

**CHARLES V'S 'ENCOMIUM MORI' AS REPORTED BY
AMBASSADOR ELYOT¹**

EL ELOGIO DE CARLOS V A MORO SEGÚN EL EMBAJADOR ELYOT

Eugenio Manuel Olivares Merino

Universidad de Jaén

eolivar@ujaen.es

Abstract

William Roper is the author of the first and most influential biography of Sir Thomas More, his father-in-law, finished in 1557. As stated in this source, shortly after More's execution for high treason at the Tower of London (1535), the Emperor Charles V met Thomas Elyot then serving as ambassador at the imperial court. The content of this meeting was later on disclosed by Elyot himself to some members of More's closest circle, among them Roper himself, whose testimony has remained the ultimate source of the episode. As soon as Charles had come to know about More's execution, he communicated the news to Elyot and shared with him his admiration for the ex-Chancellor. Several scholars, however, have questioned the reliability of Roper's memory in the light of historical evidence for Elyot's whereabouts at the time of More's death. This paper revises the main stances in the discussion of this episode, and brings into consideration other issues that might cast some light, not only on the details of this story, but also on the relationship between these two Thomases (More and Elyot) and Charles, the most powerful ruler in Europe at the time.

Keywords: Thomas More; Thomas Elyot; Charles V; the King's Matter.

Resumen

William Roper es el autor de la primera y más influyente biografía de Sir Tomás Moro, su suegro, finalizada en 1557. Según se indica en esta fuente, poco tiempo después de la ejecución por alta traición de Moro en la Torre de Londres (1535), el Emperador Carlos se reunió con Thomas Elyot, a la sazón embajador en la corte

¹ With the certainty that Erasmus of Rotterdam would have allowed me to use the title of his most popular work, *Encomium Moriae* (*The Praise of Folly*), I have slightly modified it to mean precisely his intended second meaning, 'the Praise of More'. This paper has been written within the Research Project "Thomas More and Spain (16th and 17th centuries): Ideological and Textual Construction" (FFI2017-83639-P), funded by the Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Competitividad of Spain.

imperial. El contenido de este encuentro fue después revelado por el propio Elyot a algunos de los más allegados a Moro, entre los cuales estaba el mismo Roper, quien a la postre queda como la fuente original del episodio. Tan pronto como Carlos supo de la ejecución de Moro, comunicó la noticia a Elyot, transmitiéndole también la admiración que sentía por el ex-canciller. Sin embargo, varios estudiosos han puesto en tela de juicio la fiabilidad de los recuerdos de Roper a la luz de las evidencias históricas sobre el paradero de Elyot cuando se produjo la muerte de Moro. En este artículo se repasan los datos principales en el estudio de este episodio, tomando en consideración además otros factores que podrían ilustrar no solo los detalles de esta historia, sino la relación entre estos dos ‘Tomases’ (More y Elyot) y Carlos, el gobernante más poderoso en la Europa del momento.

Palabras clave: Tomás Moro; Thomas Elyot; Carlos V; el Asunto del Rey.

In 1531 Thomas Elyot published his *Boke called the Governour*, dedicated to Henry VIII. This treatise on the education of statesmen soon became very popular at court, and Elyot gained immediate reputation: Henry rewarded him with an appointment as ambassador to the court of Charles V. On 10 September (1531), Eustace Chapuys—the Imperial ambassador at Henry VIII’s court—was already informing Caesar about the new appointment:

The ambassador to be sent to your Majesty is Master Vuylloit [Elyot], a gentleman of 700 or 800 ducats of rent, formerly in the Cardinal’s [Thomas Wolsey] service, now in that of the lady [Anne Boleyn], who has promoted him to this charge. (*L&P* V, n. 416)

Chapuys’ report was brief, but provided Charles with key information about the past and present loyalties of the Englishman. By that time, Wolsey was already dead, having fallen into disgrace after his failure to obtain Pope Clement VII’s annulment of Henry’s marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Anne Boleyn’s role in the so-called ‘King’s Matter’ needs no further explanation. Of course, Charles was well aware of Elyot’s mission before meeting the English diplomat. As specified in his instructions (dated 7 October 1531), the new ambassador’s chief concern was to obtain the Emperor’s assent (or favorable disposition) to Henry VIII’s separation from the Spanish Queen, who happened to be Charles’ aunt (Croft lxxii-lxxv). Nevertheless, it soon became clear that Elyot was by no means devoted to this task and the King called him back soon enough.

Over two decades later (1557), William Roper had completed the first biography of his father-in-law, Sir Thomas More, executed for high treason in

1535. As narrated by the author, Elyot had met him and some other members of More's closest circle to inform them about a relevant episode. As soon as the Emperor had come to know about More's execution at the Tower of London, he summoned Elyot to share with him his admiration for the ex-Chancellor, whose death was certainly a tragic event:

Soone after whose [More's] deathe came intelligence there of to the Emperour Chareles. Whervvpon he sent for *Sir* Thomas Elliott, our English Embassadour, and said vnto him: "My Lord Embassador, we understand that the Kinge *your* master, hath put his faithful seruauant and grave, wise Councellour, *Sir* Thomas Moore to deathe." Whereunto *Sir* Thomas Elliott awneswered that he vnderstood nothing thereof. "Well," said the Emperour, "it is too true. And this will we say, that if we had bine maister of such a servante, of whose doings ourselfe haue had these many yeares no small experience, we wold rather haue lost the best city of our dominions then haue lost such a worthy councellour." Which matter was by the same *Sir* Thomas Eliott to myself, to my wife, to maister Clement and his wife, to *master* John Haywood and his wife, and [vnto] diuers other his Friends accordingly reported. (Roper 103/18-24—104/1-10)

On the day of More's execution, the Emperor Charles was with his troops at the siege of La Golette, a city he had to capture before heading towards Tunis. After his African campaign, Charles left for Italy on 17 august. Roper places the conversation between the *Caesar* and the English ambassador 'soon after' More's death, something which is confirmed by Elyot's response to Charles: the Englishman was not giving a diplomatic answer, but being sincere. Only a few weeks later, such words should not be taken literally for the news of the ex-Chancellor's death soon came to be known in continental Europe. Already by August 1535, English agents were busy trying to justify the executions of More (and John Fisher) by portraying both as relentless conspirators against Henry VIII (Vocht 25-30).

The authority of Roper's original account was further supported by all the early biographers of More. Despite minor variations—such as, for example, the inclusion of Fisher's name in the Emperor's words—, there is a noticeable agreement between Roper's narration and the words of Harpsfield (1557),²

² "Who is it then but this worthy man, for whose woorthiness the late noble and newe Charles the mayne, I meane Charles the fift, gaueout such a singular and exquisite testimony and praise? For when intelligence came to him of *Sir* Thomas Mores death, he sent for *Sir* Thomas Eliott, our englishe Ambassadour, [and saide to him: 'My Lorde Ambassadour]. We vnderstande that the king, your master, hath put his faithfull seruauant and graue, wise Counsailour, *Sir* Thomas More, to death'. Wherevnto *Sir* Thomas Eliot aunswered that he heard nothing thereof. 'Well,' saide the Emperour, 'it is too true. And this will we say, that if we had beene master of such a

Stapleton (1588),³ the Ro. Ba. (1599),⁴ Cresacre More (1631);⁵ *The Life of Fisher* (1655) attributed to Richard Hall could also be added.⁶ Consequently, in his 1883 edition of Thomas Elyot's *Boke called the Governour*, Croft concluded: "... we know that Elyot was out of England when that event [More's death] happened. The tradition that the news was communicated to him [Elyot] for the first time by the Emperor himself rests on too high an authority to be rejected" (cxvii).

Yet it is a fact that Thomas Elyot's mission to Charles ended abruptly when he was summoned back to England over three years before More's execution.⁷

seruaunt, of whose doings ourselfe haue had these manye yeres no small experience, we would rather haue lost the best Citie of our dominions then haue lost suche a worthy Counsaillour"" (Harpfield 205/14-23—206/1-8).

³ "The Emperor Charles V, no less penetrating in his judgments than he was brave and fortunate in war, on hearing that More and Fisher had been put to death, spoke as follows to Thomas Eliot, who at the time was Henry's ambassador at his court. 'If I had had in my dominions two such lights, I would have rather lost my strongest city than have allowed myself to be deprived of them, much less permitted them to be unjustly put to death.' High praise from a noble prince!" (Stapleton 202).

⁴ "Charles the Emperour, the [fift] of that name, a most reverent and victorious Prince, gaue a singular testimonie of the praise of this man. For when intelligence came to hym of Sir Thomas More his death, he sent presentlie for Sir Thomas Eliot, our English ambassadour then with hym, to whom said the Emperour, 'We vnderstand that the king your maister hath put to death his faithfull seruaunt, his grave, and wise Counsellour, Thomas More.' Wherevnto our Ambassadour answered that he hard nothing thereof. 'Well,' quoth the Emperour, 'it is too true. And this we ewill say, that if we had bene maister of such a seruaunt, of whose doings ourselfe haue had these manie yeares no smale experience, we would rather haue lost y^e best Citie of our dominion then haue forgone so worthie a Counsaillour"" (Ro. Ba., 264/18-20—265/1-12).

⁵ "Last of all, I will recount what the good emperor, Charles the Fifth, said unto Sir Thomas Elliot, then the king's ambassador in his court, after he had heard of Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More's martyrdoms, on a time he spoke of it to Sir Thomas Elliot, who seemed to excuse the matter by making some doubt of the report; to whom the emperor replied, 'It is too true; but if we had had two such lights in all our kingdoms, as these men were, we could rather have chosen to have lost two of the best and strongest towns in all our empire, than suffer ourselves to be deprived of them, much less to endure to have them wrongfully taken from us'" (Cresacre More 307).

⁶ "Lykewise the most noble and Christian Emperor Charles the Vth at such time as Sir Thomas Moore was beheaded, and word therof brought to him, he sent speedily for Sir Thomas Elliott, the kings Ambassador, there resident with him, and asked him whether he heard any such newes or not; who answered him that he heard noe such thinge. 'Yea' (said the Emperour), 'it is trewe, and too true that Sir Thomas Moore is now executed to death as a good Bishopp hath lately bene before;' and with that (geving a sigh) said: 'Alas, what ment the kinge to kill two such men: for' (said he) 'the Bishopp was such a one, as for all purposes (I thinke) the kinge had not the lyke againe in all his Realme, nether yet was to be matched through Christendome; So that' (said he) 'the king, your maister, hath (in killinge that Bishopp) killed at one blowe all the bishoppes in England,' meaning (no doubt) that this bishop, considering his pastorall care and constant profession of his bishoply duty in defence of the Church, in respect of the rest of his brethren did only deserve the name of a bishopp. 'And Sir Thomas Moore' (said he) 'was well knowne for a man of such profound wisdom, cunninge, and vertue, that yf he had bene towards me as he was towards the kinge your maister, I had rather have lost the best Citie in all my dominion then such a man'" (Hall 128-29).

⁷ Elyot was replaced in January 1532 by Thomas Cranmer, who returned to England in October as he had been elected Archbishop of Canterbury. Nicholas Hawkins was then designated for

Even when he knew that Elyot had been called back to Henry VIII's court in 1532, Croft was eager to accept the veracity of Roper's words: it was equally true—he argued—that the English diplomat was not in England at the time of More's death, which made it theoretically possible that Elyot was again with Charles. The plausibility of his suggestion—"a gallant attempt" by Croft, as Donner put it (55)—was indirectly encouraged by the presence in Charles V's correspondence of a nameless English ambassador who accompanied him along his African campaign and his subsequent journey through the Italian peninsula (Croft cxx-cxxiv).

The first scholar to question the veracity of Roper's account (or at least in all its terms) was A.F. Pollard in a letter published in *The Times Literary Supplement* (July 1930). There was no way that the Emperor had informed Elyot of More's death, and this for two reasons. In the first place, Elyot was in England at the time of More's death "visiting monasteries and inquiring into the value of other ecclesiastical property". Furthermore, the nameless ambassador who accompanied Charles V was, in fact, Richard Pate.⁸ Pollard concluded that Roper's account, "true in substance, had merely acquired an inaccurate date of recollection or transmission" (qtd. by Chambers, "Historical Notes" 353, note to 205/16—206/8). Chambers himself further stated that "Roper's story must have some foundation in fact ... that he had a very definite scene in his mind" ("Historical Notes" 353-54, note to 205/16—206/8), thus laying the basis for a hypothesis that is held to date.

Before Elyot left for England early in 1532, the Emperor was well aware that More's position as Chancellor was no longer defensible: "This news must have moved Charles: for More's troubles were closely linked with his championship of the Emperor's aunt". And so, "[i]t is but natural that the Emperor should have burst into an encomium of More, esteeming him above the best city in his dominions" (Chambers, "Historical Notes" 354, note to 205/16—206/8). Back to London, with More's resignation (16 May 1532) as the talk of the town, Elyot would have repeated Charles' words of praise to Roper and others. But he "would hardly have done so after More's execution", as this might have been considered disloyalty (or censure) to his king (Chambers, "Historical Notes" 354, note to 205/16—206/8). Chambers concluded that, after two decades, "Roper's mind doubtless went back to many meetings of his little band: one perhaps shortly after More's resignation, another after his death. Roper transfers Elyot's words, by a

the post.

⁸ In November 1533, Archdeacon Pate was appointed King Henry's ambassador resident in the court of the Emperor. He remained in this post until June 1537. Thomas Wyatt, an experienced diplomat, served in this position until 1540. Pate was again designated. However in December 1540, he defected from his post: his disagreement with Henry VIII's separation from the Church of Rome and the King's mistrust were the main causes behind his defection (Sowerby 2011).

natural lapse of memory, from an earlier to a later meeting” (“Historical Notes” 355, note to 205/16—206/8).

Similarly, in his 1935 edition of Roper’s life of More, Hitchcock insisted on what was already known: Elyot’s only mission to Charles had finished long before More’s death. In any case, for Hitchcock (as for Chambers) the value and relevance of Roper’s testimony was safeguarded: “there was some definite scene in his [Roper’s] mind—probably after More’s resignation in 1532, the Emperor’s words referring to Henry’s loss of his wise councilor by that act” (126, n. 103/19-23). Roper’s fragile memory was again the backbone of Chambers’ line of argumentation when he dealt with this anecdote in his biography of Thomas More (originally published in 1935). The Emperor would have summoned Elyot for an audience and inquired about More—whose difficult position even before resignation was known to him through Chapuys’ dispatches. The old biographer would have mixed up two visits paid by Elyot to More’s family: the first one, “just after More’s resignation,” and the second “not long after More’s execution” (Chambers, *Thomas More* 288).

Despite Chapuys’ warnings to the Emperor about Thomas Elyot’s sympathies, the real feelings of the English ambassador seemed to incline towards the legitimate Queen, Catherine of Aragon. His diplomatic efforts reported too little, and therefore incurred in suspicion from the English court. His appointment lasted only from October until the following January (1532), when he left the Emperor’s court. Elyot left behind “the esteem in which [he] was held by the members of the Emperor’s court” (Croft lxxxi). Apparently—as Chapuys reported to Charles—the reason behind Elyot’s return to England was Catherine’s will: “the King [Henry] told me that he [Elyot] had been recalled merely on his wife’s application” (5 February; *CSP IV*. 2, n. 898).⁹ One may safely assume that Henry did not want Charles to think that Elyot had been withdrawn for being of very little use in fulfilling a task for which he felt no enthusiasm at all.

To sum up, Roper’s anecdote must be understood under the following premises:

1. The Emperor knew that by the end of 1531 Thomas More was in a difficult situation as a consequence of his sympathies for Queen Catherine and his duty and loyalty towards his King.
2. Before he left for England (January 1532), Elyot was summoned to an audience by Charles V. The Emperor transmitted to the English ambassador his fear that soon enough Henry would lose such ‘a worthy counselor’ as More. Obviously, his execution was in no one’s mind at the

⁹ Chapuys is obviously referring to Catherine when he talks about Henry’s wife. Anne Boleyn and the Tudor king formally married on 25 January 1533.

time, so it never came up in their conversation.

3. Elyot arrived in London shortly after More's resignation (May 1532). The Emperor had rightly foreseen the end of his office. Elyot paid a visit to the family and friends of the ex-Chancellor, and shared with them the Emperor's words of praise for More.
4. On July 6, 1535 More was executed for high treason. Elyot visited the family soon after. Despite the explicit reference to Charles' praise for the dead ex-Chancellor in the biography by Roper', this is a remote possibility. Elyot's prudence would not run this risk; besides, Charles and the English ambassador never talked about More's death, as they were not together when it happened.
5. In Roper's recollection of these events, two visits by Elyot (one after More's resignation, the other after his death) merged into one, which was most probably recreated in the likeness of the second one. However, the message delivered by Elyot in the earlier meeting was preserved and necessarily updated to the new scenario after More's death.

A few considerations remain to be added before ending this paper. Sir Thomas Elyot returned to England in May 1532—as argued—shortly after More's resignation. Then he would gladly have reported the Emperor's words to that group with whom he had so many things in common. None of the authors who have analyzed this episode has suggested the possibility that More himself had been present at the time of Elyot's first visit. In fact, I do think it is a reasonable possibility: the Mores were living in the Chelsea household, and the Ropers with them. It is true that the biographer did not place his father-in-law at that meeting, but it seems clear to me that he probably gave the names (Margaret Roper, the Clements and the Heywoods) of those who welcomed Elyot in his visit after More's death. Therefore, if Sir Thomas More—as I claim—was at Chelsea, he would surely have received Charles' *encomium Mori* with caution. Although grateful, he might not feel very comfortable with this praise, now that the King had apparently left him aside in the issue of his 'Great Matter'. Any sign of favor from the Emperor, the nephew of the dethroned Spanish Queen, could be very dangerous.¹⁰ Free from his public office, the ex-Chancellor hoped that he might very well devote his time to read and write, spend more time with his family and see his grandchildren grow.

Despite the fact that More was over ten years older than Elyot, Thomas Stapleton refers to the younger humanist as one of More's friends, since both

¹⁰ It is relevant to mention at this point More's prudence when in March 1531 he refused to accept a letter of gratitude by the Emperor for being, in Chapuys' words, "a good servant of the Queen Catherine" (Olivares Merino, "Thomas More" 209-20).

shared an interest in the pursuit of “polite literature”; furthermore, Margaret, Elyot’s wife “also gave herself to the study of literature in Sir Thomas School” (40). The younger humanist would later on present himself as an advocate for the right of women to education in his *Defence of Good Women* (1540)—a work dedicated to Anne of Cleves; there is no need to further insist on More’s pioneering commitment with this cause. Some other details also point at a certain familiarity between both humanists—even when they both fail to name each other in their correspondence. One of the first works published by More was the *Lyfe of Johan Picus Erle of Myrandula* (1510), an English translation of the Latin *Vita* written by Pico’s nephew Gianfrancesco. More’s work triggered a keen concern for the writings of this Italian humanist. In the words of one of the editors of *Lyfe of Johan Picus*, this interest “achieves its most sustained expression” (CW 1: lvi) in a later work by Elyot, a translation of a work by Pico, titled *The Rules of a Christian lyfe made by Picus Erle of Mirandula*. Elyot published this text in 1534, as an addendum to his *A swete and devoute Sermon of Holy saynt Ciprian of Mortalitie of Man*. I do think More was also behind the election of this Father of the Church, whose presence in the works of the former I have elsewhere discussed (Olivares Merino, “Cyprian”). All in all, as stated by John M. Major in his biography of Elyot, it is fairly probable that when shaping his conception of an ideal state, the author of the *Governour* was influenced by what More had written in his *Utopia* fifteen years before. Therefore, the author concludes that the relationship between the two “was probably that of master [More] and pupil [Elyot]” (Major 89). It is equally significant in this sense that in a letter written to Cromwell in 1536, Elyot himself talks about the “amity betwene me and sir Thomas More” (Wilson 31).

As More, Elyot sympathized with Catherine’s party, and probably wished the King to return to her. On 5 June (1532), Chapuys wrote to Charles, telling him that the former ambassador had visited him to inform about a meeting with Henry VIII; Elyot had declared to him his best dispositions towards Charles and his aunt Catherine:

But whatever may be Master Heliot’s assertions, I have strong doubts of his report having produced as good effect as he says on the King ... The said ambassador [Elyot], as he tells me, has put down in writing the whole of his conversation with this king, and addressed it to Señor Don Fernando de la Puebla [Puebla] according to Your Majesty’s wishes in the very cipher which that gentleman gave him for the purpose, and, therefore, I will forbear saying anything more about it. ... and [I] will also try to pump the ambassador [Elyot] and pay him as much court as possible for the better success of the Queen’s case. (CSP IV.2, n. 957)

However, there was no case for the Spanish Queen, especially after Anne Boleyn became Henry's wife at the end of January 1533. Writing to the Emperor on 10 May (1533), Chapuys claimed that "the King's ministers themselves by false representations [were stirring] the people on to disorder" and trying to "find an excuse to arm against Your Majesty, thereby depriving the English of all hope of that good-will towards them, at which, as I have understood from ambassador Elyot and others, they are nowadays aiming" (*CSP* IV.2, n.1072). The king's new wife was crowned on June 1. Elyot was among those who were asked to attend the celebration, since they were not particularly enthusiastic about Anne Boleyn; so was Cuthbert Tunstall, More's friend and a character in *Utopia*. More himself did not accompany them to the ceremony of coronation at Westminster Abbey. It has been suggested that Elyot was secretly trying to help "the fallen queen—and the Catholic struggle as well" (Major 94). This seems to be confirmed in another dispatch to the Emperor written by Chapuys at the beginning of the following year—all references to the Queen are, of course, to Catherine, even though she was not anymore:

As to the sending of personages which the Queen desires, I have never had much hope that they would persuade the King or obtain leave from him to appear in Parliament to act on the Queen's behalf. I was moved to write about it by the Queen's order and the request of several persons of whom Elyot was not the last, and he was instigated from a good quarter, as he himself told me. Though Elyot ought not to be considered one of the principal, I mention him because you know him. (29 January 1534; *L&P* VII, n.121)

As he had already done in his dispatches about Thomas More, Chapuys always did his best to present Elyot as one of those whose support and loyalty to Catherine turned them into undercover agents of Charles and the Pope. In the case of More, he was obviously wrong in his assumptions; as for Elyot's pro-Imperial sympathies (or how far he was involved in plots against Henry), Garrett Mattingly's assertion that he was among those "conspirators from the south-east and the home counties [who] were the most dangerous" (289) seems a bit far-fetched.

Elyot would meet again Roper after More's execution (6 July 1535). The date of this second visit to those close to the dead humanist must have been not long after his death. Elyot surely offered his condolences to family and friends, either at the Ropers' or the Clements'. As pointed out, it is not reasonable to argue that he would run the risk of reporting Charles' praise in this new scenario, after More's execution for high treason. The frail memory of the biographer would bring together an early meeting with a later one, mixing up the date of the second with the words spoken at the first. Things got increasingly dangerous for More's

relatives and friends. All those who had had any closeness with the traitor were questioned, spent some time in prison or were executed. Already in 1536 Elyot was trying to cut off his links with his former friends, as proved by a letter he sent to Thomas Cromwell. Elyot could not possibly deny his well-known sympathy for More, but he was wasting no time to state that his loyalty to Henry had always been his primary concern:

I therefor besieche your goode lordship now to lay a part the remembraunce of the amity betwene me and sir Thomas More which was but *Vsque ad aras*, as is the proverb, consydering that I was never so moche addict unto hym as I was unto truthe and fidelity toward my souveraigne lorde, as god is my Juge. (Autumn [after July 2], 1536; Wilson 31)

More's alleged last words at the scaffold also establish a hierarchy of affections and loyalties. As reported by the anonymous author of the *Paris Newsletter*,¹¹ the convict declared "qu'il mourait son [the King's] bon serviteur et de Dieu premierement"¹² (*Paris Newsletter* 266).

Roper quoted the dialogue between Charles and Elyot as a solemn colophon to his biography, as it bore testimony of Charles' high opinion of the ex-Chancellor. This was not only because he knew that More supported his aunt, but because the Emperor himself had had the opportunity of dealing, directly and indirectly, with such a skilled diplomat "of whose doings"—in his own words—"ourselves have had these many years no small experience" (Roper 104/3-4, Harpsfield 206/5-6, and Ro.Ba. 265/9-10). For Chambers, Charles' comparison between losing More and losing the best of his cities was "inadequate" or "absurd" (*Thomas More* 289). But it might not be so; in fact I think it was probably common at the time (still is) to measure the value of man (or his life) in terms of material properties. More himself used a similar comparison in a conversation with Roper, his son-in-law:

"I thancke our Lord, sonne," quoth he, "I find His Grace my very good lord indeed, *and* I beleeeve he dothe as singularly favour me as any subiecte within [this] realme. Howbeit, sonne Roper, I may tell thee I haue no cawse to be proud thereof, *for if my head [could] winne him a castle in Fraunce[...]* it should not faile to goe". (my emphasis; Roper 21/7-13)

¹¹ The *Paris Newsletter*, dated from the said city on July 23 (1535) is the French translation of a now lost account in English of More's trial and execution, probably composed by a first hand witness.

¹² "that he died his good servant and God's first" (my translation).

WORKS CITED

- Chambers, R.W. "Historical Notes". *The Life and Death of Sir Thomas More*, by Nicholas Harspfield. Ed. E.V. Hitchcock. Early English Text Society, o.s. 186, London: Oxford University Press, 1932. 297-370.
- . *Thomas More*. 1958. Ann Arbor Paperbacks: The University of Michigan Press, 1962.
- Croft, H.H.S. ed. *The Boke named The Gouernour, deuised by Sir Thomas Elyot, Knight, edited from the First Edition of 1531, Volume 1*. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1883.
- CSP IV.2: *Calendar of State Papers: Spain, IV.2 (1531-1533)*. Ed. Pascual de Gayangos (London, 1882). *British History Online*. Web. 30 Sep. 2020. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol4/no2>>.
- CW 1: *Complete Works of St. Thomas More, Volume 1 English Poems, Life of Pico, The Last Things*. Ed. Anthony S. G. Edwards et al. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Donner, H.W. "The Emperor and Sir Thomas Elyot". *The Review of English Studies* 2.5 (1951): 55-59. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/II.5.55>
- Hall, Richard. *The Life of Fisher*. Transcribed by R. Bayne, Early English Text Society, e.s. 117, London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Harspfield, Nicholas, *The Life and Death of Sir Thomas More*. Ed. E.V. Hitchcock. Early English Text Society, o.s. 186, London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Hitchcock, E.V. "Historical Notes". *The Life of Sir Thomas Moore Knighte*. 1935. Early English Text Society, o.s. 197, London: Oxford University Press, 1998. 105-28.
- L&P V: *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 5, 1531-1532*. Ed. James Gairdner (London, 1880). *British History Online*. Web. 30 Sep. 2020. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol5>>.
- L&P VII: *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 7, 1534*. Ed. James Gairdner (London, 1883). *British History Online*. Web. 30 Sep. 2020. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol7>>.
- Major, John M. *Sir Thomas Elyot and Renaissance Humanism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.
- Mattingly, G. *Catherine of Aragon*. 1942. London: Jonathan Cape, 1971.
- More, Cresacre. *The Life of Sir Thomas More*. Ed. J. Hunter. London: William Pickering, Chancery Lane, 1828.

- Olivares Merino, Eugenio M. "Thomas More and Charles V (part II / III): A good servant of the Queen". *Moreana* 50.193-194 (2013): 187-228. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3366/more.2013.50.3-4.11>
- . "Cyprian in Thomas More's Writings". *Moreana* 57.1 (2020): 23-47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3366/more.2020.0072>
- Paris Newsletter*: "Appendix II: *The Paris News Letter*". *The Life and Death of Sir Thomas More*, by Nicholas Harspfield. Ed. E.V. Hitchcok. Early English Text Society, o.s. 186, London: Oxford University Press, 1932. 253-66.
- Ro.Ba. *The Lyfe of Syr Thomas More, sometymes Lord Chancellor of England*. Eds. E.V. Hitchcock and P.E. Hallet. Early English Text Society, o.s. 222. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Roper, William. *The Life of Sir Thomas Moore Knight*. 1935. Early English Text Society, o.s. 197, London: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Sowerby, Tracey A. "Richard Pate, the Royal Supremacy, and Reformation Diplomacy". *The Historical Journal* 54.2 (2011): 265-85. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X1100001X>
- Stapleton, T., *The Life of Sir Thomas More*. Trans. P.E. Hallet. Ed. E.E. Reynolds. London: Burns & Oates, 1966.
- Vocht, Henry de. *Acta Thomae Mori. History of the Reports of his Trial and Death with an Unedited Contemporary Narrative*. Nendeln: Kraus Reprint LTD, 1966.
- Wilson, K.J. ed. "The Letters of Sir Thomas Elyot". *Studies in Philology* 73.5 (1976): ix-xxx and 1-78.

Received October 8, 2020

Revised version accepted October 20, 2020