although he was
not of the same degree as those he cultivated, and he was distantly unpopular with both
Catholic and Puritan, Munday was being recognized by the powers that be. This was to
help him for the rest of his life.

The problem with the extant records is that they do not yield the complete story.
A very good example of this can be seen in the leases ceded to Munday in 1587. These
leases actually demonstrate our knowledge of Munday’s relationships during this
period quite effectively. We know they were ceded to Munday because of the records. But we do not know why they were granted. We can speculate, but that is all. Likewise, we know that Munday worked for Topcliffe and/or Walsingham, but we do not know the nature of that relationship beyond the fact that Munday served as a pursueivant in certain cases. There is no way to tell whether the extant cases are typical or not, or even whether his service was continuous.
CHAPTER FOUR -- WRITING FOR THE PROFESSIONAL THEATRE

Introduction: Munday and the Stage

Anthony Munday’s interaction with the theatre may have begun as a young actor, perhaps as early as 1575. We cannot pinpoint a specific company with which he worked, although many suppose it was Oxford’s Men. This supposition is based upon evidence concerning Oxford as his patron. In fact what little we do know about his acting career comes from his own writing or from the already discussed negative commentary of Alfield. His early writing in the performance field actually took the form of anti-theatrical polemic in translation as well as in his own prose. By the late 1590s he had entered the professional theatre as a writer of plays and collaborator. His last work in the theatrical profession took the form of civic pageants mostly for the City of London. Many of Munday’s pageants remain extant, and most contemporary scholarship on Munday is regarding them.

*Primary Documentation*

The sources for primary documentation of this period of Munday’s life are similar to those in earlier periods of his life. Again there remain state and church records, as well as those of the City of London. Munday is mentioned quite frequently in records of the Guilds who commissioned him to write a significant number of the Mayoral Pageants during this period. There are a number of references concerning payments to Munday as a playwright in Henslowe’s “Dairy.” Further, he is mentioned in at least one diary of the period, that of actor Edward Allyn.
Table 5. Munday’s Family in the Records of St. Giles, Cripplegate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Name and Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 October, 1585</td>
<td>Christened</td>
<td>Roase, the Daughter of Anthony Monday gent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 January 1585/6</td>
<td>Buried</td>
<td>Rose the Daughter of Anthony Monday gent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 January 1586/7</td>
<td>Christened</td>
<td>Pricilla the Daughter of Anthony Monday gent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 January 1587/8</td>
<td>Christened</td>
<td>Richard, the Son of Anthony Monday, gent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 1589</td>
<td>Christened</td>
<td>Anne the Daughter of Anthony Monday, gent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 October 1621</td>
<td>Buried</td>
<td>Elizabeth wife of Anthony Monday, gentleman.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Church Records**

Munday’s name in Church records from this period covers his family life in the Parish of St. Giles in Cripplegate. G. E. Bentley, in his 1929 article published the names and baptismal dates of five children born to Munday as well as date of the death of Munday’s heretofore unknown wife, Elizabeth. Unlike the uncertainly over Munday’s birth, the evidence indicates that these are indeed Munday’s children. We have guild records of his son, Richard, receiving his freedom of the drapers by patrimony and working as “A Paynterstayner by St Buttolphe without Aldersgate.”\(^{219}\) We also have Munday’s will in which he speaks of Richard and daughters Elizabeth and Pricilla as being well provided for. He notes that “As for my Sonne Richard Mundy, and my two daughters Elizabeth and Pricilla, being all married, haveing had their severall portions already in bountyfull manner.”\(^{220}\)

---

\(^{219}\) Qtd. in Bergeron, 1969., p. 115.
\(^{220}\) Turner-Wright, 1929, p., 171
Guild Records

There are also numerous references to Munday in the records of the various guilds that he wrote for during this time. These references cover payments both for manuscripts and production expenses. Additionally, there is at least one case where the patron, in this case the Ironmongers, was not pleased with the product and Monday was forced to appear before the guild court to collect his earnings. The majority of information concerning Munday’s work with the professional London theatre appears in Henslowe’s “diary.”

Henslowe’s “Diary”

Philip Henslowe, (ca.1550 – 1616) was an entrepreneur and financier turned theatre manager who, among other things, built and managed both the Rose (1587) and Fortune (1600) theatres over the course of his career. Both were home to the Admiral’s Men, with whom most of Munday’s plays are associated. Henslowe is best known from the publication of his “diary,” a fascinating source that provides a wealth of data pertaining to Elizabethan theatre production during the period.

The “diary” is unique and thus perhaps requires some description. Despite the popular title, it is not actually any sort of diary at all, but rather what Neil Carson refers to as a “commonplace book in which Henslowe recorded interesting and miscellaneous bits of information.” Of more import, the “dairy” offers a record of several types of financial transactions kept by Henslowe and others during the years 1576 to 1608. The

---

information in Henslowe can also be somewhat misleading, as it is quite easy to assume that it tells us more than it actually does. For example, there are three entries that record loans to one “antony the poyet” (in one form or another) totaling twenty-five shillings in “pte of payment of A comedy called A widowes cherme.” As the play does not remain extant, and as Henslowe makes no other identification of the “poyet,” it is impossible to positively to discern whether the entries relate to Munday, or not. While scholars must be cautious about assuming that the “diary” offers a picture of standard theatrical practices of the day, it does offer the accounts of a single theatre entrepreneur and provide titles, authors, and production information that would otherwise be lost to us.

Foakes, notes that physically, the “diary” is a folio of some two hundred forty-two pages, about thirteen and a quarter by eight inches long that has suffered wear and tear and is missing a number of pages. Historians speculate that most of these pages were lost prior to Henslowe’s use of the book as the data within actually spans several of the gaps created by the missing pages. There are, additionally, some partial pages that have been removed from the book over the years including six signatures that have since been found in the Bodleian Library. One of these signatures is that of Munday.

The book contains a number of different accounts beginning with those of a mining and smelting operation run by Henslowe’s brother John in the Ashdown Forest from 1576 to 1581. Foakes speculates that the book came into Philip’s hand upon his

---

222 Henslowe, 1961, p. 204.
223 Ibid., p. xv.
224 Ibid., p. 265.
In addition to his brother’s records, Philip Henslowe recorded several different types of information in the book over the years. These include loans, rents received and such, as well as what Foakes refers to as Henslowe’s “pawn accounts.” These detail transactions in which Henslowe loaned money and held items as security. The “diary” is best known for the entries in it relating to the theatre of the period. Foakes notes that these entries fit four distinct categories. From February, 1591/2 through July 1600, there are records of daily (later weekly) receipts from theatrical performances at either Henslowe’s Rose or Fortune “playe howsse”. There are several of Munday’s plays listed. Second, there are entries related to the finances of the Admiral’s Men (as “mr lord of notingame men” and “my Lorde admeralle seruantes) as well as to Worcester’s Men. Henslowe acted as banker for the former and there are numerous transactions listed. Third, there are expenses related to the playhouses themselves. Finally, there is what Foakes refers to as “a mass of notes of many kinds, relating to such matters as the hiring of actors, payments to the Master of the Revels, various legal proceedings and other miscellaneous transactions.” This section of the “Diary” has to have significantly affected contemporary perceptions of the Elizabethan Theatre as it offers one of the few sources of contemporary data pertaining to both Elizabethan dramatic collaborations and theatrical production in

---

225  Henslowe, 1961, p. xv; The Ashdown Forest is located about twenty miles south of London and remains extant today in the form of a 6,400 acre park. Historically the area is remembered both for the mining and smelting operations as well as for hunting in the thirteenth century and for grazing and timbering as well. See http://www.ashdownforest.co.uk/main-index.htm.
226  Ibid., xxiv.
227  Ibid., xxviii.
228  Ibid., xviii.
general. Of these transactions there are around sixty that are related to Munday or the plays he co-authored from 1597 to 1602.

There are also several references that may be related to Munday’s work in a set of playhouse inventories taken in 1598. Appearing in “a bundle of loose papers,” these inventories, since lost, were first published by Edmond Malone in 1790, but as Foakes notes, there is no reason to doubt their veracity. Foakes further suggests that, given the spelling of the inventories, it is likely they were the work of Henslowe during the period March 1598 to perhaps as late as January 1599. There are five lists entitled, “The booke of the Inventory of the goods of my Lord Admeralles men, tacken the 10 of Marche in the yeare 1598,” “The Enventory of the Clownes Sewtes and Hermetes Sewtes, with dievers other sewtes, as followeth, 1598, the 10 of March,” “The Enventory of all the aparell of the Lord Admeralles men, the 13th of Marche 1598, as followeth,” “The booke of the Inventory of the goods of my Lord Admeralles men, tacken the 10 of Marche in the yeare 1598,” and “A Note of all suche bookes as belong to the stocke, and such as I have bought since the 3d of march, 1598.”

Of these, works that may belong to Munday are listed specifically eleven times (see table). Given that there are few references that relate specific plays to specific items, and given the somewhat non-specific nature of Henslowe’s thinking when dealing with play titles, any use of these data as single sources of information is problematic. As confirming data, however, their use is certainly appropriate.

---

229 Ibid., p. 316.
230 Ibid.
Table 6. Anthony Munday and His Plays in Henslowe’s “Diary” and Papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>layde owt the 22 of desemb, 1597 for A booke called mother Readcape to antony monday &amp; m' drayton.</td>
<td>iii\text{`i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>layde owt the 28 of desemb, 1597 to antoney Monday toward his booke w\text{ch} I delyvered to thomas dowton</td>
<td>v\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>layd owt the 22 of desemb, 1597 for a booke called mother Read cape to antony monday and drayton.</td>
<td>iiij\text{`i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>layde owt the 28 of desemb, 1597 for the booke called mother Read cape to antony mondaye.</td>
<td>v\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>pd vnto antony monday and drayton for the laste payment of the Booke of mother Readcape the 5 of Jenewary the some of</td>
<td>Iv\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Layd owt vnto antony monday the 15 of febreary 1598 for a booke called the firste parte of Robyne Hoode</td>
<td>v\text{`i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>lent vnto thomas dowton the 20 of febreary 1598 to lende vnto antony mondaye vpon his second parte of the downefall of earll huntington surnamed Roben Hoode I saye lent the some of</td>
<td>xs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Lent cnto Thomas dowton the 25 of febreary 1598 to geue vnto chettell in pt of paymente of the seconde pte of Robart Hoode I saye lent</td>
<td>xxs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>lent vnto antony mondaye the 28 of febreary 1598 in pte paymente of the second pte of Roben Hoode</td>
<td>x\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Lent vnto Robart shawe the 8 of marche 1598 in full paymente of the seconde pte of the booke called the downfall of Roben hoode the some of</td>
<td>iiiij\text{`i}v\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Layd owt the 28 of marche 1598 for the licencynge of ij booke to the m' of the Revelles called the ij ptes of Robart Hoode</td>
<td>xiiiij\text{`i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>lent vnto mr willsone the 13 of June 1598 vpon A bocke called Richard cordelion funeralle</td>
<td>v\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>lent vnto cheattell the 14 of June 1598 in earnest of A bocke called Richard cordelions funeralle</td>
<td>v\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>lent vnto cheattell the 15 of June 1598 in earnest of ther bocke called the funerall of Richard cvrdelion</td>
<td>v\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>lent vnto cheattell willsone &amp; mondaye the 17 of June 1598 vpon earneste of ther booke called the funerall of Richard cordelion</td>
<td>x\text{`v}\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>lent vnto m' cheattell the 21 of June 1598 in earnest of A bocke called the fenerall of Richard cvrdelion the some of I say xxv\text{`s} witnes w'\text{m} birde</td>
<td>x\text{`v}\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>lent vnto antony mvnday the 23 of June 1598 in earneste of a booke called the fenerall of Richard cvrdelion</td>
<td>x\text{`v}\text{`s}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lent vnto m' drayton the 24 o June 1598 in earnest of a booke called the funerall of Richard cordelion the some of

Lentvnto m' willson the 26 of June 1598 the some of xxs wth is in full paymente of of his pte of the booke called Richard cordelion funeralli

lent vnto Robarte shaw O& Jewbey the 19 of July 1598 for A Booke called Vallentyne & orsen in full paymente the some of vth to paye hathe waye & mondaye.

lent vnto antony monady the 9 of aguste 1598 in earneste of A comodey for the corte called the some of m' drayton hath geuen his worde for [yt] the booke to be done wth in one forntyght witnnes Thomas dowton

Lent vnto the company the 19 of aguste 1598 to paye vnto m' willson monady & deckers in pte of payment of A booke called chance medley the some of iiij v in this mane willson xxs cheatell xxs mondy xxv I saye

pd vnto m' drayton the 24 of aguste 1598 in fulle payment of A Booke called chance medley or worse a feared than hurt the some of

Lent vnto harey Chettel at the requeste of Robart shawe the 25 of Novemb 3 1598 in earneste of his comodey called tys no dedeayt to teseue the deseuer for mendinge of Roben hood. for the corte

y 20 of Jenewary 1599 Reveeyved in pt of payment & in erenest of a playe called Owen Tewder the some of foure pounde witnnes o' Ri: Hathwaye R Wilson An: Mundy witnes Robt Shaa

this 16th of October 99 Receued by me Thomas downton of phillipp Henchlow to pay m' monady m' drayton & m' wilsson & haythway for the first pte of the lyfe of Sr Jhon Ouldcasstell & in earnest of the Second pte foe the vse of the compnyny ten pownd I say receued

as A gefte

Receved of Mr hinchelow for Mr Mundaye & the Reste of the poets at the playnge of Sr John oldcastell the ferste tyme

Lent vnto mihell drayton antony monadye m' hathwaye and m' willsone at the apoyntment of Thomas downton in earneste of A playe Booke called Owen teder the some of
| 135 | Received of Mr. Henshlowe thys 3\textsuperscript{rd} of June 1600 in behalfe of the Compny to An: Munday & the rest in pt of payment for a booke Called the fayre Constance of Roome the some of iiiij\textit{i} vs |
| 135 | pd vnto drayton hathway monady & deckers at the a poynment of Robaet shawe in full payment of A Booke called the fayer constance of
| | of Rome the 14 of June 1600 some of xiiiij\textit{s} |
| 180 | pd vnto the tyer man the 14 of aguste 1601 for mony wch he layd owt to bye teffeny for the playe of carnwolle wolsey some of xiiiij\textit{d} |
| 180 | Lent vnto Robart shawe the 18 of aguste 1601 to paye vnto harey chettle for his Booke of carnwllw wolsey athe some of xx\textit{s} |
| 180 | Lent vnto the companye the 20 of aguste 1601 to bye A docters gowne for the play of carnwolle wolsey the some of xs |
| 180 | Lent vnto Robart shawe the 21 of aguste 1601 for veluet and mackynge of the docters gowne in carnwolle wolsey the some of xx\textit{s} |
| 180 | Lent vnto Robart shawe the 24 of aguste 1601 to lend vnto harey chettle in earneste of A play called the j pt of carnall wolsey the som of xx\textit{s} |
| 181 | Lent vnto the company the 3 of septemb\textsubscript{r} 1601 to paye vnto the m\textsuperscript{o} of the Revelles for licensynge of the 3 pte of thome strowde and the Remaynder of carnwolle wolsey |
| 183 | Lent vnto Robarte shawe to lend vnto hary chettle & antony mondaye & mihell drayton in earneste of A Booke called the Rissenge of carnwolle wolsey the 10 of octob\textsubscript{r} 1601 xiiiij\textit{s} |
| 184 | Lent vnto harey chettall by the company at the eagell & the chillde in pt payment of A Booke called the Rissynge of carnoll wolsey the some of 6 of novemb\textsubscript{r} 1601 xs |
| 184 | Lent vnto the company the 9 of novemb\textsubscript{r} 1601 to paye vnto mr monady & harye chettle in pt of payment of A Booke called the Rissyng of carnoll wolsey the some of x\textit{s} |
| 184 | Lent vnto the company the 12 of Novemb\textsubscript{r} 1601 to paye vnto antony monady & harye chettell mihell drayton & smythe in fulle payment of the firste pt of carnwll wolsey the some of iiiij\textit{li} |
| 200 | Lent vnto the companye the 5 of maye 1602 to geue vnto antony monady & thomas deckers I earnest of a Booke called Jeffae A may apere the some of v\textit{li} |
| 201 | Layd owt for the companye when they Read the playe of Jeffa for wine at the tavern dd vnto thomas downton | ijs |
| 296 | Receved of m' Henslowe the iiij of Aguste 1602 for one montthes paye: due to my m' Edmund Tylney vppon the xxxijth day of July last past the som of iiijI I say Rd bookees owinge for /5/ p mei Willplaystow baxteres tragedy Tobias Comedy Jepha Judge of Idrael & the cardinall loue parts frendshipp |
| 201 | Lebt vnto Thomas downton the 18 of maij to by a grene sewt & wouon sleves the some of for wollseye231 | 1s |
| 201 | Lent vnto the company the 22 of maij 1602 to geue vnto antoney monday & mihell drayton webester & the Rest mydellton in earneste of A Boocke called sesers ffalle the some of | vli |
| 202 | Lent vnto Thomas sownton the 29 of Maye 1602 to pay Thomas dickers drayton mydellton & webester & mondaye in fulle paymente for ther playe called too shapes the some of (“too shapes” is not in Henslowe’s hand. Foakes notes that it may be Downton’s) | iiij li |
| 202 | Lent vnto Thomas downton the 8 of maye [June?] 1602 to bye cottes for the playe of Jeffa the some of | vjli |
| 202 | Lent vnto thomas downton the 12 of June 1602 to by Rebatous & other thinges for the playe of Jeffa the some of | iiijli |
| 202 | pd at the apoynpt of thomas downton vnto the tyller for mackynge of sewte for Jeffa the 25 of June 1602 some of | xxxs |
| 202 | Lent vnto the company 1602 the 27 of June to paye vnto hime wch made ther properytes for Jeffa the some of | xxvs |
| 202 | Lent vnto thomas downton the 5 of July 1602 to paye the cvter for the play of Jeffa the some of | xxijx |
| 202 | Lent vnto thomas downton the 9 of July 1602 to Lend vnto antony the poyete in earneste of A comody called the widowes cherme the some of | xs |

231 This entry is between that for a payment to to Downton to buy “maskyngsewt antycke for the 2 pte of carnowlle wolsey” and the one pertaining to Munday below. It is unclear which production (if not both) that is was purchased for.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Lent vnto antony the poet in pt of payment of A comody called widowes Charme the 26 of agust 1602 the some of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Lent vnto w(^m) Birde &amp; w(^m) Jube the 2 of septmb; 1602 to paye vnto antonye the poet in pt of payment of A comody called A widowes Charme the some of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Lent vnto antony the poet the II of septmb, 1602 in pt of payment of A comody called the widowes charme some of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Lent vnto Edwarde Jube the 2 of desemb, 1602 to paye vnto antonye mondays in fulle payment for a playe called the seeat at tenes some is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Quinto die Maij. 1602.(^2)233 Bee it knowne vnto all men by this pnte that wee Anthony Mundy &amp; Them(^s) Dekker doe owe vnto Phillip Hynchlay gent the Some of five powndes of lawfull mony of England to bee payd vnto him his execut(\text{ors}) or assignes vppon the x(^th) of June next ensuing the date hereof In witnisses hereof herevnto wee haue Sett o(\text{r}) handes dated the day and yere above written. (The signatures are cut out, but are in the Bodleian.(^2)234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Lent vnto the companye the 17 of aguste 1602 to paye vnto thomas deckers for new A dicyons in owldcastelle the some of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Lent vnto John ducke and John thayer the 21 of aguste 1602 to bye A sewt for owld castell &amp; A sewt &amp; A dublet of satten the some of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Lent vnto John Dicke to paye for the tvrkes head and ij wemens gowns mackenge &amp; fresh watr for owld castell &amp; the merser bill &amp; harey chettell in earnest of a tragedie called ye 24 of aguste 1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Kebt vnto Hohn thare the 7 of septmb; 1602 to geue vnto Thomas deckers for his adicions in owld castell the some of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>I praye you M(\text{r}) Henshlowe deliuer vnto the bringer hereof the some of fyue &amp; fifty sshillinges to make the 3(^\text{ii}) fiue shillinge w(^c)h they receaued befire, full six poinde in full payment of their booke Called fayre Constance of Roome. whereof I pray you reserue for me M(\text{r}) Willsons whole share w(^c)h is xj s. w(^c)h I to supply his neede deliuered hime yernight yo(\text{r}) Lovinge ffrend Robt Shaa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{232}\) As Henslowe does shift his form of address around “antony the poet” or “poet” may or may not be Anthony Munday. Given that these are the only references to *A Widows Charm* and that the play is not extant, no definitive answer can be given.  

\(^{233}\) Foakes notes that his is the entry from which Munday’s signature (now in the Bodleian) has been removed.  

m droit that this 25 of marche 1598 Thomas hawoode came &
heired hime seallfe with me as a covenate searvante for
ij yeares by the Receuenge of ij syngell pence acordinge to the statute
of winshester & tp beginne at the daye above written &not to playe
any wher publicke a bowt london not whille thes ij yeares be exspired
but in my howsse yf he do then he do the forfett vnio me the Receuine
of thes ij d fortie powndes & witnes to this
Antony  monday   w  Borne
Gabrell spencer  Thomas downton
Robart shawe    Richard Jonnes
Richard alleyn

Table 7. Anthony Munday’s Works in the Playhouse “Enventary” Lists.

“The Enventory of the Clownes Sewtes and Hermetes Sewtes, with dievers other sewtes, as
followeth, 1598, the 10 of March.”

Item, iiiij Herwodes cottes, and iiiij sogers cottes, and j green gown for Maryan
Item, vij grene cottes for Roben Hoode, and iiiij knaves sewtes.
Item, j hatte for Roben Hoode, j hobihorse

“The Enventory tacken of all the properties for my Lord Admeralles men, the 10th of Marche 1598”

Item, j syne for Mother Redcap; j buckler
Item, j Mercures wings; Tasso picter; j helmet with a dragonl j sheld with iij
lyons; j elme bowle.

“The Enventory of all the aparell of the Lord Admeralles men, the 13th of Marche 1598”

Item, Roben Hoode’s sewtte
Item, the fryers trusse in Roben Hoode.

A Note of all suche bookes as belong to the stocke, and such as I have bought since the 3d of march,
1598.

Read Cappe, Roben Hode, I, Roben Hode, 2
Specific secondary sources include Turner-Wright, of course, as well as a number of others. The latter part of the period, when Munday was writing his pageants has been researched most thoroughly by David Bergeron. Of particular interest, though, is the work of E. K. Chambers. I found it profitable to revisit his *Elizabethan Stage* despite its inherent inaccuracies and biases because he tends to reprint and quote from materials that are no longer available for various reasons.

Munday and the Professional Theatre

As the Campion affair drew to its inevitable conclusion, Munday found himself further in pawn to the crown. His patently false testimony may have only hastened the inevitable as far as Campion and his compatriots were concerned, yet for Munday it was a continuation of exploitation by the Tudor government and drew the ire of the Catholic community as a whole, as well as the Jesuits specifically. Yet, as noted, he turned that position to one that was not only secure from persecution, but was fairly lucrative as well. Exploitation by the government was apparently not a full-time position. Although he remained active as a persuivant until after the Marprelate affair, Munday found time both for his translations, and for a new business undertaking. This new venture had its roots both in his translation and in his previous theatrical experience. Munday began to write plays. Prior to that however, he appears to have had experience on the stage.

*Mundy as Actor*

We know little of Munday’s early time on the stage. There is speculation that he was an actor in his younger days both during the period after his parent’s death and
after his return from Rome. This speculation is grounded in two publications from the period. The later of the two is found in John Marsten’s 1633 *Histrio-mastix* in which is offered a satirical view of Munday through the character Postehaste. That character is presented playing, “‘extempore,’ like the Italian comedians at the Roman carnival.”

Another view of Munday’s early acting career can also be found in Thomas Alfield’s *True Report* of 1582. As noted, Alfield wrote a Catholic response to Munday’s *Discoverie of Edmund Campion* in which he did not handle Munday gently.

Munday, who first was a stage player [no donbt a calling of some credit] after an aprentise which tyme he welseined with deceauing of his master then wandring towards Italy, by his owne report became a coosener in his journey. Coming to Rome, in his short abode there, vwas charitably releued, but neuer admitted in the seminary as he pleseth tolye in the title of his booke, and being wery of well doing, returned home to his firste vomite againe. I omite to declare howe this scholler new come out of Italy did play extempore, those gentlemen and others whiche were present, can best giue witness to his dexterity, who being wery of his folly, hissed home from his stage. Then being thereby discouraged he set forth a balet against playes, but yet (O constant youth) he now beginnes againe to ruffle vpon the stage.

Both of these allusions to Munday as an actor may well suggest he took the clown’s part. The famous Elizabethan clowns Richard Tarlton and Will Kemp were noted for extemporaneous performance.

For whom Munday was acting for remains a topic of debate. Most often discussed as Munday’s troupe is Oxford’s Men. Although there appears to be a hiatus in that company’s performances between 1565 and 1580, Oxford’s men were playing the

---

235 Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 39.
236 Alfield
237 See Nungezer, pps. 216-222 (Kemp) and pps. 347-364 (Tarleton).
provinces around the time of Munday’s return from Rome. The Records of Early Drama database shows them as touring in Coventry, Norwich, and Bristol during the years 1580 and 1581.\textsuperscript{238} Chambers suggests that the company may have occupied the Theatre in June of 1580, during the absence of Leicester’s men.\textsuperscript{239} Additionally, in Bristol, there is record of a payment to “my Lord of Oxforde players at thend of their play in the yeld hall before master mayer & master mayer Elect and the Aldremen beyng j man and ix boyes at ii s. per piece, the sume of xx s.”\textsuperscript{240} Turner-Wright speculates that the man was Munday.\textsuperscript{241} This is presumably not the version of Oxford’s boys that was formed in 1583 as the Children of Paul’s joined the Children of the Chapel to play at the first Blackfriars. Chambers notes that this group played Lyly’s \textit{Campaspe, Sapho and Phao}, as well as \textit{Agamemnon and Ulysses} in 1584. These were the same productions that Lyly later took to court on 1 January, 3 March, and 27 December respectively, and the same productions that Hamilton uses to date the court performance of Munday’s \textit{Fedele and Fortunio}.

The identification of Munday with Oxford’s men is based upon the supposition that Munday was a client of deVere. There are other possible companies and situations that could account for the references to Munday’s acting career. Hill suggests that Munday may have actually been a child actor for one of the earlier children’s companies, or for companies performing in the 1570s at the Red Lion or in Newington.

\textsuperscript{238} See Cite REED volumes
\textsuperscript{239} Chambers, 1965, v. ii, p 100.
\textsuperscript{240} Pilkington, p. 122.
\textsuperscript{241} Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 28.
Butts. Additionally, given his dedication to Fernando Stanley (Lord Strange), in his 1593 translation of C. Estienne’s *Defence to Contraries*, it seems possible that he could have been with Strange’s Men as an actor. More on this later in the discussion of *John a Kent and John a Cumber* and *Sir Thomas More*.

*Munday’s Early Theatrical Writing: A Study in Opposites.*

Like so much of Munday’s career, his early theatrical writing offers a study in safe topics. If we are to believe Thomas Alfield, Munday began writing anti-theatrical polemic not from any great ethical awakening, but rather because of his performance in which “those gentlemen and others whiche were present, can best giue witnes of his dexterity, who being wery of his folly, hissed him from his stage.” Thus, not only was Munday an actor at some point prior to his trip, but upon his return, he participated in some sort of improvisational performance and was hissed from the stage. Turner-Wright suggests that “the hissing, gave him grounds for his apostasy from the boards” and suggests that his short lived anti-theatrical polemic phase was grounded in pique because of such treatment.

Chambers suggests that Munday’s anti-theatrical polemic works began with that “balet against playes” mentioned by Allfeld and that *A Ringinge Retraite Couragiouslie sounded*, licensed to Edward White in November, 1580 (not extant), is a likely choice. Turner-Wright, in supporting this position, notes that as it is “the only publication of

---

244 Ibid.
245 *A Ringinge Retraite Couragiouslie sounded, wherein Plaies and Players are fytliie Confounded*. Turner notes that this was most likely a ballad. Not extant. See Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 40.
the exact kind described in [Alfield’s] Caveat.” Munday’s next anti-theatrical work remains extant and makes use of both his translation and writing skills.

*The Second and Third Blast*

Released in 1580, the *Second and Third blast* is actually two different works in one binding. In his introduction, “Anglo-phile Eutheo to the Reader, S,” Munday clearly delineates a sort of time line of anti-theatrical polemic:

Thou hast here, Christian reader, a second and third blast of retrait from plaies and Theaters. The first blast in my compt is The Schoole of abuse: a title not vnfitlie ascribed vnto plaies. For what is there which is not abused thereby? Our hartes with idle cogitations; our eies with vaine aspects, gestures, and toies; our eares with filthie speach, vnhonest mirth, and rebaldrie; our mouths with cursed speaking; our heads with wicked imaginations; our whole bodies to vncleanes; our bodies and mindes to the servuice of the Diuel; our holie daies with prophanes; our time with idlenes; al our blessings, health, wealth, and prosperitie to the increase of Satans kingdome, are there abused: that not vnfitlie they are tearmed, as of late The schoole of abuse, by one; The schoole of Bauderie by another; The nest of the Diuel, and sinke of al sinne, by a third so long agoe, The chaire of pestilence, by Clement Alexandrinus; by Cyril, and Saluianus; The pompe of the Diuel; the soueraigne place of Satan, by Tertullian.

With a brief apology starting, “Loth was the Autor, I must needs confesse, to haue his worke published...” not because he would not haue plaies openlie reproued, which from his hart he wisheth were most straightlie forbidden, but through a too too base conceipt of his owne worke, thinking that some grounded Diuine were more fit to dehort from so prophane an exercise, than he, whose profession (if so I maie saie) is otherwise. But hearing partlie by me, and partlie by others, what a ioie to the children of God, and griefe to the seruants of [...] would be to heare, that he, who [...] so famous an Autor,
was now [...] a religious dehorter from [...] yea, thinking how the one sort would with more Zeale auoide them, & the other with more shame appeare on stage, when they should understand that al the world knoweth that their exercise is neither warranted by Gods worde, nor liked of Christians, but disallowed ytterly by Scripture, by reason, by Doctors, by Byshops, by their verie Autors themselues, yea and by al other good men, as the enimie to godlines, and the corruption of the wel disposed, and so consequentlie a special engine both to subuer al Religion, and to ouerthrowe the good state of that Common-weale where it is maintained, he altered his minde, and gaue me his booke, wishing me to do therewithal as I thought best for the glorie of God, and thy commoditie.249

Munday’s motivation for producing the Second and Third Blast may have been grounded in the events described by Alfield, but there are other possibilities as well. In attributing the work to Munday, Turner-Wright notes that “His religious scruples (and the hissing) may even have impelled him to accept in October a comfortable fee paid by the Corporation of London to the anonymous author of Second and Third Blast of Retrait from Plaies and Theaters.”250 Similar publications were very popular at the time. John Northbrooke’s treatise wherein dicing, dauncing, vaine playes or enterluds… (1577 and 1579) and Gosson’s Plays Confuted (1582) and School of Abuse (1587) attracted a burgeoning Puritan audience. Was this an example of Munday selecting his audience and the catering to it? Whether his religious scruples were involved or not, it is likely that this is the first work of Munday’s that was written with a specific audience in mind.

Up to this point, his selection of works to produce appears to be grounded in two criteria. First, Munday concerned was with his own security. In light of his trip to Rome, this security could be best enhanced through the procurement of powerful patrons.

249 Ibid.
250 Turner-Wright, 1929, p 40. But unfortunately does not cite her source. It is difficult to tell whether this is speculation or fact.
Additionally, such patrons would also fill his need for income. Second, Munday has heretofore been trying the market and seeking the most profitable genres to publish in. He seems to have craved variety throughout the course of his life anyway, but why not make money as well? At this point in his life he had not yet received the leases from Elizabeth I. Supporting family and basic survival would have been very high priorities.

Second, books dealing with religious subject matter in some form or another had "from the beginning of printing in England...provided the greater part of printers’ output." The market existed. Further, the ongoing pamphlet wars were just the sort of thing to get a young author noticed. As this was several years before the Puritans became a real problem, *Second and Third Blast* represents a blatant attempt to sell to a burgeoning Puritan market while at the same time maintaining a safe facade. Munday was simply riding a trend into the so-called pamphlet wars of the late sixteenth century.

Munday’s first extant script: *Fedele and Fortunio*

Scholars believe that Munday’s writing career in public performance began with his translation of Luigi Pasqualigo’s *Fedele and Fortunio*. The play was entered into the Stationers’ Register 12 November, 1584. Modern efforts to date the actual translation work of the play can be found in the work of Hosley, who suggests the period between

---

1579 and 1584 as most likely for the composition.\textsuperscript{253} It seems very unlikely that the play was translated while Munday was on his Rome trip, as he would have had other, more pressing, issues occupying him during that time. Therefore a window between late July 1579 and the 12 November, 1584 registration seems most likely.

\textit{Editions}

The \textit{English Short Title Catalog} lists a single edition printed in 1585. The printing was done “At London : Printed for Thomas Hacket, and are to be solde at his shop in Lumberd strete, vnder the Popes head, Anno. 1585.” \textsuperscript{254} Oddly, there are two separate versions, with differing dedications, that appear to have come from that first printing. One, signed A.M., is dedicated to John Heardson. The other is signed M.A. and is dedicated to “Maister M.R.”

Heardson is a likely target for Munday’s sponsorship hunt as he was from a rich family. Three copies of the 1585 printing are known to remain extant. One, to Heardson, signed A.M., is in the Huntington Library. Two are in the Folger Shakespeare Library, one as dedicated above, one variant with the M.A dedication.

\textit{Authorship Issues}

Because the work was published under initials rather than a name, and because of the variant copies, Munday’s authorship of this play is not assured. However, while the play has also been attributed to both George Chapman (by Crawford and Greg) and


\textsuperscript{254} \textit{English Short Title Catalog}. Available from http://www.ohiolink.edu. Hereafter cited as ESTC.
to Stephan Gosson (by Chambers, cautiously), the preponderance of evidence indicates Munday’s authorship.

Hosley suggests that there are eight disparate circumstances that support this supposition. First, he offers Munday’s use of his initials post 1580 “in more than thirty separate books, either on the title page ... as signature of a dedicatory epistle ... or ... as a signature preceded by “Finis” at the end of the text”(321). Second, there is material in the play that is re-published in John Bodenham’s *England’s Helicon* (1600) under the pseudonym “Sheepheard Tonie.” While the material (a short, eighteen line, pastoral poem entitled in this case, “To Colin Cloute”) is modified and a “few substantive variants, none of any consequence, were presumably introduced to give the poem a pastoral flavor,” the two are clearly related. Further, the material was published again in 1619, this time in an undisputed work of Munday, his *Primaleon of Greece* of that year. It is, in fact, this link that allowed nineteenth century scholars associated with the Malone Society to associate the Shepard Tonie pseudonym with Munday in the first place.

Third, the work of Muriel St. Clare Byrne in analyzing the spelling in manuscripts known to be Munday’s suggests that *Fedele and Fortunio* is his work. Fourth, Hosley suggests the subject of the dedication of the play, Master John Heardson was most likely known to Munday through relatives in the Draper’s Company. It seems

---


256 *Englands Helicon*. *Casta placent superis, pura cum veste venite, et manibus puris sumite fontis aquam*.

likely that Munday was again “shopping around” for sponsors and saw potential profits. Hosley notes that, not only was Heardson wealthy, but his older brother, Thomas, was a draper. He further reminds the reader that 1585 is the year that Munday was made free of the Drapers, and suggests that the two had to know each other because of this fact.

Fifth, Hosley suggests that the timing of Munday’s Rome trip was such that he could well have acquired a copy of the second edition of Pasqualigo’s *Il Fedele* while passing through Venice. Hosley also argues that Munday’s play was based upon that specific edition of the original. Sixth, the first edition of *Fedele* was “published by Thomas Hacket, who in 1584 published Munday’s *Watchword to England* and on July 6, 1584 (four months before registering *Fedele and Fortunio* on November 52), entered *Munday’s Banquet of Dainty Conceits* in the Stationers’ Register.” Seventh, the play was printed by Munday’s old mentor, John Allde, who also printed the *Mirrour of Mutability*. Eighth, and perhaps most important, Hosley suggests that *Fedele and Fortunio* is stylistically similar to Munday’s non-dramatic works of the period.

*Early Production*

*Fedele and Fortunio* most likely played before Queen Elizabeth, but the date of that occurrence remains unclear as well. Citing Gurr and other sources, Hamilton notes

---


260 There remains some small question as to the provenance of *Fedele and Fortunio* although Turner-Wright has established Munday as the author to the satisfaction of most contemporary academics; Turner-Wright, 1959, p. 159.
that Oxford’s men played at court on 1 January and 3 March 1584, but that there is compelling evidence that these dates featured performances of Lyly’s *Campaspe* and *Sapho and Phao.*\(^{261}\) Likewise when the company played at Court on 27 December and 1 January the next year, Hamilton notes that the first date was *Agamemnon and Ulysses* and the second a tumbling exhibition. She suggests that “Given the Stationers’ Register entry of 12 November 1584,” the company visit for Arundel House listed in the Chambers Accounts in December is a strong possibility.\(^{262}\)

**Scholarly Views of Fedele and Fortunio**

Hamilton also argues that the play “aligned with the Catholic loyalist politics of Mundy’s *A watch-woord to England,* while representing another challenge to the Leicester group.” This is unlikely in the extreme. Even given Munday’s apparent proclivity for seeking the widest possible base of sponsorship, the alignment with Leicester would have been unacceptably away from the safety of such a base of sponsorship. If Munday was truly concerned with survival at this point in his career, such an alignment would have been counterintuitive as well as potentially counterproductive. As he gradually gained his freedom from the government, he needed to try alternate genres once again in order to assure himself of sufficient income to support his family. Once again, this is before he was awarded the leases. Meddling in court politics was not a good way to ensure one’s financial success let alone freedom.

---

\(^{261}\) Hamilton, 2005, p. 60.

\(^{262}\) Ibid.
or survival. This especially for a person with Munday’s history. I think it more likely that Turner-Wright’s notion is correct:

Munday’s following of Pasqualigo was by no means literal: he adapted the comedy with considerable skill to English tastes of the eighties, turning the prose into merry rimen lines—alexandrines, septenarii, pentameters, tumbling verses. He changed the order of scenes, added songs, made the comic passages more boisterous. Instead of adopting the Italian pedant as his chief laugh-maker, he transferred most of the pranks of that academic figure to one of Pasqualigo’s minor characters, with the happiest results. Captain Crackstone, whose “vile canniball words” were still a byword with Nashe twelve years later, had few rivals on the English stage in 1584.²⁶³

In other words, Munday was in the early parts of a process of would allow him to reap the “fortunes (amountinge to Fortie or fiftie poundes yearlie) wch here to fore maintayned me and my former Charge substantially” mentioned in his will.²⁶⁴

Munday’s Work, 1585 to 1590.

Despite the apparent success of Fedele and Fortunio, there appears to be a hiatus in Munday’s theatrical writing. There are no other extant plays for which his authorship is attributed until John a Kent and John a Cumber appears in 1590. In 1961, I. A. Shapiro questioned the validity of the notion of such a hiatus.²⁶⁵ While he notes that, “Until Henslowe’s theatrical account-book was discovered, no play by Mundy was known to have survived,” Shapiro argues based upon the evidence offered by Meres and in Henslowe’s “Diary,” that Munday must have been well known both as a comic writer

---

²⁶³ Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 67.
²⁶⁴ Ibid., 170.
as well as a provider of plots or scenarios for others to amplify. Shapiro speculates that there are almost certainly missing plays belonging to Munday. “It seems to me highly probable, therefore, that during the 1580’s and earlier 1590’s some of the plays Mundy wrote would have been historical plays on patriotic and anti-papal themes.” He further suggests that Munday may have provided a plot for *The Troublesome Reign of King John* (1591) noting that “The plot, however, and most of the segments ... might well have come from Munday, and it is at least conceivable that ‘our best plotter’ plotted it, leaving others to drape his outline with dialogue.” While Shapiro offers the caveat that he is only speculating, there is merit to his suggestion. It seems very unlikely that Munday’s later works could have been as well developed or his collaborations as successful without the experience that would come with writing during this period. Further, given the fact that there are twelve of Munday’s plays for which the only source of information is Henslowe’s “Diary,” it is very likely that plays with which Henslowe was not concerned have been lost. This notion in and of itself supports Shapiro’s argument for missing plays.

---

266 Ibid., p. 25.
267 Ibid., p. 30.
268 Ibid., p. 30; [The] troublesome raigne of Iohn King of England, with the discoverie of King Richard Cordelions base sonne (vulgarly named, the bastard Fawconbridge): also the death of King Iohn at Swinstead Abbey. As it was (sundry times) publikely acted by the Queenes Maiesties Players, in the honourable citie of London. STC (2nd ed.) 14644. There is also a 1611 version that is entitled *The first and second part of the troublesome raigne of Iohn King of England. With the discoverie of King Richard Cordelions base sonne (vulgarly named, the bastard Fawconbridge): Also, the death of King Iohn at Swinstead Abbey. As they were (sundry times) lately acted by the Queenes Maiesties Players. Written by W. Sh.* It has also been attributed to Marlowe. Despite the title there is no compelling evidence to attribute the work to either of these authors.
Table 8. Known Non-Extant Plays of Anthony Munday.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother Redcap</td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Cordelion’s Funeral</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine and Orson</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance Medley</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Tudor</td>
<td>1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rising of Cardinal Wolsey</td>
<td>1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Constance of Rome</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar’s Fall</td>
<td>1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Two Shapes or Two Harpies</td>
<td>1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Widow’s Charm</td>
<td>1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Set at Tennis</td>
<td>1602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Munday’s (Known) Later Dramatic Works

In addition to his translation of *Fedele and Fortunio*, Munday is known to have authored eighteen plays, mostly in collaboration with others. Of these, only six are extant. As noted above, the only reason that we are even aware of the non-extant plays is due to their mention in Henslowe’s “Diary.” Of the six that remain extant, *The Book of John a Kent and John a Cumber* (1590?), and *The Booke of Sir Thomas More* (1592?-1594?) exist only in manuscript form. *The downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon*\(^{269}\) (acted 1598, published 1601), *The death of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon*\(^{270}\) (also acted 1598, published 1601) are collectively known as the “Huntington Plays” and were most likely written,

---


performed, and published as a pair. *The first part of Sir John Oldcastle*\(^ {271}\) (acted 1599, published 1600) is a single play that has drawn some interest from scholars. Munday’s authorship has also been suggested for *Fair Em*.\(^ {272}\)

John a Kent and John a Cumber and Sir Thomas More

**Editions**

*John a Kent and John a Cumber* and *Sir Thomas More* have come down to us in manuscript form. That of *John a Kent and John a Cumber* provides one of the few extant samples of Munday’s signature.\(^ {273}\) There are no extant printed editions of either manuscript that are contemporary to Munday. Nor were either listed in the *Stationers’ Register*. In fact, there is little or no evidence to suggest that either played on stage. Hamilton notes that the significance of *John a Kent* has historically been recognized as it relates to theatrical activity that surrounded its composition.\(^ {274}\) Given the treatment of the play in articles such as John Ashton’s “Conventional Material in Munday’s ‘John a Kent’ and ‘John a Cumber’” and “Revision in Munday’s ‘John a Kent’ and ‘John a Cumber’,” it is easy to see how such a thought could occur.

Evidence that *John a Kent and John a Cumber* may have been played is limited although the manuscript is such that it may have been used as an acting edition.

\(^ {271}\) *The First Part Of The True And Honorable Historie, Of The Life Of Sir John Old-Castle, The Good Lord Cobham. As it hath been lately acted by the right honorable the Earle of Nottingham Lord high Admirall of England his servants.* There is evidence of a second part, but it is not extant.

\(^ {272}\) *A pleasant commodie, of faire Em the Millers daughter of Manchester: vvith the louse of William the Conqueror: As it was sundrietimes publiquely acted in the honourable citie of London, by the right honourable the Lord Strange his seruaunts.* STC (2nd ed.) 7675. There is also a 1631 edition of the same title. Sometimes attributed to Robert Wilson, Shakespeare, or Robert Greene. See Barzak, p. 43.

\(^ {273}\) Another was removed from Henslowe’s “Diary.” See that section above.

Chambers suggests that this is the case, as the manuscript was purchased from Edward Allyn by the Admiral’s Men in 1601. That the script was owned by the premier actor of the Admiral’s Men after his retirement suggests that he had considered performing the play and perhaps had done so already.

The interest in *Sir Thomas More* rose when, at the turn of the twentieth century W.W. Greg analyzed the handwriting in the manuscript and found no less than seven differing hands. These include that of Munday, as well as those now thought to belong to Chettle, Haywood, Dekker, and Shakespeare. Additionally the hand of Edmund Tilney is found offering instructions as to how the play was to be censored.\(^{275}\) The fifth hand is thought to be the company “book keeper.”

**Authorship**

Although separated at some point in the past, both *John a Kent* and *Sir Thomas More* had apparently been stored together for a long while, wrapped in the same piece of vellum. Scholars began to suspect a common origin when it was discovered that both manuscripts feature a very similar set of stains. Once the common origin was deduced and once the manuscript of *John a Kent* was identified, by handwriting, as Munday’s by W.W. Greg in his 1900 *Plays*, it was a simple leap to offer Munday as the author of the play, especially given that Munday’s was the predominant hand in *Sir Thomas More*.

Despite this, there remain significant issues regarding the primary authorship of *Sir Thomas More*. The arguments for Munday are summarized by Merriam in his 1994

---

\(^{275}\) Tilney, Edmund. (c.1536-1610), Master of the Revels from 1578 to 1610.
“Was Munday the author of Sir Thomas More?” There is the physical evidence of the vellum wrapper from a single source and the stains shared by both manuscripts despite their having been separated for some time. Added to this is the fact that the primary handwriting in the manuscript (hand “A”) is a match for a known source of Mundy’s handwriting: that of the signed manuscript of John a Kent and John a Cumber with which it was stored for an extended period of time as some point. Additionally, Merriam also notes “the similarity between themes of conscience in Sir Thomas More and Sir John Oldcastle.”

Yet Merriam remains the chief proponent of a different, as yet unknown, author, noting that Munday’s hand in the manuscript “has led scholars to presume Munday's compositional involvement, despite the play's favourable portraiture of More which,” he asserts, “contrasts with Munday's known political and religious Weltanschauung [world view].” Merriam is unwilling to credit Munday any role further than as a scribe for the manuscript.

Tilney’s notation actually makes it problematic that the play was staged. Scholars agree that the notation stems from about 1593.

‘Leave out the insurrection wholly and the cause thereof and begin with Sir Thomas More at the Mayor's sessions, with a report afterwards of his good service done, being Shrieve of London, upon a mutiny against the Lombards, only by a short report and not otherwise, at your own perils.'
Greg regarded this notation as a “very conditional license” for production and suggests that it is extremely unlikely that, given the political situation at the time, the play was presented.\textsuperscript{280} This despite the attempts of at least four other playwrights to clean up the play.

The Huntington Plays: *The Downfall* and *The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon*, Munday’s Prototypical Robin Hoode Plays.

Most likely written in early 1598, the authorship of the Huntingdon Plays is not in question. Henslowe made note of three payments to Munday in February of that year. These included five pounds on 15 February for “a booke called the firste parte of Robyne Hoode,” ten shillings on 20 February, “vpon his second parte of the downefall of earle huntyngton surnamed Roben Hood,” and an additional ten shillings on 28 February “in pte paymente of the second pte of Roben Hoode.” Additional payments of twenty shillings and four pounds, five shillings were made to Henry Chettle and Robert Shaw on 28 February and 8 March respectively. On 28 March, 1598 Henslowe “Layd owt” the sum of fourteen shillings “for the licencynge of ij booke to the m of the Revelles called the ij ptes of Robart Hoode.”\textsuperscript{281} In all Henslowe lists a total of eleven pounds ten shillings for the writers of the two plays, an additional fourteen shillings for licensing from the Master of Revels (Tilney), and an additional ten shillings for Chettle to “mend” the play for presentation to the court. In total Henslowe recorded spending twelve pounds, nine shillings total to bring the play to the stage. There remains no


\textsuperscript{281} Henslowe, 1961, pps. 86-88. See also details in table 9.
record of the court performance, however. While the Admiral’s Men did play at court in the following January, the titles performed are unknown.282

The inventory taken in March 1598 lists a number of items apparently related to the Huntington Plays. These include, play books, “properties, and costumes, “j green gown for Maryan,” “vj grene cottes for Roben Hoode,” and “j hatte for Roben Hoode;” and suggest rather strongly that the shows were meant to be and established part of the repertory of the company. There is no corroborating evidence to support this, however. Henslowe’s entries may not relate to either play. Both titles were entered in the Stationers’ Register on 1 December, 1600. The first edition of each was published by R. Braddock “for William Leake” in 1601, and they were most likely issued together.283

Scholars have traditionally examined both manuscripts as members of a body of five “Robin Hood” plays of the period, or in light of the larger body of

| Table 9. Henslowe's Expenditures for the Huntington Plays. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Title           | Payee           | Amount          | Subtotals       |
| Downfall        | Munday          | £5              | £5              |
| Death           | Munday          | £1              |                 |
|                 | Shaw            | £4 and 5        | £6 and 5        |
|                 | Chettle         | £1              |                 |
| Licensing       | Tilney          | 14s             |                 |
| “Mending”       | Chettle         | 10s             | £1 and 4        |
|                 |                 |                 | £12 and 9       |
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Robin Hood literature. From this point of view the Huntington Plays are actually prototypical as the Robin Hood character had heretofore always been represented as a commoner. This is, in fact, the tack that Turner-Wight pursues in her original work. Her estimate of the worth of the plays might be seen in the fact that she offers but two pages of her biography to them, and then does not deal with them again in that or any other work.

More recently scholars have pursued the study of the Huntingdon Plays, although not in anywhere near the volume of other works. Kahan uses the plays as a device to explore the collaborative processes in their creation in a sort of “who wrote what part” school of thought, that is speculative, at best.284 Given that there exist no manuscript versions of either play and that Munday is thought to be the main author of both this would seem to be an exercise in futility.

The majority of contemporary scholarship pursues the plays as examples of a specific genre, with the identification of the genre varying from author to author. Andrew Gurr sees them as representative of innovation in the use of old material due to the demands of theatrical repertory and contemporary audience trends.

Together they make a lively hotch—potch of the current fashions, implanting political and romantic sub-plots from the pastoral and Arcadian modes of urban theatre into the popular old stories, turning the Robin Hood figures from rural may-games into stage stereotypes mixed incongruously and usually irrelevantly into courtly romance. Such remixing of old traditions shows how strongly the new fashions were impressing themselves on London audiences. It was a time of consolidation in the repertory when almost everything being consolidated

was itself so new that it had no stock shape to flow into. The one consistency seems to have been variety.\textsuperscript{285}

J.M.R. Margeson offers a slightly version of the same point of view and sees within the Huntingdon plays “a wonderful hodgepodge of popular dramatic elements... which might well remind us of experiments on the modern stage that try to incorporate a variety of popular theatrical techniques.”\textsuperscript{286} Thus, he notes, they offer “somewhat unsatisfactory examples of the romantic genre... They are not chronicle plays nor pastoral comedy mixed with tragedy of blood but primarily romances.” and Margeson suggests that they should be viewed as “late examples of a continuing dramatic tradition with strong roots in the medieval stage, a tradition of independent vitality whose conventions were easily understood by actors and audience alike.”\textsuperscript{287} Margeson concludes that plays are a member of a genre unique to the period, chronicle-romances, and that as such they:

\begin{quote}
made history and legend into something local, human, and individual; in part they were fervently patriotic or moralistic, in part ironic or even skeptical; sometimes they developed an intense pathos, and sometimes, even within the same play, they mocked the serious. They cared little for accurate history in comparison with the rightness of a good story, but they were interested in the great variety of emotional experience that belongs to human life in any period.\textsuperscript{288}
\end{quote}

Both of these scholars imply that in writing these plays Munday was keeping his ear to the ground to produce works he believed popular with the common market.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{285} Gurr, 1996, p. 240.  \\
\textsuperscript{286} Margeson, 1974, p. 238.  \\
\textsuperscript{287} Ibid., 223.  \\
\textsuperscript{288} Ibid., 238.
\end{flushleft}
Munday’s true skill at this point in time was his ability to please the crowd without incurring the wrath of the authorities.

*Oldcastle*

As a playwright, Munday is perhaps best known for his work on *Oldcastle* for Henslowe and the Admiral’s men, in collaboration with Drayton, Hathway, and Wilson, most likely in late 1599.\(^{289}\) On 16 October, 1599, Henslowe paid ten pounds to the authors via Thomas Downton, “for the first pte of the lyfe of S[r] Jhon Ouldcasstell & in earnest of the Second pte foe the vse of the compynyn.”\(^{290}\) Assuming that Henslowe has the entries in chronological order, the play opened between the first and the eighth of November of that year at the Rose as an undated entry with “as A gefte” as a marginal notation, notes the sum of ten shillings paid to “Mr Mundaye & the Reste of the poets at the playnge of Sr John oldcastell the ferste tyme.”\(^{291}\) Knutson suggests that the play, along with a second part, was sold by the Admiral’s Men for publication in August of 1600.\(^{292}\) The play was entered in the Stationers’ Register on 11 August 1600, and, that same year, "Printed by V[alentine] S[immes] for Thomas Pauier, and are to be solde at his shop at the signe of the Catte and Parrots neere the Exchange.”\(^{293}\) A second edition was printed in 1619, this time by William Jaggard for Thomas Pavier.\(^{294}\)

---

\(^{289}\) Henslowe, 1961, p. 214.  
\(^{290}\) Ibid., p. 125.  
\(^{291}\) Ibid., 126.  
\(^{292}\) Knutson, 2001, p. 70.  
\(^{293}\) *ESTC*  
\(^{294}\) Ibid.
The second printed edition of 1619 attributes the play to William Shakespeare on the title page, but scholars do not accept that attribution. That same title page also offers a 1600 publication date. Hamilton, suggests that this is an attempt on the part of the publishers (Pavier and Jaggar), “to anticipate the newly-printed Shakespeare folio.” This is possible, but, as the First Folio was not published until four years later, in 1623, and this version is included with the so-called “Pavier Quartos” in 1619, it seems more likely that “Pavier was attempting to demonstrate his ownership of what then amounted to copyright in these nine plays and that he may have hoped eventually to obtain permission from the Stationers’ Company (the guild which assigned rights to printers) to publish the authorized collection of all Shakespeare’s plays.”

Additionally, as Turner-Wright notes, “The voice of Munday, whose works often advertised the absence of “any ill motion to delight the vicious,” [can] almost be heard in the prologue.”

Henslowe’s payments virtually prove Munday’s authorship in collaboration with the others. The extent of Munday’s involvement in the project is a bit less clear, however. Hamilton argues that, based the order in which the authors are listed in Henslowe, he may have been the major contributor. This is problematic given

297 Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 132.
Henslowe’s lack of standardization within the text of his journal. As with the Robin Hood plays, we have no manuscript version from which to compare differing hands.

*Oldcastle* is viewed by scholars in four differing ways. First and foremost, academics from the turn of the nineteenth century through the present have seen the play as an indicator and a bellwether of trends in the relationship between the Chamberlain’s and the Admiral’s Men. Scholars suggest that the circumstances surrounding *Oldcastle* exemplifies the relationship between Lord Chamberlain’s and Admiral’s Men as both combative and competitive. Andrew Gurr notes that “More than anything else, this play signals the sense of rivalry between the two companies, and Henslowe’s concern at the threat to the Rose from the other company’s transfer to the Bankside.”

Turner-Wright suggests that the “heavy indebtedness” of the plot of *Oldcastle* to Shakespeare’s *Henry V* and *VI* is indicative of the competition between the companies and that the success of *Oldcastle*, “as a rival to Shakespeare’s plays moved Henslowe in November, 1599, to divide “as a gefte” ten shillings among [Munday et. al.]”

Scholars also take note that Sir John Oldcastle himself is presented in an entirely different light in the two plays and suggest that the difference is grounded in the competition between companies. Thus the title character in *Oldcastle* becomes a direct challenge to the original Shakespearean Falstaff character, also originally named

299 Ibid.
300 Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 134
Oldcastle, that appeared first in *Henry IV Part 1* (1598). This is likely as well because that play had proved embarrassing to the Lord Chamberlain’s Men for reasons that surrounded the use of the name Oldcastle. The name and the title were both unfortunately shared with Sir John Oldcastle (Oldcastell) (ca 1370-1417).

The real Oldcastle became “Lord of Cobham” by courtesy when he married Joan daughter of John de Cobham, third Baron Cobham, prior to his summons to parliament as a Baron in 1409. A Lollard rebel against Henry V, he was executed by the order of the crown in 1417 after leading an uprising. The problem for the Chamberlain’s men was twofold. First, despite that fact that he was hanged and burned for attempting to overthrow Henry V, Oldcastle was considered a Protestant martyr and was thus very popular with the burgeoning puritan movement. Second, and perhaps of more immediate import to the Lord Chamberlain’s men: Oldcastle was also a relative of William Brooke, the tenth Baron of Cobham. Cobham was made Lord Chamberlain in 1596 on the death of Henry Carey and may have been offended by Shakespeare’s portrayal of his relative. Or he may have been offended by the satirical view himself or his son, Henry, eleventh Baron Cobham offered in the play. In any case, despite the fact that Shakespeare may have used the name inadvertently, their production of *1 Henry IV*

---

301 ESTC. *The history of Henrie the Fourth; vith the battell at Shrewesburie, betweene the King and Lord Henry Percy, surnamed Henrie Hotspur of the north. With the humorous conceits of Sir Iohn Falstalffe.*

302 John Foxe. *The first volume of the ecclesiastical history [electronic resource] : containing the acts [and] monumentes of thinges passed in every kinges time, in this realme, especially in the Churche of England principally to be noted. with a full discourse of such persecutions, horrible troubles, the suffring of martirs, the severe punishment of persecutors, the great providence of God in preseruing many, and other thinges incident touching aswell the sayde Church of England, as also Scotland, and all other fforerine nations, from the primitiue time, till the rainge of king Henry the Eyght. Newly recognised and inlarged by the author. I. Foxe. 1576.* Early English books, 1475-1640 ; 540:4, N.P., ch. 14. Available by subscription from http://wwwlib.umi.com/eebo/image/22099. Accessed 17 December, 2005.
placed the Chamberlain’s Men in a sort of double jeopardy. They were on extremely thin ice with the burgeoning Puritan movement because of their apparent satire of a protestant proto-martyr and they were also guilty of biting the hand that literally fed them.

Their embarrassment offered the opportunity for the Admiral’s men, “to reproach the tact and morals of their opponents by displaying ... the godliness of the actual Oldcastle.”303 Or, as Gurr notes, given that Henslowe paid more than the going rate for a script and sequel; and a bonus as well, he “certainly had the more mundane intention of reminding London of the Chamberlain’s Men’s old mistake, because once the Admiral’s transferred north to the new Fortune he gave the play to Worcester’s for them to use at the Rose alongside the Chamberlain’s.”304 This perception of the play is in fact confirmed by Munday and the other authors. They leave no doubt as to their intentions, noting in their prologue:

It is no pamper’d Glutton we present,  
Nor aged counsellour to youthful sinne;  
but one, whose vertue shone aboue the rest,  
A valiant Martyr, and a vertuous Peere,  
In whose true faith and loyalty exprest  
Vnto his Soueraigne, and his countries weele:  
we striue to pay that tribute of our loue  
Your favours merit: Let faire Truth be graced,  
Since forg’d inuention former time defac’d.305

Hamilton notes that, “Consistent with how the Prologue of Oldcastle characterizes itself, critics have tended to see Oldcastle as presenting the ‘loyal, honest

303 Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 132.  
304 Gurr, 1996, p. 245.  
305 Munday, Oldcastle, p. A2.
and innocent’ Oldcastle; that is, not a traitor, but rather a martyr of the Foxian tradition, and thus as reversing Shakespeare’s confrontational representation.”306 Thus in their version of the story, Munday and the rest are offering the truth about Cobham, rather than the lies from those who would offer a forgery for his past and deface his honor.

Also a traditional view, scholars have suggested that Oldcastle is an indicator of the place of Sir John Oldcastle, himself, and by proxy many of the Protestant proto-martyrs in English society at the end of the sixteenth century. Munday and company offer a popular “truth” that comes at a cost. In this perception the acts of rebellion and treason for which Oldcastle was put to death for are ignored and the fourteenth century perceptions of Oldcastle as a villain rather than a hero are put aside. Rather, the Lollard martyr comes to the fore, and is perched for the examination and edification of the populace.

A second view of the play lies exclusively within the province of contemporary scholarship. A number of scholars have suggested that the circumstances surrounding the composition of the play illustrate the political gamesmanship that was a part of the theatre at this time. In creating this perception scholars have suggested that Oldcastle was commissioned by a number of people. Hill summarizes this school of thought in great detail:

In relation to the brouhaha over the depiction of Oldcastle in Munday’s very successful play of 1599, Rutter identifies Nottingham (and hence, by implication, his Company) with ‘the [court] Establishment’, in contrast to the Chamberlain’s Men, whose patron, George Carey, Lord Hunsdon, flirted in the 1590S with dangerous courtiers such as Essex. Furthermore,

as Paul Whitfield White points out, Nottingham himself was then ‘a political ally’ (as well as being the putative father-in-law) of Henry Brooke, Lord Cobham, a member of the family with which Oldcastle had become associated. Indeed, White suggests that the ‘bonus’ that Munday and his collaborators received from Henslowe for this play may have been the gift of ‘an outside party’; thus the play may in effect have been commissioned, or at the very least was rewarded, by a member of the Cobham faction. Andrew Gurr’s view of this theory is that Nottingham himself may have ‘suggested the subject to his company’, given Lord Cobham’s betrothal to his daughter, although Roslyn Knutson cautions that ‘there is no document in Henslowe’s papers to support the claim of a company commission’.307

Third, another contemporary notion suggests that the actual production of Oldcastle was an indication of the company’s perception of their place in English society at the time. Along these lines, Gurr suggests that “the run of plays that followed Oldcastle does give some support to the idea that the Admiral’s Men saw itself as representing the traditional order in 1599.”308

Finally, Hamilton attaches elements of Catholic representation to the traditional Protestant perception of the play that is not entirely compatible with other four. She argues that rather than simply parodying 1 Henry IV, the writers of Oldcastle through their additions of characters and to the plot, actually add their own deliberate commentary surrounding the story. She suggests that, while the traditional positions may appear to be plausible; they pay “no attention to how the Oldcastle collaborators embellished their version so that it becomes in turn a parody and imitation of Shakespeare’s play that also adds its own commentary.” Her notion is that said commentary is directed at Catholics as well as Protestants. Thus in Hamilton’s view:

308 Gurr, 1996, p. 245.
Additions of characters and scenes — the actions of Sir John Wrotham, the scenes of disguise and mistaken identity at the inn and in court, the actions of the Irishman Macchane — parody the situations of Catholics in relationship to Protestants, thereby not only targeting Protestant—Protestant conflict, but also reviving the Catholic—Protestant controversy that historically had formed the basis of the debate about the interpretation of Oldcastle’s actions.  

In Hamilton’s perspective, the additions to plot are not a means of supporting the existing order and “Validating the Protestant view that Oldcastle was a martyr.” Rather, the opposite: in representing both “Catholic and Protestant martyrs and traitors as indistinguishable from each other, “the authors are questioning that order in a manner that is both subtle and ingenious:

In competition with the best writer of their day, the experienced team that produced Oldcastle competed by ‘reading’ Shakespeare’s treatment of Falstaff, imitating while varying the representation, and also elaborating its implications.

In any case, the relationship between Munday’s Oldcastle and Shakespeare’s Falstaff is made clear by Shakespeare himself in the epilog to Henry IV, part two:

Be it known to you, as it is very well, I was lately here in the end of a displeasing play, to pray your patience for it and to promise you a better. I meant indeed to pay you with this; which, if like an ill venture it come unluckily home, I break, and you, my gentle creditors, lose. Here I promised you I would be and here I commit my body to your mercies: bate me some and I will pay you some and, as most debtors do, promise you infinitely…

…One word more, I beseech you. If you be not too much cloy'd with fat meat, our humble author will continue the story, with Sir John in it, and make you merry with fair Katharine of France: where, for any thing I know, Falstaff shall die of a sweat, unless already a’ be killed with your hard opinions; for Oldcastle died a martyr, and this

---
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is not the man. My tongue is weary; when my legs are too, I will bid you good night: and so kneel down before you; but, indeed, to pray for the queen. 312
CHAPTER FIVE -- ANTHONY MUNDAY AND THE CITY OF LONDON

Civic Pageantry

David Bergeron divides English civic pageantry into three distinct forms.³¹³ First are what he refers to as “progress pageants” which are presented for the sovereign while on summer tours of the realm. The second is that of the entry to London of the sovereign, or in at least one case, the crown-prince. The third is that of the Lord Mayor’s Pageant. Anthony Munday was certainly involved in two of these three genres. He is well known for his Lord Mayors Pageants during the early Jacobean period. He also wrote at least one from the second group, his London’s Loue, to the Royal Prince Henrie.³¹⁴

Munday is one of the most prolific of the pageant writers of the Jacobean era. In fact, although only eight of his mayoral pageant texts survive (1604, 1609, 1611, 1614, 1615, 1616, and 1618), guild records indicate that he was involved in no fewer than sixteen entertainments of this type over the course of the eighteen year period that spanned from 1604 to 1623. These included both annual pageants funded by the guilds to celebrate the installation of one of their members as lord mayor of London, and at least one civic pageant, that of the investiture of the Prince of Wales in 1610. It is for this


reason that Bergeron refers to him as being “to the Jacobean Lord Mayors Show what
Ben Jonson is to the court masque.” 315 Munday is dominant in the field (see table).

Scholars suggest that Munday left the professional stage because his work was
outdated, a charge never leveled against Shakespeare. As may be, but it seems more
likely to me that he may have been attracted to the notion of working a bit less. Not
only would pageants pay a something, but working only one or two a year would lend
itself to Munday’s desires to research and update Stow’s Survey. Further, it may be that
he no longer needed the income generated from the plays given that leases from
Elizabeth were now starting to come into his possession and he could collect income
from them.

The accession of James I to the crown of England meant new ways of dealing
with both court and commoner. Despite the peaceful succession, James’ place on the
throne was not as secure as it might have been. Thus, within a year a number of events
occurred that were aimed at solidifying the new king’s hold on power. Forse notes that
among these, all three of the major theatre companies found themselves under Royal
patronage.316 This purported act of support was in truth a way for James to subsume
the theatrical voices that had heretofore been used by the noble patrons of those
companies in a sort of preemptive strike. Munday’s early pageants are indicative his
awareness of these actions by the crown.

316 James H. Forse. “After 1603 London Theatre is Spelled J A M E S: The ‘Royalization’ of the
Theatre as a Facet of Attempts by James I to Put his New Kingdom ‘in good order’.” *Shakespeare
*Forse, 1995.*
His earliest two extant pageants, *The Triumphes of Re-Vnited Britania* and *Londons Loue*, themes of love for the crown, and a united kingdom, both near and dear to James I. Bergeron correctly notes that Munday’s extant early pageants can be differentiated from his later ones by their focus on the court and the King. That is to say, rather than simply trying to garner preference through dedications, Munday seems now to be trying to do so in a much more subtle manner. He almost seems to be playing the role of an accepted (during the previous reign) artist seeking readmission to a very selective club. It seems, however, that acceptance by the court of Elizabeth was in no way a guarantee of such in the Jacobean court. There are examples of individuals who had been on the inside of Elizabeth’s court finding themselves no longer a factor at the beginning of that of James I. For example, such stalwarts of the Elizabethan age as Henry Brooke (Lord Cobham), and Sir Walter Raleigh found themselves accused of treason and locked in the tower as a result of the 1603 Bye Plot.

---


318 Ibid., p. xiii.

319 Forse, 1995, p. 49, 50.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>Peele (missing.) 1596-1601 missing. Speculation is that Munday was involved because of the Jonson’s “Antonio Balladino” (circa 1600) comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Unknown (missing.) Last pageant of the Elizabethan era. Munday received thirty shillings from the Merchant Tailors for “speeches” and additional money for providing children’s costumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Unknown (missing.) (Cancelled?) (Queen’s death?) (Plague?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Unknown (missing.) Munday received £2 from the Haberdashers “for his paines” with this pageant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Munday, <em>Triumphes of re-united Britania</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606-1608</td>
<td>Unknown (missing.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Munday, <em>Camp-Bell, or Iron mongers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Unknown (missing.) Munday received a payment from the Merchant Tailors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Munday, <em>Chryso-thriambos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Dekker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Middleton. Munday assisted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Munday, <em>Himatia-Poleos: triumps of olde draperie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Munday, <em>Metropolis coronata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Munday, <em>Chrysanaleia: golden fishing</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Middleton. Munday received £5 from the Grocers “for his paines in drawing a project for this busynes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Munday, <em>Sidero-Thriambos: or steele and iron</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Unknown (missing). Munday submitted a “a plot for the devices of the lord mayor’s pageant “ to the Ironmongers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Unknown (missing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Middleton. Munday paid to assist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Unknown (missing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Middleton. Munday was responsible for a water show.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>No pageant held</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Munday’s Extant Pageants.

---

322 Ibid.
323 Ibid.
324 Ibid.
Further, in the two examples above, Munday is not only showing his own loyalty and willingness to support the crown, but he is also applying his old tactics of fishing for sponsorship as well as catering to his own patriotism. Additionally, in *Triumphes of re-united Britania*, Munday used the title “citizen and draper of London” in his “by-line.” This is telling, and scholars agree that it indicates a growing association with the city of London, an association that lasted until his death in 1633 and would reach its peak with Munday’s release of his editions of *Stow’s Survey*.

**Early Pageants 1602-1610**

Turner-Wright notes that Munday “may, of course, have written civic pageants before: Jonson’s ridicule of Balladino…almost certainly appeared about 1600; and as the name of no other “city poet” is linked with the show…the year of Peele’s last pageant, and 1605, the year of Mundy’s first extant effort, it is likely that he prepared two or three shows in the interval.”

It is important to note that the perceptions of Munday’s pageants from this period are based only upon two works, those of 1605 and 1610. In discussing Munday’s first extant pageant, *The triumphes of re-united Britania*, Bergeron notes that, “No other Lord Mayor’s Show so consciously, explicitly, and unrelentingly refers to the sovereign. I am suggesting not only that this is logical and timely on Munday’s part, given the

---
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date, but also that it may be his way of casting his eye toward the court.”\[327\] While Bergeron leaves his reasoning behind his statement as an exercise for the reader, and while the notion of may seem at first to be contradictory, given Munday’s prior need to keep a lower profile, the fact that he was at last free to follow his muse without the fear of the government dragging up old charges against him had its downside. While his freedom from the fear of persecution may have been sweet, the lack of revenue that came with his freedom from government work was not. I suggest that Bergeron is correct for this reason. Additionally, while The triumphes of re-united Britania may have been extreme in its orientation towards the court, Munday continued in that direction at an albeit reduced level until his post-1610 pageants.

*The triumphes of re-united Britania*

*The triumphes of re-united Britania* was most likely written in the month or so immediately prior to its presentation on 29 October, 1605, as Munday had two other translations published that year, *Falshood in friendship*, and *The dumbe divine speaker*.\[328\] As none of the three works are mentioned in the Stationer’s Register, it is impossible to assign a date beyond the year offered by the printer.

---


Triumph of Reunited Britania is unique for four reasons. It is the earliest extant pageant from the Jacobean period; James VI and I having been crowned on 24 March, 1603. Second, as discussed, it is heavily laced with references to King and court. Third, it is the only pageant known that had to be built twice. This as a result of a storm that damaged elements of the original before it could be undertaken. The Merchant Tailors funded a rebuilding and “the same shewes were newe repaired, and caned abroade upon All Saincts day.” Further, Munday received a payment from the company for 38 pounds:

for providing apparel for all the children in the “pageant, ship, lion, and camel, and for the chariot,” and £6 more for “printing the books of the speeches in the pageant and the other shows …” A “Mr Hearne,” a painter, received £75 “for making, painting, and gilding the pageant, chariot, lions, camel, and new painting and furnishing the ship, and for the furniture for both giants” … The £10 paid to “88 porters for carrying the pageant, ship, and beasts” suggests that workers carried the devices in a typical Lord Mayor’s Show through the city rather than having them remain stationary, the common practice in the royal entry pageants.

Finally, it is the only work of Munday’s that deals with the mythical history of England. Bergeron notes that:

The historical complexity of Munday’s opening section of the text, his citation of many other writers—such as Annius de Viterbo, Berosus, Wolfgang Lazius, Geoffrey of Monmouth, John Bale, John Price, John Cazus, John Leland—and the structure of the pageant suggest to me that in one effort Munday had moved this kind of pageant far beyond the much simpler Elizabethan Lord Mayor’s Show, of which the few surviving texts typically record only the speeches. Munday, on the other hand, is at considerable pains to display his learning in a discourse which no one
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standing in the streets could have had access to until the printed text was available.\footnote{331}

To me this subject matter constitutes a logical extension of Munday’s early English patriotism. I believe that it was this patriotism that led him to return to England in 1580, rather than following a safer course of action, and that this is simply a logical extension of that behavior, a logical extension with potential financial benefits as well. For if Munday was fishing for a sponsor, preferment, or simply for future employment, he may have caught something. Five years later, a pageant was laid on for the 31 May, 1610 arrival in London of the Prince of Wales and Munday was responsible for it.

The message inherent in \textit{Britania} also reflects the avowed desire of the King to merge his three kingdoms, England, Ireland, and Scotland. Further, in 1604 James had proclaimed a new style of address for himself, that of “James, King of Great Brittaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith.” At the same time, the King pushed, unsuccessfully, to merge the kingdoms of England and Scotland. Given Munday’s already discussed patriotic bent, the notion of “Great Brittaine” would have attracted him.

The 1609 Lord Mayor’s Pageant

Munday produced his next extant in 1609. \textit{Camp-bell} remains extant in only one copy; that with pages missing.\footnote{332} Despite the missing pages, it appears that the themes from the 1605 pageant were recycled. \textit{Camp-bell}

\footnote{331} Ibid.
\footnote{332} Anthony Munday. “Camp-Bell, or, The Ironmongers Faire Field:[a Pageant at the Installation of Sir Thomas Cambell in the Office of Lord Mayor of London, Sunday, 29th October, 1609,”}
reveals an emphasis on abstract virtues that support the kingdom. For example, Majesty is surrounded by several virtues essential to the kingdom’s well-being, such as Religion, Nobility, and Policy. As Munday writes in his description: “In briefe, this whole relation, and circumstances thereto belonging, is but a morall type or figure of his Majesties most happie and gracious governement, which heaven blesse with unaltering continuance.” St. George and St. Andrew reinforce this praise of James in their speeches of explication.333

Bergeron notes that “Of the one hundred sixty lines that remain, the incoming Lord Mayor is addressed in only two speeches; one by Saint Andrew, the patron saint of Scotland, and one by Saint George, the patron saint of England.”334 Whether one subscribes to theories of Munday as a clandestine Catholic, or not, the choice of these two characters can be nothing but a reference to King James.

As a result of this pageant, Munday was required to appear before the Ironmonger’s court. The guild was not satisfied for three reasons. “that the children weare not instructed their speeches which was a spetiall iudgment of the consideration, then that the Musick and singinge weare wanting, the apparrell most of it old and borrowed, with other defects.”335 Although Munday defended himself, arguing as to the difficulty of using children, the guild was not satisfied, and soon thereafter, when Munday requested an additional payment to cover his expenses, the Ironmongers turned him down cold.336

Civic Pageantry: Londons loue, to the Royal Prince Henrie, 1610.

---

334 Ibid.
335 Robertson, 1954, p. 76.
336 Bergeron, Pageants, p. 32.
In 1610, James I had his eldest son, Henry, created Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester. He returned to London on 31 May, 1610 and was greeted by a flotilla created by the Livery Companies on a week's notice. The flotilla and other events that were part of the pageant created for the young prince were at the direction of Anthony Munday as part of his *Londons loue, to the Royal Prince Henrie*.

Munday’s reaction to the commission can be perhaps discerned in his note enclosed in the published copy:

> The shorthnes of time, hath bin no meane bridle to their zealous forwardnes, which (else) would have appeared in more flowing and abouodant manner. Neverthelesse, out of this little limitation, let me humbly entreate you to accept their boundlesse love, which is like to Jaacobs Ladder reaching from Earth to Heaven. Whereon, their hourelie, holie and devoute desires (like to so many blessed Angelles) are continually ascending and descending: For their Royall Soveraigne your Father, his Queene your peerlesse Mother, your sacred selfe, and the rest of their illustrous race. That unpolluted soules may be ever about yee, false harts or foule hands never to come neere yee; but the baste of Heaven, alwayes to defend yee.  

The pageant itself featured the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and the guilds departing to intercept the young Prince at eight in the morning. “They rowed, with such a cheerfull noyse of Hermonie, and so goodlie a shewe in order and equipage, as made the beholders and hearers not meanely delighted; beside a peale of Ordenance, that welcomde them as they entred on the water.” Greetings to the Prince were made
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and speeches featured by Richard Burbage and John Rice, of the King’s Men, on a whale and a dolphin.\textsuperscript{340} The records are not clear on which actor had which speech.

Later Pageants: 1611-1623

Bergeron notes of Munday’s later pageants that, “After 1610, Munday makes no extended reference to King James; instead, the national and civic life that he honors centers on the city and guilds and their historical past.”\textsuperscript{341} He further suggests that Munday perhaps “joined the increasing ranks of those disillusioned with James by the end of his first decade in England, a situation exacerbated by the premature death of Henry in 1612.”\textsuperscript{342} Or perhaps Munday simply decided to pin his financial hopes on the guilds. In any event, he moves in the direction of recovering the past in order to honor the companies from which the new mayors come. This process can be seen at work in \textit{Chruso-thriambos}, the pageant of 1611, in which Faringdon, a former mayor, resurrected by Time, joins in the celebration of the Goldsmiths.

\textit{Chruso-Thriambos}, 1611

The 1611 pageant, \textit{Chruso-Thriambos}, was written to celebrate the inauguration of Sir James Pemberton.\textsuperscript{343} Turner-Wright notes that Munday used the pageant to display
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\end{flushright}
“as might be expected from so learned a chronicler…much antiquarian learning.” \textsuperscript{344}

The pageant is broken into three distinct sections. The first takes the form of a water pageant on the Thames, “when he [Pemberton] tooke Bardge, with all the other Companies towards Westminster;” and shows the processes required to bring gold into the country.\textsuperscript{345} In the second, the viewer is transported to Baynard’s Castle on the Thames for a visit to a tomb and the ghosts of Kings Richard Lion Heart and his brother John Lackland. In this section we meet former Provost of the City Leofstane who guides the tour of the King’s tombs.\textsuperscript{346} Here also, Faringdon for the first time when he is resurrected by the character Time to view the “The Triumphes of Golde.” The third part tells the story of the origins of gold itself from mining and smelting, through the casting process and, finally to the assayer’s shop.

In the printed edition of the text, the reader is told to:

Imagine then, that from the rich and Golden Indian Mines, sundry Ships, Frigots, and Gallies, are returned home; in one of which, Chiorison the Golden King, with Tumanama his peerlesse Queene, are (at their owne entreatie) brought into England, with no meane quantity of Indian Gold, to behold the Countries beauty, and the immediate day of sollemne tryumph.\textsuperscript{347}

After the Mayor and his entourage board their “bardge,” they are treated to

Divers Sea-fights and skirmishes…actively performed, both in the passage on to Westminster, and backe againe, each Galian having his Indian Page attending on him, laden with Ingots of Golde and Silver, and those Instruments that delved them out of the earth. In which manner they march along by Land likewise, the Indian King and his Queene beeing

\textsuperscript{344} Turner, 1929, pps., 158, 159
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\textsuperscript{346} Bergeron, Pageants, p. 69, n. 31.
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mounted on two Goiden teopardes, that draw a goodly triumphal Chariot.348

“No sooner landeth the Lord Maior at Baynards Castle,” than he is met and
“sainted” by the ghost of Leofstane, provost of London during the reign of Henry I.349
(The position of Provost of the City of London was a predecessor to the position of Lord Mayor.) At Baynards Castle the incoming Lord Mayor and his “worthy train” find “an ancient Toombe or Monument, standing in apt place appointed for it: and by it is ordered the Triumphall Chariot.”350 In that chariot are the ghosts of Richard I (the Lion Hearted) and John (Lackland). The party is halted by Time:

Time. Leofstane I charge thee stay.

Leofstane. What art thou, that dar’st bar me of my way?

Time. He that survaies what ever deedes are done,
Abridges, or gives scope, as likes me best;
Recalling to the present sight of Sunne
Actions, that (as forgot) have lien at rest,
And now, out of thy long since buried Chest At Hermondsey raisd thee to see this day:
Leofstane tis he, that dares compell thy stay.

Leof. See in how short a while a quiet Soule,
Hid from this world five hundred years and more,
May be forgetfull of great Times controule,
By such gay sights as nere I saw before.
My selfe yer while could tell this worthy Lord,
Time had reviv’d me, to attend this day:
Pardon me then, that I durst breath a word
In cootestation, where all ought obey.
Needs must these gaudier dalea yeild greater crime,
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When long grav’d Ghosts dare thus contend with
Time.

Time then offers those gathered a capsule history of the office of the Lord Mayor of
London, noting that Richard I created the position:

reducing it from the rule of Portgreves, Provosts, and Bayliffes to that
more high and honourable Title: yet with this restriction, that the election
of the Maior consisted then in the King himselfe, as it did all King
Richards life time, and so continued til the fifteenth yeare of King John,
who then (most graciously) gave the Cittizens of London absolute power,
to elect a Lord Mayor amongst themselves...\textsuperscript{351}

Time concludes his speech with the presentation of another ghost. This time, Nicholas
Faringdon appears.

Time. How many Gold-Smiths have enjoyed the place,
Were needless to recount. Yet heere aleepea one,
Whom in this urging and important case,
(He being Gold-Smith too, and long since gone
Out of this world, old Nicholas Faringdon
Four times Lord Maior I may not wel omit,
Because I thinke him for this triumph fit.
These gates he built, this ward of him took name,
And three and fifty yearea he did survive
   After his first being Major. What plentie came
To greete his daies, with former times did strive,
And nere the like as when hee was alive:
Arise, arise I say, good Faringdon
For in this triumph thou must needs make one.
Time striketh on the Tombe with his silver wand,
and then Faringdon ariaeth. \textsuperscript{352}

Faringdon, played by John Lowen, member of the Goldsmiths, and, by this time a
prominent actor with the King’s Men, appears. Although somewhat disoriented by the
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process of awakening, he is introduced to the incoming Lord Mayor, Pemberton, his brother goldsmith. To Pemberton, Faringdon offers the following advice:

...Glad and golden be your dales,
Live in Prince and peoples praise:
Honoor London with yoor care,
Study stiU for her welfare:
And as Gold-Smiths both yoo are,
Such good and golden deeds prepare,
That may renowne our Mystery,
To times of otmost memory. 353

Then, overwhelmed, Faringdon does not wish to depart. As is “that in this daies honour raisde us both,” Time allows Farringdon to enter the Chariot and acts as coachman for the Lord Mayor and entourage as they drive to the pageant proper.

Theatrically, the pageant consisted of a four sided revolve unit “of apt constructure, and answerable strength.” 354 On that structure was built a “Rocke or Mount of Golde, in such true proportion, as Art can best present it with clifts, crannies, and passable places, such as may best illustrate the invention, and expresse the persons therein seated.” 355 The mountain itself must have been reasonably large, as there were many people placed upon it including, in one scene “Pioners, Miners, and Oelvers…the industrious Fioer…the Mint-Maister, Coyners, Gold-Smithes, Jeweller, Lapidarie, Pearle—Driller, Plate—Seller, and such like, all lively acting their sondry professions.” 356 A second scene features an “Essay-Maister” who is “to distinguish those precious Mettals of Gold and Silver, from base adulterating or corruption…with his Furnaces,
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Glasses of parting each Mettal from other, his Table, Ballance, and Weightes, even to the very smallest quantitie of true valuation, in Ingots, Jewelles, Plate or Monies, for the more honour of the Prince and Countrey, when his Coynes are kept from imbasing and abusing.  

A third scene showed Justice and her daughters Gold and Silver attended by the ladies Antiquity and Memory. Silver and Gold have made a long voyage around the earth leaving minerals in the ground to be mined.

But the “greedy and never-satisfied Lydian King” finds himself cursed as Midas was, with the touch of gold. He turns himself “imaginarily” into a stone, is picked up by Justice, and, as a warning against greed, turned into a touch-stone that can be used to find “the vertue of her Ingots, Jewels, Monies, &c.”  

She gives the touch-stone to her “golden sonnes the Gold-Smiths, but her Daughter, Goldes figure likewise, appointing her to sit on their Armories creast, with the Touch-Stone in the one hand, and Ballance in the other, to represent her own sacred person in Justice, and to verify their word [motto]: Justitia Virtutum Regina,” which can be seen at the very top of the mountain.

In David Bergeron’s, *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, Leah Sinanoglou Marcus suggests that the pageant can be seen as a commentary on the monetary policies of James I because he “receives short shrift in the allegorical scheme of the pageant.
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Munday need not have introduced the subject of kingship at all." 360 To this end she notes that James I:

was constantly out of it [gold], widely known already for his conspicuous consumption of it, involved in numerous controversial projects to get it, and committed to specific programs for improving its quality and regulating its supply. Not all of the money problems of the second decade of his reign could be blamed on James's personal extravagance. In addition to a shortage of royal income, there was a genuine and serious scarcity of gold and silver coins in England. 361

Such an interpretation is possible. Indeed, Marcus' theory is supported by the fact that Munday did not receive another commission for the Mayoral pageant until 1614. Yet it seems unlike Munday to do such a thing. Heretofore, he has always been careful to remain on the right side of the government. Given that James I was one of the more scholarly of the British Kings, it seems unlikely that Munday would have tried such commentary with any hope of getting away with something. Further, the fact that Munday did not receive a commission for three years does not mean he was not involved, for we have records that he assisted Middleton in that of 1613. Turner-Wright notes that the 1613 Pageant was "'furnished with apparell and porters by Anthony Munday, Gentleman'; but apparently, as a draper and author, he had made himself indispensable in the matter of "tyring and tryming." 362 Further, she suggests that:

Mundy gained from this pageant not only £80 for his pains and expense, but a further opportunity to display his talents as poet: the ceremonial had so impressed Ills Honor's family, that two years later, upon his decease,
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they engaged Mundy to compose the epitaph for the monument in St. Zachary, Aldersgate. The aged poet responded generously with some fifty lines of debate between Virtue and Death, who, though all flesh is grass, finally reach the conclusion that good works and civic glory outlast even the grave.363

For the next three years we have little or nothing on Munday beyond his assistance with the Middleton’s 1613 pageant. Munday himself suggests that this time may have been spent with his work on Stow’s Survey. In the dedication to the 1618 of Stow, the first that he edited, Munday talks of having spent a significant part of the last years (i.e. since 1606) working on the Survey.364 In fact, though, we only have two records from this period that name Munday. There is the already discussed 1612 case where Munday testified against two recusants. There is also a record of his appearing at the London sessions in 1611, and testifying against a stationer charged with injuring a barber-surgeon. Beyond these cases there is no other data from this period extant.

Himatia-Poleos

In 1614 Munday returned to the world of pageants as an author. His own brothers of the Drapers’ Company commissioned him to produce what wound up becoming Himatia-Poleos: The Triumphs of Old Drapery, or the Rich Cloathing of England.

Bergeron notes:

What a delight it must have been to Munday when in 1614 his own company, the Drapers, secured his services for the mayoral show to honor Thomas Hayes the new mayor. Hayes was son of Thomas Hayes of Westminster.365
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Himatia-Poleos is interesting for a number of reasons. Bergeron notes that guild records of the pageant are scarce, and indeed they are; guild records offer a single entry dated 21 October noting that “a score of new freemen are admitted and assessments of five pounds per bachelor are may to pay for all the new clothing and the barge.”

Second, the Artificer, the rough equivalent to a theatre technical director, begins to receive his due around this time. A note at the end of Munday’s text includes the following:

To conclude, as the severall Inventions (with all their weaknesses and imperfections) were mine owne: so the worth and credit of their performance (if any may waite on so meane a businesse) belongeth to the exact and skilfull Painter Maister Rowland Bucket whose care, diligence, and faithfull dealing I must needs commend, and should wrong him overmuch if I did not give him due praise to his merit.

Bergeron notes that “this is the first time that an artificer has been singled out in a Lord Mayor’s Show text.” Actually, though, in the program pamphlet from previous year, 1513, one John Grinkin, “‘artfully and faithfully performed’ all the ‘worke and body of the Triumph,’ had become official “scene painter” for such affairs.” Either way, given the immense amount of work that had to have been put into the pageants, the recognition was long overdue.

In addition to the script, Munday provided costumes as he had in 1605. Bergeron note that in addition to providing the script, and the tradition printed copies, Munday agreed “to make fitt and apt speeches for expressing of the Shew, bothe for
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Lepaton, ffairington, the Kinges, and boyes and all the rest, and to cause 500 bookes thereof to be made and printed to be deliuected to Mr Wardeins by them to be disposed.”  

Further, as it appeared that the queen might attend, the guild chose to add a water pageant. According to the records, “it is certainly knowne that the Queenes Maieatie in her royall person will vouchsaffe her highnes presence to see those shewes and triumphes, aswell on the land as by water.”

Bergeron also notes that there are a number of errors presented in the text.

While Munday suggests that the Drapers are the oldest guild in the city, they are in fact third in precedence, and he tries to settle the issue of what company Fitz-Alwine, the first Lord Mayor, belonged to, noting that he had been misled on this matter by Stow. He also includes a figure representing Sir John Norman, a fifteenth-century mayor and supposedly the first to go to Westminster by barge, a legend generally discredited now.

Within the text of the pageant, Munday first introduces the Livery Companies and their place within the City of London as having:

brought forth many severall Mysteries or Professions, hath referred them all in eminencie of place, to twelve onely. Amongst which twelve gradations of honour and dignitie, the first originall began in the first Companie of all other in this Citie, the ancient fellowship or Societie of Drapers.
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Munday goes on to note that “Out of this list or band of Drapers, issued Sir Henrie Fitz Alwine knight,” and that Fitz-Alwine, by the favor of Richard I, became the first Lord Mayor of London.374 Munday then digresses to explain how he had placed Fitz-Alwine in the Goldsmiths’ Company:

before I passe any further, it may appeare as a blemish on mine own browe, because in my Booke in the worthie Company of Goldsmiths, I did set downe Henrie Fitz-Alwine, Fitz-Lenfstane to be a Goldsmith, and the first Lord Haior of London alleading my authoritie for the same in the margent of the same booke, out of John Stow, which now I may seem to denie, and affirme the same man to be a Draper, to the disgrace of the forenamed Company, and mine owne deepe discred.375

After setting the scene for his readers, by suggesting that the walls of a city are the best garments of that city, he explains his “devise, in the honour of draperie the rich Clothing of England which (long before the knowledge of fantisticke habites) clothed both Prince and people all alike.”376 Munday then notes that since Sir Francis Drake:

who having rounded the whole world, and noated the riches and best endowments of every nation: founde none to equall the Draperie and cloathing of England. In regarde whereof, he chose to be a loving Brother of the Drapers Societie, before all other Companies of the Citty.377

Drake does not appear to have been a Draper, he certainly provided an adequate “devise” for the pageant. The pageant consisted of several parts. First there seems to have been a parade including a ship, “very artificially and workemanly framed...fitted
with Captaine, Naister, Mate, &c. and supposedly laden with woollen cioatbes, to sake exchaungue for other Countries best commodities.” The ship was followed by “A beautifull Chariot, drawen by two golden pelletted Lyons...graced with the supposed shape of King Richard the firs, with the severall figures of so many Citties in about him.” After the chariot, there came what sounds like a traditional pageant wagon in the form of a “Pageant or goodly Monument, figuring the whole estate of Londons olde Draperie.” The pageant wagon is occupied by Himatia, “as Mother, Lady and commaunddresse of all the rest,” and her attendants.

Upon the arrival bankside of the Lord Mayor and entourage, they were met by “the supposed shadow of Sir John Norman with the seaven liberall Sciences (all attired like graceful Ladies) sitting about him,” as well as the new barge purchased by the Drapers. By legend, Norman was the first Lord Mayor to take a barge, purchased with his own funds, to Westminster. Norman delivers the “devise” to the Mayoral party in a speech bankside.

Welcome to the water, worthy Brother Draper. Imagine me to the true resemblance of olde Sir John Norman sometime Lord Maior of his famous Cittie, and the first that devised this water honour, making my Barge at mine owne proper cost, and rowed with silver Oares to Westminster when (as you now) I then went to take mine oath.

From there is was off to Westminster. In this case accompanied on shore by:

---
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divers sweet singing youths, belonging to the maister that enstructeth the yong Quiristers of Paula, being all attired in faire wrought wastcoates, and caps belonging also to them, each having a silver Oare in his hand; do sing a most sweet dittie of Rowe thy Boate Norman and so seeme to Rowe up along to Westminster, in honour of the Lord Maiors attendance.\(^{383}\)

Upon landing, the Lord Mayor and his party are greeted by a shepherd with a golden ram who represent the wool industry. He discourses on the high place of the Drapers’ Company, and the place of wool within that industry concluding with a somewhat doggerel speech:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{For, if wee have no Ramme, wee are sure to have no Lambe: no Lambe, no Wooll: no wooll, no Cloth: no Cloth, no Draper.} \\
&\text{Heaven graunt that we may never see these noes,} \\
&\text{For we shall then feele twise as many woes:} \\
&\text{But that of Ram, Lambe, Wooll, Cloth, still we have store:} \\
&\text{So shall the Drapers then thrive more and more.}\(^{384}\)
\end{align*}
\]

The pageant concludes with Fitz-Alwine discoursing upon the Drapers’ Company once again. The most interesting thing about this pageant to me is the things that it seems to be missing. Munday’s previous pageant was rife with advice for the new Mayor, most of it of the treat-the-people-well variety. Here, that sort of advice is lacking. In fact, it almost seems as if Himatia-Poleos is intended to glorify the Drapers more then the new Mayor. Perhaps Munday thought that his brother Draper did not need the advice. Or perhaps this is an example of Bergeron’s notion that the pageants moved from the basis in speech to spectacle.

\(^{383}\) Ibid., pps. 9-10.  
\(^{384}\) Ibid., pps., 11-12.
Turner-Wright notes that “old drapery” triumphed again with the 1615 election of John Jolles as Lord Mayor. Munday triumphed as well, for the Drapers spent over six hundred eighty five pounds on the pageant. This time, the “devise” to be used was that of Jason and his Argonauts crossed with the wool trade. Munday revived both the Fitz-Alwine and Time characters again, and had created

a goodly Argoe, shaped so neere as Art could yeeld it, to that of such auncient and honourable fame, as convaied Jason and his valiant Argonauts of Greece to fetch away the Golden fleece from Cholchos; we make use of that memorable historie, as fit both for the time and occasion.

It is not clear in the text whether the Argo was a pageant wagon or a barge given the nature of the “devise.” However, it may well be that Argo was afloat. Within the Argo, are Jason, the golden fleece, and his Argonauts as well as other mythical and semi-mythical characters such including Hercules, Orpheus, Castor, and Pollux. The latter are armored in “faire guilt armour” and “bearing triumphall Launces, wreathed

---

386 To put this in perspective, consider the average wage of a skilled craftsman or tradesman in London as about twenty pence per day. Simple multiplication yields one hundred twenty pence in a six day week, and, based upon a year of three hundred days, twenty four and a half pounds per year. The Drapers spent two thousand seven hundred percent of that figure. Munday’s pageant the previous year cost slightly less the two hundred pounds. This was apparently the Titanic of Mayoral Pageants.
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about with Lawrell, Shields honoured with the Impresse of the Golden fleece, and their heads circled with Lawrell, according to the manner of all famous Conquerors." 389

Sitting aloft, “playing with his love-lockes, and wantoning with him in all pleasing dailiance, to compasse the more settled assurance of his constancy,” is Medea. 390 Argo is being rowed by “divers comely Eunuches, which continually attended on Medea, and she favoring them but to passe under the fleece of Golde, had all their garments immediatly sprinkled over with golde.” 391

“The Shewes appointed for service on the Land” included “a faire and beautifull Shippe, stiled by the Lord Maiors name, and called the Joell, appearing to bee lately returned, from trafficking Wool and Cloth with other remote Countryes.” 392 Neptune and Themisus, “the one on a pelletted Lyon, the supporter to the Drapers Armes, and the other on a seahorse, belonging to the Lord Maiors Armorie, doe both (with their presence) approve this dayes delighting.” 393 They are in turn followed by a Golden Ram, bearing crest of the Drapers “having (on each side) a housewifely Virgin sitting, seriously imployed in Carding and Spinning Wooll for Cloth.” 394 A “Chariot of Mans life” follows “as also that other Monument of London and her twelve Daughters.” That last was presumably recycled from the previous year.
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To cap the whole thing off, the Lord Mayor and his entourage received a final group of visitors, this time:

Huntsmen, all clad in greene, with their 200 Bowes, Arrowes and Bugles, and a new slaine Deere carried among them. It savoureth of Earle Robert de la Hude, sometime the noble Earle of Huntington and Sonne in Law (by Marriage) to olde Fitz-Alwine raised by the Muses all-commanding power, to honour this Triumph with his Father. During the time of his out-lawed life, in the Forrest of merry Shirwood and elsewhere, while the cruell oppression of a most unnaturall covetous Brother hung heavy upon him, Gilbert de la hude, Lord Abbot of Christall Abbey, who had all, or most of his Lands in morgage: hee was commonly called Robin Hood, and had a gallant company of men (Out-lawed in the like manner) that followed his downcast fortunes, and honoured him as their Lord and Master; as little John Scathlocke Much the Millers soone, Right-hitting Brand, Fryar Tuck, and many more. In which condition of life we make instant use of him, and part of his brave Bowmen, fitted with Bowes and Arrowes, of the like strength and length, as good Records deliver testimonie, were then used by them in their killing of Deere.395

Although the device of the pageant differred in this year, the text is remarkably similar. Once again the text does not contain any advice to the mayor. The remarkable amount of money spent by the Drapers as well as Munday’s descriptions of the different parts of the pageant almost certainly fail to do it ant sort of justice. Once again, it is clear that the spectacle is what Munday is attempting to create. Further, he ends the pageant with characters from what may have been his most successful plays, the Robin Hood plays.

395 Ibid.
Chrysanaleia: golden fishing, 1616

The 1616 pageant celebrated the election of John Lemon of the Fishmongers’ Company. Although there is no record of how much was spent, Munday seemed satisfied with the generosity of that guild. As with Munday’s three previous pageants, the device differs, but the emphasis is on spectacle. Chrysanaleia is best known because images of the various units remain extant. In what may be one of the earliest examples of pre-visualization, the company commissioned a set of drawings from “Clay, a carver,” prior to their being constructed. The drawings were kept in the archives of the Fishmongers’ Company and were published in an 1844 reprint of the pageant commissioned by the guild.

Munday’s device for this Chrysanaleia was simple:

because Fishing is the absolute Embleme of our present intendement, and Fishmongers having beene such worthy Merchants in those reverend and authentique times: leaving their matter of Commerce and Merchandise, and ayming at their true Hierogliphical impresse for the dayes intended honour, thus we marshall the order of proceeding.

The pageant includes a fishing boat “called the Fishmongers Esperanza or Hope of London being in her true old shape, forme and proportion, yet dispensed withall in


397 Turner-Wright, 1929, 162.

398 Munday, Chrysanaleia, p. B.
some beantie, for the dayes honour.” 399 Aboard her are fishermen “drawing up their Nets, laden with living fish, and bestowing them bountifully among the people.” 400 Perhaps recalling his trip to the Continent, Munday next calls for “a crownded dolphin, “inclined much (by nature) to Musique,” with Anon a famous musician and poet on its back. 401 The dolphin has just saved the musician’s life “when Robbers and Pirates on the Seas, would maliciously have drowned him.” 402 Following Anon, the King of Moors on a golden leopard, “hurling gold and silver every way about him,” and surrounded by his vassal kings wearing “faire guilt Armours, and apt furniture thereto belonging.” 403 The kings are followed a leman tree, “in full and ample forme, richly laden with the fruite and flowers it beareth.” 404 The tree is followed by a flower arbor bearing the arms of other Fishmongers elected Lord Mayor, and a tomb in which “lyeth the imaginary body of Sir William Walworth sometime twise lord Maior of London and a famous Brother of the Fishmongers Company.” 405 Walworth, it would seem has been chosen by London’s Genius (rather than Time) to be a master of ceremonies in this pageant. Finally, the end of the procession arrives in the form of a chariot drawn by two mermen and two mermaids. Within the chariot is an angel. She is sitting above Richard I and, “with one hand... she holds his Crowne on fast, that neither forraine Hostilitie,
nor home-bred Trechecie should ever more shake it. In the other hand shee holds his striking Rodde.” 406 They are preceded by Truth, Vertue, Honor, Temperance, Fortitude, Zeale, Equity, and Conscience, who are “beating downe” Treason and Mutiny. 407 On the sides and the back of the pageant wagon ride Justice, Authority, Laws, Vigilancy, Peace, Plentie and Discipline, who “are best observed by their severall Emblems and properties, borne by each one, and their adornments answerable to them in like manner.” 408

*Sidero-Thriambos: or steele and iron, 1618*

Munday’s last full pageant was that of 1618, celebrating the inauguration of the Ironmongers’ Sir Sabastion Harvey. Bergeron notes that “Sir Walter Raleigh’s execution was placed on the same day as the Lord Mayor’s Show ‘that the pageants and fine shewes might drawe away the people from beholding the traguedie’…” 409 The pageant cost about five hundred twenty three pounds and unlike his previous work for the Ironmongers was well received. It appears that there were also issues with the weather.

In Consideracion of Anthony Mundyes good performance of his business undertaken and of the spoyling of his Pageant apparaile by the foule weather it was agreed to give him three powndes as a free guift of the Companie besides and above the Contract. 410

---
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The pageant is also the second upon which Munday’s son Richard worked with his father. The younger Munday was paid eight pence for making two “kettle drumme banners.”

Once again, spectacle holds the stage. Munday’s first unit is Lemnos, an imaginary island. There, within the “Ironmongers’ Mine,” and “divers of his one-eyed Cyclops about him,” Mulciber and his Cyclops are creating steel for his patrons. All are singing in “sweet Musicsll voyces, andd delicate variety of pleasing changes, doe out—weare their worke merrily, as scountiog no toyle tedious, thus beStowd to the Societies service: closing up every Stanza with Acier Dure, the worde or Moto belonging to the Companie.” All are surrounded by the four graces, Chrusos, Argurion, Calcos and Sideros, who represent four ages of the world, Golden, Silver, Bronze, and the Iron-Age “wherein wee live.”

Next, Triumph, “Commandresse, in Mettals of most usuall imployment” displays weapons of war an tools of peace. This is followed by a wagon with the Ironmongers’ crest, as well as Jupiter, “clad in a faire Armour, intended for the service of Mars.” They are drawn by two Ostriches. This unit is followed by a cannon “with all necessarie furnishiment, for charging and discharging, by her, as also diverse Chambers, to bee shot off as occasion serveth, and as the Maister Gunner and his Mate (there present) please to give direction, or performe the service in their owne persons.” Accompanying the cannon are mounted Knights in armor, and a unit of musketeers.

Ibid., see both sources.
The dialog in *Sidero-Thriambos* is limited to that of the Master Gunner and his mate, and to the British Bard who, acting in the role previously held by Fitz-Alwine, seems to speak with a Scots accent. There is no verbal advices to the new Mayor, and even the awakening of the Bard is handled without dialog. Visually, the pageant seems to have set a very marital tone. The characters in the pageant seem to echo that sentiment.

*Sidero-Thriambos* was the last pageant for which Munday had sole responsibility. He continued to work on pageants, at the age of sixty-three assisting Middleton in 1621 and again in 1623 as well. But it appears that his real interests at this point may have been centered on his work with *Stow’s Survey*.

Anthony Munday and the City of London

Munday’s non-polemic work for the City of London was in two separate works. The most well known of these is *Stow’s Survey*, for which he received a number of payments and benefits from the city. He also wrote *a breife chronicle, of the successe of times* which was published in 1611, for which he was awarded twenty nobles by the city, matched by a similar gift from the Goldsmiths Company. Turner-Wright speculates that his dedication to that company may have led to award of the 1611 pageant as well.

---

412 Turner-Wright, 1929, pps., 157, 158. A noble is six shillings, eight pence.
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Stow’s Survey

John Stow was born in London in 1524/5. He was the son of a tallow-chandler. We have no records of his education, but his ability as a writer and his fluency in both English and Latin languages as well as his knowledge of history and literature suggest that he attended school. He possessed a large manuscript collection some of which remains extant today. Although at one point suspected of harboring Catholic sympathies, Beer notes that this was most likely because his library contained titles that the Bishop of London found objectionable. The Lord Mayor, William Cecil, and the Privy Counsel all refused to act against Stow, when informed of objectionable titles in his library.

Committed to historical accuracy in his publications, Stow spent a great deal of time collecting historical records and documents. It seems likely that this is where he got the notion for his Survey. The Survey was first published in 1598. A second edition was published in 1603. It was expanded, updated and reprinted in 1603, 1607, 1611, 1615, 1618, and 1633. The start of Munday’s involvement with Stow is unclear. Turner-Wright suggests that they may have met at the guild hall. At some point prior to his death in 1605, Stow apparently made Munday what Turner-Wright refers to as his “Literary executor. Munday notes:

Much of his good mind he had formerly imparted to me, and some of his best collections lovingly delivered me, prevailing with mee so farre, by his importunate perswasions, to correct what I found amisse, and to proceed in the perfecting of a Worke so worthy; that being overcome by affection to him, but much more by respect and care of this Royall Citie, being birthplace and breeder to us both: I undertook.414

---

414 Qtd in Turner-Wright, 1929, p. 150.
By the time the 1618 edition of the *Survey* came out, Munday had been working on updating it for twelve years.\footnote{Ibid.} His work on that edition is, apparently difficult to spot. Turner-Wright also notes

> I spent several days in comparing the editions of Stow for 1603, 1618, and 1633, but found no personal touches in Mundy’s additions except his mention of his rides, his evident liking for the “proper little church” of St.-Mildred’s, near Allde’s shop, and his familiarity with his own parish of Cripplegate.\footnote{Ibid., n 17.}

Munday continued to work on the text and had was preparing another edition at the time of his death in 1633.

Munday’s writings in his last years, most especially his will seem to indicate that he was short of funds. This is perplexing to me. His leases from Elizabeth began to expire in 1606, but the last one did not expire until 1633. Further, Munday’s work on *Stow’s Survey* was not unrewarded. The 1618 edition garnered him sixty pounds from the City of London, as well as at least one smaller gift from St. Botolphs church. It is possible that other parishes presented in the text made gifts to Munday as well. In 1623 the City also granted him a pension of four pounds per year as well as “granted unto him yearly, during his natural life, the nomination and benefit of one person to be made free of this Cittie by redemption.”\footnote{Ibid., p. 169.} This benefit was transferred to his wife by the city upon Munday’s death. As with the advowson which he may or may not have received, this would have been worth a good bit of money annually.
His will indicates, however that his finances had declined by 1628 when he wrote it. He notes that he, “fayleinge of such fortunes (amountinge to Fortie or fiftie poundes yearlie) wch here to fore maintayned me and my former Charge substancially.” Yet Munday’s financial woes may not have been as dire as heretofore thought. His discussion prior income amounting to forty or fifty pounds has generally been taken to mean that he was in dire straits financially. It may be, however, that this language refers to the expiration of the Elizabethan leases that had been providing income. If this is the case, then we may be able to establish the value of the leases at forty to fifty pounds annually. The loss of this extra income would account for his discussion of reduced circumstances, in regards to his bequests to his children:

as for my Sonne Richard Mundy, and my two daughters Elizabeth and Pricilla, being all married, haveing had their severall portions already in bountyfull manner, and not knoweinge in what poore condition I married with this my present wife (haveinge indeed deceaved myselfe and her to benefitt them) their expectation from me can be nothinge, because they live in as good (if not better estate) then I did. Nevertheless, to shewe that I forgott them not, I have allowed my Wife Twelve pence apeece for each of them, which they maye take as a love token rather then in any respect of need they have.

In addition to the benefit from the city, his wife, Gillian, received ten pounds compensation for the 1633 edition of *Stow’s Survey* from the guilds as well. It is interesting that even after his death, Munday’s writing career left enough of a legacy to support his wife.
CHAPTER SIX -- CONCLUSIONS

Playwright, pamphleteer, translator, historian, pageant-master, royal messenger, and spy--this is certainly a disparate group of genres and jobs for one man. Yet Anthony Munday appears to have been all of these things. By all rights, because of the varied aspects of his life and works, Munday should be of interest to any student of Tudor/Stuart England. The wide range of time and scope of Munday’s written works offers the literary scholar a compendium of the tastes, trends, forms, and issues emerging in the early modern literary world over a fifty year period. At the same time, his varied activities offer the social historian a window into the nature and functions of an early modern professional writer within the broader framework of the rising middling classes.

Up to this point, scholars have failed to examine the whole Munday. Rather they have tried to examine discreet bits of Munday’s life and fit those parts into their preconceived notions of who Munday was and what were the literary merits of his works. Rather, Munday should be viewed as a case study of the professional author of early modern England. His career stretches over the reign of three monarchs, Elizabeth I, James I, and Charles I. During that time, he did as much exploration of genres as anyone, more than most, and more than all of the “major” players in the English literary trade. In a broader sense that career exemplifies the new potential for members of the middling classes to move from the traditional trades, create new professions, and thus raise their economic and social status.
These perspectives on Munday emerge from a re-examination of his life and place. This sort of case study of an early modern author and how that author also exemplifies those rising middling classes must be grounded on two things. First, and most obvious, is a return to the primary sources, what they say and do not say. The emphasis of such an examination must be on the sources themselves, rather than on speculation spun out from those sources.

Further, Munday’s life needs to be examined in totality, rather than concentrating on specific jobs, genres, or works. For it is in that totality that a true picture of the professional writer as a member of the upwardly mobile, middling classes can be seen. Munday’s life lends itself to such an examination because of the clear-cut chronological delineations that are evident in his life and work.

From 1577 to 1580, we find a period dominated by verses, translations of romances, and works offering moral instruction, all of which demonstrate the young author “cutting his teeth” on the tried and true and searching for a patron. From 1580 to 1584, Munday concentrated chiefly on works that reflect government propaganda and that corresponded to public interest in current affairs. This time span reflects the years in which he was most closely tied to Richard Topcliffe and some form of court patronage. From 1585 to 1588, Munday published the first of his romances and his early theatrical works. From 1588 until 1602 Munday’s focus shifts almost exclusively to playwriting. By 1589 references to his government service disappear from the primary sources except
for a 1606 commission to search for priests in Warwickshire in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot. His writing for the commercial theatre, therefore, parallels his dwindling ties to the court.

After 1602 Munday’s writing shifts from the commercial theatre to scenarios for civic pageantry. These years match the time in which the leases granted by Queen Elizabeth may have begun to generate income for him. It is probably no coincidence that by 1605 Munday no longer identifies himself as a messenger of the sovereign’s chamber, but rather as a “citizen and Draper of London.” After 1623, in the last years of his life his literary output slowed. Primarily, it seems that he was involved in the re-editing of Stow’s *Survey of London*.

Throughout all of these stages in his career, however, Munday offered up a fairly regular stream of translations regardless of his then specific focus in genre. Perhaps he used these works as a means to maintain contact with the general reading interests of the literate citizens of London.

The shifting roles of apprentice, polemicist, persuivant, translator, playwright, pageant-master, and “citizen and Draper” are not unconnected. When placed within the context of his whole life, they become stages in his attempts to better himself through his special skills, in his case writing. As we have seen, regardless of what stage Munday may have been in his life, he always wrote, and his writing was usually for commercial gain, be it via the press, the theatre, or civic spectacles for the other citizens of London. That thread in his
writing is where Munday the early modern author converges with Munday the member of the middling classes seeking status and income in the increasingly fluid social milieu of early modern England.

Future Research
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Future Research

There is still much to be done with Munday. Further investigation of the leases from Queen Elizabeth might yield a clear value of those leases in terms of annual income. That in turn might shed light on whether his switch from writing for the professional stage to writing civic pageants was grounded in his artistic desires rather than in his finances. The current work of Professor Nelson into the life of Edward deVere will hopefully lend insight into his relationship to Munday. Such insight might also lead to the discovery of Munday’s relationships with other patrons. In a different vein, of specific interest to me is the relationship between Munday and both the Jesuit Mission and the Catholics in England.

Finally, this case study approach to Munday needs to be applied to other authors of the period. Viewing Munday in that light has offered a case study outside of the usual “life and works of…” approach, and, as such, provides us with a clearer picture of both the man, and of his place within the world of early modern England. Perhaps the best candidates for this sort of appraisal are the other lesser-known early modern
writers such as Thomas Kyd, Thomas Dekker, George Chapman, John Fletcher, and John Webster.

Heretofore these men have, for the most part, been observed in light of their works. A more honest appraisal of their place might be yielded through reversing the traditional paradigm and looking at their works as part of their lives.
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## APPENDIX--A TIMELINE OF THE LIFE OF ANTHONY MUNDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title/Event</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Two -- 1553-1579</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>19 July 1553 (ca.)</td>
<td>Queen Mary I ascends the throne.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td></td>
<td>Munday’s traditional birth year based upon his age at death as carved on non-extant tombstone but reported in Stow’s Survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>17 Nov 1558</td>
<td>Mary I dies, Elizabeth I ascends to the throne and the Elizabethan era begins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>13 Oct 1560</td>
<td>Munday baptized in St. Gregory’s by St. Paul’s. He is thought to have been born just prior to this date.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last evidence of Earl of Oxford’s Men until Edward deVere (seventeenth Earl of Oxford) reconstitutes them ca. 1579.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turner-Wright speculates that Munday may have started as a student with expatriot French scholar Claudius Hollyband.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>9 Jan 1570/71</td>
<td>Father (John) and Mother (Jane) were both deceased by this time. Shapiro speculates that Munday was raised locally by relatives from this point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>24 Aug 1576</td>
<td>Munday apprenticed to John Allde, Stationer of London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Three -- 1577-1612</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>5 June 1577</td>
<td>Munday has a commendatory verse published in A gorgeous gallery of gallant inventions.</td>
<td>Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Nov 1577</td>
<td>The Defense of povertie against the Desire of worldly riches, Dialogue wise collected by Anthonie Mondaye. Partially extant.</td>
<td>Moral Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haynes and Hess suggest that Munday was advised or ordered to the Continent by Edward deVere. Chambers suggests, cautiously that he may have been working for Cecil. There is no direct evidence to support these suppositions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 Jan 1577/78</td>
<td>Allde fined by the Stationers for keeping an apprentice without registering him with the Stationers’ Company.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>20 Aug 1578</td>
<td>Allde fined by the Stationers for &quot;printing iij ballades for Edward White and Mundaiies Dreame for hym selfe without lycence.&quot;</td>
<td>Romantic Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rome Trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Fall 1579</td>
<td>Return from Rome</td>
<td>Tabloid News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 Oct 1579</td>
<td>Newes from the north.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Oct 1579</td>
<td>The Mirroure of Mutabilitie.</td>
<td>Moral Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

418 For publications, the year listed in column one is the year of publication. If a date is given in column two, it is the date of entry in the Stationers’ Register. In the case of Civic Pageants, which were rarely entered in the Stationers’ Register, the date in column two is the performance date unless otherwise noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Mar 1580</td>
<td>&quot;a ballot made by Anthony Munday of th[e] encouragement of an Englishe Soldior to his fellow mates.&quot; Not extant.</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Apr 1580</td>
<td><em>A View of Sundry Examples.</em></td>
<td>Moral Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sept 1578</td>
<td>Payne of Pleasure compiled by N. Britten. Attributed to Munday as the first poem is &quot;Author’s Dream” which may be the piece for which Allde was fined in 1578.</td>
<td>Moral Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Oct 1580</td>
<td><em>A Second and Third Blast of Retrait From Plaises and Theaters.</em></td>
<td>Anti-theatrical Polemic and partially a Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Jan 1580/81</td>
<td>Munday before the London Court of Aldermen on 12 January 1580 to prove that he was twenty-one or older, and receive his inheritance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 July 1581</td>
<td><em>A breefe discourse of the taking of Edmund Campion.</em></td>
<td>Political Polemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Nov 1581</td>
<td>Munday testifies at Campion’s trial providing hearsay evidence that appears to be taken almost directly from his <em>English Romayne Life.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec 1581</td>
<td>Edmund Campion executed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec 1581</td>
<td><em>A courtly controversie, betweene looue and learning.</em> Not entered in the Stationers’ Register.</td>
<td>Moral Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Dec 1581</td>
<td><em>The true reporte of the prosperoues successe which God gaue unto our English souldiours. Not entered in the Stationers’ Register.</em></td>
<td>News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mar 1582</td>
<td><em>A breefe answer made vnto two seditious pamphlets.</em></td>
<td>Political Polemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mar 1582</td>
<td><em>A discoverie of Edmund Campion.</em> Printed 29 Jan 1582/3</td>
<td>Political Polemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May 1582</td>
<td><em>A breefe and true reporte, of the execution of certaine traytours at Tiborne.</em></td>
<td>Political Polemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June 1582</td>
<td><em>The English Romayne lyfe.</em></td>
<td>Political Polemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The English Romayne lyfe. 2nd Printing.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A discoverie of Edmund Campion. 2nd printing.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A breefe answer made vnto two seditious pamphlets. 2nd printing.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td><em>The paine of pleasure. 2nd printing.</em></td>
<td>Moral Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td><em>A vvatch-vvoord to Englande.</em></td>
<td>Political Polemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A vvatch-vvoord to Englande. 2nd printing.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Ballad in praise of the navy.&quot; Partially extant.</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Two godly and learned sermons. Not entered in the Stationers’ Register.</em></td>
<td>Religious/ Moral Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>12 Nov 1584</td>
<td><em>Fedele and Fortonio.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Oct 1585</td>
<td>Munday’s daughter Rose christened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>19 Jan 1585</td>
<td>Munday’s daughter buried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1585/86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>9 Jan 1586/7</td>
<td>Munday’s daughter Prycilla christened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 Nov 1586</td>
<td><em>The true image of Christian love.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 July 1584</td>
<td><em>A banquet of daintie conceits.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Jan 1587</td>
<td>Munday’s son Richard christened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1587/88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>20 Nov 1587</td>
<td><em>The famous, pleasant, and variable historie, of Palladine of England.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Munday was responsible for the arrest of puritan Giles Wigginton on a warrant issued by Archbishop of London, John Whitgift at the start of the Martin Marprelate affair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looney speculates that Munday serves as one of Oxford’s secretaries; and with Nash, Greene, and perhaps Oxford himself, writing to defend Anglican bishops against Marprelate attacks 1588-92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Munday is named in the Marprelate tract <em>Just Censure and Reproofe</em> in which Whitgift is lampooned addressing Munday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Palmerin D’Oliua.</em> Not entered in the Stationers’ Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>9 Jan 1589/90</td>
<td><em>The honorable, pleasant and rare conceited historie of Palmendos.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Sept 1589</td>
<td>A reprint of <em>The Admirable Deliverance of 266 Christians,</em> this time by J Raynard (as opposed to the earlier editions where the hero was John Foxe. In Richard Hakluyt’s Voyages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Sept 1589</td>
<td>Munday’s daughter Anne christened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The declaration of the Lord de la Noue.</em> Not entered in the Stationers’ Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Jan 1589/90</td>
<td><em>The First Book of Amadis de Gaule</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter Four -- 1590-1602**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>26 Mar 1590</td>
<td><em>The coppie of the Anti-Spaniardi.</em></td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The coppie of the Anti-Spaniardi.</em> 2nd printing.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 June 1582</td>
<td><em>The English Romayne lyfe.</em> 3rd printing.</td>
<td>Political Polemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The Booke of John a Kent and John a Cumber,” Dec, 1590.</td>
<td>Play MS (Comedy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>8 Aug 1592</td>
<td><em>Gerileon of England.</em></td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>16 Apr 1592</td>
<td><em>Archaioptutos.</em></td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1 May 1592</td>
<td><em>Axiochus... Heereto is annexed a sweet speech or oration, spoken at the tryumphe at White-hall before her Maiestie, by the page to the right noble Earle of Oxenforde.</em></td>
<td>Public Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td></td>
<td>“The Booke of Sir Thomas More.”</td>
<td>Play MS (Drama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>9 Jan 1589</td>
<td>The defence of contraries. Not entered in the Stationers' Register.</td>
<td>Moral Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Aug 1594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Jan 1589/90</td>
<td>The First Booke of Primaleon of Greece.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Apr 1592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Oct 1594</td>
<td>The Second Booke of Amadis de Gaule.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Munday in the low countries on business of an unknown nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter Five -- 1596-1633

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>13 Feb 1581</td>
<td>The seconde part, of the no lesse rare, historie of Palmerin of England. Contains part one as well.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Aug. 1596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 July 1596</td>
<td>The orator.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Aug 1594</td>
<td>The second booke of Primaleon of Greece.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>13 Feb 1581</td>
<td>The seconde part, of the no lesse rare, historie of Palmerin of England. Contains part one as well.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Aug. 1596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 July 1596</td>
<td>The orator.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Aug 1594</td>
<td>The second booke of Primaleon of Greece.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td></td>
<td>The first part of the honourable historie, of Palmerin d'Oliua. Partially extant.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother Redcap. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A &quot;comodey for the corte.&quot; Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chance Medley. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>10 Apr 1592</td>
<td>The fift booke of the most pleasant and [d]electable historie of Amadis de Gaule.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Oct 1594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Frenche chirurgerye.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The funerall of Richard Coeur de Lion. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valentine and Orson. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>26 Jan 1599</td>
<td>A vromans vvoorth.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Book of physic.&quot; Not extant.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A breefe treatise of the vertue of the crosse:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Tudor. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>19 Jun 1600</td>
<td>Fair Constance of Rome. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bel-vedere or The garden of the Muses.</td>
<td>Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;To Colin Clout&quot; in England's Helicon.</td>
<td>Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fortune's Tennis. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Tudor. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Aug 1600</td>
<td>The first part of the true and honorable historie, of the life of Sir John Old-castle.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1 Dec 1600</td>
<td>The downfall of Robert, Earle of Huntington.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Dec 1600</td>
<td>The death of Robert, Earle of Huntington</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Mar 1601</td>
<td>The rising of Cardinal Wolsey. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Mar 1601</td>
<td>The strangest adventure that ever happened.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Mar 1601</td>
<td>The strangest adventure that ever happened. 2nd. pr.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>27 Oct 1601</td>
<td>The true knowledge of a man's own self.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Mar 1595</td>
<td>Caesar's Fall or The Two Shapes. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Feb 1603</td>
<td>The heaven of the mynde, or The myndes heaven. Extant in manuscript form only</td>
<td>Moral Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Oct 1601</td>
<td>The Set at Tennis. Not extant.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>29 Oct 1603</td>
<td>A true and admirable historie, of a maiden of Confolens.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>5 Sept 1604</td>
<td>The dume divine speaker.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>29 Oct 1605</td>
<td>The triumphes of re-united Britania. Not entered in the Stationers' Register. This is the first extant instance of Munday identifying himself as “citizen and draper of London” within the title.</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606-1608</td>
<td>Mayoral pageants for the city of London are missing during this period. Again, Munday's involvement seems likely.</td>
<td>News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>In the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, Richard Vaughan, the Bishop of London commissions Monday and two other pursuivants to search Warwickshire for priests.</td>
<td>News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Oct 1608</td>
<td>The conversion of a most noble lady of Fraunce.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 July 1579</td>
<td>The admirable delivrance of 266 Christians by John Reynard. First separate printing.</td>
<td>News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Edition/Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>29 Oct 1609</td>
<td>Camp-bell, or the ironmongers faire field. Not entered in the Stationers’ Register.</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The first part, of the no lesse rare, then excellent and stately historie, of the famous and fortunate prince, Palmerin of England.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>11 Aug 1600</td>
<td>Bel-vedere or the garden of the Muses.</td>
<td>Civic Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Nov 1600</td>
<td>Lonndes loue, to the Royal Prince Henrie. Not entered in Stationers’ Register.</td>
<td>Civic Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 May 1610</td>
<td>The Mayoral Pageant for this year is missing. That Munday received a payment of £80 from the Merchant Tailors for costumes and duplication of the book suggests that he wrote it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>29 Oct 1611</td>
<td>A briefe chronicle, of the success of times.</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td></td>
<td>Munday testifies against suspected Puritans Hugh Holland and Thomas Bell at their trials for recusancy.</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td></td>
<td>Munday assisted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>29 Oct 1614</td>
<td>Himatia-Poleos.</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>30 Oct 1615</td>
<td>Metropolis coronata.</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palmerin d’Oliua.</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>29 Oct 1616</td>
<td>Chrysanaleia.</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palmerin d’oliua. 2nd printing.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The first part of the no lesse rare, then excellent and stately historie, of the famous and fortunate prince Palmerin of England. 2nd Printing.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td></td>
<td>The pageant was written by Thomas Middleton (The Triumphs of Honor and Industry). Munday received £5 from the Grocers “for his paines in drawing a project for this busynes.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>2 Mar 1618</td>
<td>The famous and renownd historie of Primaleon of Greece.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 Oct 1618</td>
<td>Sidero-Thriambos.</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The survey of London. This is the first edition featuring Munday’s work.</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Apr 1592</td>
<td>The third booke of Amadis de Gaule. Contains the fourth book as well.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Oct 1594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Nov 1613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archontorologion.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ancient, famous and honourable history of Amadis de Gaule. Books one and two. 2nd printing. Often bound with the 1618 edition of the third and fourth books.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The first part of the true &amp; honorable history, of the life of Sir Iohn Old-castle. Another printing, this one citing Shakespeare as the author.</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Mayoral Pageant for this year is missing. Munday submitted a “plot for the devices of the lord mayor’s pageant,” to the Ironmongers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant, <em>The Triumphs of Integrity</em>, by Middleton again. Munday, now seventy, was responsible for a water show, <em>The triumphs of the Golden Fleece</em>, that was based extensively upon his work from <em>Metropolis Coronata</em> and included the same Argo, refurbished, from that show.</td>
<td>Mayoral Pageant</td>
<td>The theater of honour and knight-hood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Munday buried at St. Stephens, Coleman Street, London.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The survey of London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The survey of London, 2nd pr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>