

## **DAY 1- Europe and Tyranny**

8:00 Accueil des participants

**9:00 Welcome by Bernard BOURDIN,**  
*Université de Lorraine, Président des Amici Thomae Mori*

**Panel 1 – 09:20 – 10:45 – Europe & Tyranny 1**

Président /Chair : **Catherine CURTIS,** *University of Queensland, Australia*

**Juliana SCHIESARI,** *University of California, Davis, USA - ENGLISH*

### **Rivalry, Gender and Power in the Italian Renaissance: Caterina Sforza and Niccolò Machiavelli**

A woman in the public sphere who could be eloquent in the humanist tradition and a warrior in the public sphere was an “abomination of nature”. Caterina Sforza was the embodiment of the virago, a woman with male characteristics, in literature heralded by such figures as Ariosto’s Bradamante or Tasso’s Clorinda, women of rank who fought alongside men and whose equestrian skills were remarkable. In spite of Caterina’s masculinized persona, through the arts of riding, hunt and war, she was nonetheless attacked by Machiavelli whose own Republican values descending from Roman culture could not imagine a woman who could wield power to the degree that Caterina Sforza did.

This paper will address how, in theory, rank, as Tasso stated, could trump gender hierarchy. The social practice and tyranny over women in public affairs, however, is most prevalent in Machiavelli’s harsh critique of Caterina. Early in his *Discourses*, Machiavelli had already denounced women as those who instigate the loss of virility in men and are the catalysts for the destruction of state and virile power. Caterina would elicit harsh criticism from Machiavelli for her actions. His refusal to see her as a state representative and “only” as a woman who would barter the lives of her children to win over rival armies, points to how even the most skilled woman in the arts of war is judged to be nothing more than a figure for evil Fortuna, one of Machiavelli’s favorite personifications for the winds of change that continued to plague much of Italy during his and Caterina’s lifetime. As a direct consequence of the Early Modern tyranny against women and directed towards narrowly defining female roles, Caterina became the victim of public castigation, not because she was a warrior who perhaps made military mistakes but because she was a woman doing male work – a tyrannical conviction based on “natural law”.

**Brenda Deen SCHILDGEN,** *University of California, Davis, USA - ENGLISH*

### **Tyranny of Literalism in the Early Modern Period: Girolamo Savonarola and the “Bruciamenti delle vanità”**

The first major example of tyranny against the arts (literature, sculpture, and/or painting, as well as architecture) that would become commonplace in Northern Europe in the sixteenth century occurred in Florence in 1497 and 1498. Inspired by Girolamo Savonarola’s charismatic style, at two famous carnivals (Fat Tuesday) “bruciamenti delle vanità” (burning of vanities), one on February 7, 1497 and another the following year, February 27, 1498, Florentines burned or mutilated books, artifacts, and art works. According to Pseudo-Burlamacchi, who gives the most widespread description of the two burnings (dated 1530, thirty years after the events), sculptures of women (in the antique style), paintings of beautiful nude figures, both ancient and contemporary Florentines, and various lascivious books in Latin and vulgar tongues including Petrarch, Dante, and Boccaccio’s *Decameron* “and similar dishonest things” were among the victims of the pyre. While establishing the circumstances for these Fat Tuesday burnings based on the historical evidence available, this essay will focus on Savonarola’s “Apologetico: Indole e natura dell’arte poetica” to examine the tyranny of literalism, and its consequences to arts and letters.

**Melinda A. CRO**, *Kansas State University, USA - ENGLISH*

**Folly's Tyranny: Theatricality in Erasmus' and Labé's Portraits of Folly.**

In 1511, Erasmus first published in Paris the *Praise of Folly (Moriae encomium)*, an oration given by Folly herself, expounding her virtues and her preeminence in all aspects of human existence. A few decades later, in 1555, Louise Labé's works were published, including her *Débat de Folie et d'Amour*, inspired by Erasmus' work which was published multiple times in Lyons (Labé's hometown) from 1511 on and was translated in 1520, making it readily available. The goal of this paper is comparative: in Erasmus' vision, Folly takes on the role of tyrant, imposing her will over humanity without discrimination; yet, hers is an unusual tyranny, one that, while felt by all according to her, is acknowledged only by the few fools who are "wise" enough to recognize her influence. There is a constant tension between what is readily visible as folly and what is secretly folly in disguise, masquerading as something altogether different—wisdom, for example, or love. In Erasmus, the true nature of humanity is revealed, ironically, through the theatricality of Folly's tyranny—the oration is akin to the dramatic monologue, and Folly plays the role of puppet master. Labé further draws on this tension between representation and reality, what is seen and unseen, by presenting Folly in juxtaposition with Love. The purpose of this paper is to further elucidate this link between tyranny and theater and how Erasmus and Labé develop the character of Folly and her role as tyrant over the human condition.

*Panel 2 – 11:00 – 12:00 – Europe & Tyranny 2*

Président /Chair : **Bernard BOURDIN**

**Olivier MILLET**, *Université de Paris 1, Panthéon-Sorbonne, France- FRANÇAIS*

**"Liberté de conscience, hétérodoxie et tyrannie, à propos de la mention de Castellion dans *Les Essais* de Montaigne".**

Il s'agira de rappeler l'importance pour Montaigne de la liberté de conscience (dans le sens où cette expression est légitime pour Montaigne), en montrant comment, dans le Livre I, des *Essais*, la référence à Castellion, d'abord implicite (*Essais* I, chap. 16), puis explicite (chap. 35) permet d'articuler entre eux la réflexion politico-religieuse d'actualité sur la tyrannie et la reprise discrète d'une idée fondamentale de Sébastien Castellion formulée ainsi par Montaigne : "On ne peut se prendre à nous que de ce que nous faisons contre notre conscience". On dressera alors un parallèle entre Castellion et Montaigne sur l'opposition de la tyrannie et de la liberté de conscience dans le contexte de la crise religieuse du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle.

**"Freedom of Conscience, heterodoxy and tyranny, regarding Montaigne's mention of Castellion in *Les Essais*"**

*This study will recall what great value Montaigne attaches to freedom of conscience (insofar as this expression is legitimate for him), by showing how in Book I of the *Essais*, the reference to Castellion, first implicit (*Essais* I, chap. 16), then explicit (ch. 35), permits to debate the current political-religious reflexion on tyranny while discreetly borrowing from Sébastien Castellion a fundamental idea, formulated by Montaigne as follows: "We can only be accountable for what we do which is contrary to our conscience". A parallel will be drawn between Castellion and Montaigne on the opposition between tyranny and freedom of conscience in the context of the 16th century religious crisis.*

**Fausto ARICI**, *Facoltà teologica di Bologna, Italia - FRANÇAIS*

**Un manuscrit inédit d'ambiance savonarolienne sur l'assassinat d'Henri III**

Frère Serafino Razzi (Marradi, 1531- Florence, 1613) a été un des plus illustres dominicains italiens du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, très sensible à l'héritage savonarolienne. Philosophe et commentateur de la quasi totalité de l'œuvre d'Aristote (*Praedicamenta, Perihermeneias, De Anima, Methaphisica...*); théologien et exégète subtil de Thomas d'Aquin ainsi que écrivain de livres de conscience; physicien, mathématicien et homme de lettre auteur de raffinées livres de voyages, devenus un incontournable model pour la suivante littérature de voyage. Un savant d'Ancien Régime – pas du tout enfermé dans un couvent – qui à la fin du 1589 sent l'exigence de

défendre son confrère Jaques Clément, assassin de Henri III de Valois Angoulême.

Avec le *Discorso sopra la occisione di Enrico terzo Re di Francia fatto l'anno 1589*, concis manuscrit inédit et gardé à la bibliothèque du couvent de Fiesole (Florence), Razzi présente un efficace raccourci des grands thèmes théologiques de la tradition scolastique sur le tyrannicide, mais en les relisant par une nouvelle sensibilité intellectuelle qui a ses racines soit dans une intuition presque humaniste du pouvoir, soit dans une nouvelle vision théologique, celle de l'école tardo-scholastique qui a comme maître reconnu le cardinal dominicain Cajétan (Gaeta, 1468- Roma, 1534). L'autographe, presque intègre, peut être donc colloqué parmi les ouvrages qui, au début de la modernité, inaugurent une nouvelle théologie politique catholique de l'autorité.

***The Savonarolian ambiance of an unpublished manuscript about the murder of Henri III***

*Friar Serafino Razzi (Marradi, 1531- Florence, 1613) was one of most illustrious Italian Dominicans of the 16th century, and much influenced by Savonarola's heritage. He was a philosopher and a commentator of nearly all of Aristotle's œuvre (Praedicamenta, Perihermeneias, De Anima, Methaphisica...); as a theologian, he proved a subtle exegete of Thomas Aquinas and wrote a few books on conscience; a physician and a mathematician, he was also a refined author of travel accounts, which became models for the ensuing travel literature. Far from being a man enclosed in a convent, Razzi was an Ancien Régime scholar, who, at the end of 1589, felt the urge to defend his colleague Jacques Clément, the murderer of Henri III de Valois Angoulême.*

*With the Discorso sopra la occisione di Enrico terzo Re di Francia fatto l'anno 1589, a concise unpublished manuscript kept in the convent library of Fiesole (Florence), Razzi presents an efficient sample of the great theological themes of the scholastic tradition on tyrannicide, but re-interpreting them with a novel intellectual sensibility rooted in a new theological vision, belonging to the tardo-scholastic school whose well-known master was the Dominican Cardinal Cajetan (Gaeta, 1468- Rome, 1534). The nearly complete autograph can therefore be counted among the works which, in early modern times, mark the beginning of a new political Catholic theology of authority.*

**Panel 3 – 14:00 – 15:30 – Europe & Tyranny 3**

Président /Chair : **Eugenio OLIVARES MERINO**, *Universidad de Jaén, Spain*

**Eduardo A. SALAS ROMO**, *Universidad de Jaén, Spain - ESPAÑOL*

**El concepto de *tiranía* en la obra de Antonio de Guevara**

***The concept of tyranny in the writings of Antonio de Guevara***

The aim of this paper is to elucidate a particular vision of the concept of tyranny as presented in the works of Antonio de Guevara, one of the most distinguished and influential Spanish scholars in the Sixteenth Century. Guevara contributed to the shaping of many meaningful terms and ideas that kindled the cultural ambiance of his days. Furthermore, this Spaniard's writings establish a dialogue with the works by the leading figures of the European Renaissance, such as More's *Utopia*, Erasmus' *Institutio principis christiani* or *The Courtier* by Castiglione.

The detailed analysis of Guevara's texts will show how the Renaissance revitalized Classical motifs instilling into them new meanings. This is the case, for example, in the case of *genres* such as the *Specula (Principis or Militis)*. Guevara claims for a proper education for both the prince and the court, concluding that sovereignty must be properly supported by the ethical (or even intellectual) principles of the monarch.

**Regina Maria CARPENTIERI MONTEIRO**, *Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Brasil- ENGLISH*

***The City of The Sun: From The Middle Ages To The Renaissance***

Tommaso Campanella (1568-1539), in *The City of the Sun*, a utopian text written in 1602, transfers his political philosophy to fiction. A priest, named "Metaphysician" or "Hoh," assisted by a triumvirate – Pon (Power), Sin (Wisdom) and Mor (Love) – governs a republic of wise men, in which religion and politics form a single unit. The Calabrian philosopher has always defended the union of all people under the aegis of a single monarch, who holds secular and ecclesiastical powers. This theocratic universalism appears in *Monarchia Christianorum* (1593) and in *Monarchia di Spagna* (1598). In the latter, Campanella proposes a harsh critique of Machiavelli

(1469-1527), who defends the notion that it is men's duty to build and to conduct state politics, and that only concrete reality can provide its characteristics and principles. On the other hand, Campanella believes that the precepts by which men must be ruled can be found in nature, the principles of nature being an expression of God's art. At this point, Campanella's philosophy departs from the idea of secular preeminence which is advocated by the author of *The Prince* (1532). In spite of declaring himself to be Machiavelli's enemy, certain aspects of Campanella's political reflections are similar to the Florentine writer's ruminations. It is possible to verify this affinity in *The City of the Sun*, especially in the approach to nature of the Dominican monk – the basic point of reference for his utopia. For Campanella, the truth of all things and, in this sense, political principles must be sought within concrete reality, that is to say, in nature. The main purpose of this communication lies in an examination of *The City of the Sun*, considering these two points of proximity.

**Stelio CRO**, *Professor Emeritus, McMaster University, USA - ENGLISH*

### **The Lion and the Fox: An unholy animal kingdom**

In this study, I will discuss two works written almost contemporaneously, the *History of Richard III* (1512) of Thomas More and *The Prince* (1513) of Niccolò Machiavelli. Both works deal with the question of tyranny versus *raison d'état* as represented by rulers who, according to the differing viewpoints of the two authors, are most representative of either tyranny or statesmanship.

More attributes to Richard III, the last Plantagenet king, a detailed list of moral vices that leaves no doubt as to his very negative view of Richard. More views history from a moral and religious perspective designed to serve as a moral guide to the reader. Even his several references to contemporary history are cloaked in metaphoric language and given an apocalyptic style inspired in the Bible.

On the other hand, in *The Prince*, Machiavelli's style is direct and deals with contemporary events without moral or religious preoccupations. He constructs a portrait of Cesare Borgia in which many of the characteristics mentioned by More as vices of Richard III are considered virtues for a successful ruler. Reviewing the examples of rulers to be imitated, Machiavelli chooses Ferdinand of Aragon, the husband of Isabella the Catholic. In Machiavelli's opinion, King Ferdinand succeeded because he never kept his word, another vice transformed into a political virtue.

In essence, for More history is "magistra vitae", as long as the Christian values are conveyed by the historian, whereas for Machiavelli history's lesson is valid regardless of religious and/or moral issues. Whether or not the modern reader, basing his reading on contemporary sources, rejects More's depiction of Richard III as inaccurate, is largely immaterial since my emphasis is not on the historical accuracy of either of the two authors, but rather on moral issues that even today flavor our view of politics and history and the literary aspects of their expression.

*Panel 4 – 16:00 – 17:00 – Tyranny and the Law*

Président / Chair : ----- **UNDECIDED** -----

**Hernán CORRAL TALCIANI**, *Universidad de los Andes, Santiago, Chile - ESPAÑOL*

### **Tyranny and Law in Thomas More's Declamation in Reply to the Lucianic one**

The analysis of More's declamation in response to Lucian's *Tyrannicida*, despite its rhetorical and literary character, may be useful for deducing the importance that More attributes to Law, since its existence and healthy efficacy are the exact opposite of tyranny, as laws are captive to tyranny and are substituted by terror. Tyrannicide, which More accepts as implied in the case, as well as the exiling and overthrowing of the tyrant, are meritorious only when they allow the city's recovery of freedom and a Rule of Law.

We concluded that in an indirect and implicit manner, More's answer to Lucian's *Tyrannicida* posits the importance (if not, decisiveness) that is attributed to law in order to neutralize the possibility that a State fall into tyranny. Tyranny is totally incompatible with the validity of law, in that the laws proper to a tyrannical regime are neither authentic laws nor part of a legal regime. Indeed, the law is as captive as the city itself, the divine laws are despised and the tyrant maintains power through terror and violence, without permitting any control of power through other authorities or governmental organizations, while making the criminals who commit misdeeds, their accomplices.

Although it cannot be sustained, due to the rhetorical nature of the work, that More approves of tyrannicide

*Thomas More, Renaissance & Tyranny – International Conference – updated May 7  
Paris July 4-6, 2012*

morally and politically, it can be conjectured that in any case, what he values is not the death of the tyrant, but the recovery of freedom, since this supposes the recovery and establishment of a Rule of Law.

*El análisis de la declamatio de Moro en respuesta al Tyrannicida de Luciano, aun considerando su prevalente carácter retórico y literario, puede ser útil para deducir la importancia que Moro atribuye al Derecho pues su existencia y eficacia saludable son justamente lo opuesto a la tiranía. Las leyes están cautivas en la tiranía y son sustituidas por el terror. El tiranicidio, que Moro acepta como presupuesto del caso, así como el exilio o deposición del tirano son meritorios sólo en cuanto permiten la recuperación de la libertad de la ciudad y la recuperación del Estado de Derecho.*

*Se concluye que, de manera indirecta e implícita, la respuesta de Moro al Tyrannicida de Luciano plantea la importancia (si bien, no decisiva) que se atribuye al Derecho para neutralizar la posibilidad de que un Estado venga a caer en la tiranía. La tiranía es totalmente incompatible con la vigencia del Derecho, en cuanto las leyes propias de un régimen tiránico no son auténticas leyes ni conforman un régimen jurídico, las leyes propiamente están tan cautivas como la misma ciudad, las leyes divinas son despreciadas, y el tirano mantiene el poder por el terror y por la violencia, sin permitir ningún control de su poder por otras autoridades u órganos gubernamentales, y haciendo de los criminales que cometen fechorías con impunidad, sus cómplices.*

*Aunque no pueda sostenerse, por la naturaleza retórica de la pieza, que Moro apruebe el tiranicidio moral y políticamente, puede conjeturarse que en todo caso lo que valora no es la muerte del tirano sino la recuperación de la libertad, en cuanto ella supone la recuperación y establecimiento de un legítimo Estado de Derecho*

**Christopher J. RILEY, Attorney at Law, Minneapolis, MN, USA - ENGLISH**

### **Constitutional Law as Bulwark against Tyranny**

Thomas More was executed at Tower Hill in 1535 following his conviction on a charge of treason. For over three years Thomas More attempted to avoid controversy and legal sanction by carefully ordering his affairs and avoiding any comment on the events of the day. Thomas More and John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, were unsuccessful in their efforts to avoid legal sanction and death. Both spent long periods confined to the Tower of London and were executed. Thomas More's imprisonment without conviction was illegal. A significant portion of the time he was held captive was based on an attainder passed by Parliament. More was convicted of treason on the perjured testimony of Richard Rich. Two others present during the conversation between More and Rich (as testified to by Rich) refused to corroborate Rich's account of the event.

By contrast, the US Constitution contains a number of legal protections that, if they had been available to Thomas More, would have made the result much more difficult for King Henry to achieve. The Constitution prohibits Congress from passing a bill of attainder, as was employed to hold Thomas More, Bishop Fisher and others in prison. The Constitution includes a very strict definition of treason, essentially requiring proof of an act of war against the country or giving aid and comfort to an enemy in wartime. No one may be convicted of treason without the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act. The axe swung freely in Tudor England because so many things could be found to be treason and uncorroborated evidence, such as the testimony given by Rich, was sufficient to obtain a conviction.

The Constitution contains structural protections against tyranny. Legislative, executive and judicial powers are separated and assigned to their respective branches of government to better secure liberty. The legislature and judiciary also enjoy significant protections against executive encroachment or interference.

Another provision that avoids tyrannical exercise of power is the limitation on any individual serving as president for more than two terms. While this was simply a custom begun by President George Washington, the custom became law when the 25th Amendment was ratified. See U.S. Const. amend 25. Our constitution thus specifically forbids dynastic service, which avoids questions of dynastic succession that plagued Tudor England.

These structural provisions protect the country and its citizens from tyrannical exercises of power. These protections were mostly lacking in Tudor England. The comparison shows that laws, properly drawn to protect rights and liberty, may stand as a bulwark against tyranny.

***17h15 – 18h : Vihuela Concert by Pascal Boëls***

## **DAY 2- England and Tyranny**

*Panel 5 – 09:00 – 10:30 – England & Tyranny 1*

Président / Chair : **Cecilia HATT, UK**

**Jean-Philippe GENET**, *Université de Paris 1, Panthéon-Sorbonne, France - ENGLISH*

### **The problem of tyranny in fifteenth century England, from the War of the roses to Henry VII**

Tyranny is familiar both as a word and as a concept to the student of sixteenth century England: indeed, all 16th century authors discuss the problem, to begin with Thomas Elyot and Thomas Starkey, not to mention More himself. It is also a medieval topic, to which John of Salisbury or Giles of Rome have devoted many pages; words with the root “tiran” or “tyran” occur 236 times in the *De regimine Principum*! However, the word is conspicuously rare in sixteenth century political literature, with the possible (and moderate) exception of Sir John Fortescue, who could not avoid the topic when discussing the distinction between his two kinds of dominium, the royal and the royal and political. But if the word is not in the texts, the concept may be hiding in the thought and the imagination of the members of the political society, while the real thing might appear in the course of the power struggles which are conveniently summarised by the phrase “War of the Roses”, whatever its dubious origins. Starting as a lexicographical analysis of the available political literature, the paper turns to an interrogation on the contractual and constitutional foundations of the English policy in a long second half of the fifteenth century, from the end of the minority of Henry VI to the reign of Henry VII.

**William ROCKETT**, *University of Oregon, USA - ENGLISH*

### **Tyranny?**

Thomas More may or may not have been a victim of Henry VIII’s tyrannical vengeance, but what is certain is that he was indeed a victim of a constitutional revolution. He would not allow himself to subordinate loyalty to the Church to loyalty to the Crown, and the Crown would not allow him to maintain loyalty to the Church if it meant making the Church his highest allegiance and the Crown subordinate. More’s options were to endorse either royal sovereignty or the sovereignty of the Church. More chose the second option, which under English law made him a traitor. He was put on trial on a charge of capital treason and executed inside the Tower walls on the fifth of July 1535.

*Panel 6 – 11:00 – 12:20 – England & Tyranny 2*

Président / Chair : **Stephen M. FOLEY, Brown University, USA**

**Paul QUINN**, *University of Sussex, UK - ENGLISH*

### **Identifying tyrants, nullifying tyranny on the early modern stage.**

Greg Walker suggests that ‘by no stretch of the available definitions was the England of 1509 or even 1527 tyrannically governed’ but that by the time of Henry VIII’s death in 1547, ‘all this had changed... England had fallen under a despotic regime... Henry was a monster whose death was a blessing to his subjects’. Walker’s *Writing Under Tyranny* argues for the development of rhetorical tropes and modes in order to write within and against the Henrican regime; Walker suggests that ‘many modes of writing now seen to be characteristic of the English literary renaissance’ were products of the negotiations necessary to survive in mid-Tudor England. However, one of the most characteristic English Renaissance modes of literary discourse - drama on the public stage - was a later development. In that literary model, a product of the reign of Elizabeth I, we find a markedly different way of writing about tyranny, in particularly in staged reconstructions of the reign of Henry VIII.

As this paper will demonstrate, playwrights including Shakespeare, William Rowley and the group of authors responsible for the *Thomas More* play utilise a number of dramatic and rhetorical techniques in order to avoid directing the accusation of monarchical tyranny against Henry VIII while simultaneously suggesting the

*Thomas More, Renaissance & Tyranny* – International Conference – *updated May 7*  
Paris July 4-6, 2012

tyrannical nature of England after 1529. The result is a series of late Elizabethan and early Stuart plays which employ the image of ‘Bluff King Henry’ to nullify charges of tyranny, a technique then undercut by pointed rhetoric and the staging of contentious moments of recent history, which suggest the brutal nature of Henry’s England.

**Cecilia HATT**, *Independent Scholar, UK - ENGLISH*

**Keeping the Conversation going: Fisher & More and Henry VIII’s intellectual tyranny**

The unfinished text of the *History of King Richard III* ends with Cardinal Morton telling the fable of the lion and the horned beasts. He moralises that a person speaking with the best of intentions may nevertheless endanger himself if his words can be maliciously interpreted. Taking it as a principle that tyrannical forms of government depend on the denial of hermeneutic freedom, I propose to consider the socio-philosophical effects of Henry VIII’s attempts to exert control, not just over the physical but also the intellectual activities of his subjects. When the king came to the throne, he inherited a court and judiciary which years of comparative political stability, increased access to public education, and the offerings of the printing press had formed into a highly articulate and argumentative society. It was a time, moreover, when the attention of royal advisers was much exercised with questions about political theory and the functions of government. To achieve his ends, the king had radically to limit the extent of conversational freedom, while seeking to legitimise his own decisions by insisting that they were the result of discussion and the advice of others.

I shall discuss the ways in which both Thomas More and John Fisher contrived to “converse” within a perilously maintained community of trust. I would also like to consider, with reference to Augustine’s *City of God* and the poetry of Robert Southwell, the implications of an alternative: a recourse to a kind of Platonist stoicism that disputed, if not the reality, at least the significance of the material world.

**Eugenio OLIVARES MERINO**, *University of Jaén, Spain - ENGLISH*

**Thomas More’s refusal to read a letter by the Emperor**

On March 11 (1531) the Emperor Charles V wrote a brief letter to the Chancellor of England, Sir Thomas More. It was to be handled personally by Eustace Chapuys, the Imperial Ambassador to England. Charles manifested his gratitude to More for being, in Chapuys’ words, *a good servant of the Queen Catherine*, Charles’ aunt, in the “King’s Great Matter”. However, on April 2, Chapuys informed the Emperor that the English Chancellor had refused to receive the letter (or even meet the ambassador).

More was favourably disposed towards Charles, with whom he shared the conviction that the Turks were “so cruel and implacable an enemy”, as Chapuys reported to the Emperor on April 11. Despite the fact that the government of the Ottoman Empire was characterized as tyranny in Sixteenth Century Europe, More also complained “of the blindness of those princes who refused” to assist the Caesar against the Turk.

Taking into account this wider scenario, I propose a reconsideration of More’s attitude in the letter episode, as discussed by his biographers (Chambers and Marius, among others). Furthermore, I will attempt to deepen into More’s relation with Queen Catherine, Chapuys and the Emperor.

*Panel 7 – 14:00 – 15:30 – Thomas More and Tyranny 1*

Président / Chair : **Seymour B. HOUSE**, *Mount Angel Seminary, USA*

**Gerard WEGEMER**, *University of Dallas, USA - ENGLISH*

**Exposing Tyranny: More’s Earliest Literary Experiments**

This paper analyzes More’s six earliest treatments of tyranny, all completed before joining Henry VIII’s court in 1518. This study, accompanied by a listing of all sources in context, proposes answers to these questions: What is young More’s view of tyranny and of its significance? What are More’s major sources? Is his treatment of tyranny novel in any way, given the contexts he creates and the sources that he invokes? Since More publishes five of his six treatments of tyranny, why might he have decided not to publish what has become his most famous work on that subject, *The History of King Richard III*?

**John GUY**, *Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, UK - ENGLISH*

**John Guy is our guest of honour.**

The author of *Thomas More* (2000) and *A Daughter's Love: Thomas and Margaret More* (2008), John Guy is a leading historian on Tudor England, and we thank him for accepting our invitation to participate in this Conference. His keynote lecture will deal with Thomas More and Tyranny.

Professor Guy wrote: "I believe fear of tyranny to be the main issue for Thomas More as a statesman and politician, and I'll accordingly range across his entire career and writings."

*Marie-Claire Phélippeau*

**Panel 8 – 16:00 – 17:30 – Thomas More and Tyranny 2**

Président / Chair : **Gerard WEGEMER, University of Dallas, USA**

**Uwe BAUMANN, University of Bonn, Germany - ENGLISH**

**Richard III as Classical Tyrant: From Thomas More to William Shakespeare**

In his Latin versions as well as in the English account of the *Historia / History of King Richard III* Thomas More uses an abundance of classical topoi to depict Richard III as tyrant and usurper of the throne (cf. Richard S. Sylvester, Uwe Baumann, Daniel Kinney). William Shakespeare portrays the king in a similar way in his *Richard III*, even though references to a classical tradition are not as distinct in his history play. The first part of the paper is to examine how the Tudor chronicles (especially Edward Hall and Raphael Holinshed) modified More's prototype („Richard as Prototypical Classical Tyrant“). In the second part the same question is to be answered with regard to Thomas Legge's Latin history play *Richardus Tertius* and the anonymous *True Tragedy of Richard the Third*.

Thus, the contributed paper points out how classical topoi concerning tyranny were developed in such way that they helped shape the public image of Richard III. It is highlighted how these literary representations of the last king of the House of York served the political objective to create a 'Tudor Myth', and it becomes obvious that – simultaneously - they affirmed the humanists' principle of „*historia magistra vitae*“.

**Stephen W. SMITH, Hillsdale College, MI, USA - ENGLISH**

**Tyranny and Imagination: Shakespeare, Thomas More and the Education of Princes**

Like More and Erasmus before him, Shakespeare was interested in the so-called "education of princes," especially in his late Tudor plays *Richard the Third*, *Hamlet*, and *The Henriad* (Henry IV and V). This paper will explore Shakespeare's teaching on the tyrannical soul and what I will call "the arts of tyranny". The paper will also compare Shakespeare's understanding of tyranny and the tyrannical soul with Thomas More's, especially as More's understanding is revealed in his humanist writings such as *The Life of Pico*, *The History of Richard the Third*, *Utopia*, and *Dialogue Concerning Heresies*.

Both More and Shakespeare spend considerable time representing and exposing how and why tyranny proves so successful on this earthly stage. Both provide interested readers with the most searching accounts in the Renaissance of "the arts of tyranny", especially the tyrant's appeals to superbia, desire, and imagination. Both also provide readers with the means of defending oneself against tyranny, especially tyranny of soul.

**18h- 19 h : Concert - Académie Vocale de Paris**



## **DAY 3 - Thomas More and Tyranny**

*Panel 9 – 09:00 – 10:30 – Thomas More and Tyranny 3*

Président de séance / *Chair*: **Franck LESSAY**, Université Paris 3 Sorbonne Nouvelle

**Isabelle BORE**, *Université de Picardie-Jules Verne, France - ENGLISH*

### **Writing under Tyranny: the examples of Thomas More and Thomas Elyot**

Within the context of a discussion about tyranny in the Renaissance, we shall propose to deal with the literary devices used by such intellectuals as Thomas More and Thomas Elyot to go on making themselves heard at the time of the King's Great Matter when the monarchical system set up by Henry VIII obviously turned into a tyrannical form of government. Even if Thomas More and Thomas Elyot made radically different choices – the former refused to take the oath whereas the latter accepted it – and if we have only very little information about friendly or business relationship between the two men, we shall prove that they both considered writing as an efficient weapon to struggle against tyranny.

Starting from the meditations on tyranny which interested Thomas More at the beginning of his literary career – these meditations being largely influenced by the Græco-Roman Antiquity and symbolical both of the image of the tyrant and of the fear he provoked – then, we shall focus on the texts produced by Thomas More and Thomas Elyot between 1529 and 1541 at the time of the King's Great Matter and its political consequences. The comparison of these texts will give us the opportunity to highlight the different devices used by Thomas More and Thomas Elyot. The parallel reading of their texts will contribute to revealing two experts in dramatization, theatricality and disguise. Indeed, as they often used the mask of anonymity and made up their speeches thanks to sarcasm and irony, More and Elyot did not hesitate to manipulate dates and sources and to multiply paradoxes in order to produce speeches disconcerting enough to avoid being censored and accused of high treason.

Although More and Elyot did not advise the same medicines to cure Henry VIII of his tyrannical instincts, the similar literary devices they used will finally enable us to conclude that there is a fighting literature testifying to the former's dissenting spirit and the latter's resisting attitude.

### ***Ecrire en temps de tyrannie : les exemples de Thomas More et Thomas Elyot***

*Dans la perspective d'une réflexion sur la tyrannie à la Renaissance, nous proposons de nous intéresser aux moyens mis en œuvre par des intellectuels tels que Thomas More et Thomas Elyot pour continuer à faire entendre leur voix à l'époque de la Grande Affaire du Roi où le régime mis en place par Henry VIII prend une tournure manifestement tyrannique. Même si Thomas More et Thomas Elyot posent des choix radicalement différents, l'un refusant de prêter serment et l'autre pas, et si nous ne disposons que de très peu d'informations sur les relations amicales ou professionnelles entre les deux hommes, nous montrerons que pour l'un comme pour l'autre, l'écriture est une arme efficace dans la lutte contre la tyrannie.*

*Partant de la réflexion que Thomas More mène au tout début de sa carrière sur la tyrannie, une réflexion largement influencée par l'Antiquité gréco-latine et symbolique de l'image du tyran à la Renaissance et de la crainte qu'il inspire, nous nous concentrerons, ensuite, sur les textes que Thomas More et Thomas Elyot ont produits entre 1529 et 1541, à l'époque de la Grande Affaire du Roi et de ses conséquences politiques. La confrontation de ces œuvres nous permettra de mettre en lumière les différents procédés auxquels ont recours aussi bien Thomas More que Thomas Elyot. La lecture parallèle de leurs œuvres permettra de découvrir deux écrivains passés maîtres dans l'art de la théâtralisation, du travestissement et du déguisement. En effet, utilisant souvent le masque de l'anonymat et maquillant leur discours au moyen du sarcasme et de l'ironie, More et Elyot n'hésitent pas à manipuler dates et sources et à multiplier les paradoxes de façon à produire un discours suffisamment déroutant pour échapper à la censure et aux accusations de trahison.*

*En dépit d'intonations spécifiques à chacun des deux auteurs, ces similitudes, nous permettront, alors, de conclure à l'existence d'une littérature de combat témoignant de l'entrée en dissidence de l'un et de la résistance de l'autre.*

**Mario TURCHETTI**, *Université de Fribourg, Suisse - FRANÇAIS*

**Thomas More et la tyrannie, ou le déchirement de la conscience**

Cette étude aborde le travail intérieur de Th. More à travers les notes prises par sa fille, dans lesquelles la « conscience » de l'auteur est souvent sollicitée et finit par jouer le rôle d'une interlocutrice. Cette approche – qui se tient à distance de toute perspective psychologisante – se base sur les relations que notre auteur va en tissant entre ses études historiques sur la tyrannie et le tyrannicide anciens et modernes, d'une part, et les réflexions que la réalité historique vécue lui suggère, d'autre part. Il s'agit d'une contribution à la question fondamentale que posent sa vie et sa mort : pourquoi Th. More, parmi les alternatives dont il disposait, a choisi de ne pas se soustraire au supplice ?

***Thomas More and Tyranny, or conscience torn up***

*This study addresses Thomas More's interior debate visible through the notes taken by his daughter, in which the author's "conscience" is often solicited and ends up by playing the role of an interlocutor. This approach – which distances itself from a mere psychological perspective – is based on the relations that More gradually wove between his own studies on ancient and modern tyranny and tyrannicide on the one hand, and the reflections drawn from the historical reality he faces on the other. This is a contribution that wishes to address the fundamental question raised by his life and death: why did Thomas More, when faced with the choices at his disposal, choose not to escape torture?*

***Panel 10 – 11:00 – 12:20 – Thomas More and Tyranny 4***

**Président de séance/ Chair: Stephen W. SMITH Hillsdale College, USA**

**Jeffrey S. LEHMAN, Thomas Aquinas College, CA , USA - ENGLISH**

**Seeing Tyranny in Thomas More's *Richard III* and *Utopia***

As they embark upon a dialectical examination of justice in Plato's *Republic*, Socrates admonishes his interlocutors that the pursuit of justice is for those who "see clearly". Indeed, the dialogue itself is meant to bring about such clear-sightedness as the interlocutors dialectically winnow the various accounts of justice proposed. In like manner, two of Thomas More's works—*Richard III* and *Utopia*—help his readers to see clearly the tyrant and tyranny. In *Richard III*, More presents a portrait of a tyrant and the conditions that make his tyranny possible. Crucial to this portrait is *what* the various characters see as well as *when* they see within the dramatic context. Why are so many blind to Richard's machinations? Is their blindness willful? What internal and external factors contribute to their blindness? Who *does* see and how, if at all, do they respond?

In answering these questions, we as readers come to see the nature of the tyrant and tyranny. Seeing the tyrant and tyranny in *Richard III* prepares us to see tyranny and the tyrant in *Utopia*. Although these themes are not as explicit in *Utopia* as they were in *Richard III*, we still see the tyrant and the coming to be of tyranny in the utopian dreams of Hythlodæus, the "purveyor of nonsense". By framing the monological account of *Utopia* found in Book II within the context of a dialogical exchange between Morus and Hythlodæus of Book I, we are invited as readers to enter into the dialogue ourselves, carefully weighing the claims of Hythlodæus against one another as well as the political realities of England and other existing regimes. By so doing, we come to see the tyrannical spirit of Hythlodæus as it manifests itself in the constitution and political practices of the Utopians.

In the end, we find that *Richard III* and *Utopia* present complementary portraits of the tyrant and tyranny. The former is a retrospective glance at how the tyrant and tyranny come to be in an actual regime; the latter is more prospective in character, taking us into the mind of the tyrant and revealing how he creates a tyranny in speech that carries us ever further from the political tensions of regimes in the real world.

**Benjamin BEIER, University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA – ENGLISH**

**"Damning Dissuaded Time": Tyranny and Rhetoric in *The History of King Richard III***

Renaissance humanists sought to renew the commonweal and emphasized the need for citizens to be skilled in the art of rhetoric to achieve this end. However, some humanist writers, such as Thomas More, were acutely aware that skilled speech need not be ethical and could be used in the service of both statesmen and

tyrants. More's *History of King Richard III* presents a tyrant whose skill in speaking we take for granted. My paper, however, will argue that More provides a much more complicated view of the sophisticated Duke of Gloucester in which the speeches of both the future King and his henchmen serve the end of tyranny, but in which such speeches are not particularly forceful or captivating.

The first section of my paper will show that More employs ironic language to evoke the Roman ideal-orator tradition when describing the future tyrant-king. These allusions lead the reader to anticipate that Gloucester will be unstoppable in his attempt to scatter a gathered humanity and take the throne. However, in the second section, I will show that More instead crafts many characters who are never 'dissuaded' (despite the excuses some will later fashion), but who see through Richard's dissembling and have the potential to forestall Gloucester's tyrannous ascent. Richard is less skilled in speech than we are accustomed to think! This unexpected and underappreciated fact of the *History* allows for fresh insight into More's rhetorical ethics—and the philosophical anthropology, epistemology, and ontology that undergird his moral thought—that ultimately deepens our understanding of both More's civic humanism and his view of tyranny.

**Samuel GREGG**, *Acton Institute, USA – ENGLISH*

### **Intentionality and Moral Identity in Thomas More's *History of King Richard III***

Questions of intentionality, morality and identity have been central to moral, philosophical and political reflection since Plato's time. The purpose of this paper would be to (1) trace the workings of inquiring, understanding, reasoning and free choice in shaping the moral identity of key characters in Thomas More's *History of Richard III*, especially Richard of Gloucester, and (2) illustrate the significance of the development of these moral identities for the formation of the tyrannical regime portrayed by Thomas More.

Two basic arguments will be presented in the proposed paper. *First*, Thomas More is especially attentive to the role played by flaws in moral character – such as excessive self-regard and tendencies to self-deception – in paving the way to the gradual dissolution of legitimate government and the establishment of a tyranny. *Second*, and at a deeper level, More is interested in illustrating how the *intention* to dispose oneself either for or against essential moral goods (including the good of coherent reasoning) contributes to the formation of moral commitments that become core to people's identities (for better or worse) as moral and political actors. In his *History of Richard III*, this paper will argue, More holds that every particular free choice made by such actors – even a choice to do something morally neutral in kind – is either morally good or evil because of its role in contributing to or detracting from such an actor's orientation to more general ends that are not morally neutral.

Central to both arguments will be the claim that Thomas More highlights the *intransitive* effects of intentionality and choice upon the formation of given persons' moral identities, as well as their significance in shaping the character of a given political regime. In short, the growth of tyranny results not simply from choices to instrumentalize and manipulate others, but also from the *interior* effects of the very same choices upon a person's identity. To that extent, More reveals himself as one who holds that the free willing of our intentions makes us as much the object of our own choices as those external objects that one consciously chooses to pursue through our actions.

**Panel 11 – 14:00 – 15:00 – Thomas More and Tyranny 5**

Président de séance/ Chair: **Jeffrey S. LEHMAN**, *Thomas Aquinas College, USA*

**Emily A. RANSOM**, *University of Notre-Dame, USA - ENGLISH*

### **Not By Any Means Necessary: More's Stylized Criticism of Lucian's Tyrant-Killer**

Thomas More's literary explorations on the subject of tyranny were not confined to his *History of Richard III* and Latin epigrams; in 1506 he and Erasmus published their translations of Lucian's declamation defending tyrannicide and their own declamations in response. As More engages the Greek satirist, he employs rhetorical tactics partially derived from Cicero's three styles but with an Augustinian forcefulness that emphasizes tyranny as an affront against "the gods", not only against justice. Yet with his three distinct rhetorical styles that roughly approximate the high, middle, and plain styles of the classical oration, More demonstrates that just as tyranny is an affront against the law, human nature, and the gods, those who oppose tyranny can only do so on those grounds. Through this criticism of the opportunistic assassin, we may understand the shades of ambivalence that

obscure his incitement against tyranny in his contemporaneous *Richard* and epigrams.

**Stephen M. FOLEY**, *Brown University, USA - ENGLISH*

### **The Trope of Tyranny in More's epigrams**

Tyranny in early modern Europe is never only a metaphor, but the prominence of tyranny as trope in More's epigrams is also remarkable in epigram and in its time: so what are the semiotic dimensions of tyranny as trope in the epigrams at the moment of More's staged entrance to European letters? What are the verbal terms upon which fatal consequences may seem to turn at the time or in retrospect? How is More's wit cold or intellectual? How is it warm to human consequences? How does the grammar of tyranny in the epigrams relate to the translations from Lucian? To Utopia? To Erasmus's hand in the epigrams? And to the afterlives of trope in experience?

*Panel 12 – 15:00 – 16:00 – Thomas More & Tyranny 6*

Président / Chair: **Elizabeth MCCUTCHEON**, *University of Hawaii, USA*

**William ROGERS**, *U.S. Air Force Academy, USA - ENGLISH*

### **“Charitable Hatred”: More on Heresy, Tyranny, and the Disordered Will**

This paper explores possible parallels between More's attitudes towards heresy and tyranny. Drawing heavily on the polemical discussions of heresy (in particular in *The Confutation* and the *Dialogue Concerning Heresies*), and on the treatment of tyranny in *The History of Richard III*, I investigate the ways in which More might view both of these ills as functions of a similarly misguided will, and how for More not only the response to but the ontology of heretical and tyrannical acts are similar. In each case, the real threat is that the heretic or tyrant might similarly disorder those around him, either through persuasion or force. In such cases, both the heretic and tyrant must be dealt with swiftly and, at times, mercilessly (i.e., not with “council” or catechetical dialogue, but with violence), due to the respective threats they pose to innocent bodies and souls. In a classic Morean irony, this firm sort of dealing proves to be the truest, most properly directed form our rightly felt compassion for others can take.

The paper draws heavily on Augustine's distinction between heavenly and earthly realms of action in *The City of God* (a distinction I argue that is key to More's approach), and works to establish a point of theological and political consistency in More's work and in his endorsement of what Alexandra Walsham calls a “charitable hatred” towards heretics and tyrants judged irredeemable.

**Marie-Claire PHELIPPEAU**, *Moreana Editor, France - ENGLISH*

### **Thomas More and the Sins of Tyranny: being evil and acting evil**

As it became more and more apparent, in early modern times, that the traditional conception of sin, based on the Seven Capital Sins, bore no scriptural authority, the Ten Commandments gradually replaced the former system in theological and moral literature. Thomas More's theology of sin, throughout his work, still relies on the Seven Sins much more than on the Decalogue. This paper argues that the consequence of this conception is an emphasis on the sinner rather than on the sin committed, on being evil rather than on acting evil. However, in his treatment of the tyrant, More uses a much broader range of sins and portrays the epitome of evil, likening the tyrant to the devil himself. The study will try to determine Thomas More's modernity in his conception of the devil-tyrant.

*Panel 13– 16:00 – 17:30 – Digital Thomas More Projects*

Président / Chair: ----- **UNDECIDED** -----

**Romuald I. LAKOWSKI**, *Grant MacEwan College, Edmonton, Canada - ENGLISH*

**Proposal for a “Digital Thomas More”**

After briefly discussing the impact of "Digital Humanities", including "text encoding" (both TEI [the Text Encoding Initiative] and XHTML) and databases, on traditional humanities scholarship, I will outline a number of projects that I am either presently working on or hope to work on in the future. Part of my presentation will involve a call for potential future collaborators, and a discussion of how that collaboration might take place. Here are the four projects that are either already under way or that I am proposing:

1) The International Thomas More Bibliography (Presently ~5,000 items in 7 XHTML files) available at [www3.telus.net/lakowski/itmb.html](http://www3.telus.net/lakowski/itmb.html). I will include some discussion of the problems of updating it and of turning it into a database.

2) A TEI-encoded Edition of Thomas More's English Poetry based on the 1557 English Works, to be made available shortly at [www3.telus.net/lakowski/poetry.html](http://www3.telus.net/lakowski/poetry.html). This will be as far as I know the first "digital edition" of any of Thomas More's works.

3) A proposal for a TEI-encoded digital critical edition of Thomas More's *Utopia* together with a detailed scholarly commentary meant to update the Yale Edition. While I plan to include all my researches on the geographical background to More's *Utopia*, the commentary especially will need to be a collaborative venture bringing together the work of other More scholars with varied interests. This could also eventually lead to a printed commentary as well.

4) A proposal for a TEI-encoded digital edition of More's "letters and papers", including not only transcriptions, translations or modernizations (and in some cases facsimiles) of More's correspondence and the records of his imprisonment and trial, but also letters and documents composed by others, especially Erasmus, relating to More's life. The site could also eventually include facsimiles and transcriptions of More's Prison Works, especially the autograph MS of *De Tristitia* and More's *Prayer Book*. This again would have to be a collaborative project. While I envision this as an online resource for scholars and students of Thomas More, it could also lead in time to a new print edition of More's Correspondence.

**Jeffrey S. LEHMAN**, *Thomas Aquinas College, CA, USA - ENGLISH*

**The Arts of Liberty Project**

"Arts of Liberty", a state-of-the-art, multi-media web site, is an interdisciplinary resource for teachers and students of liberal education. In its final form, the site will include online courses for each of the classical liberal arts (the *trivium*: grammar, logic, and rhetoric; and the *quadrivium*: arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy) as well as chronologically sequenced courses on "great books" with an emphasis on literature, history, and politics. A detailed timeline with images, text, audio/video clips, and other supporting materials will tell the story of education in the Western tradition and contextualize that story within the larger scope of world history. Other resources will include an image library of art and architecture as these relate to the tradition of liberal education. Furthermore, a special emphasis will be placed upon how the liberal arts and liberal education aim to produce citizens capable of entering into and sustaining a mode of ethical and political life that is ordered to true freedom.

Intended principally for educators, each course will provide lesson plans, questions for discussion, study guides, paper topics, exams, etc. that will be of use to anyone seeking to acquire a knowledge of the liberal arts and the "great books" for themselves, or to teach the same to others. The entire web site is a collaborative effort, involving scholars from around the world who are actively engaged in liberal education at the college and university level. Among other things, the site will include video lectures from the greatest teachers of the liberal arts and liberal education, amounting to an online archive of those inimitable giants to whom we all owe so great a debt.

In time, we also plan to establish an online peer-reviewed journal where scholars can submit articles to encourage widespread dialogue among teachers of the liberal arts and liberal education. Finally, we hope to found a center for the study of liberal arts and liberal education that will become the premiere location for lectures and conferences, aiming to enhance fruitful dialogue among scholars as well as to serve as a base of operations for strengthening and expanding the knowledge of the liberal arts and their increased incorporation into the curricula of educational institutions, from advanced high schools to colleges, universities, and graduate schools. To make all this possible, we have the generous support of a five-and-a-half-year grant to develop the web site, to begin sponsoring lectures and conferences, and to publicize the work of the Arts of Liberty project.

**18h – 20h / 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm**

**Au Revoir Cocktail**