

Ecclesia, Anima and Spiritual Priesthood in
Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*

For that in those things wherein man's greatst excellency consists, the Soul, and its Faculties, we are told by Scripture-philosophy, that all souls are equal, made so by God, all come out of the Hand of God with equal Faculties, and when they return to God, shall in their degrees, be Crowned with equal Glory ... All souls are of the same Kind and Order; Souls know no Sexes ... In Christ Jesus neither Male nor Female, all stand alike related to Christ ... stand in equality of relation in identity of Sex.¹

It has been suggested that Aemilia Lanyer challenges the Anglican consensus of her time at several points in *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* (1611), particularly in the title poem, where, in an apparently 'transgressive' act, she seems to ascribe 'those Keyes Saint Peter did possesse' (109.1369) to her patron, Margaret Clifford, Countess Dowager of Cumberland.² According to Micheline White, this vision of 'a woman wielding the spiritual power of St. Peter's keys must surely have startled Lanyer's readers'. White suggests Lanyer's interpretation of the *potestas clavium* ('authority of the keys'), draws on a 'tradition of dissent regarding women's supposed inability to access the gifts associated with the Christian priesthood', and her 'representation of women's hieratic gifts contributes to this tradition of dissent'.³ However, Lanyer's treatment of these themes is in many ways conventional, grounded in the Protestant insistence on the devolution of spiritual priesthood onto all believers as members of the Church that is the *sponsa Christi* ('bride of Christ'), which finds allegorical expression in the soul of Margaret Clifford. Moreover, Lanyer draws upon eminently orthodox patristic and medieval exegetical traditions which would have been extremely familiar, at least to her more learned Anglican readers. What is perhaps more significant for an understanding of Lanyer's

purpose in *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* is not her alleged theological radicalism, but the depth and sophistication of her theological engagement with the nature of the *potestas clavium*, and contemporary polemics concerning the spiritual priesthood of women in an Anglican context. This engagement results in an eminently Protestant reappropriation of the veneration of Mary as *spiritualis sacerdos* ('spiritual priest').

Certainly, the title poem is distinguished by a subtle interrogation of the Petrine texts: Matthew 16:17-19; Luke 22:32; John 21:15-17, interpreted as evidence of the primacy of Peter in the apostolic Church on both sides of the confessional divide throughout the Reformation. That the *potestas clavium* conferred on Peter by Christ (Matthew 16:19), but promised by him to all of the apostles (Matthew 18:18), and conferred on them by the power of the spirit (John 20:22-3) was the exclusive preserve of a sacramentally ordained priesthood was reaffirmed for Roman Catholic Europe in the sixth dogmatic chapter of session fourteen of the Council of Trent (25 November 1551).⁴ However, Anglicanism eschewed a sacramentally ordained priesthood, but accepted the sacerdotal interpretation of Matthew 16:19.⁵ While such Papalists as Bellarmine emphasize the *plenitudo apostolicae potestatis* ('fullness of apostolic power') invested in Peter as the first bishop of Rome, Lanyer, in keeping with Anglican doctrine, rejects that this power inheres in the Pope because of his primacy in succession to Peter. However, through adroit employment of the exegetical tradition, particularly sapiential and Mariological imagery, Lanyer sidesteps the controversies surrounding the nature and extent of the *potestas clavium*, and the precise interpretation of Matthew 16:19, which dogged the Anglican Church during her lifetime, culminating in the Aristotelian niceties of the Westminster Assembly. These controversies centred on whether the *potestas clavium* conveyed 'a generalized power of the universal church, a power reserved to the Apostles, a power given to all believers, or a power delegated or communicated by believers to the pastors of the church'.⁶ Lanyer accepts Peter as *primum*

subjectum ('first subject') of this power, but throughout the volume she focusses on the subsequent dispensation of the *potestas clavium* to the entire Church, figured forth in the title poem by the soul of Margaret Clifford, itself an allegory of *Ecclesia as sponsa Christi*. This portrait of a soul draws on the attendant imagery of the *thalamus* ('nuptial bedchamber') in the Song of Songs and the concept of *Maria Ecclesia*, or Mary as the Church as *sponsa Christi*, in patristic and medieval exegesis, albeit deployed in a distinctly Anglican context. However, Lanyer does not address the ecclesiological implications of the fullness of the *potestas clavium* as given to all Christians in spiritual priesthood, including women.

The ministrall jurisdiction of the Anglican Church was a contentious issue throughout Lanyer's lifetime. Notwithstanding the fissiparous characteristics of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Anglicanism, that a woman had exercised civil, if not spiritual, jurisdiction under the Elizabethan Settlement led to persistent and widespread charges across Roman Catholic Europe of a recrudescence in the Church of England of Montanism, often referred to as Pepuzianism due to its geographical origin. According to contemporary sectarian polemic, Anglicans walk in the heterodox shadow of Montanus and his fellow prophets, Maximilla and Prisca (or Priscilla), because these second-century 'Peputian Hereticks' preach that women are possessed 'of such souls, as that they may be Priests', as Donne puts it.⁷ Given this hotly contested accusation of heresy, Lanyer is careful to depict the soul of her patron, in contradistinction to Margaret Clifford herself, as an allegorical personification of *Ecclesia as sponsa*. It is hardly the case, as Catherine Keohane has claimed, that Lanyer 'literalizes' the relationship between the *sponsus* and his beloved, 'substituting a real woman for Christ's figurative bride, the Church'.⁸ Rather, she draws on long-standing exegetical traditions, specifically the hermeneutic topos of the soul as *sponsa*, crystallized by Ambrose in Western Christendom, but more familiar to a Jacobean, Protestant audience in the pithy definition ascribed to Hugh of St Victor: *Sponsus est Deus; sponsa est*

anima ('the Bridegroom is God; the bride is the soul').⁹ This concept of the *sponsa* as *anima sitiens deum* ('the soul thirsting for God'), is also found in Bernard of Clairvaux's eighty-six sermons on the Song of Songs, which retained their popularity throughout Protestant Europe, including England.¹⁰ Indeed, 'the continuity of the tradition between the Middle Ages and the Reformation is strikingly evident from an examination of the authorities utilized by the English commentators', as 'in commentary after commentary', the 'dominant explicit influence of Augustine and Bernard' is discernible, allied to the 'favorable citation' of such patristic authorities as 'Gregory the Great, Ambrose, Jerome', and such medieval exegetes as Rupert of Deutz and Hugh of St Victor.¹¹

This exegetical tradition was summarized for sixteenth-century readers across the sectarian divide in two great alphabetical compendia: the *Isagoge ad sacras literas* of Xanthus Pagninus, first published in Cologne in 1511, and the highly influential *Silva allegoriarum otius sacrae scripturae* of Hieronymus Lauretus, first published in Barcelona in 1570.¹² Allied to the Origenistic concept that the soul of a just person is the bride of the Divine Word, is the concept of the *anima ecclesiastica* ('ecclesial soul'), whereby the individual soul dilates to become one with the *sponsa* as *Ecclesia*. This is reflected in John Harmar's translation of Beza's commentary on the Song of Songs: 'Euery faithful soule' is found 'in the person of the spouse (by whom is vnderstood al the company of the faithfull)'.¹³ Moreover, Origen's identification of the *sponsa* as *anima ecclesiastica* gradually became associated with the Ambrosian concept of *Maria Ecclesia* in patristic and medieval exegesis, still readily accessible to a Jacobean, Protestant audience. In fact, most Protestants continued to interpret the Song of Songs as a dialogue between Christ and the faithful soul, or the faithful as the soul of the Church, or a dialogue between Christ and the Church, if not Mary as that Church.¹⁴

It is highly likely that Lanyer had sufficient Latin to consult such alphabetical compendia as Pagninus and Lauretius, in addition to the numerous glossed versions of the Latin bible, from postillated editions of the Vulgate to the so-called Protestant Vulgate, first published in London in 1579-80, with significant revisions to both text and gloss in 1590, 1596, and 1693.¹⁵ Indeed, the very title of Lanyer's volume, *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*, is neither a direct quotation from the Vulgate, as some critics have assumed, nor a botched conflation of 2 Kings 16:16; 18:28 ('Salve rex') and Matthew 27:29; Mark 15:26; John 19:21 ('Ave rex Judaeorum'), which might suggest that Lanyer's latinity was exiguous.¹⁶ Rather, this title suggests a nexus of Latin allusions hitherto overlooked. In addition to a possible echo of the parentation in honour of Romulus in Livy 1.16.3, 'salve deus, salve rex, salve parens urbis Romanae', Lanyer's salutation echoes those found in Latin liturgical drama, epitomized by the acclamation of Christ by the Magi in the twelfth-century *Le Jeu d'Hérode*, preserved in the so-called Fleurie playbook.¹⁷ This type of *salutatio* not only informed the opening line of the *Oratio ad sanctam crucem* according to Sarum use, 'Salve, salve rex sanctorum', and such Catholic motets as *Salve rex regum* by Orlando di Lasso, but also the numerous Lutheran contrafacta of the Marian hymn, *Salve Regina*, including that given by George Joye in his *Ortulus anime* of 1530.¹⁸

Indeed, Lanyer's text is saturated with themes and images informed by the classical tradition, and patristic and medieval exegesis. Her title poem opens with a celestial vision of Elizabeth as Cynthia, amounting to a visual contrafactum of the *Maria Synthronos* ('Mary enthroned with Christ the King') motif that emerged in the West in the mid twelfth-century, in which the *sponsus* shares his throne with his mother as *sponsa*.¹⁹ In a conscious evocation of the Virgin Mary 'crown'd with glory from above' (98.1089), the Virgin Queen assumes the role of the *sponsa* in glory who figures forth the Church Triumphant, 'crown'd with everlasting Sov'raigntie':

Where Saints and Angells do attend her Throne,
And she gives glorie unto God alone. (51.7-8)

Our gaze is then directed earthward to the Church Militant figured forth in the ‘blessed Soule’ (51.11) of Margaret Clifford, who attended Elizabeth in death.²⁰ Lanyer’s ejaculation, ‘Long may thy Soule be pleasing in his sight’ (53.66) is echoed at a later juncture, where the Countess herself is described as ‘pleasing in thy Maker’s sight’ (62.249-50). At certain points in the title poem Lanyer speaks to Margaret Clifford directly, giving a literal, albeit panegyric, description of her attributes to the audience as bystanders, but we are also presented with an abstract personification of her soul as the *anima ecclesiastica*: the ‘Deere Spouse of Christ’ (101.1170).

Lanyer’s address to her patron initially refers to ‘thy sad soule’ (52.34) and ‘the sorrowes of thy Soul’ (53.50), recalling, albeit obliquely, the unhappy state of the Countess’s earthly marriage to the buccaneering George Clifford, in the manner of her later reference to ‘Octaviaes wrongs, and his neglects’ (60.216). Here, Lanyer echoes Samuel Daniel’s ‘A Letter sent from Octavia to her husband Marcus Anthonius into Egipt’, entered in the Stationers’ Register on 9 January 1599, with its dedicatory sonnet ‘To the right Honourable and most vertuous Ladie, the Ladie Margaret Countesse of Cumberland.’ The particular significance of Lanyer’s examples of Cleopatra and Rosamund Clifford find notable parallels in Daniel’s ‘The Complaint of Rosamond’ and ‘Octavia’, even though ‘The Complaint of Rosamond’ is dedicated to Mary, Countess of Pembroke.²¹ However, this sorrow dissipates with the indwelling of the heavenly ‘Bridegroom’ (54.77) in ‘his Tabernacle’ (56.129). Lanyer assures her patron that the *sponsus* has ‘full possession of thine heart, / From whose sweet love thy Soule can never part’ (116.1519-20). Similarly, she enjoins the dedicatee to

‘Take this faire Bridegroom in your soules pure bed’ (20.42) in ‘To the Ladie Susan’, and there is further recourse to the *thalamus* imagery of the Song of Songs in ‘To the Ladie Lucie’. Lanyer promises the Countess of Bedford ‘your faire soule may sure and safely rest, / When he is sweetly seated in your brest’ (33.20-1). It is between the ‘brests’ of Margaret Clifford’s ‘constant soule’ (108.1344), in marked contrast to the ‘perjur’d soule’ (61.230) of her earthly husband’s putative, albeit equally wanton, kinswoman, ‘Faire Rosamund’ (61.225), that this ‘Sweet of sweets’ (108.1344) abides.²² This image of *divinae suavitatis* (‘divine sweetness’) draws on the motif of Christ as the *fasciculus myrrhae* or bittersweet bundle of ‘pure mirrhe’ (107.1319), resting in the bosom of the *sponsa*, who is generally interpreted as *Maria Ecclesia*, welcoming ‘Her Sonne, her Husband, Father, Saviour, King’ (95.1023).²³ Because of her identification with the Church, Mary has long been venerated as *spiritualis sacerdos*, and never more so than in post-Tridentine devotional works. By contrast, Lanyer’s concept of *Ecclesia* is uncompromisingly Anglican, but she projects the concept of the spiritual priesthood of *Maria Ecclesia*, stemming from patristic and medieval exegesis, onto the soul of Margaret Clifford in an artful reappropriation of this uncompromisingly Roman Catholic concept. Similarly, the ‘righteous Soules’ (55.106) of the aristocratic women known to the Countess, if not Lanyer personally, are also associated with the spiritual priesthood of Mary, albeit deployed in an Anglican context which endorses the universal priesthood of believers. Mary’s spiritual priesthood is represented as potentially open to her female readers, in contradistinction to her matchless position as *spiritualis sacerdos* in contemporary Roman Catholic devotion. However, Lanyer does not speculate on the ecclesiological implications of the *potestas clavium* being given to all Christians, including women, in spiritual priesthood.

There are certain parallels between Lanyer’s concept of the *potestas clavium*, and her ascription of the spiritual power to heal and shepherd to the *sponsa*, in patristic and medieval

ordinals and consuetudinaries. However, her allusions to women exercising episcopal and presbytal powers, albeit mediated through the typology of *Ecclesia* as *sponsa*, are more readily informed by contemporary sectarian polemic concerning the role of women in the Anglican Church on both sides of the confessional divide. It is simply not the case that Lanyer's 'work is all the more remarkable since there was no significant discussion about women and the priesthood in mainstream Elizabethan or Jacobean discourse'.²⁴ Moreover, this discussion redounds to a decisive turning point in the attitude of the early church toward women in ecclesiastical orders, and episcopal and presbytal office in particular: the emergence of the New Prophecy in Asia Minor in the late second century (156-72). This movement, known as Montanism from the mid fourth century, spread throughout the Roman Empire until the sixth century. During this period, the followers of Montanus, Maximilla and Prisca, were referred to by a number of disparaging epithets which became bywords for heresy.²⁵ As the eighteenth-century patristic scholar, Nathaniel Lardner, explains, they were 'called Montanists from Montanus; Phrygians and Cata-Phrygians from the country where they sprang up; Pepuzians from a village in Phrygia, which was respected by them as another Jerusalem.'²⁶ The initial eschatological impetus of the New Prophecy centred on the villages of Pepuza and Tymio: the location of the imminent Parousia according to the prophets. However, the term *Peputiani* ('Pepuzians' or 'Peputians'), used to describe Anglicans in sectarian polemic during sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was not employed in the context of apocalypticism; rather, the heretical governance of the Anglican Church by a woman in the matter of Maximilla and Prisca.

By the early third century, the New Prophecy exercised a particular hold on the North African church, evinced by *The Passion of Saints Perpetua and Felicitas*, and the works of Tertullian. Contrary to later heresiologists, it seems likely Tertullian never actually seceded from the Christian Church in Carthage, though for a while at least he regarded the New

Prophecy as orthodox in most matters of doctrine and praxis. Yet although he accepted the prophetic calling of women, as *Against Marcion* evinces, he consistently condemned the appointment of women to episcopal and presbyteral office.²⁷ In *The Prescription Against Heretics* he inveighs against women, probably Marcionites, who teach (*docere*), dispute (*contendere*), conduct exorcisms (*exorcismos agere*), undertake cures (*curationes repromittere*), and even baptize (*tingere*).²⁸ Paradoxically, his views on women in ministerial offices did not change under the influence of the New Prophecy, at a time when women taught, healed, baptized, and offered the Eucharist within the movement. According to *On the Veiling of Virgins*, a woman must not speak in church, teach, baptize, offer the Eucharist, or claim any manly function, let alone the *sacerdotale officium* ('priestly office') of the episcopate and presbyterate.²⁹ Here, Tertullian neglects to mention *exomologesis* ('confession'): the penitential rite involving public discipline and ecclesiastical absolution, but elsewhere he identifies the remission and retention of sins, which he equates with the *potestas clavium*, as one of those functions proper to men alone.³⁰ Certainly, later heresiologists, especially Epiphanius and Augustine, took pains to create the impression that the sacramental ordination of women was confined to heterodox Christians, especially followers of the New Prophecy. Epiphanius focuses on the mariolatrous Collyridians and what he erroneously identified as a Tertullianist sect of Montanism known as the Pepuzians, Quintillians or Artotyrites, best known to a Jacobean, Protestant audience through Bullinger's *Decades*.³¹

Moreover, the vestigial memory of women bishops and presbyters was associated with Montanism throughout the middle ages on Augustine's authority.³² This culminated in the charge levelled against Elizabeth by Counter-Reformation commentators across Europe that she had presumed to declare herself *Supremum Caput Ecclesiae Anglicanae* ('Supreme Head of the Anglican Church'), even though Elizabeth herself settled on the title of Supreme

Governor in the final wording of the Act of Supremacy 1558 (i Eliz.c.i), eventually passed on 29 April 1559.³³ That her dominion had embraced Pepuzianism remained the topic of considerable sectarian debate, not only during Elizabeth's reign, but throughout the seventeenth century.³⁴ In England, the debate was sparked by a speech addressed to the House of Lords by Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York (1555-9), opposing the Second Bill of Supremacy which did refer to Elizabeth as *Supremum Caput Ecclesiae Anglicanae*.³⁵ In his speech, usually dated to 18 March 1559, Heath states he is against the bill because it would bestow a 'spirituall government' on Elizabeth as 'supream head of the church of England, ymmediat and next under God'. This 'spirituall government' consists of four principal functions, 'wherof the first is to loose and binde, when our Saviour Jesus Christ, in ordeyninge Peter to be the cheffe governor of his church', said '*Tibi dabo claves regni caelorum*' (Matthew 16:19: 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven').³⁶ Regarding the 'second pointe of spiritual government', Heath refers to 'these words of our Saviour Jesus Christ, spoken unto Peter' in John 21:15-17, *Pasce, pasce, pasce*, before pointing out that 'her highness, beyinge a woman by birthe and nature, is not qualyfyed by God's worde to feed the flock of Chryst', at least according to 'Paul's doctryne'. Heath cites 1 Corinthians 14:34-5, and 1 Timothy 2:12, concluding 'her highness may not entermeddle her self' with feeding Christ's lambs and sheep, 'therefore she cannot be supream head of Chryst's church here in this realme.' Heath moves on to the 'third and cheffe pointe of spiritual government', grounded in 'the wordes of our Saviour Jesus Christ, spoken unto Peter' in Luke 22:32, whereby he is charged 'to confirme his brethren, and ratifie them bothe by holsome doctryne, and administracion of the blessed sacraments. But to preach or mynister the holy sacraments, a woman may not; neither may she be supreme head of the church of Chryst.' Finally, Heath turns to the 'fourthe and last pointe of spiritual government', the 'excommunication and spiritual punishment of all such as shall approve

themselves not to be the obedient children of Chryst's church'. Citing Matthew 18:17 and Ephesians 4:11-12, he concludes that 'a woman, in the degrees of Chryst's church, is not called to be an apostel, nor evangelst, nor to be a shepherd, neyther a doctor or preacher. Therfor she cannot be supreme head of Christ's militant church, nor yet of any part therof.'³⁷

In *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* Lanyer not only ascribes the functions of shepherd, doctor and preacher to the soul of Margaret Clifford as a figure of *Ecclesia*, but also that of apostolic, evangelical healer to 'the soules of those that doe transgresse'. This gives rise to the progress of these souls by mimesis, 'Such as thou art, such they desire to be':

If they be blind, thou giv'st to them their sight;

If deafe or lame, they heare, and goe upright. (110.1374-6)

The *sponsa* as *anima ecclesiastica* ministers to these 'soules so pain'd', exorcising 'any evill spirits' (110.1377), but also exercises pastoral authority which 'mai'st in time recover / Those weake lost sheepe that did so long transgresse, / Presenting them unto thy deerest Lover' (111.1396-8). In reassuring the Countess that Christ is 'the Husband of thy Soule' (62.253), Lanyer introduces an extended allegorical treatment of the *anima ecclesiastica* as 'his faithfull Wife', revealed as 'holy Church' (106.1291-2), who pours forth the spiritual healing signified by the application of oil in Mark 6:13 and James 5:14:

The oyles of Mercie, Charitie, and Faith,

Shee onely gives that which no other hath. (106.1295-6).

On one level, this vignette, which owes a debt to Caesarius of Arles's exegesis of the Wise and Foolish virgins,³⁸ could be read as an encomiastic allusion to Margaret Clifford's interest in therapeutic healing and Paracelsian medicine, evinced by the 'Great Picture' commissioned by Anne Clifford in 1646, and her memoirs of her mother.³⁹ However, Lanyer makes it clear that the healing of the spirit through mercy, charity and faith is reserved to *Ecclesia* as *sponsa*, while simultaneously rejecting the power and efficacy of physical anointing, in keeping with contemporary Anglican practice. In *A Treatise of the Sacraments*, published in 1583, Bishop Jewel employs the Caesarian metaphor also employed by Lanyer to describe the spiritual anointing espoused by the Anglican Church, 'Thus are the sick among us anointed with the inner and invisible oil of the mercy of God. Thus are they put in mind to have the oil of faith, and of a good conscience, and that their lamps may ever be burning, that so they may enter in with the bridegroom.'⁴⁰ In applying the 'pretious oyntements' of spiritual healing to the 'greivous woundes' (107.1297) inflicted on Christ by the sins of the world, *Ecclesia* fulfils the ministry of the *Myrophorae* ('Myrrhbearers'), in this instance the Three Marys, whose visit to the open tomb points to the sacramental nullity of Extreme Unction:

The *Maries* doe with pretious balmes attend,
But beeing come, they find it to no end. (106.1287-8)

In eschewing the adiaphora of Popish sacramentalism, the Anglican Church reveals herself in all her unvarnished glory as 'the spouse of Christ', and true believers bear witness 'that Christ alone is the bridegroom of this spouse', as Jewel puts it.⁴¹ In Lanyer's title poem, *Ecclesia* as *sponsa* becomes increasingly identified with the soul of Margaret Clifford. She

tells her patron, ‘Thy Soule conceaves that he is truely wise’, even when the *sponsus* descends on the *anima ecclesiastica* in the guise of the ‘imprison’d, naked, poore and bare’:

Full of diseases, impotent, and lame,
 Blind, deafe, and dumbe, he comes unto his faire,
 To see if yet shee will remaine the same;
 Nay sicke and wounded, now thou do’st prepare
 To cherish him in thy dear Lovers name:
 Yea thou bestow’st all paines, all cost, all care,
 That may relieve him, and his health repaire. (109.1350-60)

These ‘workes of mercy’ (109.1361) are the ‘fruits of faith’, which ‘follow after justification’ according to Article Twelve of the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1571. They are the product of the ‘faith’ and ‘prayers’ of the *sponsa* and the prevenient, ‘speciall grace’ of the Bridegroom, which ‘open Heav’n’ (109.1367-8). We are reminded of Cramner’s Collect for the First Communion on Easter Day, where Christ’s ‘special grace preventing’ opens the ‘gate of everlasting life’.⁴² It is at this point the *sponsa* receives the keys, ‘Which with a Spirituall powre are giv’n to thee’ (109.1370).

That the *potestas clavium*, the spiritual power of the church, is bestowed on the soul of Margaret Clifford as *Ecclesia* as *sponsa* does not suggest she is ‘interrupting the apostolic succession and establishing a new church in – and of – herself’.⁴³ Rather, Lanyer’s vision of the *anima ecclesiastica* builds on Augustine’s definitive interpretation of the rock and keys. She not only espouses the later Augustinian position that Christ ‘is the rocke that Holy Church did chuse’ (46.131), found in the dedication ‘To the Ladie Anne’, but also the Augustinian concept of *claves ecclesiae datae sunt unitati* (‘the keys of the Church were

given to the whole church’).⁴⁴ Apart from the standard medieval Papalist exegesis of the *traditio clavis* (‘handing over of the keys’), reaffirmed by the weight of Tridentine authority, which focusses on Peter’s exalted position as the first bishop of Rome, we can distinguish three patristic interpretations of Matthew 16:18, outlined by Jewel in his *Defence of the Apology* of 1567. Peter can be interpreted as the rock, not because his primacy engenders the apostolic succession, but because he represents all of Christ’s disciples, figuring forth all of the faithful in the Church. Alternatively, the rock is representative of Peter’s confession of faith; he speaks for all the Church when he testifies that Christ is the Messiah. Lastly, Christ himself is interpreted as the rock who is the embodiment of Peter’s confession of faith. Augustine bears witness to this interpretation in the *Retractions*, as espoused previously by Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, and reaffirmed with greater clarity by Eusebius.⁴⁵ It is grounded in Deuteronomy 32:4, 1 Corinthians 10:4, and the Christological exegesis of the *lapis in caput anguli* (‘head stone of the corner’) of Psalm 118:22.⁴⁶ In acknowledging that ‘Christ is the rock that standeth forever’, as Jewel puts it, Lanyer is not only following in his footsteps, but also those of such reformers as Zwingli, Bullinger, and Tyndale, who adhere to ‘the plain doctrine of St Augustine’.⁴⁷ Moreover, Lanyer’s concept of the keys as *ecclesiae datae* concurs with Augustine’s statement, cited by Jewel, ‘When Christ said unto Peter, Unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, he signified thereby the whole church.’⁴⁸ Augustine’s interpretation is based on Tertullian’s belief that Christ gave the keys to Peter and through Peter to the church.⁴⁹ Similarly, Origen states that the promise made by Christ in Matthew 16:19 was not confined to Peter alone, but applied to all of the apostles, evinced by Matthew 18:18, and by extension to all of the Church, as revealed in John 20:22-3.⁵⁰ This may explain why Lanyer takes the traditional identification of Peter and Paul as the *coryphei* or ‘Princes of th’ Apostles’ (127.1801),⁵¹ and applies it to Peter and John the Baptist in her list

of those Martyrs and Confessors who are the flowers of the Church.⁵² It also succeeds in putting Paul, or at least Paul as poster boy for patristic anti-feminism, in his place.

Notwithstanding that she passes over Pauline authority in silence, Lanyer does not so much undertake a 'critique of apostolic priesthood' as provide her patron with a vision of its plenitude, revealed in the *anima ecclesiastica*.⁵³ The spiritual function of the keys is conferred by the breath of the Bridegroom on *Ecclesia* as a whole, as one spiritual body wedded to Christ. As Cyprian of Carthage puts it, the Church was 'founded by the word of the Lord upon one man, who also received its keys', but these were not granted just to Peter and by extension his successors in primatial office: 'It is she alone who holds in her possession the whole of the power of her Spouse and Lord.'⁵⁴ This nuptial imagery is also found in Ambrose's exposition of Psalm 119, where *Ecclesia* processes into the *thalamus*, as she 'is not merely betrothed; she is already married', and 'given the keys of lawful consummation'. The keys allow the *sponsus* to lie between her breasts as the *fasciculus myrrhae*, as he 'leads her into his profoundest mysteries':

He has given her the keys so that she can unlock for herself the treasures of the sacraments and the doors of knowledge that had previously been closed. There she can discover the grace of repose, the sleep of death and the power of resurrection.⁵⁵

Lanyer employs a skilful reversal of this genre of architectonic imagery near the close of the title poem. She stops short of describing the 'purest colours both of White and Red' (129.1828) adorning the Confessors and Martyrs, in contrast to those 'matchlesse colours Red and White' (59.193) of *fin' amors* and the Petrarchan blazon, yet she echoes the description of the Bridegroom as *candidus et rubicundus* because 'My weake Muse desireth now to rest / Folding all their Beauties in thy breast' (129.1831-2).⁵⁶ This mirrors the action

of folding away the previously open doors of a winged altarpiece, once more enclosing the vision of the *anima ecclesiastica* revealed by Lanyer as an object of contemplation, not only for her patron, but also for her reader. Moreover, this image builds on the idea of the heart as the tabernacle of the soul: a polyptychal *Schnitzaltar* revealing at its kernel ‘His perfect picture, where it still shall stand, / Deeply engraved in that holy shrine, / Environed with Love and Thoughts divine’ (108.1326-8).⁵⁷

In ‘To the Ladie Margaret’ Lanyer reminds us that this translation of power and authority to *Ecclesia* as *sponsa* was presaged by the prophetic thaumaturgy of ‘Saint Peter who gave health to the body’ in Acts 3:2-8, which acceded to ‘the health of the soule’ (34.9-10). This is better than all gold and silver as Sirach 30:15 reminds us; ‘the inestimable treasure of all elected soules’ (35.29) who are one in Christ and ‘Co-heire of that eternal blisse’ (62.258).⁵⁸ However, it is hardly the case that Lanyer ‘outdoes even St Peter himself’ as she merely delivers this treasure, that ‘can receive no blemish, nor impeachment, by my unworthy hand writing’ (35.24-5) in her own time, not that in which the extraordinary powers of the keys were granted to the apostles in the charismata.⁵⁹ The age of miracles worked on the body has ceased, and Margaret Clifford and the reader are enjoined to contemplate those miracles which occur in the living Church figured forth in the faithful soul.⁶⁰ The apostolic mission of Peter is fulfilled in this Church, rather than in an apostolic succession based on the primacy of Peter as pope, which is a theological imposture by ‘Romes ridiculous prier and tyranny’ (19.25), as Lanyer puts it in ‘To the Ladie Susan.’

This rejection of the *primatus papae* (‘primacy of the Pope’) informs Lanyer’s interpretation of ‘Aarons pretious oyle’ in ‘To all vertuous Ladies in general.’ She pours this ‘precious ointment’ that ‘runneth down upon the beard, even unto Aaron’s beard which went down on the border of his garments’ (Psalm 133:2) on the ‘haire’ (14.36) of her female readership, because as the gloss in the Geneva Bible informs them, this ointment is ‘a figure

of the graces which come from Christ the head unto his Church'.⁶¹ This echoes the Anglican repudiation of Aaron as the 'shadowe' of Christ's 'vycare saynt Peter whiche vnder christ was also the heed of chrysten people', and thus a *typus papae* ('type of Pope'), found in such sixteenth-century Roman Catholic writers as John Fisher and Thomas Harding.⁶² According to Jewel, they claim 'that, as God commanded the people of Israel to obey Aaron, so Christ commanded all his sheep to obey the pope succeeding Peter', and that 'Christ made the pope shepherd over his whole flock'. However, these claims have no scriptural basis, 'ye are not able to find, neither any such commandment of Christ: nor any mention of Peter's successor: nor all his sheep: nor shepherd over his whole flock: nor our pastor: nor our judge: nor our head shepherd'.⁶³ Although the pontificate of Aaron was crystallized by Bernard of Clairvaux, the Aaronic powers of the Renaissance papacy were embodied in the *triregnum* reintroduced by Paul II in 1464.⁶⁴ This jewelled, golden, triple tiara, based on Josephus's description of Aaron's (Exodus 28:4, 37, 39; 29:6; 39:28; 31; Leviticus 8:9), came to represent the *nec plus ultra* of papal pomp and curial wealth in Protestant iconography.⁶⁵ Aaron wears the *triregnum* in Botticelli's *The Punishment of Korah* on the south wall of Sistine Chapel, in typological correspondence to Perugino's *Handing of the Keys to Saint Peter* on the north wall; both murals are part of the fresco cycle (1481-3) commissioned by Sixtus IV as a powerful assertion of the *primatus papae*.⁶⁶ Here, Aaron's *triregnum* is modelled on that of Sixtus IV, which, although not as notoriously ostentatious as that of Paul II, was valued at 100,000 ducats. This grandiose emphasis on the 'Hebraic prefigurement of papal roles and powers reached its apex during the pontificate of Julius II'.⁶⁷ Certainly, the Aaronic pretensions of Wolsey are indicative of his 'Popering' in Skelton's 'Speke, Parrot', where this 'chefe Cardynall' of 'Pope Julius' leads his people into idolatry by making gold his idol, '*Sicut Aaron populumque, / Sic bubali vitulus*'.⁶⁸

Against this backdrop of studied, hieratic magnificence, John Hooper condemned the outward trappings of episcopal consecration in a Lenten sermon of 1550 as ‘the habit and vesture of Aaron and the gentiles’, rather than ‘the ministers of Christ’, while Cramner dropped the typology of bishops as Aaron and priests as the ‘sons of Aaron’, according to Sarum use, in the revised Ordinal of that same year.⁶⁹ Hooper continued to rail against ‘Aaronical rites’, and ‘the use of such vestiments or apparel, as obscure the ministry of Christ’s church, and representeth the form and fashion of the Aaronical ministry of the old law, abrogated and ended in Christ’, even though Jewel accepted Aaron as a type of the episcopate.⁷⁰ However, all reformers could agree on the legitimacy of Aaron’s sacerdotal role. Hooper calls him ‘Aaron, that fidele high priest and preacher of Gods word’, who ‘never usurped’ the papal title, *Vicarius Christi*, in an attempt ‘to be as a second Christ and master over mens conscience’.⁷¹ Aaron’s priesthood was redefined in terms of the inheritance of the Church, after ‘the authorities of St Augustine, St Ambrose, St Hierom, and St Chrysostom, that whosoever is a member of Christ’s body, whosoever is a child of the church, whosoever is baptized in Christ and beareth his name’, is ‘fully invested’ with a spiritual priesthood, ‘and therefore may justly be called a priest.’⁷² Lanyer also redefines Aaronic investiture in metaphorical, spiritual terms; just as the oil of unction flowed down Aaron’s hair and beard to the robes covering his entire body, so Christ’s anointing with the spirit flows down covering his entire body: the Church. As Herbert puts it, ‘Thus are true Aarons drest.’⁷³

The Aaronic inheritance of women as part of the body of the Church would have had an added resonance for Lanyer’s readership. The strong emphasis on Mary’s spiritual priesthood in seventeenth-century Mariology was rooted in the patristic tradition that Mary was not only descended from the royal tribe of Judah, but also from the priestly tribe of Levi; thus, one of the daughters of Aaron like her relative, Elizabeth. That Mary was a Levite

sprung from Aaron was particularly emphasized in the Eastern tradition, where the budding of Aaron's rod (Numbers 17:8), the affirmation of his priesthood, was interpreted as a symbol of Mary and the fulfilment of her Aaronic lineage in Christ.⁷⁴ In lauding Mary as the *virga Aaron*, Andrew of Crete states she emerged from Judah and David endowed with the aspect of kingship and the priesthood of Aaron, 'Today grace has made white the mystical Ephod of divine priesthood that, as a type, it wove in advance from levitical seed, along with the regal purple robe which God made purple with Davidic blood.'⁷⁵ Similarly, the 'roabes' of 'purple scarlet white' which Lanyer endows on each 'blessed lady' as 'wedding garments' (12.1-15) not only recall the Christological significance of *candidus et rubicundus*, but also the commingled hues associated with Mary's Davidic and Aaronic lineage. Mary's spinning and weaving of the scarlet and true purple of the temple veil, described in the *Protoevangelium of James*, symbolize her regal and sacerdotal roles because she is, as John Damascene puts it, the *purpura* woven into the kingly robe of Christ and the pure, white linen of his priestly vestments.⁷⁶ As Lanyer reminds us, these 'royall robes' (90.905), prefigured in the 'royall robes' of 'Salomon' (13.20), were worn by Christ during his cosmic sacrifice. 'Pure white, to shew his great Integritie, / His innocency' is combined with the 'Purple and Scarlet' (89-90.891-5).

The concept of Mary as *virga Aaron* is also linked to her priestly lineage in Western Christendom, especially during the later medieval period, but it was a commonplace in England since the Anglo-Saxon period.⁷⁷ As the author of the late fifteenth-century *N-Town* play on the Root of Jesse puts it in relation to Mary, 'Of sacerdotale lynage the trewth I yow tell / Flessch and blood to take, God wyll be born!'⁷⁸ Bernard of Clairvaux describes her as the *virga sacerdotalis* ('priestly rod'), as well as the *virga Aaron*, and conflates the image of the Levitic rod of Aaron with the Davidic *radix sancta* ('holy root'), who brings forth 'the Jesse floure and bud' (95.1021) of Isaiah 11:1.⁷⁹ According to Amadeus, the Cistercian

bishop of Lausanne, ‘the priestly rod signifies that same glorious one who, descended from a priestly and royal stock, gave birth to the king of saints’.⁸⁰ Mary’s spiritual priesthood is given powerful expression by Albertus Magnus, who stresses her Aaronic and Levitic lineage, but also the idea that the Church subsisted solely in her from the time of the Passion, when all of Christ’s ‘deare Disciples do forsake him’ (78.624), to the Resurrection.⁸¹ This concept is found in the writings of the twelfth-century Cistercian, Odo of Ourscamp,⁸² and such thirteenth-century Franciscans as Alexander of Hales,⁸³ and Bonaventure.⁸⁴ More importantly, it was appropriated by the Conciliar Movement during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when such theologians as William of Ockham, Nicholas of Clémanges, and Conrad of Gelnhausen, interpreted the idea that faith abided *in sola virgine* (‘in the Virgin alone’) as testimony that *Ecclesia* may survive in a single soul if the body of the institutionalized Church is corrupt, ‘above all the papacy’.⁸⁵ The anti-Papalist implications of the *in sola virgine* theme were exploited by Jewel:

The catholic church of God standeth not in multitude of persons, but in weight of truth. Otherwise Christ himself and his apostles had not been catholic. For his flock was very little: and the catholic or universal consent of the world stood against it ... Some say, that at the time of Christ’s passion, the whole faith remained only in the blessed Virgin our lady: and that even now the same faith may be so straited, that it may rest only in one poor old woman.⁸⁶

Jewel’s redeployment of this Mariological motif in an Anglican context is echoed in Lanyer’s emphasis on the frailty of Peter, who ‘thought his Faith could never fall’ (66.341). In ‘Denying him he did so much adore’, Peter and ‘all the rest’ of Christ’s apostles, who ‘did likewise say the same’ (66.349, 353), provide a resonant, ecclesiological counterpoint to the

steadfast heroism of his ‘comfortless’ (94.1010) mother, who redeems the fall of ‘Our Mother Eve’ (84.763). For Lanyer, as for the Conciliarists, *Ecclesia* is consistently embodied in the ‘soule’ (98.1096) of Mary, identified with the soul of Margaret Clifford, ‘most pretious in his glorious sight’:

Because the Worlds delights shee doth denie

For him, who for her sake vouchsaf’d to die. (62.254-6)

Moreover, a looser analogy between the Virgin and the Countess is established in the final image of the title poem. Lanyer hails her patron as ‘the Articke Starre that guides my hand’ (129.1839): a conscious evocation of Mary as *stella maris* (‘star of the sea’).

Lanyer presents her female readers with a powerful redeployment of Mary’s spiritual priesthood as potentially open to all Christian woman. This stands in marked contrast to the emphasis on the unique nature of Mary’s sacrifice as *spiritualis sacerdos*, espoused by a number of post-Tridentine devotional writers who often associate her priestly role with her Immaculate Conception.⁸⁷ However, Lanyer does not speculate on the broader implications of this spiritual priesthood for the nature and form of Church government, especially the role of women. This is hardly surprising given that any overt suggestion of women exercising spiritual authority in the Anglican Church would immediately conjure up the charge of Pepuzianism, which persisted long after the death of Elizabeth. Although Anglican apologists maintained that a woman might hold civil, if not spiritual, jurisdiction as a monarch, a number of Roman Catholic writers insisted on the heretical nature of the Elizabethan Act of Supremacy. From their perspective, the Anglican Church’s lapse into heresy was partly due to its leadership by a woman, as Archbishop Heath predicted. Heath’s objections were not simply grounded in a natural disinclination toward Luther’s

understanding of the Cyprianic concept of the universal priesthood of believers, shared by many Anglican clergy who started their sacerdotal life in the Old Dispensation. As a keen scholar of the English Church he would have been aware of the beliefs of certain Wycliffites, especially Walter Brut, possibly a former fellow of Merton College, Oxford, who first appeared before John Trefnant, bishop of Hereford, on 15 October 1391. John Foxe describes Brut's inquisition and eventual abjuration outside Hereford Cathedral on 6 October 1393 in great, albeit rather anachronistic, detail in the 1570 edition of *Acts and Monuments*. The sum of his 'hereticall naughtyness' was condensed down to 'certayne articles, to the number of 37', taken seriously enough to be 'sent to the Universitie of Cambrige to be confuted'.⁸⁸ However, Foxe strategically chose to omit Brut's testimony that 'Women have power and authority to preach and make the body of Christ, and they have the power of the keys of the church, of binding and loosing', most likely because of the contemporary accusation that Pepuzianism flourished in the Anglican Church.⁸⁹

The recrudescence of Pepuzianism was defined as a peculiarly Anglican affliction in Bellarmine's *Disputations on the Controversies*, and this charge was repeated by Francis de Sales and a number of Continental writers.⁹⁰ As De Sales puts it in one of his *Controversies* (1594-8), 'The Pepusians, says S. Augustine (or Montanists and Phrygians, as the Code calls them), admitted women to the dignity of the priesthood. Who is ignorant that the English brethren hold their Queen Elizabeth to be head of their Church?'⁹¹ British and Irish Recusant clerics such as Nicholas Sanders, John Copinger and John Sinnich embraced the charge wholeheartedly.⁹² It was strongly refuted by Thomas Rogers in *The English Creede* (1585-7, revised and retitled in 1607), who condemns those who believe that 'women may be deacons, elders, and bishops' as 'the Pepuzians did maintain'.⁹³ Richard Field took up the challenge in *Of the Church* (1606), 'The fourth heresy imputed unto us by our adversaries, is that of the Peputians, who gave women authority to intermeddle with the sacred ministry of the Church.'

This ‘supposed heresy’ is ‘a devilish slander of this shameless Jesuit’ and bugbear of Anglicanism, Bellarmine, whom seventeenth-century Protestants transmogrified into a witch bottle as the apotropaic epitome of evil.⁹⁴ Joseph Hall adopts a typically bullish stance in *Roma Irreconciliabilis*, or *No Peace with Rome* (1611), where he states that *Ecclesia Romana* admits ‘Jews into her bosom’, while Anglicans are anathemized as ‘Pepuzians, that ascribe too much to women’.⁹⁵

In Problem Six, ‘Why hath the common opinion afforded woemen Soules?’, Donne adopts a lighter approach to these current accusations of Pepuzianism, which he knew all too well given his familiarity with Bellarmine. He situates the ‘Peputian Heretikes’ who made women ‘Bishops’ firmly in the past, distanced from contemporary Anglicanism as a curiosity *all’ antica*.⁹⁶ Similarly, although Lanyer might allude to an ecclesiology where women appropriate presbytal and episcopal office, she distances herself from contemporary polemical controversy through the appropriation of hermeneutic topoi, personification allegory and other rhetorical stratagems typical of patristic and medieval exegesis. Ultimately, Lanyer concurs with the Anglican consensus of her time; the *potestas clavium* can only be exercised spiritually by every member of the Church Militant in the tabernacle of the soul. Yet in the unfolding of *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* we are granted a lambent prefiguration of the equality of all souls in the Church Triumphant, where ‘Sexe, or Sence’ (63.290) are things indifferent.

¹Edward Rainbowe, *A Sermon Preached at Appleby, April 14, 1676, at the Funeral of the Right Honourable Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset, and Mountgomery, Reprinted from the Original Edition of 1677* (Carlisle, 1839), 13.

²Brenda J. Powell, “‘Witnesse thy wife to wife (O Pilate) speakes for all’: Aemilia Lanyer’s Strategic Self-Positioning’, *Christianity and Literature*, 46 (1996), 5-23 (18). All references are to *The Poems of Aemilia Lanyer: Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*, ed. Susanne Woods (Oxford, 1993), with page and line numbers cited parenthetically in the text.

³On the apparent radicalism of the sacerdotal functions and privileges ascribed to Lanyer and her patrons see also Lynette McGrath, “‘Let us have our libertie againe’: Amelia Lanier’s 17th-Century Feminist Voice’, *Women’s Studies*, 20 (1992), 341-9, and ‘Metaphoric Subversions: Feasts and Mirrors in Amelia Lanier’s *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*’, *LIT: Literature Interpretation Theory*, 3 (1991), 101-13; Catherine Keohane, “‘That Blindest Weakenesse Be Not Over-Bold’: Aemilia Lanyer’s Radical Unfolding of the Passion’, *ELH*, 64 (1997), 359-89; Micheline White, ‘A Woman with Saint Peter’s Keys?: Aemilia Lanyer’s *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* (1611) and the Priestly Gifts of Women’, *Criticism*, 45 (2003), 323-41; Erica Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2004), 80-1; Debra Barrett-Graves, ‘Aemilia Lanyer’, in Diana Robin, Anne R. Larsen, Carole Levin (eds), *Encyclopedia of Women in the Renaissance: Italy, France, and England* (Santa Barbara, CL, 2007), 199-200; Caryn A. Reeder, ‘Vindicating Womankind: Aemilia Lanyer’s *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*’, in Nancy Calvert-Koyzis, Heather Weir (eds), *Breaking Boundaries: Female Biblical Interpreters who Challenged the Status Quo* (London, 2010), 34-52 (51).

⁴Cf. Isaiah 22:22; Revelation 3:7. Cf. also Matthew 23:13; Luke 11:52.

⁵Cf. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. N.P. Tanner, original text est. G. Alberigo *et al.*, 2 vols (London and Washington, 1990), vol. 2, 10.

⁶Richard A Muller, ‘Diversity in the Reformed Tradition’, in Michael A.G. Haykin, Mark Jones (eds), *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism* (Göttingen, 2011), 11-30 (21).

⁷Cf. Sermon ‘Preached at a Marriage’ (1621), *The Sermons of John Donne*, ed. George R. Potter, Evelyn M. Simpson, 10 vols (Berkeley, 1953-61), vol. 3, 242.

⁸“‘Blindest Weakenesse’”, 381. Cf. Barbara K. Lewalski, ‘Of God and Good Women: The Poems of Aemilia Lanyer’, in Margaret Patterson Hannay (ed.), *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators,*

and *Writers of Religious Works* (Kent, OH, 1985), 203-24 (213), and 'Re-Writing Patriarchy and Patronage: Margaret Clifford, Anne Clifford, and Aemilia Lanyer', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 21 (1991), 87-106 (99; 104); Marie H. Loughlin, "'Fast ti'd unto Them in a Golden Chaine": Typology, Apocalypse, and Woman's Genealogy in Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*", *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53 (2000), 133-79 (160); Kari Boyd McBride and John C. Ulreich, 'Answerable Styles: Biblical Poetics and Biblical Politics in the Poetry of Lanyer and Milton', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 100 (2001), 333-54 (353).

⁹*De amore sponsi ad sponsam*, PL 176, 987; cf. Peter Comestor, *Sermo* 29, PL 198, 1784.

¹⁰Cf. *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, 7, 2, SBO 1, 31.

¹¹George L. Scheper, 'Reformation Attitudes toward Allegory and the Song of Songs', *PMLA*, 89 (1974), 551-62 (557).

¹²On the use of Lauretus in an English Protestant context, cf. Carol V. Kaske, *Spenser and Biblical Poetics* (Ithaca, NY, 2000), 28, 42, 81, 83, 165-6.

¹³*Master Bezaes Sermons vpon the Three Chapters of the Canticle of Canticles* (Oxford, 1587), STC, 2nd edn 2025, 283; cf. 235: 'this sleepe of the spouse, that happy repose and contentment, which euerie faithful soule enioieth'. Cf. Origen, *De oratione*, 17.2, GCS 2, 339; *In Canticum homilia*, 1.10, GCS 8, 41.

¹⁴Cf. Hilda Graef, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion* (London, 1963), 84-5.

¹⁵Cf. Suzanne Woods, *Lanyer: A Renaissance Woman Poet* (New York, 1999), 9-14.

¹⁶Pace Janel Mueller, 'The Feminist Poetics of Aemilia Lanyer's "Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum"', in Lynn Keller and Christianne Miller (eds), *Feminist Measures: Soundings in Poetry and Theory* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1994), 208-36 (226): 'Salve Rex Judaeorum' is 'in the Latin of the Vulgate'. Cf. Kari Boyd McBride and John C. Ulreich, "'Eves Apology': Agrippa, Lanyer, and Milton", in Charles W Durham, Kristin A Pruitt (eds), *All in All: Unity, Diversity, and the Miltonic Perspective* (Selinsgrove, PA, 1999), 100-11 (111).

¹⁷Cf. *Le Jeu d'Hérode: Drame liturgique du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1988), 48: 'Salve Rex seculorum! Salve, deus deorum.'

¹⁸Cf. Charles C. Butterworth, *English Primers (1529-1545): Their Publication and Connection with the English Bible and the Reformation in England* (Philadelphia, 1953), 44-5; Mary E. Frandsen, 'Salve regina / Salve rex Christe: Lutheran Engagement with the Marian Antiphons in the Age of Orthodoxy and Piety', *Musica disciplina*, 55 (2010), 129-218.

¹⁹The *Maria Synthronos* motif illustrates Psalm 45:10, where Mary is crowned as *sponsa*, rather than as *Deipara* or *Theotokos*, but the iconography of her coronation is also derived from Song of Songs 4:8. On the syncretic

association of Elizabeth with Cynthia as a type of the Virgin, cf. Elkin C. Wilson, *England's Eliza* (Cambridge, MA, 1939), 273-320; Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London, 1995).

²⁰Cf. Anne Clifford, *The Memoir of 1603 and The Diary of 1616-1619*, ed. Katherine O. Acheson (Peterborough, ON, 2007), 45.

²¹Cf. *Delia. Contayning Certayne Sonnets: With the Complaint of Rosamond* (London, 1592), STC 6243.5; *The Poeticall Essayes of Sam. Danyel. Newly corrected and augmented* (London, 1599), STC, 2nd edn 6261. Cf. also John Pitcher, 'Negotiating a Marriage for Anne Clifford: Samuel Daniel's Advice', *RES*, 64 (2013), 770-94 (785-8).

²²On the alleged common ancestry of Rosamund and George Clifford, cf. Alfred Clifford, *Collectanea Cliffordiana in Three Parts* (Paris, 1817), 15; George C. Williamson, *Lady Anne Clifford: Countess of Dorset, Pembroke & Montgomery, 1590-1676* (Kendal, 1922), 500-1; *The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford*, ed. D.J.H. Clifford (Stroud, 1990), 5; Richard T. Spence, *Lady Anne Clifford: Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery (1590-1676)* (Stroud, 1997), 15, 168, 180.

²³Song of Songs 1:13 (Vg 12); cf. Matthew 2:11; Mark 15:23. Cf. also Justus of Urgell, *In Cantico Cantorum Salamonis explicatio mystica*, PL 67, 968; Bede, *In Cantica Canticorum allegorica expositio*, 2.1.4, PL 91, 1097; Rupert of Deutz, *In Cantica Canticorum*, CCCM 26, 32.

²⁴White, 'Woman with St Peter's Keys', 324.

²⁵On the term 'Montanistae', cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses*, 16.8, PG 33, 927-30.

²⁶'History of Heretics', 2.2, *The Works of Nathaniel Lardner D.D.*, 11 vols (London, 1788), vol. 9, 482-3.

²⁷*Adversus Marcionem*, 5.8, CCSL 1, 685.

²⁸*De praescriptione haereticorum*, 41.5, CSEL 1, 221; cf. *De Baptismo*, 1.3; 17.4, CSEL 1, 277, 291.

²⁹*De Virginibus velandis*, 9.2, CSEL 2, 1218-19.

³⁰Cf. *De pudicitia*, 21, CCSL 2, 1368.

³¹Cf. Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 48.14; 49.1, GCS 37, 240-4; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 5.18.2, GCS 9.1, 472-3. See also *The Decades of Henry Bullinger: The Fifth Decade*, ed. Thomas Harding, PS 10 (Cambridge, 1892), 370-1; 410.

³²Cf. Augustine, *De haeresibus*, 26-7, CCSL 46, 302-3.

³³Cf. 'Elizabethan Gleanings', *The Collected Papers of Frederic William Maitland*, ed. H.A.L. Fisher, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1911), vol. 3, 157-209 (203), noting a letter from Edmund Sandys to Matthew Parker, 30 April

1559, stating it was Thomas Lever, who ‘wisely put such a scruple in the Queen’s head that she would not take the title of supreme head’. Maitland notes Philip II’s envoy, the Count of Feria, also took the credit.

³⁴Yet the title ‘Supreme Head of the Church’ was used initially by Mary I, in succession to Henry VIII and Edward VI; cf. Edward Coke, *The First Part of The Institutes of the Lawes of England, or, A Commentarie upon Littleton* (London, 1628), STC 15784, I.i.1, 7; cf. *The Selected Writings and Speeches of Sir Edward Coke*, ed. Steve Sheppard, 3 vols (Indianapolis, IN, 2003), vol. 2, 627. See also Gilbert Burnett, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, ed. Nicholas Pocock, 7 vols (Oxford, 1865), vol. 5, 605.

³⁵According to Maitland, ‘Elizabethan Gleanings’, 203, it was Elizabeth’s original intention to retain the title held by her father, brother and sister in turn: ‘Sandys would hardly be telling Parker this at the end of April if all along it had been clear that Elizabeth was only to be supreme governor’. Maitland concludes that ‘Bill No 2 declared that Elizabeth was supreme head of the church of England, though perhaps in its ultimate form, when the lords had amended it, she was given an embarrassing option of saying whether she was supreme head or not’. But ‘at the last moment, and when the bill, having passed both houses, was no longer amendable’ she decided ‘she would not assume the irritating title’.

³⁶All Bible quotations in English are taken from the Douay-Challoner translation of the Vulgate unless otherwise indicated. References are, however, cited according to the Hebrew chapter and verse unless otherwise indicated.

³⁷John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, 4 vols in 7 (Oxford, 1824), vol. 1, ii, 405-7.

³⁸Cf. *Sermo* 155, CCSL 104, 632-5.

³⁹In the ‘Great Picture’ attributed to Jan van Belcamp, formerly at Appleby Castle, Margaret Clifford clasps an octavo psalter, while three folios are stacked at her back: ‘A written hand book of Alkimee, Extractions of Distillations and excellent Medicines’, ‘All Senekae’s Workes, translated out of Latine into English’ and ‘The Holy Bible, the old and new Testament’; cf. Graham Parry, ‘The *Great Picture* of Lady Anne Clifford’, in David Howarth (ed.), *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts* (Cambridge, 1993), 202-19; Karen Hearn, ‘Lady Anne Clifford’s “Great Triptych”’, in Karen Hearn, Lynn Hulse (eds), *Lady Anne Clifford: Culture, Patronage and Gender in Seventeenth-Century Britain* (Leeds, 2009), 2-24. See also *Lives of Lady Anne Clifford, Countess of Dorset, Pembroke and Montgomery (1590-1676) and of her Parents Summarized by Herself* (London, 1916), 20; *The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby 1599-1605*, ed. Dorothy M. Meads (London, 1930), 57-8: ‘She was a lover of the Study and practice of Alchimy, by which she found out excellent Medicines.’

⁴⁰*The Works of John Jewel*, ed. Richard William Jelf, 8 vols (Oxford, 1848), vol. 8, 70. Physical anointing was retained as part of the Order for the Visitation of the Sick in the original Book of Common Prayer of 1549, but excised from the 1552 edition and subsequent revisions.

⁴¹*Works*, vol. 8, 286.

⁴²*The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662*, ed. Brian Cummings (Oxford, 2011), 322-3, 325. Here, 'special grace' is understood as 'preventing grace'; cf. Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (Dublin Fragments, MS TCD 121, fol. 52r), *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, ed. W. Speed Hill *et al.*, 7 vols in 8 (Cambridge, MA, 1977-93), vol. 4, 101.

⁴³Keohane, 'Blindest Weakenesse', 381.

⁴⁴*Sermo 392, Ad conjugatos*, 3, *PL* 39, 1711.

⁴⁵In addition to Augustine, *Retractiones* 21, CCSL 57, 62, cf. Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo*, 34, 36, 114, *PG* 6, 446-50; 553-6; 739-40; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, 3.21.7, SC 211, 420-2; 4.20.11, SC 100, 661-9; 4.33.1, SC 100, 802-5; 4.36.1, SC 100, 876-81; 5.26.1-2, SC 153, 324-39; Eusebius, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, 17, *PG* 23, 173, 176; *Commentaria in Hesaiam*, GCS 9.3, 293.

⁴⁶Cf. Isaiah 8:14; 28:16; Matthew 21:42; Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; Romans 9:33; Ephesians 2:20; 1 Peter 2:7.

⁴⁷*Works*, vol. 4, 389, 493.

⁴⁸*Works*, vol. 4, 494, 541; cf. Augustine, *Tractatus in Joannem*, 124.5, CCSL 36, 684-5. In addition to Bullinger, *Fifth Decade*, 79-82, 122-3, 126-7; 543, cf. Ulrich Zwingli, *Commentary on True and False Religion*, ed. and trans. Samuel Macauley Jackson, Clarence Nevin Heller, 2nd edn (Durham, NC, 1981), 161; William Tyndale, 'Obedience of a Christian Man', *Doctrinal Treatises and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scripture*, ed. Henry Walter, PS 48 (Cambridge, 1848), 217-18, 318-19.

⁴⁹Cf. *Scorpicae* 10, CSEL 21, 167.

⁵⁰Cf. *Homilia in Matthaum*, 12.10, GCS 40, 85-9.

⁵¹Cf. Juan Louis Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*, ed. and trans. Charles Fantazzi (Chicago, 2000), 94.

⁵²On John the Baptist as an apostle, cf. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, 3.11.4, SC 211, 118: 'ipse et prophetae et apostoli locum habuerit'. Cf. also John Calvin's 1536 edition of the *Institutes*, *Johannes Calvini Opera Selecta*, ed. Peter Barth, Wilhelm Niesel and Dora Scheuner, 5 vols (Munich, 1926-52), vol. 1, 129.

⁵³Theresa M. DiPasquale, *Refiguring the Sacred Feminine: The Poems of John Donne, Aemilia Lanyer, and John Milton* (Pittsburgh, 2008), 149.

⁵⁴*Epistola* 73 (72), 11, CCSL 3C, 541-2; *The Letters of St Cyprian of Carthage: 4, Letters 67-82*, ed. trans. G.W. Clarke (New York, 1989), 60.

⁵⁵*Expositio in Psalmum CXVIII*, 1.16, CSEL 62, 16; *Homilies of Saint Ambrose on Psalm 118*, trans. Íde Ní Riain (Dublin, 1998), 10.

⁵⁶On the roses of martyrdom and lilies of purity cf. Eucherius of Lyons, *Formulae spiritualis intellegentiae*, CSEL 31, 17, reflected in the red and white vestments of All Saints Day; cf. Pseudo-Bede, *Homilia* 70, *PL* 94, 450; William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*, 3.18.5, CCCM 140, 277-8.

⁵⁷‘Engraved’ is used in the sense of ‘to portray or represent by sculpture’ (*OED*, ‘engrave’, v.1, with suggestions of 3c).

⁵⁸The comparison between the *salus animae* and silver and gold is from Sirach 30:15, generally excised from Protestant English bibles from 1599 to the Authorized Version of 1611, excised again in subsequent printings (1616, 1618, 1620, 1622, 1626, 1627, 1629, 1630, and 1633).

⁵⁹Suzanne Woods, ‘Lanyer and Southwell: A Protestant Woman’s Re-Vision of St Peter’, in Daniel W. Doerkson, Christopher Hodgkins (eds) *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way* (Newark, DL, 2004), 73-86 (85). Cf. Su Fang Ng, ‘Aemilia Lanyer and the Politics of Praise’, *ELH*, 67 (2000), 433-51 (443).

⁶⁰Cf. Jewel, *Works*, vol. 6, 351-4. Elizabethan and Jacobean Cessationists cited Victorinus of Pettau, *Commentarius in apocalypsin*, 10.2, CSEL 49, 90-1; John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum*, 32 (33).7, *PG* 57, 386-8; *Homiliae in epistolam primam ad Corinthios*, 6, *PG* 61, 51-2; Augustine, *De vera religione*, 47, CCSL 32, 246-8; Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 29, 4, CCSL 141, 247-8. Cf. D.P. Walker, ‘The Cessation of Miracles’, in Ingrid Merkel and Allen G. Debus (eds), *Hermeticism and the Renaissance: Intellectual History and the Occult in Early Modern Europe* (Washington, 1988), 111-24; Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), 226-32.

⁶¹Cf. Exodus 29:7; 30:22-30; Leviticus 8:12.

⁶²‘Sermon Made Again the Pernicyous Doctryn of Martin Luther Within the Octaves of the Ascensyon’, printed in 1521; cf. *The English Works of John Fisher*, ed. John E.B. Major, EETS es 27 (London, 1876), 311-48 (316). Cf. Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises*, 214.

⁶³*Works*, vol. 4, 182.

⁶⁴Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Consideratione*, 2.8.15, *SBO* 3, 423.

⁶⁵Cf. *Antiquitates*, 3.172-8, and *Bellum judaicum*, 5.235, *Josephus*, ed. and trans. Henry St John Thackeray *et al.*, 10 vols (London and Cambridge, MA, 1926-65), vol. 3, 232-3. In addition to Bartolomeo Platina, *Platynae Historici. Liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum (AA. 1-1474)*, ed. Giacinto Gaida (Città di Castello, 1913-32), 392; cf. Massimo Miglio, “‘Vidi thiarum Pauli papae secundi’”, *Bullettino dell Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano*, 81 (1969), 273-96; repr. *Storiografia pontificia del Quattrocento* (Bologna, 1975), 119-53.

⁶⁶Cf. Leopold D. Ettlinger, *The Sistine Chapel Before Michelangelo: Religious Imagery and Papal Primacy* (Oxford, 1965), 66-70, 90-3, 104-14; Carol F. Lewine, ‘Botticelli’s “Punishment of Korah” and the “Sede Vacante”’, *Source*, 9 (1990), 14-18.

⁶⁷Charles L. Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome* (Bloomington, IN, 1984), 216.

⁶⁸‘Speke, Parrot’, *John Skelton: The Complete English Poems*, ed. John Scattergood (London, 1983), ll.70, 377-8, 431; cf. Hebrews 5:4-6.

⁶⁹‘Third Sermon upon Jonah’, *The Early Writings of John Hooper D.D.*, ed. Samuel Carr, PS 20 (Cambridge, 1843), 479. On Cramner’s omissions, cf. Edward Echlin, *The Story of Anglican Ministry* (Slough, 1974), 98.

⁷⁰‘A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments’ and ‘Seventh Sermon upon Jonah’, *Early Writings*, 346; 554.

⁷¹‘A Declaration of Christ and his Office’, *Early Writings*, 22.

⁷²Hooper to Bullinger, 29 June 1550, in *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation*, ed. Hastings Robinson, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1846-7), vol. 1, 87.

⁷³*The Works of George Herbert*, ed. F.E. Hutchinson (Oxford, 1941), 174, l.5.

⁷⁴Cf. John of Euboea, *Oratione in conceptum Deiparae*, PG 86, 1465-6; 1489-90; John the Geometer, *Hymni in beatissimam Dei Genitricem*, 2, PG 106, 857-8.

⁷⁵*In nativitatem Beatae Mariae, Sermo 1*, PG 97, 811-12; *Wider Than Heaven: Eighth-Century Homilies on the Mother of God*, trans. Mary B. Cunningham (Crestwood, NY, 2008), 76.

⁷⁶*In nativitatem Beatae Mariae, Sermo 2*, PG 96, 693-4. Here, Mary is described as *Dei sacerdos juvencula*, identified with the *sponsa* as a daughter of Amminadab (Song of Songs 7:1), the father-in-law of Aaron. Cf. *Evangelia Apocrypha*, ed. Constantin von Tischendorf, 2nd edn (Leipzig, 1876), 20-1. Cf. also Exodus 37:3-5, 2 Chronicles 3:14.

⁷⁷Cf. Pseudo-Bede, *In Pentateuchum commentarii*, PL 91, 367.

⁷⁸*The N-Town Play: Cotton MS Vespasian D.8*, ed. Stephen Spector, EETS ss 11-12, 2 vols (Oxford, 1991), vol. 1, 66, ll.13-14. Cf. ll.37-8, ‘God of his high benyvolens / Of prest and kynge wyll take lynage.’

⁷⁹*Sermo in nativitate beatae Virginis Mariae*, 11, *SBO* 5, 282; *In laudibus virginis matris*, *Homilia*, 2, *SBO* 4, 24; *In festo annuntiationis beatae Mariae*, *Sermo* 2, *SBO* 5, 13-27.

⁸⁰*Homiliae de Maria Virgine*, *Homilia* 1, 1, *SC* 72, 66; *Homilies in Praise of Blessed Mary*, trans. Grace Perigo (Kalamazoo, MI, 1979), 6.

⁸¹Cf. *Mariale Super Missus Est*, *Alberti Magni Opera Omnia*, ed. Auguste Borgnet, 38 vols (Paris, 1890-9), vol. 37, 80-1.

⁸²*Quaestiones magistri Odonis Suessionensis*, 2.56, *Analecta novissima. Spicilegii Solesmensis altera continuatio*, ed. Jean-Baptiste Pitra, 2 vols (Paris, 1885-8), vol. 2, 63.

⁸³*Summa theologica, libri I-III*, 4 vols (Quaracchi, 1923-48), vol. 1, 1130.

⁸⁴*Commentarius in III librum Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, d.3, pars I, a.2, q.3, *S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, 10 vols (Quaracchi, 1882-1902), vol. 4, 73.

⁸⁵Jesse D. Mann, 'A Conciliarist's Opposition to a Popular Marian Devotion', in Gerald Christianson, Thomas M. Izbicki, Christopher M. Belitto (eds), *The Church, Councils and Reform: The Legacy of the Fifteenth Century* (Washington, DC, 2008), 212-26 (213).

⁸⁶*Works*, vol. 4, 339.

⁸⁷Cf. René Laurentin, *Maria, Ecclesia, Sacerdotium* (Paris, 1952), 21-95, who discusses the concept of Mary's spiritual priesthood in Thomas of Villanova, Francisco de Osuna, Jacques le Vasseur, Juan de Cartagena, Christopher of Avendaño, Charles de Condren, Ferdinand Chirino de Salazar, Jean-Jacques Olier, Jacques Biroat, Ippolito Marracci, Lazare Dassier, Nicholas de Dijon, Antonio Viera, and Julien Lorient, among others.

⁸⁸John Foxe, *The First Volume of the Ecclesiasticall History, Contayning the Actes and Monumentes*, 2nd edn (London, 1570), 587-619 (619).

⁸⁹Margaret Aston, 'Lollard Women Priests?', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31 (1980), 441-61; repr. *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London, 1984), 49-70 (52). In addition to *Registrum Johannis Trefnant, Episcopi Herefordensis*, ed. W.W. Capes, CYS 20 (London, 1916), 278-68, cf. Maureen Jurkowski, 'Who was Walter Brut?', *English Historical Review*, 127 (2012), 285-302.

⁹⁰*De Notis Ecclesiae*, 4.9, *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus huius temporis Haereticos*, 3 vols (Ingolstadt, 1586-93; repr. Rome, 1840), vol. 2, 156.

⁹¹*Œuvres complètes de Saint François de Sales évêque et prince de Genève et docteur de l'Eglise*, 27 vols (Annecy, 1892-64), vol. 1, 79-80; *Library of St Francis de Sales*, ed. and trans. H.B. Mackey *et al.*, 6 vols (London, 1875-1910), vol. 3, 77, citing Justinian, *Cod.* 1.5.18.4; 1.5.19.4; 1.4.20.3; 1.5.21.2). In addition to

Caspar Schoppe's letter to the jurist Gottlieb Reich, *S.D.N. Clementis P.P.VIII. Bulla Indictionis S. Iubileii cum Gasp. Schoppi Annotationibus in eamdem. Itemque Epistola Paraenetica ad Theophilum Richium* (Munich, 1601), 13, cf. *De la déclaration du feu sieur de Sponde, par Henri de Sponde, son frère* (Bordeaux, 1595), 195-7; Stanislaw Reszka, *De Atheismis et Phalarismis evangelicorum* (Naples, 1596), 569; Pierre le Loyer, *Discours et histoires des spectres, visions, et apparitions des esprits, anges, demons, et âmes se montrant aux hommes* (Paris, 1605), 963; Godefroi Hermant, *Défense de la piété et de la foy de la sainte Église catholique* (Paris, 1651), 425.

⁹²Cf. Nicholas Sanders, *De Origine ac Progressu schismatis Anglicani*, continued after 1558 by Edward Rushton (Cologne, 1585), 145-6; trans David Lewis, *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism* (London, 1877), 240, and *De Clave David, seu Regno Christi: Libri sex contra Calumnias Acleri* (Rome, 1588), 375; John Copinger, *The Theatre of Catholique and Protestant Religion divided into Twelve Bookes* (St Omer, 1620; repr. Ilkley, 1974), 448; John Sinnich, *Confessionistarum Goliathismus Profligatus; sive, Lutheranorum Confessionis Augustanæ Symbolum profitentium Provocatio repulsa*, 2nd edn (Louvain, 1667), 228.

⁹³*The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion, Professed in England. Expressed in 39 Articles* (London, 1607); repr. *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England: An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, ed. J.J.S. Perowne, PS 40 (Cambridge, 1854), 249.

⁹⁴*Of the Church: Five Books*, 3rd edn, 3 vols (London, 1635), 134-5; repr. in 5 vols (Cambridge, 1847), vol. 2, 276-8.

⁹⁵*The Works of the Right Reverend Joseph Hall D.D.*, ed. Philip Wynter, 10 vols (Oxford, 1863), vol. 10, 352.

⁹⁶*John Donne: Paradoxes and Problems*, ed. Helen Peters (Oxford, 1980), 28.