INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17″ × 23″ black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6″ × 9″ black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI
Accessing the World's Information since 1938

300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

Order Number 8726514

An interdisciplinary examination of the personal religion of Henry VIII

Lee, Frank Lewis, D.A.

Middle Tennessee State University, 1987

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY EXAMINATION OF THE PERSONAL RELIGION OF HENRY VIII

Frank Lewis Lee

A dissertation presented to the
Graduate Faculty of Middle Tennessee State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Doctor of Arts

August, 1987

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY EXAMINATION OF

THE PERSONAL RELIGION OF

HENRY VIII

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

Fred Robertson by Fred Crawford
Major Professor

Larry W. Morris
Minor Professor

Fred Crawford

Jack D. Peters

William F. Windham
Head of the Department of History

Mary Martin
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY EXAMINATION OF
THE PERSONAL RELIGION OF
HENRY VIII

by Frank Lewis Lee

Two distinct strands are discernible in the personality of Henry VIII, King of England 1509-1547. Popular stereotype views the King as a blood swollen, uxorious devil who let nothing and no one stand in the way of his autocratic will. At the same time the historical records present the picture of a devout individual who attended Mass daily, listened attentively to sermons, quoted the Bible, argued theology and was acclaimed Defender of the Faith by Pope Leo X.

Accepting the King's religion as an honest expression of faith and not a facade, the writer proposed to examine the religious behavior of Henry VIII from the perspective of contemporary psychological theory. The dissertation was a project in the newly developing field of psychohistory, bringing together insights from the fields of religious studies, the behavioral sciences and history.

The purpose was neither to condemn nor to glorify, but to understand one of history's controversial characters.

After consideration of the meaning of "behavior" as a social science concept, and an inquiry into the origin and development of religious behavior, the writer examined an early psychoanalytic view that the "much married" behavior of Henry reflected an unresolved Oedipus complex. Henry's own statement of religion was examined in his treatise against Martin Luther, followed by a probe into the motivations involved in the long sought annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon in order to marry Anne Boleyn. Henry's claim to have been driven by conscience was taken at face value with extended consideration of the meaning of conscience both from a psychological and a Biblical point of view. The final chapter attempted a psychological profile of Henry VIII in light of Abraham Maslow's "Authoritarian Character Structure" concept studied and amplified by T. W. Adorno and his associates. Applications to contemporary society, especially in relation to religious behavior, were offered. A basic premise of the study was that religion may be viewed as a form of behavior explainable on the same basis as other kinds of behavior. Hence religion can be removed from the sphere of the sacred and untouchable to a down-to-earth fact of life which can and must be critically evaluated.

Frank Lewis Lee

This study is slanted toward the needs of upper level undergraduate students who are encouraged to approach the study of history from an interdisciplinary, inductive and problem solving approach.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Born of devout parents the year before Columbus discovered America, the naked infant was immersed three times (according to the pre-Reformation custom) in a royal christening ceremony which officially related him to the institutional Christianity of the time.[1] Fifty-five years later as King he lay in a comatose state near death, his hand clasped in that of Archbishop Crammer who urged him if possible to indicate with a gentle squeeze that he was looking to Christ for salvation. In the intervening years of life and reign, King Henry VIII of England had lived out an oftentimes story expression of the religious faith to which his parents had dedicated him in the first few days of his life.

There is a tradition often quoted and variously evaluated that Henry's father had purposed him as the second-born son to become the Archbishop of Canterbury. Accordingly, from the earliest possible time the father tailored the education of the young prince.[2] Whether or

---

[1] Allison Plowden, Tudor Women: Queens and Commoners. (New York: Atheneum, 1979), p. 19.

[2] A. F. Pollard, Henry VIII. (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1905), p. 13, citing Lord Herbert Life and Reign of Henry VIII, 1672. Pollard says Herbert's authority is Paolo Sarpi.

not this view has any basis in fact, it serves to emphasize a reality about the lifestyle of Henry VIII. In early manhood, theology was one of the King's hobbies.[3] Owning an extensive selection of works on the subject, he enjoyed spending hours discussing its intricacies with the scholars of his court, and at the age of thirty he received the title Defender of the Faith from Pope Leo X for his militant remonstrance against the views of Martin Luther. When some time later he broke with Rome to lead the Church in England down an independent path, he continued to regard himself as a loyal Catholic true to the Faith of the Fathers from which the religious Establishment of the time, not he, had turned aside.

Personally devout in his private life, the King established early in his reign the habit of hearing Mass several times daily, a practice modified somewhat but still observed as far as possible when he was away on hunting trips. On Good Friday it was his custom to creep to the altar on his hands and knees to assist the priest in the Mass, and he continued to attempt to do so when he became physically incapacitated and had to take communion sitting in a chair.[4] On one occasion he is reported to

---

[3]H. Maynard Smith, Pre-Reformation England. (London: MacMillan and Company, Limited, 1938), p. 307.

[4]Lacey Baldwin Smith, Henry VIII: The Mask of

have defended in an article not now preserved the practice of spontaneous personal prayer, contrary to the custom of the time for laymen to use devotional aids prepared by the clergy.[5] This did not indicate any antagonism to the clergy. The best preachers of the time were welcome at the royal court, and these Henry heard with interest, very often tarrying at the close of a service to discuss points made by the preacher in his sermon. Queen Catherine attributed her husband's early success to his faithfulness in religious duty, and Erasmus wrote that the English court was a model of piety and learning for all Christendom.[6]

Henry's religious orientation was not a facade. In 1527 he severely rebuked his older sister Margaret, who had been married to James IV who was killed at the battle of Flodden. Margaret's second husband was the Earl of Angus from whom she was divorced by papal dispensation of Clement VII on grounds that James had not died at Flodden but was still alive when she remarried. The occasion of Henry's letter was that Margaret was now living with Henry Stewart who had also procured a divorce to marry her.

Royalty. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971), p. 101.

[5]Pollard, Henry VIII, p. 97.

[6]Ibid. p. 84, citing Letters and Papers of Henry VIII. I 4417 and II 4115.

> ...He sends through Wolsey his brotherly rebuke and admonishments to the erring Margaret, exhorting her that he is taking time out from the pressing matters of state to express concern for her welfare, not only in the things which pertain to this life but especially in those which involve her "immortal felicity".

He would turn the attention of her soul to the doctrine of Christ, to the only ground of salvation, and he goes on to quote several passages of Scripture to reinforce his admonitions.[7]

On the basis of the evidence available to us it would seem difficult to resist the conclusion that Henry VIII was a very religious individual. G. R. Elton points out that even the twelve battle stations in the King's personal warship bore the names of the apostles of the Lord.[8]

Yet over against the evidence for the avowedly religious lifestyle of Henry Tudor, there is another set of facts which must be viewed in perspective. There is a traditional stereotype reinforced by considerable scholarship which views the King as a blood swollen luxurious devil about whom there is little anyone can

---

[7]M. St. Clare Byrne (ed.), The Letters of King Henry VIII: A Selection with a Few Other Documents. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1936), p. 65.

[8]Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558. (Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1977), p. 33.

admire. Sir Walter Raleigh writing at the beginning of the seventeenth century commented to the effect that if all the crimes of kings from the beginning were suddenly erased from history, the record could easily be restored by simply retelling the misdeeds of this one very evil man.[9]

With a reputation like that, to speak of the religion of Henry VIII seems a contradiction in terms. Winston Churchhill has appropriately summarized:

> Henry's rule saw many advances in the growth and character of the English state, but it is a hideous blot upon his record that the reign should be widely remembered for its executions. Two queens, two of the King's chief ministers, a saintly bishop, numerous abbots, monks and many ordinary folk who dared to resist the royal will were put to death. Almost every member of the nobility in whom royal blood ran perished on the scaffold at Henry's command. Roman Catholic and Calvinist alike were burnt for heresy and religious treason. These persecutions inflicted in solemn manner by officers of the law, perhaps in the presence of the Council or even the King himself, form a brutal sequel to the bright promise of the Renaissance. The suffering of devout men and women among the faggots, the use of torture, and the savage penalties imposed for even paltry crime, stand in contrast to the enlightened principles of humanism.[10]

---

[9] John Winston, Sir Walter Raleigh. (New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1975), p. 291.

[10] A History of the English Speaking Peoples. Volume II: The New World. (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1956), pp. 84-85.

The Problem

The purpose of this study is to examine from an interdisciplinary perspective the place of religion in the life of Henry VIII, portrayed in historical sources as ardently religious, yet viewed in popular stereotype as a murderous tyrant who seemed the incarnation of all that was contrary to the spirit of true religion.

There are two possible approaches to the dilemma of the religion of Henry VIII. One is that the King was a hypocrite who in Elmer Gantry fashion exploited religion for personal gain. In such a case, religion was extrinsic motivation.[11] On the other hand, it is possible that Henry was neither a charlatan nor a saint but a sincere man who took his religious faith seriously, a faith which came to him as a given entity, the product of his time and place and which was sometimes mixed with other less noble motivations not always clearly delineated in the consciousness of the King. In that case religion was an intrinsic motivation. The writer in this study assumes the intrinsic view, that the religion of Henry VIII was

---

[11]Peter A. Bertocci (ed.), Waiting for the Lord-33 Meditations on God and Man-Gordon Allport. (New York: MacMillan Publishers, 1978), p. 91. "Extrinsic religion exists when a person uses religion to serve his own personal interests."

neither hypocritical nor whimsical but a basically consistent entity in his personal frame of reference.

Significance of the Study

Disparity between private piety and public morality is often seen throughout history. Charlemagne "converted" pagans by ruthlessly crushing them on the field of battle.[12] Christian Crusaders thought they honored Christ by slaughtering infidel Moslems in the land of his birth,[13] and Louis XIV persecuted Huguenots in his native France, thinking thereby to please God and possibly atone for the sins of his youth.[14] Roland H. Bainton speaks of his sadness while working on his biography of Martin Luther and finding "that in this case, as often elsewhere, it is the saints who burn the saints...[15] Luther in 1530 acquiesced in the death penalty of Anabaptists, and Calvin instigated the execution of Servetus while Melanchthon

---

[12]Heinrich Fichtenau, The Carolinian Empire, The Age of Charlemagne. (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), pp. 21, 22.

[13]Roland H. Bainton, Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace. (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1960), pp. 111-114.

[14]Robert Ergang, Europe from Renaissance to Waterloo. (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1954), pp. 470-471.

[15]Roland H. Bainton, Studies on the Reformation. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), Foreword, n.p.n.

applauded."[16] In our own country some of our honored forebears came to these shores seeking relief from religious oppression but were all too often unwilling to accord the same privilege to others who had come for an identical purpose.[17] A student in the writer's survey class reacted to the presentation of material of this sort by asking bewilderedly, "How could these people claim to be religious and do such awful things?"

On the contemporary scene the same question has been pondered in recent days concerning an event like the Jamestown massacre in Guiana, November 18, 1978. This incident has led some to suggest that perhaps there should be a Congressional investigation and at least some religion should be labeled like saccharin and cigarettes as a commodity, the consumption of which may prove harmful to one's long range health.

More recently the crisis in Iran involving the seizure and holding of American hostages and the execution of many of the Bahai faith has had religious overtones. The ayatollah and those holding key positions in that country's governmental structure are of what has been called a hard line fundamentalist approach in Islam.

---

[16]Ibid. p. 212.

[17]Robert A. Baker, The Baptist March Through History. (Nashville: Convention Press, 1955), p. 58.

The value of this study is that it will not only help us to understand an important historical personage who has long interested students of the past, but it can also provide a critical stance from which to judge the functional and dysfunctional features of religion in our own time. The twentieth century American may feel that religion is a person's own business which after all really does not make that much difference anyway. If that statement be taken to mean that we no longer burn heretics at the stake or make religious tests for public office and the enjoyment of civil liberties, then it is an acceptable one. If, however, it be taken more literally, it is a statement the falsity of which this study ought to demonstrate. What Henry VIII believed and practiced made a great deal of difference to multitudes in his own time, and the influence of that belief abides even now four hundred years later.

In relation to classroom instruction, the value of this study is suggested by Polybius' definition of history as "philosophy teaching by example."[18] The example of Henry VIII provides a potential for contemporary relevance, the use of an inductive approach in teaching

---

[18]Alexander W. Mair, "Polybius," Encyclopedia Brittanica XVIII (1960), 179. The precise phraseology is that of Dionysius of Halicarnasus, paraphrasing a longer statement of Polybius from The Histories, i-35.

and an illustration of the interdisciplinary unity of knowledge, along with a general emphasis on the transfer of learning. The writer observed in his internship course teaching Western Civilization that students seemed to warm more enthusiastically to the material on Henry VIII than to any other character studied. This may be attributed in part to the fact that the King's "soap opera" type life story has been widely popularized in the contemporary media, providing a ready interest on which an instructor may capitalize. Since the format is biographical, issues can be considered as they emerge out of the story and not as artificial divisions imposed by traditional curriculum considerations. Not history, not religion, not psychology is the emphasis, but human life which is remarkably similar in the sixteenth and in the twentieth centuries. The student can thus be led to think in terms of constructive problem solving rather than just complaining about the status quo.

Definitions

Religion

Religion in this study does not mean divine revelation which is neither affirmed nor denied. Religion in this study means human behavior in which an individual acts in reference to the perceived demands of an assumed

higher power.[19] It is not the writer's purpose to "justify the ways of God to men" but rather to observe, describe and interpret the activity of a human actor as he pursues what he believes is the will of God.

Interdisciplinary

Interdisciplinary in this study means the combined insights of the three fields of history, religion and psychology.

Psychology

As the latter term is used, it does not refer to a particular "school" of psychology but rather to the broad spectrum of theoretical orientation one finds reference to in a standard textbook of General Psychology, including but not limited to such authors as E. L. Hilgarde, C. B. Morgan and Floyd L. Ruch.

The term psychology is to be understood to include overlapping disciplines which have as their concern the scientific study of human behavior from their own specialized perspective, as for example sociology, social psychology, anthropology and what may be collectively called the behavioral sciences. J. S. Bruner, a former president of the American Psychological Association,

---

[19]The writer has been influenced by Walter Houston Clark in the formulation of this definition. W. H. Clark, The Psychology of Religion. (New York: MacMillan, 1958), p. 22.

stated, "Psychology...thrives on polygamy with her neighbors. Our marriage with the biological sciences has produced an accumulation of even more powerful knowledge. So too our joint undertakings with anthropology and sociology."[20]

The interdisciplinary character of this study involving psychology and history classified it as a project in psychohistory. Terry H. Anderson defined psychohistory as inclusive of "the work of any scholar who uses psychology in an attempt to understand and explain historical behavior."[21] The International Psychohistorical Association declared in 1979,

> Psychohistory is more than the uses of psychology and psychoanalytic theory in the writing of history, more than the application of historical methods to the psychological and psychoanalytic reconstruction of events. Embracing all these disciplines, it transcends them, becoming a new discipline in its own right---psychohistory.
>
> Created in recognition of the unique perspectives of psychohistory, the International Psychohistorical Association brings together psychohistorians from all over the world whose primary training has been in a variety of diverse fields, including social, political and intellectual history,

---

[20]"The Growth of Mind", American Psychologist, 1965, 20, 1007-1017, cited by Floyd L. Ruch, Psychology and Life, 7th Edition. (Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman, 1967), p. 9.

[21]Terry H. Anderson, "Becoming Sane with Psychohistory," The Historian XLI, #1 (Nov. 1978), p. 2.

> psychoanalysis, psychoanalytic therapy, personality psychology, behavior psychology, sociology, social work, literature, creative writing, anthropology and the like.
>
> The IPA provides the means for diverse viewpoints to come together, enriching and enhancing one another. The IPA stands as a forum for innovative thinking, as well as serving as a vehicle for mutual support and encouragement. In the pioneering work of psychohistory, the IPA seeks neither to define nor to limit the scope of the field, but fosters new and provocative applications in addition to supporting work which deepens our understanding in research areas already underway.[22]

In this study it was not the writer's original purpose to pursue a project in psychohistory. The writer is, however, in accord with the objectives of the psychohistory movement. He has followed an eclectic approach, embracing insights from the differing perspectives of the major contemporary psychological viewpoints. He particularly welcomes the flexible character of psychohistory, seeking neither to define a new movement nor to conform to the demands of tradition. Basically, his purpose was educational, to integrate in a classroom context the fields of his interest and experience. While he hoped his work would be acceptable to technical scholars, the appeal has been to upper level undergraduate students being introduced to a fresh way of

---

[22]"Join the Psychohistorical Association," The Journal of Psychohistory, 7 (Fall, 1979), #2, p. 12.

thinking about traditional fields using Henry VIII as an illustrative model.

Assumptions

The writer accepts the basic assumptions of the modern behavioral sciences. (1) All behavior is caused. (2) Causes of behavior can be understood so that actions become explainable. (3) Religion is a form of human behavior and is therefore capable of explanation, as well as of modification and improvement.

Inasmuch as the religion of Henry VIII was a form of the Christian religion based on Old and New Testament Scripture, it is appropriate to examine the religious behavior of the King in relation to that standard. The writer assumes in matters dealing with Biblical scholarship the basic principles of grammatico-historical interpretation. This means that the Bible is to be viewed objectively in terms of the relationship of words interpreted in the light of the historical and cultural context of which the writing originally came. The writer's aim is not a polemical one; i.e., there is no purpose to engage in denominational controversy.

Source Material and Collection of Data

Historical materials

The standard bibliographic work on the Tudor age is Conyers Read's Bibliography of English History, Tudor

Period 1485-1603, second edition 1959, which covers the entire range of primary and secondary sources and interpretations.

In the twentieth century most Henrican studies rely heavily on the thirty-five volume collection of Brewer, Gardiner and Brodie, Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, a compilation begun in the middle of the nineteenth century and completed about 1910. These volumes summarize in chronological order every known letter and state paper relevant to English history between 1509 and 1547, a treatment which no other English reign has been so completely accorded.[23]

Foreign points of view are preserved in the Spanish State Papers and the Venetian State Papers covering this period. Important for the reigns of both Henry VII and Henry VIII is the Anglia Historia of Polydore Vergil who began to write at Henry VII's command and was an eyewitness of many of the events he describes.[24] Born in Italy, he came to England as a young man, a papal emissary in 1507 and saw the country through the eyes of an

---

[23]A. G. Dickens, "Introduction to the Torchbook Edition" p.xvi in A. F. Pollard's Wolsey: Church and State in Sixteenth Century England. (New York: Harpers, 1966).

[24]J. J. Bagley, Historical Interpretation: Sources of English Medieval History 1066-1540. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972), pp. 236, 239.

outsider. A Renaissance humanist, he was deliberately trying to write history and not merely to chronicle events. His work is heavily slanted to glorify the Tudors and is hostile to Thomas Wolsey. Vergil influenced Edward Hall and Ralph Hollinshed, two subsequent chroniclers whose works provided a source for Shakespeare's plays dealing with fifteenth and sixteenth century English history. Hall's work The Union of the Two Noble and Illustrious Families of Lancaster and York eulogizes Henry VIII and has strong Protestant leanings. It describes many occasions in this reign in eyewitness detail.[25] Hollinshed's Chronicles which came out in 1578 is a work of uncritical compilation from many sources of varying trustworthiness and has chief significance as a source for Shakespeare in historical plays such as Macbeth and King Lear.

Another primary document of significance for the student of Henry VIII is George Cavendish's Life of Thomas Wolsey. Cavendish was Wolsey's personal valet whose biography presents us with an intimate portrait of the man who was for several years a major influence in the life of the young King. A landmark in the development of English

---

[25]Ibid.

biography, Cavendish affords us a firsthand impression of the Cardinal especially during his final days.[26]

In this study the sources employed have been both primary and secondary. Among the former are those which come from Henry himself, including his correspondence with Luther, excerpts from his published treatise defending the sacraments, a special collection of personal letters, including love letters to Anne Boleyn, and his official statements of policy and doctrine.

In regard to secondary sources, the writer assumes a core of "standard literature" on Henry VIII and his age. Standard literature means that body of material with which an upper level undergraduate student can be reasonably expected to gain familiarity in an advanced college course. Such material includes but is not restricted to such Henrican interpreters as A. F. Pollard, J. J. Scarisbrick, Lacey Baldwin Smith and G. R. Elton.

A. F. Pollard has for the several years of this century been regarded as the definitive biographer of Henry VIII. His 1902 work reflecting the outlook of a Victorian liberal is based on a thorough familiarity with

---

[26]For a critical evaluation of Cavendish, see Richard S. Sylvester (ed.), "Introduction" The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey, George Cavendish (Published for the Early English Text Society, London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1959), pp. ix-xli.

the Letters and Papers and remains the starting point for the serious student. Pollard was assistant editor under Sir Sidney Lee of the Dictionary of National Biography which contains important source material not only about Henry VIII but also for other leading personalities in several periods of English history. In addition to his biography, Pollard produced a volume on Wolsey and one on Cranmer as well as several authoritative works on the general period.

Pollard has been updated and to some degree superceded by J. J. Scarisbrick of the University of London whose 1969 biography is based on documentary material from the Public Records Office in London and the British Museum. G. R. Elton, since 1967 professor of Constitutional History at Cambridge, was the mentor of Scarisbrick, his first graduate student. Elton has for twenty-five years produced a steady stream of materials which refine the details of our knowledge about the more technical aspects of the Henrican age.

Lacey Baldwin Smith is an American Tudor scholar currently at Northwestern University whose Mask of Royalty builds on the previous biographies of the King. He opens his account on the death bed of Henry VIII, and the chapters successively flash back to focus on various problems of the reign. Smith assumes that Henry's

character at the end was the crystallization of what he was at the beginning. He has written a text on later medieval English history, This Realm of England, as well as a volume on Elizabeth I and a number of other works on the Tudor period in general.

Although the primary sources are not discounted, this study has placed considerable emphasis on secondary material. The purpose was not to present hitherto unknown materials but to summarize, to organize and to interpret a portion of the mass of existing literature in a manner consistent with contemporary relevance and an interdisciplinary emphasis.

Psychohistory materials

Sources for psychohistory are abundant although varying in quality. The roots of psychohistory go back to psychoanalysis and the work of Freud. Bruce Mazlish dared to define psychohistory as "a form of psychoanalysis pioneered by Freud in his paper on Leonardo da Vinci."[27] Many of the early efforts of psychohistorians during the 1920s and 1930s were from this point of view and were presented in short articles that can be found in the volumes of the Psychoanalytic Review for that period.

---

[27]Bruce Mazlish, In Search of Nixon: A Psychological Inquiry. (New York: Basic Books, 1972), p. 151.

Richard Berringer has presented what is perhaps the best current summary of new approaches to history including Psychohistory, Quantitative History, Intellectual History and some other areas.[28] Terry H. Anderson gave a quite thorough although somewhat incisive critique of the various approaches used by psychohistorians.[29] George M. Kren and Leon H. Rappart wrote what is perhaps the best single book for overall coverage, although rather Freudian in orientation.[30]

There are currently two quarterly publications devoted to this field, the Journal of Psychohistory and the Psychohistory Review. Both of these developed out of a psychoanalytic context, although other approaches are now recognized. The former publication originally called the History of Childhood Quarterly: The Journal of Psychohistory, shortened its name in 1976. The previous year it published a comprehensive bibliography under the old name.[31] Also in 1976 the Newsletter of the Group for

---

[28] Historical Analysis: Contemporary Approaches to Clio's Craft. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

[29] "Becoming Sane with Psychohistory," The Historian, XLI, #1 (Nov., 1978).

[30] Varieties of Psychohistory. (New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1976).

[31] Fay Sinofsky et al., "A Bibliography of Psychohistory," 2 (Spring, 1975), 517.

the use of Psychology in History became the latter journal.

A basic difficulty for the beginning student of psychohistory is the fact that the field embraces a wide diversity of psychological points of view. Anderson recommends the work of Richard H. Price as "an excellent primer for psychohistorians. It defines and describes perspectives, applies these to a case history, and includes a bibliography of psychological literature."[32] It should be pointed out that Price is a clinician whose purpose is to delineate professional points of view in the field of abnormal psychology. He does not mention either history or psychohistory, and the case history he presents is that of a contemporary client under treatment for mental disturbance. The emphasis is on how therapists from different theoretical orientations would deal with the patient. The value of the book is that it presents an authoritative summary of competing psychological approaches which he calls "perspectives." This concept of perspectives provides a convenient scheme of organization by which to describe contemporary psychohistorical literature. Anderson following Price speaks of the

---

[32]Becoming Sane with Psychohistory, p. 4, citing Abnormal Behavior Perspectives in Conflict. (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1972).

psychoanalytic, learning, illness, humanist and social perspectives.

The psychoanalytic perspective stems from the work of Freud. It stresses the role of unconscious motivation of a highly sexual nature and the intrapsychic conflict of motives as the individual passes through several well defined developmental stages. Three works by the father of psychoanalysis are of importance historically, though not as models to be emulated. The paper on DaVinci previously mentioned was the first effort to apply clinical principles to an individual from the past. It sets the format of psychohistory as one of psychobiography or the "great man in history" approach. In Moses and Monotheism, Freud attempted to explain the psychodynamics of antisemitism with a reconstruction of Old Testament history which has not commended itself greatly to scholars in that field. Freud's crowning work was to be an analysis of President Woodrow Wilson on which he collaborated with William C. Bullitt who had been a member of the delegation to Versailles in 1919. When the two men disagreed on several points, the work was delayed for several years. The differences were finally resolved and the study was completed in 1938. The authors agreed, however, that they would not publish their work as long as Wilson's widow was still alive. She died in 1961, and it

finally came out in 1967.[33] The production is not good psychohistory. Eric Erikson deplored it, concluding that much of it was written by Bullitt rather than Freud. Antagonistic to Wilson, it demonstrates the ingenuity of the classical psychoanalytic scheme rather than throwing much light on the twenty-eighth president of the United States. "If it tells us little about Wilson and little more about Freud, it may nevertheless tell us something about Bullitt and a great deal about the state of psychohistory on the eve of World War II."[34]

Of special significance for the present study is a 1920 article by a practicing psychoanalyst who attempted to explain the much married behavior of King Henry VIII. Practically everything in the King's adult life he attributed to an unresolved Oedipus complex, a point of view we shall examine in Chapter IV.[35]

To say the least, the views of Freud proved controversial. Even before his death, his own followers challenged many of the tenets of classical psychoanalysis,

---

[33]Sigmund Freud and William C. Bullitt, Thomas Woodrow Wilson, Twenty-Eighth President of the United States: A Psychological Study. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1967).

[34]Richard E. Berringer, Historical Analysis, p. 87.

[35]J. C. Flugel, "On the Character and Married Life of Henry VIII," International Journal of Psychoanalysis, I (1920), pp. 24-55.

giving rise to Neo-Freudian points of view. These emphasized only certain features of Freud's thought and rejected outright other features.

One of the most prominent contemporary Neo-Freudians is Erik Erikson, who gives more prominence to cultural considerations and the continuing development of the individual after childhood. His classic work on Luther deals with the religious experience of the great reformer in terms of an adolescent identity crisis, one of eight developmental stages he postulates in amplification of Freud's scheme.[36] Erikson has also produced a study of Mahatma Gandhi, but his volume on Luther seems to have overshadowed it.[37]

At the present time the views of Freud in their classic form are in decline.[38] Most of his confessed followers accept some form of Neo-Freudianism. One feature of his original system, however, continues to be

---

[36] Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1958).

[37] Gandhi's Truth: The Origin of Militant Nonviolence. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1970). Focusing on Ghandi's early leadership of a textile workers' strike, Erikson attempted to discover the ways in which his personal history had prepared the Indian leader for leadership in militant nonviolence. Erikson hoped to find in "Gandhi's truth" an anecdote to the threat of nuclear annihilation.

[38] Anderson, "Becoming Sane with Psychohistory," p. 6.

popular, his description of particular behavior patterns known as defense mechanisms. "We do not have to buy the whole Freudian package...Many psychologists who do not accept Freud's theories as anything more than early, somewhat mistaken attempts to understand the human mind fully accept the existence of the various defense mechanisms on a descriptive level."[39] An example is David Brian Davis who applies the concept of projection to a historical situation. Persons are often afraid of their own aggressive and sexual tendencies. This arouses anxiety which in some degree is relieved when the individual attributes aggression and sexuality to other persons. Davis employs this concept to explain nineteenth century nativist behavior which feared immigrants and fought Catholics, Masons and Mormons as dangerous enemies of good Americans.[40]

Another perspective from which psychohistorians may write is the learning perspective based on the operant conditioning theory of B. F. Skinner. This approach assumes that the behavior of a person results from the combined action of his conditioning history and current

---

[39]Berringer, Historical Analysis, p. 87.

[40]David Brian Davis, "Some Themes of Counter Subversion: An Analysis of Anti-Masonic, Anti-Catholic, and Anti-Mormon Literature," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLVII (September, 1960), pp. 205, 208, 221.

environmental circumstances. Particular emphasis is on the principle of reinforcement. Rewarding a particular response strengthens it and makes it more likely to occur again. Rewarding a response with something pleasant is called positive reinforcement; rewarding a response by removing something unpleasant is called negative reinforcement. Anderson illustrates the application of this concept by citing A. J. P. Taylor's Origins of the Second World War. Taylor played down the earlier approach that claimed the war was caused by Hitler. Rather it was the appeasement policy of the British and French which was largely responsible for the outbreak of war. In terms of conditioning theory, the reward, or appeasement, of Hitler's aggressive behavior patterns from 1935 to 1939 "increased the probability that the dictator's future activities would be aggressive."[41] It should be carefully noted that Anderson does not claim Taylor as a psychohistorian. His point is that Taylor's view does illustrate a conditioning concept, although Taylor says nothing about this. As a matter of fact, Anderson claims that "...the approach is not yet formally used by psychohistorians."[42] His citation of Taylor suggests that

---

[41]"Becoming Sane with Psychohistory," p. 10.

[42]Ibid, p. 9.

historical writers do apply conditioning principles without realizing they are doing so. In general, this perspective assumes that behavior is learned. The individual acts in a particular way because he has been conditioned to do so. The environment of the individual is important, since the setting provides rewards or lack of them. Works from a general behavioral theory approach include Roll Jordan Roll by Eugene Genovese and Kupperman's study of conditions in early colonial Jamestown.[43] The latter article also includes the illness perspective which is discussed in the following paragraph.

The illness perspective seeks to discover physical causes for behavior. Edward A. Weinstein used this approach to explain the behavior of Woodrow Wilson.[44] The president was suffering from a cerebral vascular disease which attacked him in 1906, after which he became more intolerant and openly aggressive. A recent study has explained the behavior of George III at the time of the American Revolution in terms of manic depressive psychosis.[45] A previous study had concluded that he was

---

[43]Karen Ordal Kupperman, "Apathy and Death in Early Jamestown," Journal of American History 66 #1 (June, 1979), pp. 24-40.

[44]"Woodrow Wilson's Neurological Illness," Journal of American History, 57 (Sept., 1970), pp. 324, 336.

[45]Denis Leigh, "George III, King of England and

suffering from a condition known as porphyria. In either case, a physical abnormality was supposedly the cause of the King's behavior. The illness perspective may and often does occur in connection with other perspectives, especially psychoanalysis. A study of Adolph Hitler during World War II attributed his personality development to a sexual abnormality.[46]

In the humanist perspective there is an espousal of the viewpoint of such psychologists as Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow who emphasize the individual's tendency toward self-actualization. Humanistic psychohistorians investigate the subject's psychological needs during his formative years. Since satisfying these needs allows the person to grow and eventually reach his potential, practitioners examine the extent to which these needs were satisfied. The investigator then asks how and to what extent the subject self-actualized. A study of the Kennedy family is partly based on this perspective.[47] The author contends that the potential of each Kennedy boy was stunted by his father's impossible demands. The resulting

---

Ireland 1738-1820." American Journal of Social Psychiatry, 2 (1982, Summer), pp. 17-24.

[46]Walter Langer, The Mind of Adolph Hitler: The Secret Wartime Report. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1985).

[47]Nancy Gager Clinch, The Kennedy Neurosis. (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1973).

behavior for each son was a drive for power and dominance to an unusual degree.

In the social perspective, the psychohistorian emphasizes societal determinants, those factors which shape behavior for the group rather than the individual. An example is the phenomenon of "group think" investigated by Irving L. Janis.[48] How was it possible that a sophisticated group like John Kennedy and his advisors could accept the naive invasion plan for the Bay of Pigs suggested by the CIA in 1961? A partial explanation lies in the psychological dynamics of group behavior. The high esprit de corps among the Kennedy policy makers tended to decrease each member's critical thinking, suppress deviation from the consensus opinion and establish an illusion that their ill conceived plan could not fail.

Also classifiable under the social perspective approach are the applications of Leon Festinger's "cognitive dissonance theory" and Harry Stack Sullivan's concept of "significant others." In the former, there is an inconsistency between what one knows of reality as he perceives it and what he knows of his own behavior. This creates an uncomfortable feeling that the person tends to

---

[48] Victim of Group Thinking: A Psychological Study of Foreign Policy Decisions and Fiascoes. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1972).

get rid of in various ways. The simplest way to resolve the discomfort (dissonance) is to change one's behavior so that it conforms to reality. In many cases the individual or the group is so committed that it is impossible or undesirable to change the behavior. So one must change his perceptions (cognitions) about the situation. Festinger and his associates presented an in depth examination of cognitive dissonance in their 1956 study When Prophecy Fails. A midwestern sect believed that on a certain date there would be a world catastrophe from which they would be rescued by saintly beings in flying saucers. These particular individuals did not change their belief but became more persistent in holding it even when evidence was clear they were wrong. The application to psychohistory is in "the problem of understanding actions that are plainly inappropriate in view of the information individuals are known to have had."[49] Berringer presents an example of this in an article by R. C. Raach dealing with the anti-French conspiracy of 1808 in Germany. Raach does not mention by name the theory of cognitive dissonance, and his article demonstrates other methodological techniques in dealing with historical problems. Dissonance theory is clearly in view, however,

---

[49] Historical Analysis, p. 137.

since the supporters of the conspiracy actually increased their dedication to it after the original reason for it had been betrayed.[50]

Another example of the social perspective approach is Stanley M. Elkins' effort to explain the institution of Southern slavery. Elkins employs Harry Stack Sullivan's concept of "significant others" supplemented by role theory to account for the stereotype of the slave as docile but unresponsive, loyal but lazy, humble but chronically given to lying and stealing. Such behavior according to Elkins was a part of the system and was imposed on the individual who learned these behavior traits through socialization. The individual does not exist in isolation. He is shaped by his relationships. He learns to act in ways other people want him to act. These people are "significant others" and their expectations become fixed ways of doing and being called roles. Roles are not created by the individual but are imposed. The individual can in some degree manipulate the expectations of others, but never completely. In the end he has no choice. He must conform, and in that conformity there is a security in "knowing one's place." In the

---

[50]Richard C. Raach, "When Plans Fail: Small Group Behavior and Decision Making," Conflict Resolution 14 (March, 1970), pp. 3-19.

slave system keeping one's place was a matter of survival, just as in a concentration camp (which Elkins finds analogous to the slavery system). Hence the traditional Sambo stereotype of the individual Southern slave Elkins concludes is not overdrawn but is understandable and to be expected.[51]

It should be noted that Elkins' study suggests an eclecticism of several approaches. Sullivan's personal professional background is Neo-Freudian. The emphasis on behavior as influenced by expectations of others suggests operant conditioning. Role theory is of course highly evident. The present writer classified Elkins under the social perspective since he dealt with the behavior of a group rather than of a single individual. This is away from the trend of psychobiography which has dominated psychohistory.

From these examples it will be noted that there is only a small amount of material which deals with Henry VIII in particular. The writer of this study faced a mountain of nonspecific data from which he sought to extract general principles applicable to this project. There is at present no manual on how to "do"

---

[51]Stanley M. Elkins, Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

psychohistory. Induction in the method a novice must pursue. The only way to learn psychohistory is by examination of examples, a portion of which the writer has tried to describe.

Selection and Interpretation of Data

Specific data to be dealt with has been determined by concern for those problems frequently discussed in the literature on Henry VIII. The plan of interpretation of material is two-fold. Inasmuch as the study aims to be interdisciplinary, effort will be made to relate the religious orientation of Henry to a behavioral frame of reference. Objectives of the behavioral sciences include the purpose to observe, describe and explain behavior with a view toward applying the results to the improvement of human life.[52] Since the study is basically of an historical nature, observation of the behavior has already been made and preserved in the documents. The task therefore remains to translate such observation and description into the nomenclature of modern behavioral science and to attempt to explain the behavior in terms of possible cause and effect considerations which are the concern of the various theoretical orientations of the

---

[52]Ruch, Psychology and Life, 7th edition, pp. 16-20.

field. In other words, the task is to match particular segments of behavior against theoretical orientations which suggest an explanatory potential.

In addition to the behavioral frame of reference, the interdisciplinary approach will include religious considerations. This means basically a concern for the King's behavior in relation to Scriptural data out of an interest in the consistency of the King with his own avowed standard. Such considerations cannot be avoided since by and large most persons in our culture regard the Bible in some sense as normative for religion.

Three levels of understanding are to be distinguished in suggested interpretations: the phenomenological, the culturally relativistic and the contemporary pragmatic. The first level represents what the particular experience involved for the King himself. The second level involves how the experience must be viewed in terms of the special conditions of sixteenth century European society. The third level involves what the experience may mean for life today. This three-fold statement is a general guideline and not a rigid formula to be spelled out mechanically in all cases.

Preview of Organization

The schedule of topics to be covered in this study is as follows:

First, consideration will be given to definition and methodology. Religion is being viewed as a form of behavior, and it is appropriate to ask what is meant by behavior and how this concept is useful in dealing with the problem of this study.

Next there will be examination of the origin and basis of religious behavior. Why is the human race in general religious, and how does the individual become religious in a specific way?

In the third place, the writer proposes to deal with the development of religious behavior, looking at some concepts from the psychoanalytic school, in particular examining the view that much of the behavior of Henry is explainable in terms of an unresolved Oedipus complex.

An important landmark in the life of Henry VIII was his treatise against Martin Luther for which he received the title Defender of the Faith. This treatise was the first official statement of the King's personal faith and is thus of significance for this study. In this section the relation of religious experience to verbal expression will be studied.

It seems clear that Henry later modified some of the views which he so dogmatically set forth in his treatise against Luther. In considering "The King's Great

Matter," the question will be dealt with as to why and how the King's religion changed. Special attention will be given to the King's conscience and the religious implications of his attempted divorce from Catherine of Aragon.

Attempting to put everything all together, the writer will offer a psychological profile of Henry VIII from the perspective of contemporary personality theory.

A concluding summary will indicate the results of the study and offer possible modern applications. What is the message of the religion of Henry VIII to contemporary American society, and how can the results of this investigation be applied to the improvement of classroom teaching?

CHAPTER II

THE MEANING OF BEHAVIOR

For the purpose of this study, religion is defined as a form of human behavior. What is meant by behavior? How is this idea useful in dealing with the special problem of this dissertation? In this chapter the writer proposes to examine the concept of behavior in detail, noting a general definition of the word and several specialized perspectives on it. It is the purpose of this section to set forth basic psychological principles applicable to historical interpretation as it will be attempted in this investigation.

I. Evolving Concepts of Behavior

Mention of the religion of Henry VIII tends to call forth a skeptical reaction. Thinking in terms of the traditional stereotype which views the King in terms of lust and violence, many persons express the cynical sentiment, "Well, I do not call that sort of thing religion!" Such an attitude is what the social scientist labels ethnocentrism, the tendency to evaluate other groups, institutions, customs or points of view in terms of our own frame of reference. The attitude quoted above assumes that religion is supposed to make people "good." In popular estimate Henry VIII was not a good person.

Therefore, he can not be called religious. It is of course necessary for the individual to be ethnocentric in some degree. Everyone rejects some viewpoints and embraces others. These become personally absolute. In studying religion, however, an individual ethnocentric orientation becomes a hindrance. On what basis can one study the religion of another for its own sake without imposing the imprint of his own upon it?

For the purpose of this study, the writer has approached religion as a form of human behavior. Psychologists disagree on a great many issues, but at least on one point there is seeming consensus. Most textbooks for example define psychology as the scientific study of behavior. Behavior means the total activity of a subject at a given point in time. It includes everything the individual does even when he/she is apparently doing nothing. Thus, a baby sleeping is exhibiting behavior. Likewise are also a dog barking at a cat, the cat either running away or arching its back and baring its teeth. A graduate student doing research in the library, a housewife in the supermarket comparing brands of peanut butter, a bleary-eyed TV addict humped over the set at three o'clock in the morning watching the late movie are all exhibiting behavior. It will be evident from these examples that behavior includes a wide variety of

activities. The definition is a broad one, much too broad to be useful. If behavior means everything a subject does, the study of his behavior would require omniscience. Obviously the student must limit his/her study to selected phases of behavior under specific conditions.

The history of the development of psychology as a scientific discipline is the story of the successive refinement of the concept of behavior. Early researchers in the late nineteenth century emphasized introspection, a looking on the inside of the mind in an effort to analyze consciousness. Even today uninitiated persons very often regard psychology as the "study of the mind." They expect the professional in this field to be able somehow to "analyze" you and read your thoughts. While these early Structuralists (as they were called) did a necessary work in laying the foundation of a developing field, their efforts for the most part proved academic.[1] John Broadus Watson and the Behaviorists came along in 1913 to advocate an entirely opposite point of view. Mind was a nebulous concept. No one could prove the existence of such an entity. What these psychologists could do was to watch a subject and see what the person did. Behavior to Watson

---

[1]Charles G. Morris, Psychology: An Introduction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973, p. 7.

meant publicly observable activity which can be verified by more than one investigator.[2] Watson did a great deal of research using rats. He did not need, so he argued, to ask his rodents what they thought or how they felt. He just watched them and recorded what he saw them do. Some later psychologists came to admit the legitimacy of making inferences about mental processes that may intervene between stimulus and response. Yet by and large those who have been influenced by the Behaviorist approach still tend to hold the position that objective, empirical data are the basic material of a science. Watson was also an extreme environmentalist whose views have influenced the contemporary Harvard scholar B. F. Skinner. In this approach, there is emphasis on the aggregate of external influences that act on the individual.[3]

It would seem at first glance that such an approach would be ideal for the historian. After all, does he not want the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? One is reminded of the classic "cop and robber" crime series of several years back. The investigator would invariably tell the rambling witness, "Tell us what happened. Give us the facts, just the facts!" Voltaire

---

[2]Ibid, p. 11.

[3]B. F. Skinner, Beyond Freedom and Dignity. New York: Knopf, 1971.

once cynically remarked that "history is a bag of tricks which the living play on the dead." It was his way of pleading for "the facts, just the facts." He was lamenting that as far as he was concerned, most historians were mere propogandists whose motives were suspect.[4]

In view of these considerations, it becomes appropriate at this point to raise the question as to just what we mean by history. The original Greek word meant to inquire, to learn by investigation. It came in the course of time to mean the record which resulted from such investigation. Finally, it was identified with the events themselves.[5] This last usage is the naive impression many persons seem to have. The writer was introduced to such a concept in the fifth grade of elementary school in a required American History course. He was told that history is the story of what happened in the past. Such a definition may be sufficient for a time. One is not long into the field, however, before he becomes aware of its inadequacy. History is not the mere chronicling of events. It is important not only to know what happened

---

[4]Will and Ariel Durant, The Age of Voltaire. (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1965), p. 481, citing John Marley, Life of Voltaire, XXIb, p. 220.

[5]Allen Johnson, The Historian and Historical Evidence. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), p. 26.

but how it happened, especially why it happened as it did. So recent an event as the assassination of John F. Kennedy in 1963 is still surrounded by unanswered questions for many persons. Who really shot the President? How many people were involved? How many shots were fired? What were the long range motivations back of this act of violence? Despite an official government investigation which is supposed to have published the basic data, these and other questions continue to be asked as fresh studies from time to time come from the press. Even the assassination of Abraham Lincoln is not without continuing speculation on the part of some students. Of course a part of the problem does involve what happened. This, however, can not be disentangled from the how and the why. Just the facts are not enough. Facts do not speak for themselves. Facts must be interpreted. Often the same facts can be interpreted in a variety of ways, and sometimes they may be misinterpreted.

The writer recalls a television situation comedy episode of some years back. The comedienne was sure that the seedy looking character seated across from her on the plane was a hijacker. He turned out to be an airline security officer, much to the funny lady's embarrassment, along with several spur of the moment "heroes" who collaborated with her in a sincere but misguided series of

humorous acts of mayhem. The objective facts of the life of Henry VIII are all well attested by an abundance of documentary material; but the interpretation of those facts continues to be a challenge after four hundred years. How shall we identify the King, as victim or villain (or perhaps something midway between the two extremes)? The task of the historian begins right where the Watsonian Behaviorist left off.

II. Perceptual Approach to Behavior

Clearly a second approach to the concept of behavior is needed. Behavior is both objective and subjective activity, not only what a subject does outwardly which an observer can document, but also what goes on in the private world of the individual which the subject alone knows. Any investigation of the religion of Henry VIII must thus be concerned not with how others view that religion, but what religion meant to the King himself.

In this dissertation religion is defined as a form of human behavior in which a subject acts with reference to the perceived demands of an assumed higher Power. The term perceived and assumed are key words. Reality for the individual is not the world as it is but as he interprets or perceives it to be. Robert Berkhoffer writes:

> Objective reality of the actor's environment is subjectively perceived by him. Action results from his assessment of the situation as he defines it. The actor brings attitudes and beliefs to the situation that structure his perception of the situation and define it. In other words action results from his assessment of the situation as he defines it.[6]

Accordingly, the religious person acts in awareness of the existence of a Being above and beyond himself. Whether or not such a Being actually exists is not the concern of the social scientist as such. His concern as a scientific observer is with the action of his subject who is convinced of the reality of a transcendental order which is influencing him. Two common types of religious behavior can be seen in those who claim, "God told me," and, "The Devil made me do it." One discovers these patterns in the experience of King Henry. The tendency of many of the King's biographers has been to regard such statements cynically, as either the expression of an unforgivable primitive superstition or else as blatant hypocrisy. One writer comments, speaking about the Reformation, "In England...the leader of the revolt was Henry VIII, whose motives were partly personal, partly political, and (as none know better than he) not in the

---

[6]Robert F. Berkhoffer, Jr., A Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis. (New York: The Free Press, 1969), p. 38.

least religious."[7] This writer is unduly dogmatic in his assessment of what is religious and what is not!! Ethnocentrism rears its head. However, one may choose to evaluate the King's belief, what is of concern is that important behavior was going on in the inner world of Henry VIII. Such behavior alone provides a key to events occurring in the physical world which history records. As W. I. Thomas pointed out long ago, "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences."[8]

The theoretical point of view presented here is that of Phenomenology. While it can be documented from a variety of authors, one of its prominent statements is the work of Arthur W. Combs and Donald Snygg.[9] A basic emphasis of their view is that in order to understand an individual's behavior it is necessary to understand the meaning of the situation to the individual behavior at the moment of action.

Snygg and Combs speak of "the perceptual field" of a behaving organism. By this they mean "the entire universe, including himself as it is experienced by the

---

[7]James Thayer Addison: The Episcopal Church in the United States. (N. P. Archon Books, 1967), p. 6.

[8]Berkhoffer, p. 38, citing The Child in America. (New York: 1928), p. 572. Publisher not given.

[9]Individual Behavior, rev. ed. (New York: Harpers, 1959).

individual at the moment of action." All behavior, according to these authors, is determined by and pertinent to the perceptual field. The perceptual field may or may not correspond to physical reality. At any given time it may exclude much of one's physical surroundings. Thus, as an individual reads a book he may be quite unaware of his physical environment until he glances about him and brings some of those objects into his perceptual field. As he continues to read, he will bring into his perceptual field objects not physically present. If he is alone late at night, a sudden loud noise may startle him and cause him to bolt the door and call the police to report a prowler. He quickly discovers that the source of the noise is a pet cat. It had knocked over a lamp while jumping down from a chair when it spotted a mouse. The nature of the noise is of no real consequence in understanding the subject's initial behavior. What the experience meant to him at the moment of his behavior is what is important. He was acting in reference to something going on in his perceptual field, i.e., his personal and unique field of awareness at the moment. The term perceptual field is often used interchangeably with the term phenomenal field.

A characteristic of the individual's perceptual field is its dynamic character. It is constantly changing as one event succeeds another in rapid succession. Yet

amid the changes continually going on, there is a basic stability to the perceptual field. The individual's past experience has given him a unique set of meanings that are brought into play with each new experience. How the individual deals with new experience depends on the relationship of such experience to what is already in the perceptual field. The perceptual field strives to maintain itself, not to be destroyed.

An important area of the individual's perceptual field according to Combs and Snygg involves how the individual perceives himself. These authors speak of the phenomenal self and the self concept. The phenomenal self is the self of which one is aware, all of those ways in which the person views himself. The self concept, a narrower idea, involves those perceptions of one's self that are of central importance to the individual.

> Each individual wants to defend and enhance his self concept. In attempting to defend and enhance the self concept, the individual learns those things that have personal meaning to him,he rejects those things that tend to destroy his perceptions of self, and he structures the world in terms of how it is necessary for him to structure the world...Phenomenology insists that a person does what seems best to him at the time of acting.[10]

---

[10] M. Ray Loree, Psychology of Education. N.Y.: The Ronald Press Company, 1965), p. 55.

Hence a person acts in a way that is consistent with his self concept and with the demands of the situation as he sees it at the moment of behavior. The observer who would understand that behavior must ask how the subject perceives the situation and what his self concept must be for him to be acting in that manner. Hence noting how Henry VIII acted constitutes but a beginning step in observing and interpreting his behavior. The question to ask is: How must the King have thought and felt in order to do what he did? An example of this principle is afforded us in the approach of many writers to the "King's Great Matter," i.e., that period of the King's life involving his efforts to divorce Catherine of Aragon and marry Anne Boleyn with his consequent rejection of the authority of the Pope in England. Throughout this period of several years, Henry insisted that his actions were a matter of "conscience." A good many writers cynically dismiss this explanation. It was really that his conscience happened to get too close to the charms of Lady Anne! Such an explanation is in terms of these writers' own perceptual fields rather than that of the King. A subsequent chapter will deal with the King's conscience in terms of an article by Lacy Baldwin Smith who defends Henry's claim. What did conscience mean for Henry,and how did he regard himself throughout this

stormy period? Such questions are basic to the phenomenological approach with its fundamental insistence that the perceptual field is reality for the behaver who strives to preserve and enhance his self concept.

The significance of all this for the historical interpreter is presented in terms of the following Phenomenological model:[11]

1. Behavior is a function of the individual's perceptions. These include:

   a. His/her perception of reality in general, his world view or Weltanschauung.

   b. His/her perception of himself, who and what he is as well as why.

   c. His/her perception of the immediate situation, how it relates to his world view and his self perception at the moment in time.

2. The structure of the individual's perceptual field depends to a considerable degree on the structure of his culture.

3. The structure of the perceptual field changes with the historical evolution of a given community.

---

[11] Zevedi Barbu, Problems of Historical Psychology. (N.Y.: Grove Press, Inc., 1960). The writer is indebted to Barbu for much of this material.

4. Human behavior variables are both internal and external. Over-emphasis on either produces a distorted approach. Every individual exists in an environment external to himself. He reacts to that environment in terms of his internal perception of it, producing behavior which has aspects both of universality and uniqueness.

Apply now this model to A. F. Pollard's statement about the reign of Henry.

> ...The explanation of Henry's career must be sought not so much in the study of his character as in the study of his environment, of the conditions which made things possible to him that were not possible before or since and are not likely to be so again.[12]

Pollard is correct that certain external situations existed in the time of Henry VIII which never existed before and will never exist again. That, however, is only half the story. If external conditions were all, there would be no Henrican story. The particular way in which he interpreted those conditions and acted in relation to them is what the discussion is all about. The conditions in themselves were not absolute determinants, but the situation happened as it did because Henry, a certain kind of man, acted in his own way in relation to them. Pollard's statement seems to the writer to reflect what is

---

[12] Henry VIII. (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1905), p. 3.

in essence a Behavioristic orientation, particularly of the B. F. Skinner variety.[13]

III. The Problem of the Unconscious

There is a third approach to the meaning of behavior suggested in the words of Paul Donovan.

> The most perplexing problem facing the historian who wishes to view the characters of history in their entirety has been that of assigning significance to the role of the irrational in affecting individual motivation. Brought to public notice by the popularization of the studies of Sigmund Freud in the decade of the 1920's and quickly assimilated by novelists like Sherwood Anderson and dramatists like Eugene O'Neil, the ideas of infant sexuality, dreams as wish fulfillment, and other Freudian tools for unlocking the unconscious became common concepts and the conversation topic for countless cocktail parties. To be psychoanalyzed was to be fashionable, and the glib, often ribald aura which encompassed the subject made most historians wary of using psychoanalytic approaches in their investigations. Indeed, it has only been in comparatively recent times that these historians have begun to consider the advisability of exploring the unconscious mind as a legitimate method of discerning some of the whys of human conduct.[14]

Like phenomenology, the school of classical psychoanalysis emphasizes the subjective aspects of human

---

[13]This is not to say that Pollard wrote as a psychologist formally espousing this view. When he wrote, Behaviorism was in its prenatal state and B. F. Skinner had not made his debut!

[14]Historical Thought in America: Post War Patterns. (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1973), p. 72.

behavior. It is in the inner private world of the individual where the action is. Unlike phenomenology, this view stresses the role of subtle and unrecognized processes influencing the individual. Hence his behavior cannot be taken at face value. His reasons for behavior are not always the real reasons, and even the action itself may be a deceptive disguise. Henry VIII explained after the downfall of Anne Boleyn that the woman had deceived him through witchcraft, an explanation with a different twist of "the Devil made me do it" variety![15] Psychoanalysts would explain Henry's statement as an example of the defense mechanism of projection: an individual sees someone else as the source of his own unacceptable response.[16] Such an action exemplifies the fact that one's behavior is sometimes perplexing to the person himself and there is even the possibility of self deception.

Freud postulated the concept of the Unconscious to account for the radically irrational character of human experience. His view was based on clinical data, i.e., derived from his medical practice in Vienna. He thought that hypnosis, slips of the tongue, and dream analysis

---

[15]Alison Plowden, Tudor Women: Queens and Commoners. (N. Y.: Athaneum, 1979), p. 74.

[16]Loree, Psychology of Education, p. 532.

were empirical data validating this approach. Later he devised the technique of free association by which he believed he was able to probe the contents of the unconscious. The patient relaxed on a couch, was encouraged to say whatever came to mind whether or not it made sense or possessed social respectability.[17]

While the ideas of Freud continue to be highly controversial, evidence such as that generated by hypnosis seems to suggest that human beings do often act from motivations of which they are not completely aware. Moreover, many theorists find the concept of defense mechanisms pragmatically useful regardless of whether or not they buy the entire Freudian package.[18] On the one hand, no one ought to dismiss in toto the idea of the Unconscious. Yet he ought not stress it to the point at which human beings are like over-pressured steam boilers reacting blindly to forces they neither understand nor can control. Contemporary psychoanalysts such as Erik Erikson, while accepting Freud's original view, have come to place greater emphasis on the ego, i.e. on the

---

[17]Sigmund Freud, The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud, translated and edited by A. A. Brill. (N. Y.: Modern Library, 1938). See also C. S. Hall, A Primer of Freudian Psychology. (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1954).

[18]See p. 22, ff. #38.

conscious, rational phases of human personality.[19] In religion it is easy to fall into the psychoanalytic trap of reductionism. Sincerity means nothing. What passes for religion is not religion but the symbolic expression of more basic impulses below the level of conscious awareness. Roland H. Bainton, commenting on Luther, speaks of "...a serious difficulty in the case of all of the psychiatrists who have turned their hand to Luther thus far. They do not envision the possibility that he could have been impelled by any motive except egocentricity."[20]

Two extremes are thus in view. Some evidence suggests the possibility of an unconscious level of experience influencing behavior. Yet human beings by and large seem to be rational beings who are aware of themselves and have a sense of purpose and control.

In this study, the term behavior will include both conscious and unconscious aspects of human personality with the qualification that one need not press the term unconscious to the Freudian extreme. Loree has well summarized the possible approaches:

---

[19]David Elkind, "Erik Erikson's Eight Ages of Man." Sociology, 80/81, (Sluice Dock, Ct. 06437: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 1980), p. 77.

[20]Studies on the Reformation. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), p. 113.

> Some theorists say your behavior may only be completely accounted for by considering motives of which you are unaware. Others contend that unconscious factors operate as a major determinant only in the abnormal individual. Few theorists deny the possibility of some materials of some importance being stored in ways that make it unavailable to you. However, some feel a situation as you see it at a conscious level adequately accounts for the major determinants of your behavior. Whether or not you are able to divulge the information accurately is problematic. Some feel our statements may be accepted at face value; others feel, even if unconscious determinants are not a major factor in understanding our behavior, we may still be unable to identify all the conscious factors that led to our action. A major problem still lies in explaining the existence of unconscious material in brain circuitry.[21]

Perhaps a better way of expressing the matter would be that instead of speaking of conscious and unconscious, we ought to speak of varying degrees of awareness. No individual is totally aware of all the features of his behavior, and only under anesthesia would the person be completely unconscious. In the previous section the writer expressed a preference for the phenomenological approach, a point of view which is incompatible with the hard line emphasis of classical psychoanalysis but not with some of the alternatives suggested above by Loree.

---

[21] Psychology of Education, p. 517.

IV. The Principle of Behavioral Causation

Out of the discussion of the various concepts of behavior there emerges a principle which is foundational to the behavioral sciences, that of behavioral causation. All behavior is caused. That is to say, human experience is subject to the same cause and effect relationships that prevail in the rest of the universe, those relationships which regulate the planets in their courses in space,the waters in the oceans of the world, the rocks in the ground, and the birds that fly in the air. To understand behavior is to understand the factors that influence it, to describe and explain the variables that underlie its reality. Persons sometime explain eccentric behavior by dismissing it with the excuse that "Old So-and-So is just like that. That's his way!" Such a remark may preserve peace in the family circle and win friends and influence people at work. As a matter of fact, nobody is just like that because "that's his way." Such language begs the question. A person is the way he is because of the various factors that cause him to be that way. The behavioral scientist maintains that all behavior is caused; the causes of behavior can be isolated and understood; and the causes can be manipulated for betterment of human life.

To say such is not to say that behavior is a simple thing. Very often more than one variable is involved, and these may be intertwined in such a way as to preclude unraveling. One cannot diagnose an action with the same precision he diagnoses measles or a malignancy. T. H. Anderson points out the unwarranted use of behavioral theory in the 1964 Presidential campaign. A leading professional organization made the official pronouncement that Barry Goldwater was unstable in his personality orientation and therefore unfit for the Presidency of the United States.[22]

Someone may object that this makes the whole thing mere speculation and of little practical value. Vance Packard as far back as 1957 wrote that at that time several big corporations paid social psychologists $500 a day on a consulting basis for information about the buying habits of the American public.[23] Evidently hard-nosed businessmen did not consider the results of psychological research mere speculation but were willing to pay cold cash for a commodity that paid off many times over as Packard attempted to show in his book. Such pragmatic

---

[22]"Becoming Sane with Psychohistory," The Historian, XLI, #1 (Nov., 1978), p. 18.

[23]The Hidden Persuaders. (N. Y.: David McKay Co., 1957), p. 31.

validation is demonstrable in many areas: teaching, mental health, personnel selection, the guidance of political campaigns through use of scientifically constructed polls, to mention but a very few.

Of course when one applies the results of behavioral research to personalities of the past, he cannot use experimental procedures to validate the results. Yet such materials provide a broad-based frame of reference from which to view our subject, a working hypothesis which remains tentative and subject to constant revision in light of more evidence and insight.

Applying all of this to Henry VIII, the student is kept from two extreme points of view: gullibility of the Jim Jones of Guiana type, and cynicism illustrated in the debunking of heroes which has been a popular obsession in recent years. "Lincoln was a racist; Washington spent his Congressional allowance on booze; Jefferson was a rake with his captive slave woman; FDR had a four-term affair with his secretary, etc., etc."[24] The approach to Henry VIII in this study seeks neither to glorify nor to condemn, but rather to see a human being whose life was the product of the same factors which make life in any

---

[24]Melvin Stanfield, "Charisma Can Kill." Hangups from Way Back, Volume II, Second Edition, Frederick Gentler and Melvin Stanfield, eds. (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1974), p. 80.

age. The principle of behavioral causation extends to the realm of religion as anywhere else, taking it out of the realm of sacred untouchable and providing a rationale for meaningful study and analysis.

But a philosophic problem arises. What of freedom and responsibility? If behavior is caused, how then are we free agents? A part of the "fun" in studying a character like Henry VIII is to teem with wrath at the monstrous antics of such a Blue-beard King. The principle has been applied to the popularity of a current television series featuring a well known personality whom everyone "loves to hate." But hatred is inappropriate where there is no freedom of choice and the villain could be nothing other than what he is.

Two observations are in order regarding this dilemma. In the first place, human freedom is possible only because human behavior is lawful. If life were capricious and whimsical, there could be no freedom since we could not depend on anything happening the same way twice. The universe would be a chaos and not a cosmos.

In the second place, although behavior is caused, the causes can be discovered and manipulated to change behavior. Understanding and manipulation are of course relative, with the practical result that a golden mean between freedom and necessity must be maintained in one's

thinking. One cannot take refuge in either absolute freedom or rigid determinism, but must maintain the concept of behavioral contingency. In dealing with the events of past history, it is a fact that certain actions were as a matter of fact taken and others were not, but this does not mean that the particular action taken was the only one possible in the situation.

The problem of course is an old one, and great names can be lined up on either side. In the Reformation period, Luther and Erasmus differed on predestination, as did Whitfield and Wesley later on.[25] Jonathan Edwards sided with a deterministic approach;[26] and William James, after a nervous breakdown contemplating the problem, opted for free will.[27] On the contemporary scene, B. F. Skinner argues that freedom is really quite illusive and even out of date for the modern age,[28] while the existential school and the "common sense" approach in general maintains the

---

[25]M. Luther, The Bondage of the Will (1525), trans. Henry Cole, (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1931).

[26]Donald Meyer, "The Dissolution of Calvinism," Patterns of American Thought, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Morton White, eds. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963), pp. 75-76.

[27]William James, "The Dilemma of Determinism." In James' Essays in Pragmatism. (N. Y.: Hafner, 1948).

[28]B. F. Skinner, Beyond Freedom and Dignity. New York: Knopf, 1971.

necessity of genuine choice if moral responsibility is to have any meaning. The philosopher Kant set forth the problem in terms of what he called the antinomies.[29] A genuine case can be made for absolute determinism. Yet an equally strong case can be made for freedom. We must believe in both if life is to make sense and to be worth living. That approach will be used in this study with emphasis on neither freedom nor determinism, but on the question, What are the variables? Behavior is caused, and to understand it means to discover and isolate the variables. This includes religion as well as other areas of human life.

V. Chapter Summation

This chapter has dealt with a basic difficulty in the study of religion, objectivity. Each individual tends to bring to the subject his own special set of prejudices as to what religion is all about. The writer advocates a social science approach which regards religion as a form of human behavior which is by definition the province of the behavioral sciences. The term behavior is variously understood by different theoreticians. In this study it will mean publicly observable activity of the person along

---

[29]Samuel E. Stumpf, Socrates to Sartre: A History of Philosophy, 2nd ed. (N. Y.: McGraw Hill Co., 1975), p. 312.

with what is going on in his own private world, with special emphasis on the individual's unique interpretation of his experience. Behavior must also include the subjective level of experience of which the person is not completely aware and of which he may not be in complete control. The writer rejected, however, the extreme emphasis of the approach of classical Freudianism.

An axiomatic principle of this study is that all behavior is caused. This means that there are variables associated with the individual's actions which predispose persons to do and to be. Such an assumption does not deny human freedom but enhances it, inasmuch as the individual is able to understand the predisposing factors of his behavior and to manipulate them for the betterment of life. Behavioral causation is especially applicable to the psychology of religion, as it enables the student to evaluate honestly a controversial personality like Henry VIII whom he need neither condemn nor whitewash. It provides a legitimate rationale for honest religion on a basis other than "God told me" and "the Devil made me do it." Whatever the supernatural variables ultimately turn out to be (and this study does not deny them!), one can understand them practically. They work <u>through</u> the variables the investigation can discover and understand.

CHAPTER III

THE ORIGIN AND BASIS OF RELIGIOUS BEHAVIOR

Conceding the ambivalent picture of Henry VIII as an individual both devout and devilish, many persons will raise the question, "How does a person get to be that way? What is the explanation for the King becoming the strange kind of fellow he seems to have been?" In this chapter the writer will undertake to deal with the problem of the origin and development of religious behavior. Two lines of consideration will occupy the focus of attention. First, he proposes to consider religion as an aspect of human group behavior; then he will deal with the problem of how a particular individual becomes religious. The first consideration has to do with general matters about the nature of religion as a racial phenomenon, while the second concerns the process by which an individual acquires a special kind of religious orientation in the society of which he is a part. Essentially Henry VIII became the kind of person he was in the same way anyone becomes what he/she is. The chapter will attempt to spell out the variables involved in that process of becoming.

I. Religion as a Racial Phenomenon

In the first place, religious behavior is a characteristic of the human race in a broad sense. To

illustrate the concept, consider the matter of human speech. All human beings have the capacity to speak. This seems to be biologically based in the physical structure of the brain. Yet it is evident that different individuals exhibit a wide variety of speech activities. Some muted persons never speak. Some develop stuttering problems. Some become skilled communicators influencing the multitudes, while others are like President Calvin Coolidge who was known as "Silent Cal" because of his short, terse and infrequent verbalizing. Moreover, as one travels the globe he finds that human beings speak a number of different languages, and even those who speak the same language display wide variation in pronunciation and meaning. Note the contrast between British and American use of the "same" English language, as well as the very evident difference between a Southern drawl and a Bostonian accent.

In terms of religious behavior, members of the human family have the capacity to act in ways called religious. Wherever one finds the species, he finds at least some of the people some of the time at worship, in prayer, performing acts of sacrifice and devotion which reveal the consciousness of a supramundane order to which they feel an obligation. Throughout history religious belief has been a potent force in the affairs of all

people. In fact, were one to excise from the record of the past all reference to religion, he would have very little of a story left to tell. Even in countries like the Soviet Union where atheism is official policy, the spirit of religious devotion has continued to thrive despite persistent efforts to eradicate it. Our own country has seen in recent years the rise of a militant atheism which itself bears witness to a very powerful influence which its detractors must recognize cannot be ignored.

It should be observed that while religious behavior seems to be a characteristic of the human family as a whole, not every individual will necessarily manifest such behavior. Formal logic speaks of the fallacy of division, the error of assuming that what is true of a group in general is necessarily true of each member.[1] An oft cited example of this error is Titus 1:12 where the apostle declares that all are liars and one of their own prophets has said so. A dilemma arises as to whether the prophet spoke the truth! The point here is that the human race as a whole tends often to exhibit religious behavior, but this does not mean that every single human being is devout or makes a religious profession.

---

[1] Irving M. Copi, Introduction to Logic, 3rd edition. (London: MacMillan Company, 1968), p. 81.

Speaking from an anthropological standpoint, Felix M. Kessing says:

> In the broad sense...religion is clearly a universal aspect of behavior. Every known culture includes an elaborate set of beliefs which represent for the people concerned effective answers to the "why" questions of life, and also provide for organization and action appropriate to those beliefs.[2]

In more detail, Wallbank, Taylor and Bailkey speak of "a universal culture pattern" spelled out in terms of six basic needs common to people of all times and places. These involve the need to make a living (to provide food, clothing and shelter), the need for law and order (to keep peace in the group and defend themselves from enemies without), the need for social organization (to devise a social structure defining the relationship of individual members to each other and to the group as a whole), the need for knowledge and learning (to transmit knowledge gained from experience first orally and then by means of writing systems), the need for self expression (to respond esthetically to the environment, as when paleolithic man painted his cave walls with pictures of animals he had hunted), and finally the need for religious expression.

> Equally old is humanity's attempt to answer the "why" of its existence. What primitive peoples considered supernatural in their

---

[2] Cultural Anthropology: The Science of Custom. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958), p. 323.

> environment could at later times often be explained by science in terms of natural phenomena. Yet today, no less than in archaic times, men and women continue to search for answers to the ultimate questions of existence.[3]

These authors point out that elaborate burial rites of paleolithic and Neanderthal man in burying their dead "can hardly be divorced from a religious significance."[4]

Because of the seeming universality of religious behavior, scholars of another generation sought to explain it in terms of instinct.[5] "Mankind is instinctively religious," it was asserted. The statement is less popular now, although occasionally a less sophisticated religionist may quote it. By and large, instinct theory has been discredited as a meaningful approach to human behavior. This is especially so in regard to religious behavior. One problem was that of definition, since the term was used in different ways by different theorists. Moreover, instinct turned out to be a more labeling of behavior than of explaining it, since it was assumed that

---

[3]T. Walter Wallbank, Alastair M. Taylor and Nels M. Bailkey, Western Civilization: People and Progress. Volume One: Prehistory to 1750. (Glenville, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company, 1977), p. 3.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Morris Jastrow, The Study of Religion. (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1902), pp. 100-101, 153, cited by Wayne E. Oates, The Psychology of Religion. (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1973), pp. 44-45.

a group of people who shared a common activity must be doing so on an instinctive basis. A group of children fighting on a playground, for example, must be exhibiting a fighting instinct. Such a statement is tautological. It explains nothing. Contemporary behavioral scientists use the term "instinct" to refer to a pattern of inherited behavior. It is more often applied to the behavior of animals rather than that of human beings. Walter Houston Clark notes:

> ...social scientists have agreed to limit the concept of instinct to complicated, relatively invariable, inborn and unlearned reactions to stimuli. There is a story of a biologist who made a pet of a beaver, which he kept upstairs in his home. One day he was disconcerted to find the beaver chewing down the balustrade in order to build a dam at the top of the stairs. This is a good example of the invariability of a true instinct. Thus, if it could be demonstrated, for example, that man at the sound of a church bell and regardless of where he was or what he was doing, invariably reached for his best clothes, marched to church, said his prayers, dutifully listened to a sermon, and then marched out again at the recessional hymn, we might say he had a religious instinct. But since there is obviously nothing invariable or rigid in the way different people express their religious feelings or even have them at all, we must conclude that as defined, man lacks a religious instinct, or indeed any true instinct at all.[6]

---

[6] Psychology of Religion. (New York: Macmillan, 1958), p. 62.

The basic principle coming out of this statement is that religious experience is highly variable, a fact which suggests the influence of learning rather than something innate. There is no demonstrable basis for religious behavior in human genes. No one can locate its source in any structure of the body, although Rene' Descartes in the seventeenth century thought the pineal gland was the locale of the soul.

The theologian of the Judaeo-Christian tradition may think to find a basis for religious behavior in the Imago Dei concept of the book of Genesis, that God created mankind in His own image.[7] Although there has been much discussion about what the divine image in the human race means precisely, it would seem to suggest a kinship of humanity with God. In some essential sense, man is like God. On this basis, Genesis 9:6 makes murder a capital crime, inasmuch as it does violence to the representation of God in human life. Similarly, James 3:9 condemns cursing, as it shows irreverence for a being who reflects in his person the likeness to Deity. While the Imago Dei concept is compatible with the propensity for religious behavior among members of the human race generally, it is a theological statement which can neither be proved nor

---

[7]Genesis 1:26-28.

disproved. As such, it is an item of faith rather than of science.

In accord with the Imago Dei concept is the teaching of Romans 2 regarding the law of God written on the heart which the passage equates with conscience. All men have a consciousness of the existence of a Creator to whom they owe moral responsibility, so the context of the passage argues. Again, while such teaching seems to accord with observable fact, it is a theological point of view rather than a strictly scientific one. We may speak of it as extra-scientific.

Basically, one can conclude that religious behavior is a fact of human life. It seems to be a general characteristic of the human race corporately. It cannot, however, be explained in the same way that bees work in hives or the swallows go back to Capistrano.

II. Individual Religious Development

How then does the individual become religious in a particular way? A basic reason for rejecting the instinct approach is the fact of the wide variation in religious behavior. It is obvious that a person may be religious in any number of different ways. He/she may be a Jewish or Christian, Moslem or Hindu, a flower child in a cultic group, a militant atheist, or nothing at all. As a

Christian he may be Catholic or Protestant, and within these groups he may opt for further subdivision in terms of Roman and Eastern Orthodoxy and the multitude of denominations with even finer distinctions.

Speaking of religion generally, John F. Cuber points out that practically every phenomenon in the universe is or has been regarded as supernatural by the logic of one or more cultures and practically every act of which the human being is capable has somewhere or some time had a sacred significance. "...It is difficult for a contemporary American Christian to understand that such behaviors as erotic dancing, body mutilation, alcoholic drinking or prostitution can be religious in some societies."[8]

The explanation of such variation is that religious behavior, whatever its basis generally in human nature, is something which the individual acquires. Religious behavior is learned. With such a point of view, the Judaeo-Christian tradition in both Testaments is in complete agreement. In Deuteronomy 4, Moses reminds the people of Israel of their relationship to Jehovah as they stand on the edge of the Promised Land.

---

[8]Sociology: Synopsis of Principles. (N. Y.: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc., 1963), p. 576.

> Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments which I teach you. (v. 1) ...Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments even as the Lord my God commanded me... (v. 5) Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the thing which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but teach them thy son and thy son's son.

In the sixth chapter of this same book of Deuteronomy in the context of the Shema (the historic motto of Judaism through the centuries), Moses makes a further appeal:

> And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thy heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkedst by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up...And when thy son askest thee in time to come saying, What mean the testimonies and the statutes and the judgments which our Lord God hath commanded you, then thou shalt say unto thy son... (Deut. 6:7, et seq.)

The passage goes on to mandate that the parent shall rehearse to the inquiring child the great historical events which made the nation in the past and which lie at the heart of the Jewish faith now and for the future. Then, in 11:19, there is a further repetition of the command to teach the younger generation "in thine house...and by the way, when thou liest down and when thou risest up." The result of such teaching is indicated in 11:21, "That your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children in the land..." Continuation as the people

of God depends upon the transmission of the values of the past to the oncoming generation.

When one comes to the New Testament, he finds Jesus referred to as Teacher more often than by any other title; and though his ministry is often referred to as preaching, it is said more often that he taught the people. In the Great Commission of Matthew 28:19-20, the mandate of the Church is to make disciples of the nations. The word discipline means a learner. In fact, the King James translation of this verse says "teach all nations," while the latter clause of the statement reinforces the idea with the participle phrase, "teaching them to observe all things I have commanded you." The author of Hebrews chides his readers for being dull of hearing. "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again...the first principles of the oracle of god." (Hebs. 5:11-12) Likewise, the Apostle Paul in Ephesians 4:20 speaks of the uncleanness of Gentile unbelievers and counsels the Christians of that area, "But ye have not so learned Christ," while in II Timothy 3:14 he exhorts Timothy to "...continue in the things which thou hast learned and has been assured of, knowing of whom thou has learned them."

Probably the strongest statement regarding the essential nature of religion as a learned experience is found in Romans 10:13-17:

> For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? ...So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God.

The argument of this section is that for a person to become a Christian it is necessary for another Christian to be involved. Becoming a Christian in the Pauline sense is to respond to the message of Christ in the Gospel. But no one can respond to something he has never heard about. He cannot hear about something no one has made available to him, and the Gospel will not be available if those who have already heard and responded do not act to present the message. The conclusion of the argument is in verse 17, which the King James Version tends to obscure by its translation, "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God."

A misinterpretation of this verse attributed to D. L. Moody years ago continues to be popular. It is asserted that continuous and diligent Bible study will promote one's spiritual growth and faith. Moody claimed that for a long time he prayed for more faith and nothing happened. Then he read this verse and concluded that you

get faith not by praying for it but by exposing yourself to the Word of God which generates faith.[9] What Moody suggested may have a measure of truth, but that is not what this verse is saying. The faith here is not that of a Christian, but of a person not yet a believer. The Word of God referred to is not the Bible as a whole, but the message of the Gospel concerning Christ as Savior. One becomes a Christian, so the apostle argues (i.e., he comes to the place of initial faith), by hearing and responding to the Word of God in the Gospel regarding Christ when someone already a Christian presents that message. Observe the use of the verbs preach and hear. These reflect the fact that the passage was written before the days of printing. In such a time oral proclamation was the normal medium for disseminating information. The occurrence of these two verbs outline the essential message of the passage. No one becomes a Christian in isolation. There are always the two sides involved, a presentation (or preaching) and a response (or hearing). The latter is impossible without the former. While the example relates specifically to the Christian religion and

---

[9]Walter B. Knight, Knight's Master Book of New Illustrations. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1956), p. 193. The writer could not locate Moody's direct statement. The view, however, is widely quoted and thus is significant regardless of its origin.

the Deuteronomy passages cited above have to do with the Jewish faith, the general principle is applicable to all religious behavior. While religious behavior is something for which all human beings seem to have a propensity, such behavior is not automatic but depends on individual exposure, example and instructions. Religious behavior is learned.

The student should observe that learning here means both formal and informal instruction. A child at the age of six in our society begins formal learning by starting to school. But he is already a very "learned" person who has been engaging in unconscious or incidental learning experience every day of his life from the moment of his birth.

> Not all behavior is learned, but most of it is. Combing one's hair, standing in line, telling jokes, criticizing the President, going to the movies and kissing one's aunt all constitute behaviors which had to be learned. So also is feeling angry or hurt because someone laughed at you, solving a problem in mathematics or worrying about your health. Each of these had to be learned. One readily recognizes that he had to learn how to solve the mathematical problem, but he is apt to overlook the fact that he had to learn to worry, to love his mother or to use the latest slang word.[10]

To this list of learned behaviors must be added one more--one's religious orientation. The individual learns

---

[10]Cuber, Sociology: Synopsis, pp. 80-81.

to be religious in the same way he learns other kinds of behavior. Much of this learning occurs incidentally. It just seems to happen in ways that evade the person's awareness. "Socialization is the generic term to cover all of the processes and results of learning from other people, whether directly in face-to-face interactions or indirectly through reading.[11]

John F. Cuber suggests that the socialization process operates through the interaction of three basic influences: original nature, cultural exposure and unique personal experience.[12]

Original nature means the "given" elements of a person's humanity received at birth. These include genetic endowment, physical constitution, temperament, intelligence and whatever other basic factors there may be which no one yet knows.

Cultural exposure is the individual's contact with the social environment in which he lives. Culture here does not mean good taste or refinement as is the popular usage of the term. To the social scientist it means the entire social heritage of a people, agreed upon ways of believing and behaving which define its lifestyle. Every

---

[11]Ibid, p. 205.

[12]Ibid, p. 188.

society has its accepted customs which young people learn from their elders and are passed along from generation to generation. "In no society is a person really permitted to make up his own mind...Instead he comes into a world which is already equipped with the 'right' answers to the question of how shall we behave right down to the most intimate and personal act."[13] Culture thus provides for us both opportunities and limitations of our experience. Mickey Mantle could not have become a baseball star in a society where the sport was unknown.

Unique experience means what happens to the individual as he acts and reacts to persons and situations in his personal world. Every experience of course has its socializing effect. Yet it often happens that one crucial event occurs which drastically alters the direction of a life. This is quite often true of the social deviant, the militant atheist, the rapist, the avowed woman hater, yes, even the dyed-in-the-wool conservative Archie Bunker and his radical "meathead" son-in-law. Erikson makes much of the "fit-in-the-choir" episode in his treatment of the young man Luther.

While these three sets of influences are presented in terms of the overall socialization of an individual,

---

[13]Ibid.

they are especially pertinent to the consideration of how one acquires his religious orientation.

Consider the original nature of Henry VIII. He was born a male and not a female, a fact which has cultural as well as biological significance. He was born healthy and robust, not sickly like his brother Arthur who died at an early age thereby thrusting Prince Henry into a prominence he otherwise would not have had. The King's hardy physical constitution no doubt predisposed him as a young man to participation in the strenuous sports activities of the time. It is reported that on a hunting expedition he would exhaust more then one set of horses before he himself began to tire. G. R. Elton has suggested that Henry VIII was a king the people had to look up to literally![14] He was unusually tall and physically imposing. Such an orientation readily suggests William Sheldon's somatotype theory which describes the individual on the basis of body build.[15] Henry would seem to qualify as a mesomorph. A study some years ago reported that mesomorph boys tend to become delinquent more often than

---

[14] Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977), p. 23.

[15] The Varieties of Human Physique. (N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1940), and The Varieties of Human Temperament. (N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1944).

other body types.[16] A possible reason was that husky individuals may tend to "throw their weight around" and thus impose their will through physical force. Would not such an attitude tend to give Henry VIII a self concept which would make it likely that he would defy authority and hold strong religious points of view for which he was ready to fight?

The cultural exposure of Henry VIII is suggested in the fact that he was born in 1491 and not 1914. He came into a world still quite medieval, yet in the process of transition to modern times. He was born in that part of the world known as Christendom, a religio-political complex which insured that one born into the State was born into the Church as well. Henry was born into a royal family, not that of peasants. In particular, he was born into the home of Henry VII, a staunch Catholic of the time who once converted a heretic at the stake and then left him to burn. "He died a Christian," was the elder Henry's consoling comment![17] When as a helpless unclad infant only a few days old, the young prince was plunged by Archbishop Fox into the water of the baptismal font, it

---

[16]Sheldon Glueck, "The Home, the School, and Delinquency." Harvard Educational Review, XXIII (Winter, 1953): 22.

[17]Pollard, Henry VIII, p. 19.

was symbolic of his immersion into the culture of a religious system which (apart from his volition or understanding at that time) was to permeate every aspect of his life for the next half century.

When one considers unique experience, several events seem pivotal in the life of Henry VIII. Bruce, for example, suggests a basic insecurity during Henry's early years.[18] There was constant threat from those who would overthrow his father and seize the throne. As second-born son, he would always pose a danger to any would-be usurper who must seek him out and eliminate him as a possible claimant. He learned at that time that one does not even trust the closest members of one's own household! The death of his brother Arthur when Henry was ten gave him a new status which he could not have had as second in line to the throne. The death of his mother, Elizabeth, a little later produced a lasting depression in his father, Henry VII. The elder Henry reacted by giving obsessive, almost oppressive attention to the supervision of his sole surviving boy. He arranged for the prince and heir to the throne to be isolated in a small room adjoining the royal quarters. There Henry was expected to pass several hours a

---

[18]Mary Louise Bruce, The Making of Henry VIII. (N. Y.: Cound, McCann & Groghagan, Inc., 1977), p. 13, and following.

day in the study of his books. No visitors were permitted, and he was allowed minimal free time for exercise in a small adjoining courtyard.[19] During the period of the so-called "divorce" controversy (the King's Great Matter), Henry VIII experienced what may be regarded as a royal sixteenth century mid-life crisis.[20] Failure to produce a male heir challenged everything he had attained so far. An uncertain succession threatened a return to the chaos of the Wars of the Roses. The wife of his youth was now in disrepute before him, as he fell under the charms of her French lady in waiting Anne Boleyn. His confusion of mind was noted in another connection when he charged that Anne had used witchcraft to seduce him. The papacy which had once been so friendly now proved uncooperative to say the least, and at one point it was so weak and inefficient that Clement VII was actually taken prisoner by Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor. Henry now began to question his relation to God as he challenged many of the assumptions he had been taught in earlier years.

---

[19]Allison Plowden, The House of Tudor. (N. Y.: Stein and Day Publishing, 1976), p. 55.

[20]Miles F. Shore, "Henry VIII and the Crisis of Generativity." Journal of Interdisciplinary History, II (1972), pp. 359-390.

In dealing with the effects of experience, it should be noted that it is not the events in themselves which have importance. Rather, it is how one perceives the events; how one defines the meaning of any particular situation.

Cuber's three factors of socialization operate interactively, not singly. It is therefore unprofitable to argue which is most important. These factors also operate dynamically. Throughout the individual's entire life they function to make him what he is at any particular point. He is constantly in the process of becoming. Moreover, the three factors operate holistically. They produce a total person whose behavior is an expression of what he is. Religious behavior is thus an aspect of a larger entity, such that one cannot separate it out and deal with it alone. In a chocolate cake the chocolate exists inseparably with flour, eggs, butter, and the other ingredients. So in attempting to understand the religious life of Henry Tudor, sixteenth century King of England, the student must deal with many other factors of a seemingly non-religious nature which co-exist with it.

III. Chapter Summation

This chapter has addressed the question, How could Henry VIII be devout and demonic at the same time? The writer approached the question in terms of the two-pronged consideration: why is mankind as a whole religious, and how does an individual become religious in a particular way? It was observed that religious behavior is natural and normal for many members of the human race. It is therefore not surprising that Henry VIII should also be religious. Although seemingly universal, religious behavior is not instinctive. Instinct produces automatic, rigidly unvarying behavior among all members of a species. Religious behavior, however, is characterized by great variability. Genesis 1:26 sets forth the Imago Dei concept which asserts that man is a created being who shares in some manner the nature of his Creator. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the creature will seek his Maker. While such a view is consistent with the observed character of humans as religious beings, it cannot be proved or disproved apart from one's presuppositions. The wide variability of religious behavior suggests its character as something that is learned. The term socialization is given to all of those processes and products of human learning which make people what they are. Socialization proceeds in terms of the

three factors of Original Nature, Cultural Exposure and Unique Experience. A subject with basic propensities (one may include the Image of God here) exists in a particular kind of social setting which provides opportunities and limitations of experience. He acts and reacts with persons and situations in his personal world to become a particular kind of individual. Religious behavior is thus an aspect of a large entity which encompasses everything the person is. This means that religious behavior occurs in the same context with other kinds of behavior which color and shape it. The holistic principle then follows: One must deal with a total person functioning in all the aspects of his being. One must accept the entire piece of chocolate cake.

How could Henry VIII be that kind of person? The answer is, in the same way anyone is the kind of person he/she is.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS FROM THE PSYCHOANALYTIC PERSPECTIVE

No one is born with religion. He acquires it in the same way he acquires other kinds of behavior, like a Southern accent for example. Such was the emphasis of the previous chapter. The writer attempted to indicate some of the variables which operated to produce the particular kind of individual which Henry VIII became. Acquisition of religious behavior, it was concluded, was an aspect of a larger socialization process.

The purpose of the present chapter is to consider certain aspects of Henrican development from a psychoanalytic perspective. Although highly controversial, this point of view continues to exert wide influence in contemporary thought. The writer is particularly concerned in this section with what he regards as reductionist overtones in the works of some who have applied psychoanalytic concepts to religious behavior.

I. The Freudian Developmental Scheme

Popular discussions about unusual behavior sooner or later get around to the suggestion that the affected individual must have had "an unhappy childhood." Such an

assumption about the determining influence of one's early life experience reflects the abiding influence of the psychoanalytic perspective. In the early years of the twentieth century when Freud's views were just beginning to be popularized, many parents suffered unusual concern about how to raise their children. They were anxious that in possibly doing "the wrong thing" they might permanently warp the personality of their offspring. While the present generation is not as "uptight" about such matters, there is still the lingering conviction that "as the twig is bent, so the tree is inclined." Freud's theories made two basic assumptions: all human beings pass through a series of developmental stages; these stages are critical points of influence in determining the life-long behavioral tendencies of the individual.

Each of Freud's assumed stages involves a special zone of the body. The first of these, the oral stage, centers in the mouth, in the pleasure the infant derives from sucking. This pleasure eventually involves eating; and when the teeth erupt, the mouth is used for chewing and biting. Frustration at this level may result in the emergence of a kind of personality known as "oral character." This may involve oral aggression such as sarcasm and argumentativeness (after the analogy of biting

and chewing), or it may take a passive form of gullibility in which the individual will "swallow anything."

The anal stage occurs during the second year of life and is associated with toilet training. If the parent is severe in his/her discipline at this time, the child may react with defiance by withholding his bowel movements and the behavior may generalize to the retentive character of a stingy and obstinate person. Or there may result an expulsive type character in which the child vents his rage by expelling feces at inappropriate times and so becomes a cruel, wantonly destructive individual.

From about three to six years of age, the phallic stage occurs centering around the genital organs, in which the child discovers the pleasures of autoeroticism of self-manipulation. During this stage, the Oedipus complex appears in which the child develops sexual attraction for the parent of the opposite sex and a hostility toward the same-sexed parent. The boy desires to have the mother and to remove the father, and the girl likewise desires the father and the removal of the mother. Freud took the name of this phenomenon from Greek mythology in which the Greek boy Oedipus killed his father and married his mother. According to Freud's scheme, the boy during the phallic stage develops anxiety because of his incestuous feelings and fears his father may retaliate by castrating him. So

he eventually resolves his Oedipal feelings by ceasing to regard his father as a rival and beginning to identify with him, so that he can vicariously enjoy his mother. In the case of the daughter, Freud termed the situation an Electra complex, from the name of Oedipus' daughter, although the general term "Oedipus Complex" is sometimes used for both the male and female phenomenon. The girl desires to have a male sex organ like her father and has resentment toward her mother whom she blames for not having one. Eventually she ceases her hostility and begins to identify with her mother so that she can vicariously enjoy the father. Freud gave less attention to the Electra complex than to the Oedipus complex and left some unresolved issues about female development. He did, however, stress the male situation very heavily. In the normal resolution of the Oedipus complex, the boy in identifying with the father internalizes the father's moral standards, or, in Freud's terms, he introjects the super ego of the father, and so develops a set of values which are reinforced by other "father figures." The unresolved Oedipus complex on the other hand Freud theorized was responsible for antisocial behavior of an aggressive type in later years.

Following the phallic stage, the individual experiences the latency period from age eight to

adolescence. During this time sexual interests are subdued and the child interests himself in the affairs of school life and social relationships with his peers. The genital stage emerges finally when heterosexual attraction develops, and there come the interests of adult life involving marriage and the rearing of a family. With the genital stage, Freud's scheme ends. Everything of significance has happened to the individual! Whatever occurs in later years must be viewed in terms of what took place during the crucial periods of the assumed five stages.

There is of course much more to Freud's system than has been presented in the foregoing discussion. The writer has emphasized the developmental stages because they figure prominently in religious applications of psychoanalysis. There is, for example, an abundance of psychohistory material in which the experience of Martin Luther is interpreted according to this scheme. It is profitable at this point to examine some of this material on Luther as appropriate background for later considerations about King Henry.

Norman O. Brown points out that the sudden understanding of the famous passage from Saint Paul ("the just shall live by faith") came to Luther "on the privy in the tower."

> Luther, with his freedom from hypocrisy, his all embracing vitality, and his all embracing faith, records the scene of his crucial religious experience with untroubled candor. It was in the tower of the Wittenberg monastery where the privy was located. When this fact was first pointed out in 1911 by the Jesuit Father Hartman Grisar, Lutheran scholars objected to what they called "vulgar Catholic polemics." Later, however, as the smoke cleared, it was decided by both Jesuits and Lutherans that the location where Luther had received his famous illumination was unimportant, since all Christians believe that God is present everywhere...but Brown objects that psychoanalysis cannot agree that it is of no significance that the religious experience which inaugurated Protestant theology took place in the privy...Ever since Freud's essay on "Character and Anal Eroticism" (1908), psychoanalysis has accepted as a demonstrated theorem that a definite type of ethical character, exhibiting a combination of three traits--orderliness, parsimony and obstinacy --is constructed by the sublimation of a special concentration of libido in the anal zone, and is therefore labeled the anal character.[1]

In similar vein, Erik Erikson wrote in Young Man Luther that there is much of anality in the appearance of Luther, especially in his utterances regarding the Devil which are highly tinged with "bathroom language." Said Erikson:

> The Devil, according to Luther, expresses his scorn by exposing his rear parts; man can beat

---

[1]Thomas W. Africa, Richard E. Sullivan, J. K. Sowards, Critical Issues in History, pp. 308-309. (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1967), citing Norman O. Brown, Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History (Middletown, Connecticut: 1959), pp. 202-203.

> him to it by employing anal weapons and by telling him where his kiss is welcome.[2]

Explaining the origin of such an attitude, Erikson cites the fact that Luther's father was a miner, and miners often anthropomorphize, referring to the fickle and dangerous bowels of the earth. Such language it is suggested may have influenced little Martin's body concept.[3] Moreover, Erikson points out the choice of the buttocks for corporal punishment may have aggravated the significance of the general area as a battlefield of parental and infantile will.

> We cannot ignore the fact, brought out by the researchers of psychoanalysis, that the anal zone which is guarded and fortified by the buttocks, can under selective and intensive treatment of special kinds become the seat of sensitive and sensual, defiant and stubborn associations.[4]

Reacting to Erikson's point of view, Marcus commented:

> Luther was frightfully constipated. Sometimes he went for five or six days without a bowel movement. Then he defecated at last with such frightful and harrowing pain that he nearly fainted. Like hypochondriacs of all ages, he assumed that his friends at home impatiently awaited the most minute details of his symptoms. He regularly wrote back to

---

[2]Ibid, p. 79.

[3]Ibid, p. 248.

[4]Ibid, p. 79.

> Wittenberg, giving a box score on his stools and the agonies they cost him.[5]
>
> ...Was Luther's constipation a symptom of those psychological pressures inflicted upon him by Hans, a father who could be terrible at one moment and full of love and grace in the next? Some psychologists, including Erik Erikson, have thought so. But it is difficult to know how valid such conclusions are. As a class psychologists seem unusually pleased with their hindsight, but their disagreements with one another about problems and remedies in the present are so vehement as to remind a detached observer of the angry doctrinal quarrels perpetually raging among sects of Baptists. Most historians who spend their lives pondering the irreducible, grubby details of evidence are as yet unsure whether the aid proferred them by psychologists is really a rod or a serpent.[6]

While this author's criticism of Erikson is much in order, it is regrettable that he lumps together all psychologists as well as all historians. Not all psychologists agree with Erikson's interpretation, a fact which ought to be obvious from his further argument that the doctors are divided and give no practical guidance. Yet, the same situation is also in evidence among historians, who do their share of battling it out in the manner of the Baptist polemicists. It is one of the aims of the present study to deal with this situation from an interdisciplinary perspective, to "ponder the irreducible,

---

[5]Richard Marius, Luther. (Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1974), p. 160.

[6]Ibid, p. 19.

grubby details of evidence" not as psychologists, not as historians, but as human beings and scholars interested in truth from whatever source it comes and wherever it leads.

From a psychoanalytic frame of reference, one can see a vivid contrast between the developmental experience of Luther and King Henry. Lacy Baldwin Smith pointed out that Henry was characteristically embarrassed by the use of bathroom language and was quite conservative in both speech and action, a fact contrary to the traditional stereotype. "Possibly, Bluff King Hal was more of a Victorian gentleman than was supposed."[7] On the other hand, J. C. Flugel, a practicing psychoanalyst, claimed that Henry's behavior in later years, especially his "much married" activity was the result of displaced Oedipal feelings.[8] In terms of the Freudian developmental scheme, this would mean that Luther's character is explainable in terms of the second (or anal) stage, while Henry's is explainable in terms of the third (or phallic) stage. It is appropriate at this point to consider Flugel's

---

[7] Henry VIII, The Mask of Royalty. (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), p. 57.

[8] "On the Character and Married Life of Henry VIII," International Journal of Psychoanalysis, I (1920):24-55. Reproduced in Bruce Mazlish (ed.), Psychoanalysis and History. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), pp. 124-149. All page references are to this reprint.

argument, to which the writer turns in the remaining section of this chapter.

II. J. C. Flugel's Interpretation of Henry VIII

The long series of Henry's matrimonial experiences is unusual and demands an explanation. One or two such experiences would be remarkable, but six suggests that there must be an underlying factor which can be discovered. This Flugel sets out to do on the basis of the classical Freudian scheme. "The researches of Freud and the workers of his school show that a knowledge of the events of childhood and of youth is a very valuable aid to the interpretation of the mental characteristics of later years."[9]

The childhood years of Henry VIII were a time which saw several challenges to the right of his father to the throne, a right which Flugel notes was stronger through his mother, Elizabeth of York, than through the elder Henry. Although such challenges were successfully resisted in each instance, they could not fail to arouse in the young Prince Henry the thought that perhaps he might suddenly succeed to the position of his father. Such a thought would be reinforced by the fact (so alleged Flugel) that the marriage of the parents was not a happy

---

[9]p. 125.

one, "the behavior of the elder Henry being in general much wanting in warmth and affection toward his consort, in spite of the good looks, piety and learning by which the latter is reported to have been distinguished."[10] The stage was thus set for the development of a powerful Oedipus complex, i.e., the desire to get rid of the father and possess the mother in his stead, "the cold relations between mother and father and the beauty and goodness of the mother both constituting strong incentives to that desire."[11]

Yet between Prince Henry and the materialization of such a fantasy stood his older brother, who by the law of primogeniture stood first in line to succeed the father on the throne. The hostile feelings which Henry felt initially toward his father were now displaced on to the person of his older brother Arthur. When Arthur married Catherine of Aragon in 1501, Henry participated in the ceremony by escorting his sister-in-law to the altar, an event which must have further aroused feelings of envy toward Arthur, providing a basis for transference on to brother and sister-in-law respectively of the feelings originally directed toward his mother and father. Such a

---

[10] p. 126.

[11] Ibid.

situation is pictured, Flugel argues, in folklore and legend where the story is frequently encountered. A young hero is sent to welcome and escort to her new home the bride destined for the prince or king. The story ends with the hero and the lady falling into an illicit love affair. The sexual elements of the Oedipus complex are present in every child, and the legends and folklore are a witness to their reality. A short while after the marriage, Arthur died (according to Flugel of "the sweating sickness), and this aroused Henry a life-long fear of this illness. "Henry was afraid the same sickness which had swept away his rival (thus gratifying his desires for greatness) would thus prove the means of his own undoing."[12]

Some time after the death of Arthur, the Queen Mother Elizabeth died, making Henry VII a widower, and he proposed (for reasons we need not inquire at this point) that he himself should marry the young widow of Arthur, a situation which worked to re-arouse the younger Henry's Oedipal feelings, regarding himself as a rival of his father and reinforcing the transference of his mother-like feelings on to Catherine. The proposal of the elder Henry was rejected by Ferdinand and Isabella (Catherine's

---

[12]p. 127.

parents) as a thing wholly improper, and eventually the marriage treaty between Prince Henry and Catherine was arranged, the wedding to be celebrated as soon as Henry reached the age of fourteen.

However, the death of Isabella dampened enthusiasm for this arrangement, since Isabella's death brought about considerable political instability and an Anglo-Spanish alliance was no longer desirable. Other possible unions for Prince Henry were considered, and the young man on the occasion of his fifteenth birthday published a solemn repudiation of the marriage contract he had signed earlier. On his death bed three years later, Henry VII reverted to the original plan and urged his son to go ahead and marry Catherine, an action in which the son acquiesced. This was according to pattern, Flugel says, with which psychoanalysts are familiar, the tendency to follow the wishes of a dead father.

Subsequently, two sets of motives can be seen as influencing the behavior of Henry VIII in the remainder of his reign, the egoistic and the venerative. The former have to do with self seeking, self reliance and self will, while the latter concern the "displacement of tendencies and feelings originally directed to the person of his

father."[13] Venerative motives are seen in the desire of Henry to carry out his father's death bed wishes, as well as his reliance on counselors who had advised his father, such as Warham, Wolsey, Cromwell and others. Still further, there was his persistent desire to proceed in accordance with rather than against legal and constitutional authority, his anxiety to gain the approval of, and later to conciliate the Pope. "The Pope of course, as his very title signifies, is one of the most regular and normal father substitutes."[14]

As time passed, Henry's egoistic motives began to gain mastery and to overcome the venerative tendencies, so that there was a complete victory of the former over the latter. This found expression especially in his act of defiance of the Pope's authority, not only in the matter of his divorce from Catherine but in his setting himself in the Pope's place to become head of the Church in England and to assume power temporal and spiritual which has perhaps never been equalled by any other British sovereign.

> In such an attitude of defiance, psychoanalysts will immediately recognize a displacement of the desire to overthrow the rule of the father and usurp his authority, a

---

[13]p. 132.

[14]p. 134.

desire based on the primitive Oedipus complex.[15]

Up to this point, Flugel has emphasized two basic features of the Oedipus complex. One is the feeling of hostility and rejection of the father. The other is displacement, or the transfer of the individual's feelings toward the father onto other individuals who come to represent for the individual the original father. Displacement for Henry VIII was both positive and negative. In the period following his father's death, it was positive involving venerative feelings, an attitude of submission to and reverence for those who occupied a father role in his experience. Later venerative feelings turned to egoistic ones as the King became "more despotic...more intolerant of any kind of limitation on his power" in an expression of the original Oedipal hostility.

There is a third element in the Oedipus complex which is central to Flugel's view, an ambivalent attitude toward incest, i.e., a desire for it and a deep-seated rejection of it. This comes into view in Henry's relationship with his father-in-law, King Ferdinand. Ferdinand was another object of displacement, at first in a venerative way. The dying Henry VII had urged his son

---

[15] p. 135.

to defend the Church and make war on the infidel. Accordingly, the very first military undertaking of Henry VIII was an expedition in 1501 to cooperate with Ferdinand against the Moors. Henry's displacement was related to the fact that Catherine seems to have suffered a "father fixation." She was unable to transfer her loyalty and affection from her parents to her husband and the land of her adoption. For several years she continued writing to her father in most submissive terms. In fact, she regularly acted as his ambassador and supporter of his interests very often contrary to those of her husband. She seems to have customarily acted in a manner "prejudicial to Henry's influence and desire." Ferdinand thus came to occupy a place such as Henry's brother Arthur had originally occupied. Such feelings toward Ferdinand, however, had to be modified in view of Catherine's inability to produce a male heir, a fact which aroused anxiety in Henry because of the Oedipus complex. "The idea of sterility as a punishment for incest is deeply rooted in the human mind, and in the case of a union such as that of Henry and Catherine, there was Scriptural authority for the infliction of a penalty of this description."[16] Such circumstances militate against the

---

[16]p. 131.

idea (in Flugel's view) that Henry's desire to divorce Catherine was motivated by his falling in love with Anne Boleyn. Rather, deep seated psychological processes were at work, in particular the arousal of fear resting on the repression of incestuous desires, desires that were originally connected with his parents and which through force of circumstances were displaced to his brother and sister-in-law.

Incest was technically involved, so Flugel argues, in his love affair with Anne Boleyn. Henry had previously had Anne's sister Mary Boleyn as a mistress. According to the canon law of the Church, this made any possible relationship with Anne a forbidden or incestuous one. If Henry had no right to marry Catherine because she was his brother's wife, he equally had no right to marry Ann Boleyn, since she was the sister of a former mistress. Such inconsistency did not bother Henry, at least on a conscious level. Down deep, however, Flugel claims there were processes at work, unconscious in nature and of an incestuous character.

He sees significance, for example, in the fact that Henry named his two daughters Mary and Elizabeth. These were the names of his former mistresses, Mary Boleyn (Anne's sister) and Elizabeth Blount by whom he had an illegitimate son. In addition, Elizabeth was the name of

the Boleyn sisters' mother with whom rumor alleged (so Flugel suggests) Henry had also had improper relations. Thus, the recurring names of Mary and Elizabeth were to Henry's unconscious mind substitutes for Elizabeth and Mary Tudor, his mother and younger sister respectively. All of this in the argument of Flugel's article constitutes evidence in favor of incest tendencies and family fixations which fit in with Henry's relationship with Anne Boleyn.

When Anne fell from favor in Henry's eyes, she was accused of unfaithfulness to her husband. Several persons were charged as accomplices, among them her brother Lord Rockford with whom she was charged with repeated instances of incest. Anne was also charged with treason and plotting to kill the King. She and all the others were executed.

> In accusing Anne of incest with her brother, Henry produced with reference to his brother-in-law a repetition of the situation which had formerly existed between himself and his own brother in the case of Catherine. In both cases he was (in reality or in imagination) brought into competition with his brother over the person of his sister.[17]

Henry's feelings about Catherine and Arthur, Flugel stresses, were ambivalent in nature. On one hand, he wanted to kill his brother (the father substitute) and

---

[17] p. 139.

marry his sister (the mother substitute). Yet at the same time, there was a horror of such activity. The divorce from Catherine was the expression of horror, i.e., the rejection of incest feelings. Yet at the same time, there was the attractiveness of incest expressed in the choice of a fresh sister substitute in the person of Anne.

The same basic situation existed in relation to Henry's marriage to Jane Seymour. As in the case of Catherine, he was getting rid of one incestuous relationship with a "sister" while starting a new one with another sister. Inasmuch as Jane was descended on her mother's side from Edward III, a forbidden degree of relationship existed for which Archbishop Cranmer had to issue a dispensation permitting marriage. During the courtship period, the King had been in the habit of seeing her in the quarters of her brother Sir Edward Seymour, a fact which in the psychoanalytic interpretation reestablished the original brother-sister triangle. However, Henry's relationship with Jane Seymour was not to be of long duration, since she died in childbirth one year and four months after the marriage. This fact prevented in the Flugel interpretation Henry's alienation of affection according to the characteristic pattern.

There then followed the shortest of all Henry's matrimonial ventures with Anne of Cleaves, a match

arranged by Cromwell and accepted with the utmost passivity. It was basically a political arrangement, prompted by the fact that the Pope, the Holy Roman Emperor and the Kings of France and Scotland were aligned against England, threatening an invasion to bring back the rebellious land to the authority of the Church. The Duke of Cleaves was a German Protestant who had embarked on a policy much like Henry's which was a compromise between Protestantism and Romanism. An alliance with him was desirable as a means of counterbalancing the threat of the crusading Catholic powers. But his daughter proved a disappointment to Henry, who found her unattractive and her accomplishments meager as judged by English standards, along with the fact that she spoke only German! By this time the threat of invasion had subsided and Cromwell, who had engineered the scheme, was arrested and beheaded. The marriage to Anne was declared null and void, with the lady herself escaping with her life and a subsistence. Henry insisted that he had been unduly pressured into marriage and had felt conscientious scruples about the discovery that Anne had not been released from a pre-marriage contract with the Duke of Lorraine (which constituted an impediment to marriage according to canon law). The situation bears "the unmistakable trace of Henry's unconscious tendencies" according to Flugel.

There is another aspect of Henry's unconscious experience which has not been mentioned thus far. There were two conflicting motives in Henry's thinking. The first desired the most scrupulous chastity on the part of his wives, while at the same time, according to the second, he secretly desired a partner who had already enjoyed sexual experience with other men, or who was actually unfaithful after marriage. This ambivalence is also explainable in terms of the Oedipus complex. The young boy finds the idea of sexual relations between his parents a disagreeable one, and he entertains the fantasy that no sexual relations have existed between them. In later life the wife is unconsciously identified with the mother, and the ideal of chastity is displaced from the latter to the former. Eventually of course the child discovers or at least suspects that there have been sexual relations between the parents, so that the having of these relations becomes an essential characteristic of the mother. Hence, in his fantasy, any mother substitute in later life is expected to have this characteristic, i.e., only women who have had sexual experience are eligible to be the mother surrogate. So Henry "...desired a woman who

had other lovers than himself, while on the other hand he ardently desired her exclusive possession and chastity."[18]

In connection with Anne of Cleves, this motivation expressed itself in Henry's complaint to Cromwell "that he suspected Anne (groundlessly so far as we know) of being 'no true maid', thus showing the operation of the chastity complex as well as that connected with the presence of a rival." The "rival" concept here goes back again to the Oedipus complex. There is the need for an obstacle to be present as a condition for the arousal of love. This obstacle in the earliest instance is the incestuous nature of the relationship which by its nature is forbidden, since the mother is bound by ties of law and affection to a third person, the father. In later life the continuing Oedipus complex

> "...manifests itself in the choice of a love object between whom and the lover there is an impediment of the kind that existed in the original incestuous love, i.e., either the love itself is unlawful or the love object is already bound elsewhere, or else (as often happens) both conditions are present."[19]

Such a viewpoint Flugel maintains explains two very constant features of Henry's love life, his fickleness (which tended to make him unable to love a woman once his

---

[18] p. 146.

[19] pp. 137-138.

possession of her was assured) and the desire for some obstacle between him and the object of his choice.

Such a situation is readily observable in Henry's fifth marriage to Catherine Howard, who "had lived anything but a chaste life before her marriage...[and] continued after her marriage to receive her former lovers including one Culpepper to whom she had been affianced."[20] She was executed with her lovers along with all those who had been her accomplices in one way or another.

Henry's sixth and last wife, Catherine Parr, was in her second widowhood when Henry married her in the early summer of 1543. Her moral character was beyond reproach, and yet she had undoubtedly had previous sexual experience, a situation which Flugel insists was necessary to gratify Henry's unconscious desires. In addition, after the death of her second husband,Catherine was courted by Sir Thomas Seymour, King Henry's brother-in-law (the younger brother of Jane Seymour). After Henry's death, Catherine did marry Sr. Thomas as she was going to do until Henry overruled the engagement and compelled her to accept himself.

> The circumstances of Henry's last marriage thus strongly recall those connected with his first. The name of his bride was the same...and in both cases he took the place

---

[20] p. 146.

> which otherwise would have been filled by a brother. We thus see how the unconscious jealousy of Arthur (a jealousy which was itself probably only a displacement of that originally directed against his father) operated to the end of Henry's matrimonial career and acted as the determining factor in the choice of a wife more than forty years after Arthur's death. At the same time, Catherine Parr's betrothal to Seymour in one sense constituted her a sister to Henry, so that the desire for an incestuous union was also satisfied.[21]

III. Flugel's Article Evaluated

Such then is the argument of Flugel's article. What does one make of it?

The argument is basically a deductive one. It assumes the psychoanalytic system in general and the Oedipus complex in particular. All children go through Freud's developmental stages, including the Oedipal period. Therefore, Henry went through the cycle and developed an Oedipus complex that is the key to the King's entire adult life.

In attempting to apply the Oedipal principle to the historical data, Flugel's method is procrustean. The facts of history must in several cases be tailored to conform to the requirements of the psychoanalytic mold. It is much in the manner of the giant of Eleusis who forced travelers to fit one of two unequally long beds by

---

[21] pp. 147-148.

stretching their bodies or cutting off their legs. One writer explains that the interpretation of historical material is like picking out shoes. Shoes ought to fit. They must not be too long; they must not be too tight. They must conform to the body easily, comfortably and naturally. Flugel readily admits that data for the early life of Henry VIII is lacking, although there is an abundance of it for his later years.[22] Accordingly, he must make some assumptions about what must have happened on the basis of what psychoanalysts know always happens.

For example, Flugel postulates that the pretenders to the throne who challenged the elder Henry's regime must have aroused in the young Prince the expectation that he might suddenly succeed to the position of his father. The question might readily be asked whether a child of such young years would have really understood the meaning of assassination and succession to the throne. Quite possibly there could have been the reaction of fear and insecurity. If my father goes away, what will happen to me? If these violent men do away with my father, it is possible they can do away with me also. The phenomenological perspective must be maintained here. The significance of an act depends on the subject's perception

---

[22] p. 125.

of the act and how he defines the situation. There is no documentation as to how Henry VIII in these early years viewed threats to his father's position. Flugel assumes that Henry had hostility toward his father and was hopeful that the threats would succeed. Such an interpretation is of course necessary because of the demands of the psychoanalytic system.

Even if it should be granted that young Henry did have such feelings of hostility, there is no reason to suppose that he expected to take his father's place. He had an older brother who was first in line of succession, and Henry could not have taken his father's place in any event. There is nothing to suggest that he was encouraged to think of himself in any position other than a second-born son whose destiny lay in a direction other than succeeding to the throne.

Flugel's further assumption is that the idea of taking his father's place was reinforced by the fact that the marriage of the elder Henry was not a happy one, that the latter was "much wanting in warmth and affection" toward a lovely and attractive Queen who was being neglected. Such a viewpoint rests on the picture of Henry VII presented by Francis Bacon in 1622 whose biography was for three hundred years almost the sole source of information about this king. Bacon presented a

grave, austere personality who took little pleasure in life, but spent most of his time keeping account books and who feared his wife because of his hatred of her father's house of York. Modern scholars feel that Bacon's portrait is exaggerated.

> He appears to have been a devoted and faithful husband and father,and Bacon's facile phrase that 'towards his queen he was nothing uxorious' has no justification, unless it was meant to convey that he did not indulge her desire (if she had any) to interfere in matters of political decisions.[23]

There is a moving account of how the royal couple consoled each other when the news came of the death of Prince Arthur in 1502, an incident which suggests great devotion and affection for each other. When Elizabeth died in childbirth, the elder Henry seems to have taken it quite hard, going into a period of seclusion in which he gave audience to no one. Even if relations between Henry and his Queen had not been good, there would be the question of how much the young Prince might have known and understood and how he might have reacted.

There is yet another difficulty in the assumption that the future Henry VIII had and entertained the Oedipal feelings which Flugel attributes to him. This view assumes a more modern set of family arrangements than that

---

[23] S. B. Chrisme, Henry VII. (Berkley and L.A.: University of California Press, 1972), p. 302.

which prevailed in the royal family in Tudor times. Relationships between parents and children were less direct than now. There was nothing of the kind of situation often pictured in TV programs such as "The Waltons" or the "Leave it to Beaver" series of the 1950's. In the fifteenth century, royal children and parents did not share the same roof.[24] The court was not considered an appropriate place for small children, since it was constantly moving from one place to another according to the policy of Henry VII to expose his regime to as much of the population as possible. Then too there was the necessity of vacating the royal residences from time to time for cleaning. Moreover, the coming and going of many persons on official business brought the security risk of a would be assassin or perhaps the transmission of disease. Shortly after his christening, therefore, the baby Henry was transported to Eltham Palace in Kent where the responsibilities for his mothering were turned over to a wet nurse, Anne Oxenbrigge, who performed all the functions of the biological mother including breast feeding. Henry's maternal grandmother, Margaret Beaufort, supervised Anne and the royal nursery at Eltham, although she lived in her own palace elsewhere as well as at

---

[24]Mary Louise Bruce, The Making of Henry VIII. (N. Y.: Coward, McCann and Geoghegan, Inc., 1977), p. 29.

Henry's court when she was disposed to stay there. So whatever identification the young Prince Henry might have made as far as a mother was concerned, it was hardly with Elizabeth the Queen, but was divided between the surrogate Anne and Lady Beaufort. If the little prince had minimal contact with his biological mother, it was even more so in relation to his father. Of course the parents would periodically come to Eltham to visit, and at times the children might go for a short sojourn to the court. By and large, however, such occasions were only interruptions of their normal confinement to the care of a surrogate. Under such an arrangement, the idea of the development of the Oedipus complex as Freud viewed it seems less reasonable.

In fact, a basic criticism of the Oedipus complex is that its occurrence may be cultural and local rather than innate and universal, since there are some cultures in which it does not appear.

> Malinowski, in one of his best known books called The Father in Primitive Psychology (1927), took relish in showing that in a materlinically organized society such as the Trobriands, the supposedly universal infantile tendency of a son to develop an "Oedipus complex" (father hostility) did not exist in the classical Freudian manner, for a boy received his major social training on the male

> side not from his biological male parent but from the brother of his mother.[25]

Moreover, many later psychoanalysts rejected Freud's position, maintaining that the Oedipus complex is neither normal nor universal. Karen Horney, for example, saw it as a neurotic development fostered by parents who act unduly seductive toward their children. Leo Kanner maintained that the Oedipus complex was imposed by Freud and his followers on the basis of adult cases and not on the basis of the observation of children. The latter point highlights the problem of the clinical methodology of Freud and the representativeness of the sample involved in his observations.[26]

To return to the argument of the article, Flugel insists that young Henry must have resented playing second fiddle to his brother Arthur. All of the good things were going to the brother who was in line for the throne, and Henry could not help being jealous, especially when Catherine appeared on the scene. Surely he must have felt considerable hostility when as a part of the marriage

---

[25]Felix M. Kessing, Cultural Anthropology: The Science of Custom. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958), p. 171).

[26]Robert M. Goldenson (ed.), The Encyclopedia of Human Behavior: Psychology, Psychiatry and Mental Health. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970), p. 896.

ceremony he escorted his sister-in-law to the altar and then had to turn her over to another. If Henry felt such hostility, there is nothing in any of the records to indicate that he did! Henry was ten years old at this time which would have placed him in the period of latency according to the Freudian scheme. Supposedly in this period, the sexual interests of the child are not in evidence, and he gives himself to more generalized concerns of growing up. M. L. Bruce says, "Henry was at an age when most twentieth century boys look with scorn at girls."[27] One need not assume that Henry took an indifferent attitude; yet neither is it necessary to believe that he had a "head-over-heels" infatuation for his sister-in-law which made him hate his brother and secretly desire to have him out of the way so that he could have the lovely young Spanish princess all to himself.

Still building on the idea of Henry's hostility toward Arthur, Flugel explains the King's morbid fear of the sweating sickness years later as guilt reaction to the memory of his brother's death. He feared the same illness which had swept away Arthur would also be his own undoing. We cannot, however, assert with confidence that the reason

---

[27] The Making of Henry VIII, p. 116.

for Arthur's death was in fact the sweating sickness. Many authorities attribute the death to tuberculosis. Even if Arthur's death was due to sweating sickness, there would be nothing at all unusual in Henry's fearing that he too might die of it. Sweating sickness was in that day an illness much like cancer in our own. It was little understood and not much could be done to prevent it. Henry did well to fear it whether it was or was not the reason for his brother's death. In particular, no one needs to assume the absence of documentary evidence that Henry felt guilty about Arthur's dying.

The contention that Catherine of Aragon must have suffered a "father fixation" because of her devotion to and strong reliance on King Ferdinand is adequately answered by Flugel himself.

> It must be said...in Catherine's defense that the circumstance of Arthur's early death and of the none too flattering or considerate treatment she received in England during the period of her young widowhood were certainly calculated to produce a regression of feeling in favor of her own family and home.[28]

After Arthur's death, Catherine became an embarrassment to Henry VII who did not want to send her home because of

---

[28]"On the Character and Married Life of Henry VIII," International Journal of Psychoanalysis, I (1920):24-55. Reproduced in Bruce Mazlish (ed.), Psychoanalysis and History. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 131.

economic considerations (he would lose her dowry!), and yet there was no proper place where she belonged in England. For a period she almost starved to death when she was without funds, and besides everything else, she spoke no English. Her reaction was certainly a natural one, to look toward her homeland and to the protection of her father. Flugel's purpose in introducing Catherine's "father fixation" seems rather ambiguous. It does little to advance his argument other than to show Ferdinand as a "father figure" with whom Henry was in competition according to the Oedipal pattern. Flugel does not, however, emphasize Henry's behavior at this point, but Catherine's. Catherine's personality was one source of the eventual disintegration of her marriage to Henry, so Flugel suggests. "Catherine, in spite of some excellent qualities, was tactless, obstinate and narrow minded," characteristics which helped the transition in Henry's character from venerative to egoistic. Her one unforgivable transgression, however, was the failure to produce a male heir without which "Henry's egoistic impulses could find no complete satisfaction."[29]

It is of significance that Flugel speaks here of Henry's desire for a male heir as an expression of his

---

[29]Ibid, body of text.

egoistic tendencies, i.e., tendencies of a hostile and rebellious nature with rejection of the standards of his father. Egoistic tendencies are in other words a manifestation of the original Oedipal hostility. If that be so, then why did Henry continue to desire so desperately a male heir? His desire to continue the succession in a legitimate and orderly way was a value he received from his father. Writing to the Duke of Norfolk in 1540, Henry declared:

> His Majesty...being by God's sufferance born by just and most certain title and succession to such a kingdom as knoweth therein no superior his crown being close and his progenitors before afore him Emperors in their own realm and dominion, doubteth not but, with God's help, he will so prepare himself as he shall be able to leave it in as good case to his son as his father before left unto him and better.[30]

Does not this sound venerative rather than egoistic? Does it not suggest some evidence of an identification with his father and a resolution of the Oedipus complex rather than a displacement of it?

An important line of argument in Flugel's presentation concerns the King's ambivalence toward incest. He both entertained a horror of it and at the same time a compulsive attraction toward it. It is

---

[30] M. St. Claire Byrne (ed.), The Letters of Henry VIII. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1936), p. 148.

important to ask in this connection, just what does Flugel mean by the term? He seems to use it in a double sense to denote both real incest and canonical incest, i.e., that which is regarded in a technical sense as incest by the law of the Church. Henry interpreted Catherine's failure to produce a male heir as a divine judgment for his violation of Leviticus 20:21, a text which comes in a section of detailed prohibitions against incest. However, his marriage to Anne also involved incest, so Flugel argues. Anne was technically a sister to Henry in terms of canon law because he had her sister Mary Boleyn as mistress for a time. Thus, his affair with Anne involved the choice of a fresh sister substitute and the formation of a new incestuous relationship while still in the process of freeing himself from the original one with Catherine. A difficulty arises in this connection as to how Henry himself regarded incest. There is nothing in the record to suggest that Henry was troubled by the technical definition of incest. Of course Flugel's psychoanalytic system assumes that Henry was disturbed on an unconscious level. This assumption, however, seems questionable when we separate the concept of true incest from the relativistic and culturally oriented definitions of canon law.

It has long been held that the incest taboo is a universal behavior norm. Yet the precise degree of relationship within which sexual intimacy is or is not allowed is a matter of cultural definition. The obvious relationships are always forbidden, e.g., mother and son, father and daughter, brother and sister. Yet the finer relationships involving cousins for example and other family members less closely related show considerable variation from culture to culture.

> In some societies marriage between cousins or between uncles and nieces, aunts and nephews, is prohibited, in others is permitted. Privileged groups have been exempted from incest taboos in some cultures; for example during the Ptolemaic period in Egypt, marriage between brother and sister was not only permitted but required.[31]

L. B. Smith points out that in the society of Tudor times "the aristocracy was hopelessly related." Because of the complexities of canon law, the circle of possibilities for marriage was a rather limited one, and it was a likely possibility that one would become guilty of canonical incest by marrying within a prohibited degree. Henry VIII's parents required a special papal dispensation permitting their marriage, and each of his six spouses was a distant relative. "Catherine of Aragon was a fifth cousin, Jane Seymour an eighth cousin, Anne of Cleves a

---

[31]Goldsen, ed., Encyclopedia, p. 605.

seventh cousin twice removed, Catherine Howard an eighth cousin, and Catherine Parr a third cousin once removed."[32] In view of the social situation involved and the complexities of the law of the Church, incest was something about which everyone in Tudor times might have a concern, especially the royal family where everyone was related to everyone else if one probed deeply enough. As far as King Henry was concerned, there was an important distinction to be made which is decisive in fixing his attitude toward prohibited marriages. The regulations of canon law were human, pragmatic and administrative. They could be and often were set aside when expediencies of the situation made it practical; but the law of God in Scripture was a different matter. It was eternally binding and no man including the Pope had authority to set it aside. Henry's relationship to Catherine of Aragon clearly involved the latter, and whatever attitude he had toward incest was one based on what the Bible said and not the legislative opinions of the Pope. Technically, his relationship to Anne Boleyn may have been incestuous; but the issue remains one of Henry's own perspective. Did he himself regard it so? Nothing except the demands of Flugel's psychoanalytic system suggests he did.

---

[32]Lacey Baldwin Smith, The Mask of Royalty. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971), p. 376.

Flugel's argument from the names of Henry's daughters shows the extreme degree to which psychoanalysts press minute details. Supposedly the girls bore the names of Mary and Elizabeth because these were the names of Henry's former mistresses. If one studies the list of the sovereigns who have reigned over the English people, he will be impressed with the lack of originality in the names borne by each ruler. There are seven Henrys, as well as several Williams, Georges and Edwards, not to mention other repetitive names. Emphasis involved in the royal names used seems to have been not upon the individual ruler but on the succession, on the continuation of the nation and the family line in particular. The principle is illustrated in the New Testament account of the birth of John the Baptist (Luke 1:59 and following). Everyone supposed that the child would be named Zacharias after his father. The mother, however, said the child was to be called John. "Why this name?", the people objected. "No one in your family has ever been named John." When Zacharias was consulted, he concurred in the mother's statement. The child was indeed to be called John. The reaction of the people to this unusual name suggests a principle observable in the first century as well as in the sixteenth century and our own. Old and familiar names are

preferred, suggesting identification with the older generation. Two modern day authors have addressed the issue of parental name selection.[33] They agree that a basic reason for a name choice seems to be family tradition. Admiration for a famous person ranks close behind as a second factor. It is interesting to observe that three of Henry's personal ministers (Wolsey, Moore and Cromwell) were all named Thomas. This was the name of Aquinas the father of Scholasticism, as well as of the martyred Saint Becket in the time of Henry II. A plausible reason for Henry's choice for his daughters' names is that Henry had a sister Mary,and Elizabeth was his own mother's name. In addition, the fact that these were Biblical names would have influenced an orthodox person such as he was.

In the succession of Henry's spouses following Catherine of Aragon, Flugel finds the Oedipus complex expressed in two ways. One is the element of a brother rival reenacting the original triangle situation. The other is the "chastity complex" in which Henry demanded scrupulous chastity and at the same time secretly desired an experienced partner who had other lovers.

---

[33]Paul Tournier, The Naming of Persons. (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1975). See also Elsdon C. Smith, The Story of Our Names. (New York: Harper, 1950).

The validity of the argument here depends on whether one accepts the basic assumption of the primitive Oedipal hostility and its displacement. These cases, according to Flugel, involve a reliving of Henry's unconscious jealousy toward Arthur symbolized by Anne Boleyn's brother (charged with incest and treason), Jane Seymour's brother in whose apartment the King courted her, and Henry's brother-in-law who was going to marry Catherine Parr until Henry forced Catherine to break the engagement and marry himself instead. Because his system demands a triangle, Flugel must have one. It is difficult, however, to see a truly competitive situation in these cases. Anne Boleyn's unpardonable sin was not unfaithfulness to her husband, but her failure (like Catherine) to produce a male heir. The accusations against her brother suggest that he must have become a welcome scapegoat for Henry to dispose of a woman for whom he had no more use. The fact that Henry courted Jane Seymour in her brother's quarters seems to suggest the brother's cooperation rather than his rivalry. Only in the case of Henry's last marriage to Catherine Parr does there seem to be an element of competition which was easily disposed of when the King "pulled rank" and forced the issue. Whether in the sixteenth century or the twentieth, it is not unreasonable to suppose that a man

seriously dating a woman would encounter a male relative of some kind who would enter into the picture of a possible marriage. What woman is there who does not have a brother, nephew, cousin, brother-in-law, son, father, uncle, or some other male person who is a part of her life? Much of Flugel's argument depends on coincidental similarity which is not convincing. The fact that Henry's last wife had the same name as the first is not surprising in view of the trend of that day to use a few names over and over again.

Henry's concern about chastity is explainable from two standpoints. One is religious. Much of Henry's religion had an Old Testament orientation. In particular, the book of Leviticus figured prominently in the "divorce" controversy and seems to have been a favorite of the theologians of the day. Leviticus has detailed prohibitions against all kinds of unchastity, the death penalty being invoked in many cases. An orthodox Catholic such as Henry would surely be influenced by such teaching.

The second factor in Henry's seeming obsession about chastity is a pragmatic one. Henry was concerned about the succession. While a King might be promiscuous and get away with it, no such immunity was accorded the royal wife and mother. Questionable paternity would cast a shadow over a child's right to the throne. It would

forever be a point of vulnerability which a claimant could exploit mercilessly. Henry wanted an heir, a male heir, and an heir born "on the right side of the blanket."

Flugel's assertion that Henry required chastity and yet desired an experienced lover who had not been chaste is a demand of the psychoanalytic system and belief in the Oedipal complex. The question of a "chastity complex" arises particularly in the case of Henry's last two spouses, Catherine Howard and Catherine Parr. Flugel cannot take seriously the idea that Henry was unaware of the promiscuous lifestyle of Catherine Howard. All of the emotion that the King displayed on its discovery was a superficial matter contrary to his real down deep feelings. In quite a different vein, L. B. Smith writes:

> Mistress Catherine lasted eighteen months and left at her execution nothing but a broken white-haired sovereign of fifty-two, who had grown suddenly old from the knowledge that his vivacious teenage wife, the apple of his elderly eye, was not after all a "rose without a thorn."[34]

Following her execution, a law was enacted making it a treasonable offense for "a maiden who was not a virgin to wed the monarch, a limitation which the French ambassador noted excluded most of the ladies of the court."[35] Such a

---

[34] This Realm of England: 1399 to 1688. (Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath, 1976), p. 132.

[35] Ibid.

law may provide insight as to why Henry's last wife was a widow. No sensible young lady would have wanted to marry the King and expose herself to the danger of being accused under the statute! Since Henry himself was of an advanced age, it was appropriate, and much more likely, that he would find a suitable spouse among the ladies near his own age who had been previously married. "In Catherine Parr he found his most dutiful, if least romantic spouse...[one] who could double as nursemaid for an unpredictable and increasingly difficult old man."[36]

It is now appropriate in this closing section of the chapter to indicate some objections to the psychoanalytic approach as Flugel has presented it in this article. First and foremost, he assumes the universality of the Oedipus complex, a view which many psychologists reject, as well as anthropologists and some psychoanalysts too. This assumption is the foundation of his entire argument. Second, Flugel emphasizes to an extreme the idea of unconscious motivation. Nothing in Henry's behavior can abe taken at face value. Even his own statements are "cover-ups" for deeper thoughts and feelings which Henry does not know about but which Flugel is somehow able to reveal. If one accepts such a

---

[36]Ibid.

position, there can be no place for personal responsibility. Henry was neither a villain nor hero, but a victim of his own repressions which he was not aware of and could not control. Finally, Flugel's approach eliminates religion as a viable expression of human personality by its reductionism. What one would ordinarily regard as religious experience turns out to be only the disguised expression of repressed sexuality of an incestuous nature. In fact, practically everything in the King's entire life seems traceable to this single factor.

Walter Houston Clark has written of what he calls "the nothing but fallacy."[37] Because religious experience is found to contain unworthy elements, some would be inclined to dismiss all religion as nothing but sex, superstition, ignorance, emotionalism or whatever else. One must be quick to acknowledge that he can find much in the behavior of Henry VIII of an unworthy nature. Undoubtedly as a human being the King had sexual feelings and erotic overtones that colored much of his experience, religious and otherwise; but to say this is not to endorse the pansexualism of the Freudian school nor to insist that all sexual behavior conforms to the single stereotyped Oedipal model. Clark reminds us appropriately:

---

[37] The Psychology of Religion. (N. Y.: MacMillan, 1958), p. 57.

> Freud's views are always to be treated with respect though never with awe...That empirical studies are far from verifying all of Freud's hypotheses, including those concerning parent-child relations, is made clear in R. R. Sears, Survey of Objective Studies of Psychoanalytic Concepts."[38]

IV. Chapter Summation

This chapter has continued pursuit of the question, "How did Henry VIII get to be that way?" The special frame of reference was that of psychoanalysis as Freud conceived it. Human beings universally pass through five developmental stages. Unique experience at any stage may permanently dispose the individual's behavior in terms of that stage. Application of the Freudian developmental scheme was illustrated by a contrast of Martin Luther with Henry VIII. Erikson and other theorists viewed Luther in terms of the anal stage, while J. C. Flugel, an early twentieth century psychoanalyst, explained King Henry in terms if displaced Oedipal feelings arising in the phallic stage. The writer rejected both of these psychoanalytic interpretations of Luther and Henry VIII. In relation to religious behavior, such interpretations are reductionist, explaining these individuals not as reacting to the perceived demands of a Higher Power, but rather as

---

[38]Ibid, p. 88, citing Sears. (N. Y.: Social Science Research Council, 1943).

reacting to frustrated bodily urges, gastro-intestinal immobility on the one hand and incestuous feelings on the other. A recent biographer of Freud writes of the "early extravagances of the International Journal of Psychoanalysis," citing the Flugel article as the "first full dress paper." His evaluation is an appropriate conclusion to this chapter: "With psychoanalysis being supported in such terms, there was little need for its enemies to worry."[39]

---

[39]Ronald W. Clark, Freud: The Man and the Cause. (New York: Random House, 1980), p. 422.

CHAPTER V

HENRY VIII AS PROPAGANDIST, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH

Scholars in general regard Henry's treatise against Luther as a second-rate production. It is important, however, as a primary source for knowledge of the King's religion at an early period. The focus of this chapter will be on The Assertio[1] viewed from the standpoint of contemporary Attitude Theory. Attitudes are behavioral tendencies toward objects, concepts or situations. They involve three basic components of information, feeling and action. After some general considerations, the writer will attempt to analyze Henry's writing in terms of its cognitive content, affective tone and behavioral thrust (i.e., the reaction of the Pope to whom it was addressed, of Martin Luther against whom it was directed and the consistency of Henry's later behavior with the rigid stance he assumed as a young man.)

I. Background and Occasion of the Treatise

The occasion for The Assertio was the appearance in 1520 of Martin Luther's pamphlet The Babylonian Captivity of the Church. In that year the German Reformer wrote a

---

[1] Assertio Septem Sacramentorum. Louis O'Donovan, Editor. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1908.

series of articles enunciating the basic principles of the Protestant Reformation. In his Address to the German Nation, Luther called on the princes of his country to reform flagrant ecclesiastical abuses. The Babylonian Captivity summarized Luther's theological views, especially about the sacraments. Then followed The Freedom of a Christian Man, which Luther addressed to the Pope in the slight hope that reconciliation was still possible. Here Luther set forth his views about Christian behavior. "Good works do not make a man good, but a good man does good works." These three works are generally held to be the most fundamental expression of the German Reformer's views.

From the standpoint of its theological erudition, there were two extreme positions taken toward The Assertio in the sixteenth century. One said it was too good a writing for Henry to have written, while another concluded that it was too poor to have come from the pen of a King. Since that time, the practical attitude of most writers has been to ignore Henry's treatise except for mentioning that he wrote a reply to Luther's views. One does not find an abundance of reprints of Henry's article. Even extracts from it are not numerous. The writer of this dissertation had difficulty in locating the complete text of Henry's writing in English, although a Latin manuscript

on microfilm was available at Vanderbilt University. The writer was finally able to secure a 1908 edition by Louis O'Donovan in which the original Latin and an English translation were reproduced. All references to The Assertio in this dissertation are to this edition.

O'Donovan has suggested that one reason for the shortage of manuscripts of the treatise is that after Henry's break with Rome, Henry would not allow The Assertio to be reprinted.[2] Whatever the case, the practical effect of all this is to suggest that Henry's production has not gone down in history as a major contribution to theological thought. This is a contrast with the fact that Luther's writings are still copiously reprinted, and John Calvin's Institutes are required reading for theological students of the Reformed faith. For the present study, Henry's treatise is of special concern in that it is a direct statement from the King himself about the subject we are interested in. It comes as the earliest official pronouncement on the subject at the beginning of the Reformation period.

There is no problem about the genuineness of Henry's treatise. We may assume without qualms that it comes directly from the King bearing his authority. At

---

[2]Ibid, p. 102.

the time, some questions were raised about it as Doernberg details, but there is no good reason now to doubt that The Assertio was a true production of Henry VIII.[3] Most modern scholars believe that Henry had assistance in writing the treatise, although the document was officially presented as his own.[4] This is like the practice of modern American Presidents who in recent years have had speech writers. Whatever the precise truth about how The Assertio reached its final form, there is no good reason to deny that Henry could have written it. His interest and ability in theological matters was acknowledged by contemporaries, as we have previously noted. In any case, the document was formally presented by John Clarke in the name of Henry VIII to Leo X, who conferred on the King the title Defender of the Faith. The document meets all of the requirements of being a primary source.

In the discussion of this chapter, the psychological frame of reference will be contemporary Attitude Theory. While several scholars have contributed to this point of view, much of the material used in this

---

[3]Eerwin Doernberg, Henry VIII and Luther. (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press), p. 21.

[4]Richard Marius feels that Thomas More had a strong influence in the composition, although he concludes, "We may assume that the book was written 'in committee!'" See Thomas More: A Biography. (N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984), p. 279.

section comes from the presentation of David Krech, Richard S. Crutchfield and Egerton L. Ballachey in their social psychology text entitled Individuals in Society (New York: McGraw Hill, 1962). The present writer was impressed with these authors' organization of material.

At the beginning of this, psychology was defined as "the science of behavior." Behavior in turn is everything a subject does even when he appears to be doing nothing. Such a definition, while technically correct, is too broad to be useful. How can one apply the concept of behavior in a practical way that contributes to the objectives of describing, predicting and controlling human activity? The concept of attitude provides a description of behavior that both summarizes past activity and projects a probability about the future. If an individual has a positive attitude toward baseball, one knows something of how he behaved in the past with reference to this sport, and he has a pretty good idea of where he will be and how he will be spending his time when that special season of the year occurs. One of Webster's definitions of attitude is "an organismic state of readiness to respond in a characteristic way to a stimulus (as an object, concept or situation)."[5] A one-word synonym suggested is "posture."

---

[5]Henry Bosley Woolf, editor in chief, Webster's New

People often use this idea in speaking. One may ask, for example, "What is your position on this issue?" Someone may reply, "I lean toward such and such a view." Or maybe he will say, "I favored it for a while, but recently I have moved away from that idea." A scholar will refer to the stance of a particular group, while the more literal meaning of posture (a state of readiness to respond to a stimulus) is vividly portrayed by the bodily tension of the athlete on the baseball diamond, fixing his eye on the ball and straining nerves and muscles to react to its flight.

Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey explain that attitudes develop out of the human tendency to organize and conserve one's experience.[6] A person is repeatedly forced to cope with the same object in his environment, and after awhile his response disposition becomes systematized into a unified and enduring package which is always available when he confronts that particular object. He has, in short, formed an attitude. As he confronts more objects in his world and assimilates them into attitudes, he does not need to make fresh examinations and

---

Collegiate Dictionary. (Springfield, Massachusetts: G & C Merriam Company, 1975), p. 73.

[6]Ibid, p. 37.

interpretations. So his behavior becomes predictable and consistent.

There are three basic components of an attitude: the cognitive component, involving the individual's belief about an object; the feeling component, involving the emotions connected with the object as liked or disliked, pleasing or displeasing; and the action tendency component, involving the behavioral readiness of the person to act toward the object.

Each of the three components of an attitude may vary in the number and variety of elements making it up. The cognitive component may involve minimal recognition of an object, or it may involve an exhaustive set of beliefs about it. In any case, the individual will have some degree of knowledge about the object of his attitude. An individual cannot have an attitude toward something to which he has had no exposure. The feeling component may vary from the extreme of positive or negative liking to a highly complex set of emotions about it. "A man may experience feelings of love, tenderness, friendship, respect and passion for one woman and simple liking for another woman."[7] Likewise, the action tendency of an attitude may vary from a simple readiness to attack or

---

[7]Ibid, p. 142.

defend the object to a highly complex set of dispositions toward it. A person favoring a particular political candidate may well become irate and defend his candidate verbally when he is attacked in conversation. He may contribute money and volunteer to work at campaign headquarters. He may on the other hand just vote for the candidate, and maybe he will not even do that but will argue for him in the style of Archie Bunker. All of these reactions represent degrees of what the individual is actually willing to do with reference to the object of his attitude.

One of course must not think of attitudes in simplistic sense.

> Few attitudes can be thought of as existing in a complete state of isolation. Most of them form clusters with other attitudes. The degree to which all the attitudes of a person form a comprehensive and orderly pattern may be taken as an indication of the degree of unity of his personality.[8]

In this chapter, the concept of attitude has been used as a unit of analysis for the study of The Assertio. The treatise has essentially two foci. Henry is concerned with the upstart views of Luther toward which he is negative, and also with the teaching of the Catholic Church of his time which he attempts to defend. This

---

[8]Krech et al., p. 145.

chapter will approach these two points from the perspective of the three attitudinal components which provide a convenient outline for the discussion.

II. Cognitive Features of the Assertio: Henry's Argument

In the first place, consider the cognitive features of The Assertio. Attitudes involve an individual's information about an object, along with the beliefs regarding it. What did Henry know about the views of Luther at this time?

In his Ninety-Five Theses, Luther's original challenge was a general call to scholars to debate the issues. Such was a custom of the time. A part of Luther's invitation was that those who could not debate in person were encouraged to do so by letter. The friends of Luther translated his Latin document into German, and copies were distributed not only in that country but throughout Europe. An important factor in the spread of the Reformation was the printing press, which by this time had become popular and influential.

There is no record that Henry and Luther ever met face to face. One can only speculate what might have happened had there been opportunity to do so. Although this never happened, the printing press made the views of Luther and the other reformers accessible not only to

kings but to the general public. The German Reformer had posted his Ninety-Five Theses on October 31, 1517, shortly after which his views must have reached England. In the early months of 1518, Henry had at the suggestion of Thomas Wolsey already begun work on a document to refute Luther's ideas.[9] This project was abandoned, since the controversy was at first not judged to be serious. The Pope considered it an intramural squabble among certain monks.[10] After all, debate was a practice of the time not unusual in a University context such as where Luther resided. In 1519 Luther, in a debate with John Eck, more sharply enunciated his views. The following year he produced his definitive pamphlets including The Babylonian Captivity of the Church. When Henry's Assertio was published in the summer of 1521, Luther had already been excommunicated by Leo X the preceding January, and many appeals were coming to Henry to do something about the proliferation of heresy. Attempts were made to suppress the large amounts of Lutheran literature which were flooding the country, but to no avail. On May 12th there was a solemn burning of Lutheran publications in London. Wolsey presided, issuing a proclamation that all such

---

[9]Doernberg, p. 5.

[10]J. J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII. (Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), p. 110.

writings were to be turned in. Afterwards, John Fisher, Bishop of London, preached a long sermon. The effect of the fire was but temporary. Not all of the heretical writings were surrendered, and new printings took place.

It would seem clear that Henry VIII had ample opportunity to know the Lutheran doctrine which his Assertio attempted to refute. The printing press made sure that the issues could not long remain a secret. Moreover, the fact that Leo X had excommunicated Luther was something of which no loyal Catholic sovereign could have been ignorant, while advisors surrounding Henry (like Thomas Wolsey and Thomas More) exerted their own special variety of pressure to recognize and deal with the heresy even if the King himself had not been disposed to do so. It was in fact Wolsey who had sent him a copy of The Babylonian Captivity against which the treatise was aimed, and early in 1521 Pace reported that he had come upon Henry as he was studying the book.[11]

But attitudes involve more than information. The individual not only has knowledge about the object of his attitude; he has beliefs about the object. Most Americans have some knowledge about Marxist theory and the Soviet

---

[11] H. M. Smith, Pre-Reformation England. (London: Macmillan, Limited, 1938), p. 508. Pace had been dean of St. Pauls, was personal secretary to Wolsey, who had sent him on various diplomatic missions from time to time.

Union and Red China. More important, however, is what the individual believes about Communism. Recall the principle: Reality for the individual is not what is but what the individual perceives about a situation. "The most critical cognitions incorporated in the attitude system are evaluative beliefs which involve the attribution of favorable or unfavorable, desirable or undesirable, good or bad qualities of the object."[12] So in The Assertio Henry assumed a negative stance toward the views of Luther and a positive stance toward the Catholic Church of his time. Luther was "bad," traditional Catholicism was "good." The cognitive aspect of Henry's treatise against Luther, therefore, involves the rational arguments spelling out his belief in the Catholic system and his rejection of Luther.

Traditionalism

Henry's argument was in general an espousal of traditionalism. Luther's views were an innovation. The Catholic system was time-honored. The appeal here was the same as the contemporary Bible-belt Fundamentalist who sings lustily, "Give me that old-time religion. It's good enough for me!" Such a point of view often goes under the label "conservative." Expressed in terms of government or

---

[12]Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, p. 140.

social policy, it asserts: The past is good and must be preserved; change is bad and is to be resisted. Henry's argument was that the doctrines rejected by Luther were old. They had been accepted for a long time,and it was inconceivable that so many should have been deceived. Moreover, the teaching of the Church came from the authority of Christ, its divine Founder. Christ promised to be with the Church until the end of time; therefore, it could not err in significant matters. If it were in error, then Christ had broken His promise,and such a breach of faith could not be if God were God and Christ were His Son.[13] Henry maintained that even those practices not expressly taught in Scripture were divinely authoritative. In the last few verses of the Fourth Gospel, the Evangelist declared that Christ did so many things that the world could not contain the books necessary to tell them. (John 21:25) On this basis it was argued by Henry (and other churchmen of the time, including Thomas More) that everything Christ said and did was passed on in the tradition of the Church if it had not been written down. This included, so Henry argued, "even the gestures used by the priests in the mass..." These

---

[13]Marius, p. 279.

had been taught by the Lord and handed down through the centuries.[14]

Scholasticism

A particular point of Luther's attack was his rejection of the Scholastic system and the Fathers of the Church. This was a sensitive point to Henry who "was much addicted to the reading of St. Thomas Aquinas; and so was his Chancellor Wolsey, who was nicknamed 'Thomisticus' by Polydore Vergil." Vergil commented that the King and the Cardinal often wearied rather than edified one another with their subtle disputations over Aquinas. In The Assertio Henry speaks of "that learned and holy man Thomas Aquinas, which I the more willingly name here, because the wickedness of Luther cannot endure the sanctity of this man, but reviles with his foul lips him whom all Christians honor."[15]

Defense of the Papacy

Henry's argument in The Assertio not only defended traditionalism in general and Scholasticism in particular. He also defended allegiance to the Pope, a central issue to Luther and his followers. When Henry wrote his treatise, Leo X had already excommunicated Luther, and it

---

[14]Ibid.

[15]Scarisbrick, p. 507, citing Herbert of Cherbury and The Assertio.

was to Leo that the King dedicated his book. Henry hoped to receive a title from the Pope such as his rival Kings of France and Spain had already acquired. Henry praised Leo for his exemplary life and begged him to correct any possible error in his writing. Condemning Luther's position, Henry called the Pope the Vicar of Christ, whom all the Church recognized as Mother and Primate. Since the conversion of the world to Christianity, all the churches among Christians have been obedient to the See of Rome. "St. Jerome openly declared," so asserted Henry, "that it was sufficient for him that the Pope of Rome did but approve his faith, whoever else should disapprove."[16] According to Matthew 16:19 and John 20:22, Popes did have power over purgatory (an issue basic to the Lutheran objection to indulgences). All such arguments contrast with what would be Henry's later stance toward the papacy.

What is even more surprising is the reaction of Thomas More to Henry's argument at this time. More confessed that he had originally regarded the papacy as an office of human origin, legitimate in its function but having arisen gradually through a process of practical accommodation. After reading The Assertio, More was convinced by Henry's argument and decided that the papacy

---

[16] Assertio, p. 204.

was of divine institution. Marius cautions that we must be careful in interpreting the statements of both the King and Thomas More. We must not read into them the spirit of modern Catholics "who have labored stubbornly under the constraint of the First Vatican Council with its proclamation of papal infallibility."[17] Compared to other Catholic apologists of the Reformation period, Henry's argument, so this author maintains, is rather restrained.[18] Likewise, papal infallibility as proclaimed in 1870 was "a doctrine to which More never even remotely subscribed."[19] In fact, More, although impressed by Henry's arguments, suggested that Henry ought to revise his statements regarding papal power. He might be embarrassed later when some quarrel arose between Henry and a future pope. It was a prophetic piece of advice which Henry chose to ignore, saying, "We are so much bounded to the See of Rome that we cannot do too much to honor it."[20] At a later time the position of the two men would be reversed! The situation raises the question of why and how attitudes change, a problem addressed at a

---

[17]Ibid, p. 457.

[18]Ibid, p. 277.

[19]Ibid, p. 457.

[20]H. Maynard Smith, Henry VIII and the Reformation. (New York: Russel & Russel, 1962), p. 9.

later point in this study. The comment of H. Maynard Smith is appropriate at this point:

> Allowing for mixed motives and diverse aims, it is quite right to accentuate the importance of the papacy in the early years of Henry's reign. Christendom was an entity and its capital was Rome. England was regarded as a separate nation but an integral part of Western Christendom. Most of the statesmen in Europe were ecclesiastics who looked to Rome for mitres and Cardinal hats. It was thus natural that Rome became the clearing house of European diplomacy.[21]

Sacramentalism

The heart of Henry's argument in The Assertio was his defense of the sacraments. In the sixteenth century, Catholic usage sacraments were outward acts which were inherently efficacious and necessary for salvation. Peter Lombard and other schoolmen had argued in the twelfth century that the number of sacraments should be fixed at seven, including Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Matrimony, and Ordination. The Council of Florence in 1439 approved this point of view which was reaffirmed by the Council of Trent in 1547.[22]

As the title of his treatise suggests, Henry defended the divine institution of all the sacraments in

---

[21] Ibid, p. 8.

[22] J. C. Lambert, "Sacraments," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, James Orr, General Editor. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1937), 2636, Vol. IV.

the form that Catholics of the time practiced them. The writer will follow in this discussion Henry's order of listing in The Assertio: The Eucharist, Baptism, Penance, Confirmation, Marriage, Orders, and Extreme Unction.

Henry begins with what he called "the Sacrament of the Altar, the Adorable Sacrament of Christ's Body." Luther had revived the contention of John Huss that the people should receive both the wine and the wafer in communion. It was the custom of the time to give the laity only the bread and not the wine. Such an objection, so argued Henry, was a needless emphasis of detail. If we are to preserve the primitive way of giving Communion, then we cannot receive it in the morning but must wait until after supper! There would not even be any authority for putting water in the wine as was the practice. Henry dismissed Luther's argument with the comment:

> He who pretends to stand for the communicating under both kinds recommends the quite contrary, to-wit, that it may be lawful now to receive under any kind; and he esteems it an excellent liberty that the people may be altogether freed from receiving the Sacrament at all.[23]

More important than details of form and ceremony was the divine significance of the Eucharist. The doctrine of the Mass lay at the heart of the Reformation

---

[23] Assertio, p. 226.

controversy. It was the central act of Catholic worship and the focus of Luther's attach on indulgences.

> People had come to think of the Mass as productive of a quantitative measure of grace which the priest could assign at pleasure to anybody's credit. Masses were paid for, and the more anyone bought the greater was his store of grace; so that the rich could ensure an easy passage for themselves and their friends through purgatory. This mechanical system of salvation by paid deputies was revolting, and Luther revolted violently. He struck at the very root of the system when he denied that there was any sacrifice in the Mass or offering made to God. The sacrament, he argued, was God's gift to men, and not an offering made by men to God. The gift was according to the promise and testament of our Lord in the upper chamber, and was independent of the sacrifice made on the cross.[24]

In response to Luther, Henry argued that the atoning work of Christ began in the upper room with the institution of the Eucharist and continued on the cross. Christ was acting as Priest par excellence giving to His disciples His body and blood for their spiritual food. Afterward they would become priests themselves, giving them to others. The supper in the upper room was basically a sacrifice and not a meal, Henry argued, since Christ was making His last will and testament as dying persons customarily do. By definition a will has no force until the one making it has died. Therefore, what Christ

---

[24]Smith, Pre-Reformation England, pp. 510-511.

did in the upper room is related inseparably to what He did on the cross.

> For on the cross He consummated the sacrifice He began in the supper; and therefore the commemoration of the whole thing, to wit, of the consecration in the supper and the oblation on the cross is celebrated and represented together in the sacrament of the Mass, and therefore the death is more truly represented than the supper. And therefore the Apostle when writing to the Corinthians in these words, As often as ye shall eat this bread and drink this cup adds not the supper of the Lord but Ye shall declare the Lord's death.[25]

The reader will note Henry's use of two Scripture passages. His reference to a will having no force until the death of the one making it suggests Hebrews 9:17. The reference to the Corinthian passage is from I Corinthians 11:26. Of course in Henry's time there were no chapter and verse divisions.

The technical name for Henry's view of the Eucharist is transubstantiation. The term is not the invention of historians but comes from Henry himself.[26] He used it several times to declare this belief that the words, "this is my body," are to be taken literally. Of course it is not the word but the concept involved which is of importance. Henry explained:

---

[25] Assertio, p. 266.

[26] Assertio, p. 242.

> Christ is His most holy supper in which He instituted this Sacrament, made of bread and wine His own Body and Blood, and gave to His disciples to be eaten and drunk. A few hours afterward He offered the same Body and Blood on the altar of the cross, a sacrifice for the sins of the people.[27]

It is still the belief of the Catholic Church that during the Mass, the Priest's pronouncement of Christ's words at the Last Supper over bread and wine transform them into the essence of Christ's flesh and blood, though the outward appearance remains the same. Differences of opinion over this doctrine have caused many wars and the loss of many lives. Although Henry later modified some of his ideas, especially about papal primacy, he continued to the end of his life to insist on transubstantiation. At least, this was (so commented Doernberg) his one instance of consistency.[28]

In his treatment of Baptism, Henry criticized Luther for overemphasizing faith. Faith without the sacrament is not sufficient, nor can the sacrament suffice without faith. Both must concur and cooperate. But Luther attributed too much to faith so as to downgrade the sacrament. Henry found Baptism foreshadowed in the Old Testament in Ezekiel 16:9: "I washed thee with water, and

---

[27]Ibid, p. 264.

[28]Henry VIII and Luther, p. 26.

cleansed thy blood from thee." Likewise in Ezekiel 36:35 the prophet spoke of the future: "I will pour out, saith he, clean water upon you, and I will cleanse you from all your iniquities." Also in Zechariah 14:8 there was the promise of the coming age: "Living water shall flow out from Jerusalem, the one half to the Eastern Sea, and the other half to the Great Sea." This pictured baptism, said Henry, water flowing from the Church which should purge both original and actual sin. And it is not called dead but living. In the New Testament Henry cited John 3:5 and Acts 2:38. The former is Christ's word to Nicodemus that, "He who is not born again of water and of the Holy Ghost shall not enter into the kingdom of God." In Acts 2:38 Peter promised remission of sins to all who would present themselves for baptism. Yet it is doubtful, Henry concluded, that any of the people on that occasion would have been able to have known himself to have attained to that "high and indubitable faith of Luther."

Henry defended Penance in terms of its three traditional elements: contrition, confession and satisfaction. Contrition meant that one must express appropriate sorrow for his sins, and satisfaction involved the good works which were ordered to make restitution. Luther had argued that all believers are priests and therefore penance was nothing more than a confession any

Christian could make to any other Christian. Public sin demanded public confession but not necessarily private sins. Private sins might be confessed if by so doing the conscience of the individual could be relieved. Henry's defense cited evidence from the Church Fathers including Augustine and appealed to the Scriptures. One Scripture was from the Apocrypha, Ecclesiasticus 38:9, 10 (to be distinguished from Old Testament Ecclesiastes). Both Augustine and Ecclesiasticus alluded to Matthew 18:18 where Christ promised to Peter, "Whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven." Among other passages, Henry also cited James 5:16, "Confess your sins to one another." The King James Version rendered the word "sins" by the lighter term "faults." Henry was quoting the Latin text which in this case is a correct rendering of the Greek. While admitting that others had interpreted this verse differently, Henry was of the opinion that it commanded sacramental confession. Whereas Luther had asserted that faith without good works was enough, Henry exhorted him to repent and make satisfaction for undervaluing penance and denying it to be a sacrament.

Luther objected to confirmation because he found no statement of it in the teaching of Christ. It was thus the invention of the Church rather than the institution of the Lord. Henry replied:

> By this rule if there was no Gospel but that of St. John, he should deny the institution of the sacrament of our Lord's Supper; of which institution St. John writes nothing at all. Many other things done by Jesus have been omitted by all; which (as the Evangelist himself saith) are not written in this book, and which the whole world could not contain; of which some have, by the mouth of the Apostles, been delivered to the faithful and have ever after conserved by the perpetual faith of the Holy Catholic Church; who I think you ought to believe concerning some things which are not in the Gospels; when (as St. Augustine says) you could never know which is the Scripture itself, but by the tradition of the Church.[29]

In this context, Henry went on to argue that Christ had prayed for St. Peter (the Rock on whom the Church was built) that his faith should not fail (alluding to Luke 22:23). Moreover, the Lord promised the coming of the Holy Spirit who would lead His people into all truth according to John 15:26 and John 16:13, which Henry quoted. Can we not believe that the Church has learned from the Apostles and the Spirit of Truth?[30]

Henry found Scriptural evidence for confirmation in Acts 8:14-17. The people in Samaria had already been baptized, but they did not receive the Holy Spirit until

---

[29] Assertio, p. 354.

[30] Ibid, p. 358. It should be noted that there were no modern chapter and verse divisions of the Bible at this time.

later when Peter and John came among them and laid hands on them.

In his defense of matrimony as a sacrament, Henry dealt with what was to become one of the big issues of the Reformation. Luther denied the sacramental character of marriage, and in 1525 the German Reformer further outraged the King's orthodoxy by breaking his monastic vows of celibacy in order to wed an ex-nun. Moreover, in his lifetime Henry himself would have a total of six wives. At least in part the popular stereotype of the King has been bound up with his matrimonial record. At a later point this study will deal with the marriages of the King in more detail. At this point, however, it can be observed that Henry's later actions were not altogether inconsistent with the viewpoint expressed here in The Assertio. The law of the Church did not recognize the dissolution of an existing marriage. However, when Henry sought to put away Catherine of Aragon in order to marry Anne Boleyn, he was not technically requesting a divorce but a decree of nullity. This would declare his original marriage null and void. A valid marriage never existed since Scripture forbade a man to marry his brother's wife. After the deaths of both Catherine and Anne, Henry was free to marry Jane Seymour who died giving birth to the future Edward VI. Henry's marriage to Anne of Cleaves (an ill-

advised political maneuver for which Cromwell paid with his head) was never consummated, and the fifth wife, Catherine Howard, went to the scaffold on well-documented charges of adultery. Henry's sixth wife, Catherine Parr, managed to survive the King and live for several years as the wife of a second husband.

In his formal defense of marriage in The Assertio, Henry appealed to the account of Genesis to assert the divine ordination of the institution by God Himself. Christ worked his first miracle at a wedding, and later on affirmed the indissolubility of the marriage bond, except for the occasion of fornication as the Gospel of Matthew stated. The clearest statement of the sanctity of marriage was to be found in the fifth chapter of Ephesians from which Henry quoted extensively. The apostle taught in that section that the marriage of man and wife represented the union of Christ and his Church. The man and wife make one body of which the man is the head. So Christ and the Church make one body, of which Christ is the divine Head.

> Observe that the Apostle's business in that place to the Ephesians is not about teaching them how great a sacrament Christ joined with the Church is; but about exhorting married people how to behave themselves toward one another, as they might render their marriage a

> sacrament like and agreeable to that so sacred thing of which it is a sacrament.[31]

Problematic in Henry's treatment of the fifth chapter of Ephesians was verse thirty-two: "This is a great mystery." The word for mystery (Greek musterion) was rendered in the Vulgate by the Latin word sacramentum, which has various shades of meaning. Although it may mean "mystery," it has the general sense of "a holy thing." Erasmus pointed out that the word was often used in the Bible for things other than sacraments, and this figured in Luther's argument. Henry replied that the argument was not basically linguistic. Augustine knew as much as Luther about language, and he had spoken of marriage as a sacrament more than a thousand times! Besides, the concepts of "mystery" and "sacrament" were not unrelated. Every sacrament is a mystery![32]

There were two characteristics of a sacrament, Henry went on to explain. A sacrament is the sign of a sacred thing and the promise of grace. A sign is that which points to something else. This was what Ephesians Five involved. The union of man and wife pointed to the union of Christ and his Church. While Luther might agree with this, he denied that grace is conferred by marriage.

---

[31] Assertio, p. 376.

[32] Assertio, p. 380.

In reply, Henry cited two Scripture passages. First was Hebrews 13:4: "Marriage is honorable in all, and a bed undefiled." But marriage could not have an undefiled bed "if the grace which is infused by it did not turn that unto good, which should otherwise be a sin." Henry's second passage was I Corinthians 7:12. There the apostle dealt with a case where one marriage partner had become a Christian and the other remained an unbeliever. In such a case the Christian partner was not to put away the non-Christian spouse. In that situation:

> The man, an infidel, is sanctified by the faithful woman, and the woman, an infidel, is sanctified by the faithful husband. Otherwise your children should be unclean, but now they are holy.

The verse indicates, so Henry interprets it, that the sanctity of the sacrament sanctifies the whole marriage, which before was altogether unclean. "But why should that marriage be now more holy than before (as being a marriage) if for one of the parties converted, sacramental grace was not added to it?"[33]

In defending the sacrament of orders, Henry rejected Luther's view that there was no difference between the laity and the priesthood, that all men alike

---

[33] Assertio, p. 386. The rendering of I Corinthians 7:12 is that quoted in the O'Brien edition from the Latin. The word infidel is the Latin expression for "unbeliever" and does not have the connotation of the modern word.

were priests. On that basis Luther had affirmed that the sacrament of orders was therefore nothing but the custom of electing a preacher for the church. As in all other instances, Henry appealed to both tradition and Scripture in his argument. St. Dionysius, St. Jerome, St. Gregory and St. Augustine all bore witness to orders being a sacrament and of permanent character. In the Old Testament Aaron and his sons were made priests of the Old Law according to Exodus 28:1, which states that they were anointed and sanctified for their special service. Moreover, in I Timothy 3:15 the apostle Paul counselled Timothy that he "impose not hands rashly on anyone," a reference to ordination which only a bishop could administer. Then in the Acts of the Apostles (Chapter 13) when Paul and Barnabas were set apart for the work to which the Spirit called them, they were not sent away before they were first ordained by the imposition of hands. That such imposition was not just a form that stands for nothing is evident from I Timothy 4:14 where the apostle wrote to Timothy, "Neglect not the gift which is in thee, and which has been given thee by prophecy, by the imposition of the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Also in II Timothy 1:6 the same apostle says to the same young man, "I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God that is in thee by the imposition of my

hands." Priests are made by the imposition of hands, Henry argued, and that imposition involves the bestowal of special grace. He who is thus consecrated not only receives the Holy Ghost for himself but also the power of imparting it to others. It is worthy of notice here that Henry throughout his entire career never attempted to act as priest, to offer Mass or in any way to usurp the office which he has here defended.

Extreme Unction, the last of the sacraments, was rejected by Luther for two reasons. The Scriptural basis claimed for the rite was James 5:14, 15, and Luther rejected the book of James because it seemingly contradicted his doctrine of justification by faith. Accordingly, Henry accused Luther of becoming the judge of what was Scripture, throwing overboard whatever did not suit his fancy. Even if Luther were to admit the canonicity of James, however, he still would not accept Extreme Unction because it was not lawful for an apostle to institute a sacrament on his own authority. Such authority belongs to Christ alone, and we read nowhere in the Gospel of Extreme Unction.

Henry cited the authority of Jerome for the genuineness of the epistle of James and called attention to the promise of Christ in John 14:26 that He would send the Holy Spirit who would teach his people all things.

Why should it be surprising that He would teach us some things by Matthew and some things by Luke and some things by John or by Paul? Why is it not possible that He should be pleased to make some things known by the apostle St. James?

A further objection of Luther to Extreme Unction concerned the purpose of the sacrament in being administered to the dying. James says, "If any be sick," not "If any be dying!" The promise is to raise the sick person up, not to prepare him for death. Henry's reply was that the passage has in view not just an ordinary illness but an extreme one. The procedure here called for would not be appropriate for every "light fever contracted perhaps by too much drinking." Sleep or abstinence would be the best cure for that![34] Although the sacrament is called the last sacrament, it is not the intention of the Church it should be so. The sick person may recover his health. However that may be, the sacrament tends more to the curing of the soul than the health of the body. Luther's objections, Henry concluded, were to be expected. Luther has reason to deny James' epistle because it denies Luther's teaching. But Luther goes further. He denies and defies the whole Church!

---

[34] Assertio, p. 440.

III. Affective Orientation of The Assertio: Henry's Appeal

Up to this point the discussion has been dealing with the cognitive features of The Assertio. Cognitive has to do with intellectual functioning, thought, belief, reason, argument. It is not to be supposed that human behavior is ever solely the product of calculated rational appeal. The Reformation period gives ample illustration that human beings are moved to action not so much by what one things but by what he feels. In addition to the cognitive component, attitudes involve an emotional factor called the affective component. You like or dislike; you love or hate; you move toward or away from in varying degrees. For example, some persons may have a democratic neutrality toward Catholics. They neither like nor dislike them but accept them as individuals who have the same rights and privileges as any other American. On the other hand, one may react like the friend who came upon his graduate student associate in the coffee shop who was reading a paperback volume of Thomas Aquinas. "Whatcha readin' that dern Catholik for?" was the gruff greeting, accompanied by a scowl. Such an attitude was in contrast with the rather good feeling toward Catholics that was created by the visit of the Pope to America some time ago.

One school child, when asked what he thought about the Pope's visit, stated enthusiastically, "I just wish Presbyterians had Popes!"

The affective component of an attitude is closely related to the behavioral component, i.e., what an individual does on the basis of his thought and feeling. The anti-Catholic young man, had he lived in another era, might have participated in the burning of Catholic books or possibly even in the burning of Catholics! As it was, his negativism was expressed in rather crude but expressive speech.

Language is an important index to the affective component of a person's attitudes. It is particularly so in the assessment of religious attitudes, as we shall discover in the emotional tone of Henry's Assertio. Luther was "a poisonous serpent, the wolf of hell, the limb of Satan." Language scholars distinguish between the denotative and connotative meanings of words. Denotative meaning is the objective identification of that to which the word refers. Scientific terms are designed to be denotative, having an invariant agreed upon reference. Connotative meaning on the other hand involves feeling and emotion associated with the word.[35]

---

[35]Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, Individual in

It is possible for two words to have the same denotative meaning with quite different connotative significance. Non-Catholic writers for example speak of the Protestant Reformation, but some Catholic authors referring to the same period call it the Protestant Rebellion. The terms "black people" and "niggers" both refer to the same group of persons, but the emotional overtones evoked by the two expressions are very different. You might speak of yourself as being "firm," while the same behavior in a co-worker you label as "stubborn" or perhaps "pig-headed." Of course you pride yourself on your willingness to be "flexible" while accusing your wife or husband of being "unstable" or "fickle." You have made "an honest mistake," but the employee in your business has "blundered." In all these situations, the same case is viewed from different perspectives, and the language is slanted to create a special feeling. Such usage of emotive speech is a basic characteristic of propaganda. "...action, as every propagandist knows, is mightily influenced by emotion."[36]

In the Dedicatory portion of The Assertio, the emotional posture of Henry toward Pope Lee X is clear.

Society, p. 279. The presentation in this section follows these authors.

[36]Ibid.

"Most Holy Father: I most humbly commend myself to you, and devoutly kiss your blessed feet." Quite a different stance, however, is indicated toward Martin Luther. Choice words characterize the German Reformer. "...we learned that the pest of Martin Luther's heresy had appeared in Germany and was raging everywhere...many infected with its poison were falling away." Henry goes on to speak of Luther's views as "this cockle...this heresy...this deadly venom."[37] Commenting on Henry's language, H. Maynard Smith says:

> Luther had written his De Captivitate with great power and intensity, but his language, for him, had been moderate and his statements sustained by reasons. Henry in his reply, unfortunately, had too often adopted the style of an irate schoolmaster correcting an impudent and rebellious boy. He speaks of Luther in contemptuous diminutives as fraterculus, doctorculus, sanctibulus, and eruditulus.[38]

Smith's term diminutive is that form of a word expressing subtle feeling. Originally meaning "of small size," it came to suggest a judgment of endearment or contempt. In English one does this by adding various endings, -ette, -king, -ling, or -ie, as when we speak of a kitchenette or a duckling. The word darling is a diminutive of dear, as is the alteration of names such as

---

[37] Assertio, p. 152.

[38] Pre-Reformation England, p. 513.

Jack to Jackie, James to Jimmie. A certain pastor came to be known for his brief sermons of ten or fifteen minutes. A critic said of him, "Preacherettes give sermonettes to Christianettes!" In the Latin in which Henry wrote, the suffix -ulus indicated a sarcastic tone. Hence, fraterculus meant "the little brother," or more precisely, "the so-called brother"; sanctibulus meant "the so-called holy man,; doctorculus, "the so-called doctor;" and erudutulus, "the one they all say is so erudite!" Marius described Henry's tone in The Assertio as "so much royal mud slinging."[39]

Lest one comes down too heavily on Henry for his sharpness of speech, it must in fairness be pointed out that vitriolic utterance was not something confined to the King. Luther himself indulged in it in his reply to Henry. Smith points out that some of Luther's language is so extreme that "...the names he called him...must ever remain in the decent obscurity of a dead language. When Luther lost his temper he reverted to the sort of abuse which he may have heard as a small boy in a mining village."[40] Moreover, others of the time were not innocent of this verbal vice. Thomas More for example

---

[39] Thomas More, p. 279.

[40] Pre-Reformation England, p. 513.

under the name of Rossaeus wrote an answer to Luther's reply to The Assertio. His language competes with Luther's in its fiery tone.

> More calls Luther insane, a drunkard, vainglorious and self-contradictory. We need not go on; for More's plodding insults and witless vulgarity offer only a monotonous scatology as wearing as the talk of small boys in school washrooms.[41]

All such ungraciousness is repelling. How could religious persons act in such a way? One reason is that they were religious. People of that period took religion seriously in a way that many in the twentieth century do not. Yet from another standpoint these men were not religious enough! Henry had chided Luther for rejecting the book of James. Had either of them read the third chapter of that epistle? It is a famous passage dealing with the evils of the tongue, not just the tongues of persons in general but the tongues of teachers. "Don't be in a hurry to become a teacher," the chapter exhorts. "Teachers have greater influence and therefore will be the more severely judged for what they have said amiss."[42] The passage goes on to indicate what was going on in the assemblies of that time. With the tongue they were

---

[41] Thomas More, p. 282. Scatology is an excessive concern with human excrement.

[42] James 3:1, 2. The writer's personal paraphrase.

blessing God and at the same time blasting men. Chapter Four reports that not only were these "Christians" bickering and fighting, but some were even killing each other (4:2). The writer is reminded of a religious worker who authored a tract entitled, "Come to Jesus." He later wrote a scorching denunciation of a critic. Someone insightfully suggested that the second article might appropriately be entitled, "Go to Hell, by the author of Come to Jesus!"

An appropriate inquiry at this point concerns the psychological dynamics of the emotional language in The Assertio. The writer has previously maintained that religious behavior is learned as a feature of the larger socialization process. Just how children learn language is a matter of debate.[43] An older view associated with B. F. Skinner is that language is learned by a simple process of operant conditioning. The child is rewarded for proper speech and corrected when he/she makes mistakes. Basically he learns to talk in the same way we learn to behave ourselves. As the baby in the crib makes various sounds, some of them are approved by the parents who smile, fondle the child and otherwise express

---

[43]Jerome Kagan and Ernest Haverman, Psychology: An Introduction, Second edition. (N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovitch, 1972), p. 161. The writer is indebted to these writers for much of the material of this section.

pleasure. Other improper sounds are ignored and tend to disappear. Like a rat in a Skinner box getting food by pressing a bar, the baby before long discovers that he can use language as a tool for controlling the environment. He can secure food by saying the right word or group of words.[44]

Another point of view about language development is that of Albert Bandura who has stressed the role of observational learning. The putting together of sounds into words and words into sentences is more a matter of direct imitation of the parents than of operant conditioning. However, some theorists have put the two points of view together, stressing that whether imitation of any behavior actually occurs depends on how the subject perceives the model and the expectations he has about possible rewards and punishments he is likely to receive if he behaves like the model. Is the model powerful, competent and attractive, and what happened to the model when he did thus and so? Bandura's point of view, it should be stressed, emphasized imitation apart from reinforcement. Just watching someone do something may result in imitation of the behavior.[45]

---

[44] Verbal Behavior. (N. Y.: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1957).

[45] A. Bandura, "Vicarious Processes: A No-Trial

Both the views of Skinner and Bandura have been challenged by a newer approach associated with N. Chomsky of M.I.T. Chomsky maintains that neither operant conditioning nor observational learning is sufficient to account for the higher aspects of language. We use grammar; i.e., we organize our language in terms of rules which make it possible for us to devise and understand sentences we have never encountered before. In line with this point of view, recent emphasis in language study has been not so much on vocabulary as on syntax, how words are put together according to a standardized system of usage. Such an organizational tendency (according to this view) seems to be a built-in part of our biological equipment, an inherited capacity which makes possible a form of learning that can be categorized as neither operant conditioning nor observational learning.[46]

The writer does not at this point wish to choose between these approaches. The emphasis of this section, however, is not on the cognitive features of language, since that phase of the matter to some degree was dealt with in the preceding paragraphs. The concern here is

---

Learning." In L. Berkowitz, ed., Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. II. (New York: Academic Press, 1965), pp. 1-55.

[46]N. Chomsky, Language and Mind. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch, Inc., 1972).

with Henry's treatise as a social document having a distinct emotional flavor. Accordingly, the presentation in this section more appropriately focuses on the approaches suggested by B. F. Skinner and Albert Bandura, two older points of view which are perhaps now less popular than once they were. Yet the writer believes they still have viability.

> Though Chomsky's impact was the single largest influence on psycholinguistics in the 1960's, many psychologists continue to study language from the viewpoint of behaviorism, traditional learning theories and other verbal learning methodologies.[47]

From this standpoint Walter Houston Clark has spoken of "stimulus response verbalism," to denote the process of religious socialization in the young child. Recital of Bible verses, hymns, cathechism materials and such is a socially rewarded kind of expression, although in many cases the child is simply parroting words which have no personal significance. Clark points out that long after childhood, many adults continue to function on this rote type level of religion. They are able to "rattle off a list of religious beliefs sometimes with an air of great power and conviction," but it is "a hardly higher

---

[47] Psychology '73-74: Text. (Guilford, Connecticut: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 1973), pp. 298-299.

intellectual level...than was the salivation of Pavlov's famous dogs."[48]

Stimulus response verbalisms often provide amusing examples of children's misunderstanding. There was the child who recited the Lord's Prayers thusly: "Our Father who art in heaven, Harold be thy name." Or consider the little tyke in the Christmas play who spoke of the shepherds who "washed their socks by night." Attempting to recite John 3:16, one youngster habitually said, "God so loved the world that He gave His only forgotten Son." A rather embarrassing example of stimulus response verbalism was the child whose parents found him reciting his arithmetic lesson in a socially unacceptable way. "One and one, the son of a b... is two; two and two,the son of a b... is four; four and four, the son of a b... is eight," and so on. Reprimanded, the child insisted that that's what his teacher said at the blackboard. "Oh my goodness!" gasped the teacher when asked about the situation. "What I say is, one and one, the sum of which is two; two and two, the sum of which is four." The child, much to the chagrin of the parents, had been doing some modeling!!!

---

[48] The Psychology of Religion. (N. Y.: MacMillan, 1958), p. 220.

In relation to Henry VIII and The Assertio, Henry is seeking the approval of Pope Leo X, who is a father figure. He employs language that not only the Holy Father will approve but which his own natural father, Henry VII, would have liked. On one occasion, the elder Henry convinced a heretic to recant as he was about to be burned at the stake; but the King left the man to burn anyway.[49] Henry VII had a reputation for being a staunch conservative quite rigid in dealing with his enemies. The younger Henry would not hesitate to burn his own heretics later on. For now his fiery language was a symbolic gesture which spoke not only of his identification with his father and with the Holy Father but also with the orthodox advisors about him, Thomas Wolsey and Thomas More, among others who had pressed him to become involved in dealing with the Lutheran Insurgency. The writer does not of course maintain that Henry's Assertio was nothing more than stimulus response verbalism. The treatise was not without cognitive content as previously noted. It does, however, reflect the characteristics of a public relations production more than the learned theological treatise it claims to be. Henry has said all the "right"

---

[49] A. F. Pollard, Henry VIII. (London, New York and Toronto: Longmand, Greene and Co., 1905), p. 19.

words, and he now looks for approval from those who are important to his life. Clark appropriately summarizes:

> To the child saying religion is the same as religion, and his belief is bound up with a magical reliance on the power of words... The mechanism of the learning process can be persuasively explained by reference to the conditioned response. The adult speaks, while the child's repetition is accompanied by reward.
>
> ...Aiding and abetting the conditioned response, and to some degree a part of it, are authority, imitation, suggestion, social pressure and the search for security. Most of these influences are clear, with the possible exception of the search for security, which requires a brief comment. The child has learned that the proper vocal expressions will bring him the protection of his parents. It is a simple graduation from this to associating similar attitudes with the idea of a "heavenly father," and so the individual learns to "believe" through his need for security.
>
> Despite its superficiality, this verbal type of belief has astonishing vitality, a fact that behavioristic psychology would lead us to expect. The early ingrained, habitual responses are very difficult to modify. The Freudian psychologists would agree on an emphasis on the part of early influences. However, we cannot ascribe the vitality in religious belief to these causes. It is quite evident that the individual soon develops "ego involvement" concerning his beliefs. The Catholic child discovers that his verbalisms do not agree with those of his Presbyterian or Baptist fellows, while the Methodist may discover that his ideas are not consistent with those of the Jews. In the schoolyard these verbalized differences have been known to be defended by recourse to fisticuffs. On an adult level we see the same ego mechanisms operating almost as obviously with tools of hardly greater subtlety. So we have the

> spectacle of Christians belaboring one another in defending their verbalizations of Christian belief, in the process proving to the hilt that their version of the teachings of the gentle Carpenter of Nazareth is nothing more than verbalization.[50]

IV. Behavioral Thrust of the Assertio: Action Impelled

There is one other attitudinal component to be considered in relation to Henry's treatise, the behavioral component, involving the readiness of a person to act toward the object of his attitude. In this section the concern is with the practical outcomes of The Assertio. What were the results of this writing? Three principal actors were involved in the drama of The Assertio: Henry himself, the Pope to whom the writing was dedicated, and Luther against whom it was directed.

Henry's motivation in writing The Assertio has often been discussed. Most commentators agree that while the work was an act of piety and Henry doubtless believed in the cause he championed, the King wrote with an eye on the acquisition of a title from Leo X. The French King was "the Most Christian King of France," and the Spanish ruler was "Catholic King of Spain." For some time Henry, through his minister Thomas Wolsey, "...had been badgering Rome for honors...to match the titles enjoyed by his

---

[50] The Psychology of Religion, pp. 220-221.

rivals."[51] After considerable stalling, Leo in response to further correspondence from Wolsey presented the matter to an assembly of Cardinals. They eventually decided that a list of possible titles should be drawn up and sent to Henry to decide on the one he wanted. Scarisbrick suggests that the Cardinals were at first reluctant to act since they questioned what good reason there might be for paying honor to the English King. Then they remembered that Henry had sent troops against Louis XII, the French King. Louis had opposed Pope Julius II, predecessor of Leo, and encouraged the dissident French Cardinals to depose Julius at the schismatic Council of Pisa in May, 1511. When The Assertio came out, this apparently tipped the scales in Henry's favor and won him a new and resounding title.

> ...The book was not the sole reason for the title, nor did it beget the desire for the title. The Assertio was only the final motive for Leo's beau geste, and the quest for a papal title had a lengthy history before the book...was thought of.[52]

The papal bull which officially bestowed the title commanded that all Christians should name His Majesty by this title, and in their writing to him, immediately after the word King, they should add Defender of the Faith.

---

[51] Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, p. 115

[52] Ibid.

Although Leo, in the ceremony bestowing the title, spoke glowing words of praise and affection for Henry, his award was a reluctant concession, a reward for persistence as much as virtue. A year afterwards it was reported that the twenty-eight splendidly bound copies of The Assertio, which had been sent to the Pope for distribution, were lying about neglected and forgotten. In the meanwhile Leo had died, and no one in his court was now interested in the subtleties of English theology.[53]

By Act of Parliament in 1543, after Henry's quarrel with a later Pope, the title Defender of the Faith was made hereditary for succeeding occupants of the throne. This action was repealed by Mary but restored by Elizabeth. Present day British sovereigns continue to wear the title, although with questionable appropriateness. If the present monarch "defends the faith," it is assuredly not that for which Henry argued in The Assertio. In fact, by British law no Catholic can occupy the throne.[54] Moreover, it is a question as to what Queen Elizabeth II (the present reigning Queen) does when she "defends" whatever it is she is supposed to be

---

[53]H. M. Smith, Pre-Reformation England, p. 514.

[54]By the Bill of Rights - 1689. T. F. Tout, An Advanced History of Great Britain. (New York and London: Longmand's Greene and Co., 1925), p. 496.

"defending." Henry's long sought after title became in the final analysis a stimulus response verbalism, a high sounding phrase devoid of any intrinsic meaning.

The twentieth century student perhaps finds difficulty in comprehending why Henry would make so much of a mere title. Particularly after he broke with Rome, why would he continue to cling to a now tarnished symbol of his former allegiance? Jesus said that in His day the religious leaders were ambitious to be called Rabbi. Matt. 23:7, 8) In our own day they all want to be called Doctor, a desire which for some finds satisfaction in an honorary degree from their alma mater or perhaps from a diploma mill where anyone can acquire a Doctor of Divinity status for a fee. Each year the Hollywood film industry makes a great ceremony of the Academy Awards. These honor the best film, the best actor, the best producer and any number of other superlative achievements. Recipients find the awards not only personally gratifying but also have a great economic potential in terms of box office appeal for their productions. In the same way there is the young lady who wins the coveted title of Miss America, the athlete who gets a Heisman Trophy award or even the college senior who is voted by classmates as the graduate most likely to succeed. All of these instances suggest something of Henry's feelings about the title he sought

from the Pope. Yet it is probably more than just the feeling the kindergarten child has when he/she gets a gold star for good behavior by his name on a poster out in the hallway. At this time the Pope was still a powerful figure in Europe. True his status was in decline and the office would soon receive a blow from which it would never fully recover. Yet at this point papal approbation still had considerable value for a young man on the way up, especially when his closest rival had the "stamp" and he did not.

Granted that the title was thus socially and politically useful, the question still remains as to why Henry would want it after he broke with the Pope. Smith's comment is suggestive in this regard:

> Henry was delighted with his new title, and when he quarreled with the Pope he had it ratified by Parliament. He could claim that his skill in theology had been acknowledged in the highest quarter, and that he had in consequence a right to meddle in all spiritual affairs. The time came when he defined the Pope and robbed the Church, but he never ceased to be Defender of the Faith. As King he might hand and disembowel those who denied his supremacy, but at the same time, as Defender of the Faith, he burnt those who departed from his standard of orthodoxy. He became more and more odious as he grew older, but he never lost his interest in theology...[55]

---

[55]Ibid, p. 515.

What about the reaction of Luther to The Assertio? The book immediately became a best seller and went through twenty editions and translations in version. Luther made a reply, "giving Henry as thorough a lambasting as Henry had just aimed at him."[56] Henry made no direct response, but John Fisher, bishop of London, and Thomas More, using the pseudonym William Ross, published a defense of Henry's work. Likewise Thomas Murner wrote a short tract in German entitled, "Whether the King of England or Luther is a Liar."[57] In 1523 John Eck (who had debated Luther) published a defense of Henry's work.

Three years after Luther's response, he wrote Henry a long letter reversing himself and apologizing for his strong language. This surprising action was the result of a misunderstanding. Luther had believed a rumor passed on to him by Christian II, King of Denmark. Allegedly, The Assertio had not been written by Henry but by Thomas Wolsey who was no longer in the King's service. Moreover, the King had changed his views and was now leaning toward the Reformation! Henry wrote a long rebuff, attempting to set the record straight, although his letter through a combination of circumstances did not reach Germany until

---

[56]Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, p. 113.

[57]Ibid, p. 114.

two years after Luther had written. Luther was not then disposed to make any further comments. Eventually, however, he was forced to publish a statement when his enemies were playing up the fact that Luther had apologized and Henry had rejected his apology. There the matter stood until three years later when Henry reopened communications. He was seeking Luther's support for his divorce from Catherine of Aragon and seemed now in truth to be leaning toward the Reformation.

It is clear that in the later years of his life, Henry VIII modified certain of the views which he so strongly enunciated in The Assertio. This fact raises the question about why and how attitudes change. This problem will be addressed in the following chapter in connection with "The King's Great Matter," Henry's persistent effort to dissolve his marriage to Catherine of Aragon in order to marry Anne Boleyn.

V. Chapter Summation

This chapter has examined the first official statement of the religion of Henry VIII, his treatise against Martin Luther referred to from its Latin title as The Assertio. The psychological frame of reference for the chapter was contemporary attitude theory. This approach provided a three-fold outline, viewing Henry's

treatise in terms of cognitive, affective and behavioral orientations. Discussion of the cognitive orientation addressed the rational argument of the treatise. Essentially, Henry defended "old time religion," i.e., the old is time honored, the new is suspect and to be rejected. His argument was in favor of Scholasticism, the primacy of Rome and the authority of the Pope, along with the validity of the seven sacraments of sixteenth century Roman Catholicism. His views on marriage as a sacrament and the centrality of transubstantiation were of significance in the light of later developments in his life.

The consideration of the affective orientation of The Assertio dealt with the emotional content of the writing as expressed in its strong connotative language. Henry engaged in royal "mud slinging," which seems to have been a custom of the time exemplified also in Luther and in Thomas More and other associates of the King. Special emphasis was given to language development in children with attention to Walter Houston Clark's concept of "stimulus response verbalism."

The behavioral orientation of The Assertio concerned the behavior resulting from Henry's writing. Leo X to whom the treatise was dedicated conferred on Henry the title "Defender of the Faith." The title was

the culmination of a long effort by the King; and The Assertio was merely the occasion and not the cause of the award. The title represented Henry's identification with the Pope as a Father Figure whose approval he sought. Although modern British sovereigns still bear this title, it is a meaningless one since they neither hold the faith nor defend it as Henry set for in his treatise.

Martin Luther reacted to The Assertio with a strong vituperative reply. This in turn was answered by several admirers of the King. When Luther believed a false report that Wolsey was the true author of The Assertio and Henry was now leaning toward the Reformation, Luther wrote a letter apologizing to the King and welcoming him to the fold; but Henry rejected the apology and maintained his continuing opposition. Later, Henry softened his stance and reopened communication with the Lutherans when he wanted their approval for his proposed divorce from Catherine of Aragon. Subsequent developments in the life of Henry VIII would bring about a revision of some of the King's attitudes expressed in The Assertio, a problem to be dealt with in the following chapter.

CHAPTER VI

THE KING'S GREAT MATTER: WHY AND HOW THE KING'S RELIGION CHANGED

Henry VIII was thirty when he wrote his treatise against Martin Luther. The Assertio represents therefore the religious viewpoint of a young man. When one comes to consider the "King's Great Matter," (his persistent efforts to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon in order to marry Anne Boleyn), he enters the middle years of the King's life. After eighteen years of happy marriage and a relatively prosperous reign, Henry now entered upon a course which was to effect the most profound changes not only in the country but in his own personality as well.

Here is the man who had argued for the sanctity of marriage as a sacrament, who had rejected Thomas More's advice about going overboard in subservience to the papacy, affirming that "we cannot do too much to honor [the See of Rome]." This is the man who had heaped upon Luther all sorts of vituperative anathemas for his rebellion and had defended the work and character of holy orders. This same man will eventually have not two but six wives in all. He will cease speaking of "the most Holy Father," and will contemptuously refer to him as "the

Bishop of Rome."[1] He will not only make apologetic overtures to the followers of Luther but will actively seek the German Reformer's advice against the annulment of his marriage. Under the guise of opposing corruption, he will cause "...hundreds of houses of religion...[to be] ruthlessly broken up, their inmates scattered, their churches profaned, and their lands squandered among greedy courtiers."[2]

The psychological interpreter is concerned with the problem of why and how behavior changes over time. In the previous section the writer introduced the psychological perspective of attitude theory. This chapter continues that frame of reference. It is concerned to spell out some of the variables involved in the formation and stability of attitudes. As previously, the writer is indebted to the work of David Krech, Richard S. Crutchfield, and Egerton L. Ballachey.[3] He borrows three basic statements from these authors to outline the considerations of this

---

[1]Ludwig Pastor, The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages, Volume X. (Wilmington, N.C.: Consortium Books, 1972), p. 284. January 15, 1534, Parliament passed an act against the "usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome" as he was henceforth to be designated.

[2]T. F. Tout, An Advanced History of Great Britain from the Earliest Times to 1923. (London: Longman's Green and Co., 1925), p. 343.

[3]Individual in Society. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1962), p. 180 and following.

chapter. Where do attitudes come from, and why and how do they change? (1) Attitudes are influenced by the individual's want satisfactions; (2) Attitudes develop out of the individual's group affiliations; (3) Attitudes are shaped by the information to which the individual is exposed.

I. Attitudes and Want Satisfaction

In the first place, attitudes are influenced by the individual's want satisfactions. Persons tend to develop and maintain favorable attitudes toward objects and people that satisfy their wants. Conversely, they develop unfavorable attitudes toward objects that block the achievement of their goals. The blocking of goal achievement (i.e., when the want remains unsatisfied) is what the psychologist calls frustration. Frustration is a common occurrence in the lives of all people. Reaction to it, however, differs and the consequences take many forms. On one hand, frustration may have positive effects when it leads one to explore new and better ways of living. Some inventions, for example, have come out of prolonged deprivation. On the other hand:

> When an individual suffers prolonged frustration, the inability to achieve his goal may give rise to feelings of personal failure and anxiety. His goal directed, problem solving behavior may then be supplanted by behavior aimed at defending his self-

> conception and warding off threats to self esteem.[4]

It is clear that some of Henry VIII's attitudes expressed in The Assertio changed in his middle years in connection with his efforts to secure the annulment of his marriage. Frustration seems to be a convenient principle which ought to be applicable to the King's behavior during this period. The student must take care, however, not to make a simplistic application. One cannot assume that the relation between a particular event and a particular action is a simple and direct one. "...The relations between wants, goals and behavior are extremely complex and difficult to discover."[5] As Krech and his associates point out, similar actions may be related to different wants, and different actions may reflect similar wants. For example, a young person may join a political group for a variety of reasons: to satisfy a desire to associate with other young people, to seek personal power and advancement, to secure material and economic gain, to work for idealistic social goals. The same behavior here reflects different wants. On the other hand, three sons may want independence from their father and determine to repudiate his conservative, middle class values. One

---

[4]Ibid, p. 113.

[5]Krech, et al., p. 71.

becomes a labor organizer; the second becomes a digger with an archaeological expedition in Peru; while the third adopts a "hippie" lifestyle. These different actions reflect similar wants. An important principle to keep in mind is that although behavior seems to reflect certain wants and goals, it is not determined by them alone. A social science perspective assumes that all behavior is caused. Yet the causes are complex and not always evident. Causes are generally multiple and interdependent.

From this standpoint, then, one must be suspicious of a traditional interpretation which oversimplifies the behavior of Henry VIII during his middle years. It is all too easy to jump to the conclusion that the middle age monarch had grown tired of his fat and forty-year-old wife and wanted to get rid of her in order to marry a younger, more attractive woman with whom he had fallen in love. The comment of A. F. Pollard is to the point:

> To believe that the divorce of Catherine of Aragon was the sole cause of the break with Rome is to be blind not merely to the facts of Tudor history, but to the fundamental conditions which govern human affairs.[6]

---

[6] Tudor Tracts 1532-1588. (New York: Cooper Square Publications, Inc., 1964), p. xi.

A prominent exponent of attitude theory, Daniel Katz, has advocated what is called a functional approach to the study of attitudes.

> Stated simply, the functional approach is the attempt to understand the reasons people hold the attitudes they do. The reasons, however, are at the level of psychological motivations and not of the accidents of external events and circumstances. Unless we know the psychological need which is met by the holding of an attitude, we are in a poor position to predict when and how it will change.[7]

Wrightsman points out further:

> The functional approach is a phenomenological one; it maintains that a stimulus (for example, a television commercial, a new piece of information, an inter-racial conflict) can only be understood within the context of the recipient's needs and personality.[8]

In The Assertio Henry left no doubt about his attitude toward Martin Luther. One of Henry's objections to the German Reformer was his defiance of authority which threatened the position of rulers everywhere. "He was shrewd enough to detect the antinomian tendencies in Luther's writing which Luther himself was unaware of."[9] Writing in The Assertio, Henry stated:

---

[7]"The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 24, (1960), p. 170.

[8]Social Psychology in the Seventies. (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1972, p. 506.

[9]H. M. Smith, Pre-Reformation England. (London: MacMillan, Limited, 1938), p. 506.

> He robs princes and prelates of all power and authority; for which shall a king or prelate do, if he cannot appoint any law, or execute the law where it is appointed, but ever like a ship without a rudder suffer his people to float from the land? Where is that saying of the Apostle, "Let every creature be subject to the higher powers. 'Tis not without reason he carries the sword"? Where is the other, "Be obedient to your governors, to the King as excelling," and what follows? Why then does St. Paul say, "The law is good," and in another place, "The law is the bond of perfection."[10]

The student must understand Henry's reaction here in terms of the sixteenth century and not the twentieth century. The concept of separation of church and state was completely unknown. To be patriotic was to be orthodox in the manner prescribed by law. Hence to embrace heresy was to be guilty of treason. The heretic was not just a person who was mistaken. He was dangerous. He was regarded in much the same way many contemporary Americans regard communists in our society. It is not surprising, therefore, that Henry should find Luther's views disturbing. They threatened the security of Henry's position as King.

The issue which Henry raised here was not without a basis, as the peasants of Germany demonstrated a little later. In March, 1525, a group of them drew up the Twelve

---

[10] The Assertio, p. 312.

Articles protesting injustices from which they demanded relief. Although many German peasants were free, a considerable number were still serfs. Even those who were free were not independent owners of their lands but continued in bondage to their feudal lords to whom they owed ground rent plus a variety of burdensome payments and services. When the lords turned a deaf ear to the peasant's demands, the peasants revolted and violence ensued. Modern residents of the area still point out huge mounds of earth where the skulls of their ancestors were heaped up by their feudal slaughterers. Modern scholars generally agree that one of the major causes of the revolt was "the general ferment produced by Luther's writings."[11] Luther's doctrine of Christian liberty was especially applicable to the peasants' plight. At least they so interpreted it. Moreover, they expected support from Luther himself who was the son of a peasant. Although at first sympathetic to their situation, Luther's reaction was to advise the peasants to be humble and keep the peace. They must suffer patiently and wait for God's good pleasure. He would in his own time and way intervene if it were his will. When the violence broke out, Luther

---

[11] Robert Ergang, Europe from Renaissance to Waterloo. (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1954), p. 192.

hardened his position in a treatise entitled Against the Robbing and Murderous Gang of Peasants. "Let anybody who can," he wrote, "strike, kill or stab, secretly or openly..." Nothing could be more dangerous, venomous or demonic than a rebel. The peasants were no better than dogs. Rebellion was sin; rebels must be destroyed, and God was pleased thereby.[12] Like Henry VIII, "the peasants of Germany had found in [Luther's] teaching a stimulus to insurrection."[13] Moreover, Marius comments, "...the peasant's rebellion more than any other force...nearly destroyed Luther's Reformation."[14] Thereafter, not only Lutherans but other Reformation groups had to fight the impression which Catholic propagandists were quick to exploit that heresy and sedition went hand in hand.

Henry's attitude in The Assertio was not only one of condemnation for Luther, but one of the highest adulation for the Pope. It was previously noted that Thomas More had advised Henry to be cautious in his praise of the Pope. Henry might find it embarrassing later should he have a difference with the Roman pontiff.

---

[12]Richard Marius, Thomas More: A Biography. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984), p. 201.

[13]H. M. Smith, Pre-Reformation England, p. 507.

[14]Luther. (Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1974), p. 194.

More's argument was unconvincing, and Henry replied, "We cannot accord too much honor to [the See of Rome]."[15] Then he added, as More's biographer Roper reports, that it was from the Pope that he had received his "crown imperial." No one knows exactly what this strange remark might mean. Possibly Henry could have been referring to the Pope's recognition of the Tudor house the day after Henry VII's victory at Bosworth Field.[16]

Whatever the precise meaning of the saying, it represents the other side of Henry's reaction to the Lutheran movement. Luther posed a threat. He represented frustration. The Pope on the other hand represented security. Not only was this so in a physician sense, but Luther posed a challenge to Henry's self concept. His competence as a theologian was being challenged by a young upstart monk who was denying everything he had taught and believed for years. Moreover, the predictability and constancy of his cognitive world was in danger of becoming chaotic. In appealing to the Pope, Henry would find recognition of his theological acumen in the highest quarter as well as official condemnation of the disturbing new notions on the continent.

---

[15]See Chapter V, p. 118.

[16]Thomas More, p. 278.

Just at this point, however, an objector protests. "You have been talking so far about Henry's initial reaction," it is urged. "But Henry's attitude changed. How do you explain that?" Basically, this discussion has affirmed the principle that attitudes (according to the functional approach) depend upon the psychological need which is met by the holding of the attitude. Hence, if attitudes change, one must ask what need or needs are involved. That leads to a second line of consideration. Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey assert that attitudes develop out of the individual's group affiliations, a concept to be explored in the next section.

II. Attitudes and Group Affiliation

Many of a person's beliefs about politics, education, religion, race prejudice and a lot of other things come to him ready made from parents, work associates, the church he attends and other associations with the persons about him.

> To maintain his attitudes, the individual must have the support of like minded persons...the deviate cannot long oppose a unanimous majority. In his search for social support, he may proselytize and thus secure followers. If he cannot find or form a group which holds views similar to his own, he will lapse into conformity.[17]

---

[17]Krech, et al., p. 191.

In considering the experience of Henry VIII, one may be prone to suppose that a King could do just as he pleased. Why should His Majesty have to secure permission from anybody for anything? Whether in the sixteenth century or the twentieth, societies have defined and enforced standards of correct behavior called norms.

> Norms...specify those actions in particular circumstances which are proper and those actions which are improper. The norms of a group also specify the rewards for adherence and the punishment for non-adherence.[18]

Norms are of special importance to the individual in a position of leadership. It is often assumed that a strong leader by virtue of his position imposes his attitudes on the group and thus makes of it what he will. This is what may be called "the great man" concept of leadership, a view for which Thomas Carlyle was famous. While it is true that a leader influences his group in the direction of his own will, it is also true that the group precedes the leader.

> The group is stronger than the leader who must therefore conform to the established norms of the group. This view of the role of the leader in relation to the group is illustrated in the story of the French revolutionary leader who when he saw the mob rush by said, "I am their leader. I must follow them." The degree to which a leader can influence the norms of an established group is a problem of great interest and importance. At present no

---

[18]Ibid, p. 404.

> firm answer can be given. However, it appears that in order to remain a leader, the leader must accept, or seem to accept, the traditions, norms and goals of the group and assist the group in achieving its purpose.[19]

King Henry's behavior throughout the stormy middle period of this life illustrated this psychological principle. His problem was that he had to act within the bounds of sixteenth century propriety. Propriety demanded not just that he have an heir, but it must be a male heir. Neither Henry nor the country entertained at this time the idea of succession by a woman. With Mary as his sole heir, England was in danger of renewed civil war as had been so in the case of Matilda in the twelfth century.[20] Orthodox Lancastrian tradition held the doctrine of no succession except through the male line. In France there was the Salic law which dated back to an early period when the Frankish kings asserted rule over Roman Gaul. This law actually prevented succession by a woman. She could neither sit on the throne nor transmit the succession by a

---

[19] Ibid, p. 439.

[20] Henry I had in defiance of the mores of the time designated his daughter Matilda as his successor. On his death in 1135, Henry's nephew Stephen claimed the throne and two factions developed, one supporting Stephen and the other Matilda. The ensuing civil war left England in desolation. Matilda eventually withdrew to Normandy leaving Stephen as a "broken spirited monarch too weak to restore order." On Stephen's death in 1154, Henry II, Matilda's oldest son, came to the throne. T. F. Tout, An Advanced History of Great Britain, p. 115.

descendant whether male or female. England had no such law, and a woman could theoretically transmit the succession, but the spirit of the times was against it.

Two basic problems loomed in regard to female succession. One was that the heiress would marry either a foreign prince or a subject of the realm. If she married a foreigner, England was under threat of domination by an alien country. If, however, she married a subject of the realm, this would replicate the conditions which had led to the War of the Roses. On the other hand, if the Princess remained unmarried, there would be a problem of succession after her. Clearly, the only acceptable situation for Henry was a legitimate male heir.[21]

Legitimate is the key word. It was not enough that Henry have a male heir. It must be one born "on the right side of the blanket." Henry already had a son, who was the illegitimate offspring of Bessie Blount.

Moreover, Henry's problem was not simply the desire for a younger, more attractive female companion. He had several mistresses to whom he had ready and continuous access. Propriety demanded that if the succession were to be insured and a return to the War of the Roses avoided, he must have a legal wife of proper descent and

---

[21] A. F. Pollard, Henry VIII. London: Longman's, Green and Company, 1905), pp. 144, 145.

unquestioned character. In particular, she must have qualifications which satisfied the demands of canon law and Scripture. Hugh Paget has suggested that Anne Boleyn had two important characteristics which may have commended her to Henry. She was of royal descent to strengthen the claims of a legitimate heir, and she was of an exceptionally gifted and cultured nature. Educated in France at the cultural center of Europe, she had skills in French language, music and other socially useful graces which made her desirable as a consort and the mother of the son upon whom all of Henry's hopes rested. Paget's article strengthens the idea that while erotic factors cannot be ruled out, Henry's choice of Anne was on a calculated basis more than has been supposed. Even in his own case, marriage was more than just a personal matter. The social and political overtones had to be carefully considered.[22] It is significant that after Henry's appointment of Thomas Cranmer as archbishop of Canterbury, one of Cranmer's first official acts was to hold court in which he declared the King's marriage to Catherine invalid. Along with the decree, he also granted a dispensation for marriage to Anne Boleyn. One might have

---

[22]Hugh Paget, "The Youth of Anne Boleyn," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 1981, 54 (130), pp. 162-170.

supposed that by this time Henry was "fed up" with all of the technicalities of canon law, and he would just throw them all out. Quite the opposite, he was careful to observe the old forms. In all of this Henry acted as a traditionalist following the time honored way, i.e., conforming to the norms of the time.

An objector may ask, "But what of the Reformation? Was not this a radical step, a breaking with the past?" Two observations are in order. First, Henry's break was with Rome and the Papacy. He had no desire or intent to become a Protestant. It was a matter of continuing traditional Catholicism (as he had set forth in The Assertio). Second, the actions of Henry VIII were not personal actions, but official "due process" decrees of Parliament. S. E. Lehmberg has pointed out that the Reformation Parliament was not just a rubber stamp for the idiosyncrasies of the King. All of the Tudor Parliaments gave careful attention to bills, in many cases making changes and imposing refinements. Legislation was not rammed intact through browbeaten Houses. Lehmberg concludes that, "The more we know of Parliament's work, the less we can credit charges of its subservience and passivity."[23]

---

[23]"Provisos of the Reformation of Parliament," English Historical Review, 85, (1970), p. 10.

In this connection, Ergang has pointed out:

> Though they exercised their powers with almost unlimited absolutism, the Tudors did so in Parliamentary form. They did not, it is true, call Parliament as frequently as it had been summoned in the later Plantagenet era. Henry VII summoned it but seven times in twenty-four years and Elizabeth convoked it only ten times in a reign of forty-five years. But no attempt was made to supersede Parliament or abrogate the constitution. The old limitations upon the royal authority still remained: (1) the King could make no laws, nor could he repeal any statutes; (2) the King could impose no new taxes without the consent of Parliament; (3) the King could not commit a man to prison or punish him except by due process of law. Beyond these limitations, however, Parliament had no power over royal policy except insofar as it could control taxation and thus limit the income of the rulers. Hence, the Tudors, to evade the curb of Parliament, found other means of replenishing the royal purse when the regular taxation proved insufficient for their needs; and at all times they were careful to avoid friction with Parliament, particularly in regard to finance. Henry VII set the precedent in this respect, and his example was followed by his son, Henry VIII.[24]

Speaking to Parliament in 1543, Henry himself declared:

> We at no time stand so highly in our estate royal as in the time of Parliament, wherein as head and you as members are coioined and knit together in one body politic.[25]

---

[24] Europe: Renaissance to Waterloo, p. 223.

[25] Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, p. 507, quoting Holinshed, Chronicles (1808), iii, 824.

The point of emphasis here is that the actions of Henry VIII which seem so radical and precedent breaking were corporate actions and not personal ones. Sovereignty resided not in the King, but in the King-in-Parliament, a King beneath a law to which both he and his subjects consented in Parliament.

In a previous chapter the writer cited the statement of A. F. Pollard,

> ...the explanation of Henry's career must be sought not so much in his character as in the study of his environment, the conditions which made things possible for him that were not possible before or since and are not likely to be so again.[26]

Among such conditions was a readiness of the country for change which Henry was able to use for his own purpose. Consider for example the first several acts of the Reformation Parliament. In 1532 it passed The Conditional Restraint of Annates which had to do with fees paid by a bishop to the Pope on appointment to a church. In its final form it provided that henceforth only five percent of the first year's revenue should be paid by any new bishop. Any such bishop who encountered opposition from Rome on account of this action should none the less be consecrated and no excommunication or interdict should be permitted in the Kingdom. The Act was not to take effect

---

[26] Henry VIII, p. 3.

for a year after which the King would decide whether it would become law. Eventually the Act in Absolute Restraint of Annates was passed, which halted all payments to Rome and provided for appointment of bishops by the King alone. In 1533 the Act in Restraint of Appeals forbade Englishmen to make any appeals to foreign princes or potentates of the world. "This realm of England is an empire," so proclaimed the Act. It thereby asserted that England was independent of all outside authority and to the King was due supreme loyalty of all his subjects both lay and clerical. In 1534 the Act of Supremacy made Henry the Supreme Head of the Church of England and declared it treason to deny this claim.

All such legislative actions reflected the trends of the time. There was an intense spirit of nationalism which made Englishmen conscious that they were Englishmen above and beyond their membership in the medieval entity called Christendom. Moreover, there was a realization of the need for reform in the Church. Erasmus had spent time in England and taught for a time in Cambridge. His work, In Praise of Folly (written while he was in London in 1509), made clear his feelings about existing ecclesiastical abuses. Although the Lollards had just about spent their indulgence, the memory of John Wycliffe and his anti-Roman sentiments expressed two centuries

before had not been forgotten. Even so ardent a Catholic as Thomas More supported the need for some degree of change within the household of faith, notwithstanding his opposition to the radical efforts of "heretics" like Luther. Nationalism and disrespect for the Church and its representatives united in a growing resentment of the papacy which was viewed as an alien power draining off English funds in support of a foreign economy. As far back as 1353 the Law of Praemunire (so called from the first words of the Latin text of the statute) had made it illegal for Englishmen to carry lawsuits out of the country. Rome was not specifically mentioned, but it was evidently the focus of the enactment. Henry resurrected the forgotten law in his deposition of Wolsey, and he used it as a weapon against the clergy to enforce their submission to the Crown as the Supreme Head of the English Church. The removal of the papacy to Avignon in France (the so-called "Babylonian Captivity") along with the Great Schism (when rival popes contended for the office) had served to weaken the status of the papacy as an institution, and the recent captivity of Clement VII by the armies of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V in his sack of Rome served to further embarrass the pride of the Holy See.

Translating all of this into the language of behavioral theory, one may say that at this time the reference group of both King and country shifted from a continental to a national one. A reference group is that group with which the individual identifies psychologically,sharing its norms and promoting its values. A reference group often coincides with the individual's membership group. A union worker picketing a plant on strike is a good contemporary example. However, a reference group may be one that the person looks to and of which he aspires to become a member. The present chief executive of the United States was for many years a liberal Democrat who in later life espoused the principles of conservative Republicanism on which basis he was elected to the Presidency. In recent days he has expressed repeated concern for the election of conservative candidates in order to provide a compatible reference group with which he could work in Congress. The agreement of both Henry VIII and the English people in the sixteenth century made possible movement in a direction which the King along could not have brought about. Paradoxically, Henry was both leader and follower.

> To replenish the royal coffers and to gain popular support, Henry, working through Parliament, dissolved the monasteries and sold their lands to the nobles and gentry. Thus Henry acquired accomplices, in a sense, in his

> conflict with Rome. But Henry and Parliament could not have effected such sweeping changes if many Englishmen had not been anticlerical.[27]

What was true of Henry VIII was true of all the Tudors, as Warner and Marten point out:

> The Tudors are sometimes spoken of as despots. If this be taken to mean stern, absolute rulers, on whom Parliament imposed very little check, the name is fitting. If we infer that they held the people crushed down in unwilling servitude, the inference is wrong. The Tudors were absolute because England believed in them, trusted them and were willing that they should be absolute.[28]

The King's Great Matter was thus not an issue having to do with the King in isolation. It involved the entire nation whose norms the King supported and by whose advice and consent through Parliament he was able not only to reign but to do the things he did.

It should be observed that the consensus of the country regarding Henry's reforming activities was not a simple quiet agreement. G. R. Elton has pointed out in Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell (Cambridge, 1972) that Pollard

---

[27] T. Walter Wallbank, A. M. Taylor, and N. M. Bailkey, Western Civilization: People and Progress. (Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Co., 1977), p. 222.

[28] George T. Warner and C. H. Marten, The Groundwork of British History. (London and Glasgow: Blacho and Son, Limited, 1934), revised edition, p. 236.

and other traditional writers have tended to oversimplify the matter. It is certainly true that many, if not most, Englishmen "disliked clerical pretension, coveted ecclesiastical wealth, had their doubts about traditional religion and the state of the Church, and welcomed attacks on foreign power like the Pope's" (p. 2). Yet at the same time "any thought that the political and religious changes were simply and silently absorbed by the people must be forgotten." Violence was involved as Elton vividly describes.

III. Attitudes and Information Exposure

Consider now the third principle suggested by Krech and his associates regarding attitude formation and stability. Attitudes are shaped and maintained by the information to which the individual is exposed. In other words, the cognitive content of an attitude is a significant variable in shaping the direction an attitude will take.

Suppose for example a person was asked about his attitude toward Radial Keratotomy. He would probably reply that he had never heard of such a thing. He could not therefore have an attitude about it. Suppose, however, he had read an article in a magazine about a new surgical procedure for correcting nearsightedness. He

learned that the operation was introduced from the Soviet Union in 1978 and the medical community is still cautious about its safety and effectiveness. The article stated that there are some problems connected with the surgery, so that in some instances it may not be recommended for particular patients. After reading the article he may have acquired a negative attitude toward Radial Keratotomy and decided it was too new a procedure to risk. Suppose on the other hand he heard of this operation from his barber while having his hair cut. The barber said that his aunt had had the surgery and is now able to discard her glasses which she has worn for several years. He might be inclined to have a slightly positive attitude about radian keratotomy, although he does not contemplate needing such surgery any time soon. Or maybe he does need such an operation and he decides to ask his family doctor about it. The doctor replies that he knows a specialist who has performed many of these operations and they have all been successful. The doctor does not hesitate to recommend the procedure for those who need it.

In this case, the individual's attitude will be directly influenced by the sources of his knowledge. Yet one's attitude will not be just a matter of the information he has. Most persons pride themselves on their supposed scientific evaluation of things. They like

to "get the facts" and then make up their own minds "intelligently."

> Information, however, is rarely a determinant of an attitude except in the context of other attitudes. New information is frequently used to form attitudes which are consonant with pre-existing attitudes...Attitudes, primarily because of their responsiveness to information, may therefore be "valid" in that the cognitive components of the attitude may correspond to the facts about the objects of those attitudes.
>
> ...Not all attitudes correctly refer to the facts, however. Certain attitudes develop in men (such as superstitions, delusions, prejudices) which are characterized by their wide divergence from the facts...One of the major reasons why so many of us incorporate invalid and inadequate facts into our attitudes lies in the complexity of the world in which we live, and its rapidly changing nature, and in the nature of our sources for facts.[28]

Of particular interest to the social psychologist in this connection are the functions of authorities in providing ready made facts and beliefs and the natural human proclivity to "create facts."

All of this is another way of asserting the phenomenological principle. Behavior is the function of the individual's perceptions. Reality for the individual is what he interprets reality to be. It is not a case of "the facts, just the facts," but rather what the facts mean to the person, how he views them to define a

---

[28]Krech, et al., pp. 187-188.

particular situation. Two important characteristics of facts influence such interpretation and definition: Where do the facts come from, and how do they fit into the structure of the individual's past experience?

Psychologist Leon Festinger has developed a theory called Cognitive Dissonance in which the concept of consistency is in central emphasis.[29] The individual strives for harmony (or consonance) between his various cognitions, i.e., his knowledge, opinions and beliefs about the environment, about himself, or about his behavior. When a person knows various things that are not psychologically consistent with one another, he will in a variety of ways try to make them more consistent. Discrepancy between what one knows of one's behavior and what he knows about reality as he perceives it creates psychological discomfort (dissonance) which the individual attempts to reduce. An example often given of this is the conflict a smoker experiences as he faces the rather heavy evidence that cigarettes are associated with lung cancer and heart disease. He may resolve his conflict in several ways. The simplest way is to change his behavior, to stop smoking. Or he may change his perception of the evidence by denying it, by attacking the source of the information,

---

[29]Leon Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957).

by finding flaws in the reasoning which has been presented. The discomfort of dissonance may also be escaped by avoiding it; he may simply refuse to listen to any presentation of the dangers of cigarette smoking.

> Furthermore, in a group situation where a number of people suffer the same dissonance, relief for each person may easily be obtained from the social support of the others since the dissonance is identical for each member of the group. More than that the members will attempt to persuade others of the correctness of their beliefs.[30]

Thus the smoker may find comfort in the company of other smokers who agree with his position and support him in it. The case was cited earlier of the cult which preached that the end of the world was to occur on a certain date when celestial space ships would arrive to carry away the faithful. The persistence of the view was maintained by the solidarity of the group as members stayed together and constantly reassured each other of the correctness of their belief. Even when the stated date arrived and passed with no cataclysmic happenings, the group continued to flourish and proceeded to more vigorously proselyte their faith. The end of the world did not come because of their faithfulness!

---

[30] Richard E. Berringer, Historical Analysis: Contemporary Approaches to Clio. (N. Y.: John Wiley & Sons, 1978), p. 139.

> It is important to be aware that cognition, or reality as the individual perceives it, may be highly inaccurate--what counts is not what is, but what the individual thinks is, however distorted that may be. This means that efforts to dissipate dissonance may be misdirected, such as passengers may get on the wrong train, and with the same result. They may think they are on the right train...but when they get to the wrong destination their problems (dissonance) will probably be increased rather than relieved.[31]

The concept of cognitive dissonance is readily applicable to the King's Great Matter. Henry VIII made certain basic religious assumptions in his earlier years. He accepted the authority of Scripture. He accepted the authority of the Pope along with that of canon law. He believed in a Deuteronomic type of theology in which a simplistic cause and effect relationship with God prevailed. Obey and be blessed, on the one hand, and disobey and be punished on the other. This black and white formula for religious living we encounter often in the first five books of the Old Testament, and its inadequacy forms the background of the book of Job. The Biblical writers themselves often wrestled with the inconsistencies of a world where the good often suffered unjustly while the wicked seemed to prosper. Religious people in the sixteenth century for some reason or another tended to emphasize the book of Leviticus where the

---

[31] Ibid.

earlier Deuteronomic formula prevailed. King Henry had no doubt easily acquiesced in the judgment of his young wife that the initial prosperity of his reign was due to the King's faithfulness in fulfilling his religious duties.[32]

Now after almost twenty years of divine blessing on the kingdom, the dissonance began to develop. The first-born child had been a girl. This was somewhat disappointing to the King, but he had dismissed the disappointment with the observation that he and his queen were yet young and by the grace of God the sons would soon follow. But they did not follow, and Henry assumed that there must have been some sin which was blocking the blessing of God. He found his answer in the Scripture verse of Leviticus 20:21. The Word of God prohibited marriage to a brother's wife on penalty of a childless union. The New Testament backed up this prohibition when John the Baptist challenged Herod's right to have his brother Phillip's wife. Not only did Henry now begin to question his relationship to Catherine, but the dissonance soon spread to another relationship. What of the papal dispensation which had approved the illicit union to begin with? And what of the Pope who had by his action made the Word of God of no effect? Henry would resolve his

---

[32]Pollard, Henry VIII, p. 84, citing Letters and Papers, i 4417 and i 4115.

cognitive dissonance by changing his behavior. The new "information" demanded a separation from the woman with whom he had been "living in sin" all these years. Ultimately it was to mean a break with Rome which continued to condone a union which the Scripture clearly prohibited.

Prior to this drastic procedure, however, Henry sought social support for his troubled conscience in an appeal to the universities. The idea was actually that of Thomas Cranmer, a fellow of Jesus College in Cambridge. Cranmer proposed:

> ...that the King should engage the chief universities and divines of Europe to examine the lawfulness of his marriage; and if they gave their resolutions against it, then it being certain that the Pope's dispensation could not derogate from the law of God, the marriage must be declared null and void.[33]

Among those consulted was Luther, and although there is no evidence that Henry directly appealed to Erasmus, the King's friends did ask Erasmus' opinion.[34] In the long run all such advice proved of little value, since the universities gave a divided answer and many of them gave a verdict in accord with the dictates of the ruler of the

---

[33]Hans J. Hillerbrand, The Reformation: A Narrative History. (N. Y.: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 315, quoting John Foxe, Book of Martyrs.

[34]Roland H. Bainton, Erasmus of Christendom. (N. Y.: Charles Scribners Sons, 1959), p. 252.

country in which they were located. At least one thing was clear in Henry's mind. If the issue of his marriage was to be resolved, he himself must act. He called Parliament into session, which continued for seven years (1529-1536). Before it finally adjourned, the famous Reformation Parliament had taken steps to break with the papacy and to establish the English Church as an independent entity as completely separate from Rome as were the Protestant churches in Germany. Meanwhile in August of 1532, William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, died, and Henry appointed Thomas Cranmer to his stead. After six years of delay, the King's Great Matter was about to be resolved.

IV. Chapter Summation

In this chapter attempt has been made to analyze the behavior of Henry VIII in the so-called "divorce" controversy. The writer has applied selected insights from attitude theory as given by Krech and his associates. The Assertio presented Henry's religion as a young man of thirty. With the passage of time, however, some of his views changed. The chapter considered three principles of attitude formation and change which relate to the King's behavior in these later years.

First, attitude formation and stability is related to the individual's want satisfactions. Favorable attitudes develop toward persons and things which satisfy wants. Likewise, one develops negative attitudes toward whatever frustrates his desires. According to Daniel Katz' functional theory of attitudes, attitudes develop out of psychological needs which are met by the holding of a particular attitude. In the case of Henry VIII, Henry's initial reaction to Martin Luther was one of insecurity and threat. Since there was no separation of church and state, an attack on the church meant an attack on the authority of rulers as well. Henry's attitude was thus a defensive one with a negative stance toward Luther and a positive stance toward the Pope who had been supportive of the regimes of both Henry and his father.

In the later years of his life, Henry's attitudes developed in relation to the social pressures upon him regarding the succession. Although it would appear that he acted from personal motives, his behavior was directed by the norms of sixteenth century culture which dictated what he could and could not do. All of his actions were carried out by "due process" involving the advice and consent of Parliament. Paradoxically, Henry was both leader and follower. This is Krech's second principle

about attitude formation and change. Attitudes are related to the individual's group affiliations.

In the third place, attitude formation and stability is related to the cognitive content of the attitude. This involves not only the information to which the individual is exposed but how he perceives the information and in particular how it fits into the structure of the individual's past experience. All persons have a normal drive toward cognitive consistency. When a new experience does not fit with what the person "knows" about reality, he will act in some way to reduce the discrepancy. Henry VIII experienced cognitive dissonance from his reading of Leviticus 20:21 which promised the punishment of childlessness to a man who marries his brother's wife. Henry reacted by rejecting his wife of eighteen years and ultimately by severing his relationship with the papacy which had condoned what the Word of God prohibited. Henry sought social approval in an appeal to the universities for a consensus statement, as well as a request for Luther's opinion. Although not directly asked, Erasmus also expressed his views in the matter. When all such advice failed to satisfy Henry, he took matters into his own hands by summoning the Reformation Parliament which sat for seven years and formally initiated the English Reformation. The King's

Great Matter was finally resolved when William Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, died and Henry appointed his own supporter Thomas Cranmer in his place.

CHAPTER VII

THE CONSCIENCE OF THE KING: CONSCIENCE OR CASUISTRY?

The word "conscience" occurs often in the literature of Henry VIII, especially in connection with the divorce controversy. Henry's consistent argument was his appeal to an aroused conscience brought about by his reading of Leviticus 20:21: "If a man takes his brother's wife, they will die childless. He has done a ritually unclean thing and has disgraced his brother."[1] How seriously can one take this claim? What is conscience, and what light does contemporary behavioral therapy cast on this concept?

The purpose of this chapter is to consider conscience as a variable in human behavior. After dealing with the problem of the legitimacy of Henry's claim, the writer will make some observations about conscience from a psychological and theological perspective. He will then examine the Leviticus text which it was claimed acted as the cue which prompted the arousal of the King's moral anxiety. Finally, he proposes to consider in some depth the penalty of childlessness which the text pronounced on

---

[1] Good News Bible: The Bible in Today's English Version. (New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1976).

those who violate the incest prohibition. This penalty, it would seem, was the heart of Henry's anxious concern.

I. The Case for Conscience

Historical interpreters have tended to be skeptical of Henry's claim to have been motivated by conscience in his efforts to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon in order to marry Anne Boleyn. Miles F. Shore points out:

> Virtually no one has ever believed that he was really sincere in his "Levitical scruple." Most historians have explained it as the rationalization of the sexual and political dissatisfactions of a thirty-five-year-old King whose forty-one-year-old wife had not borne him the son he needed to insure the royal succession...Of thoughtful historians, only Smith has suggested that Henry's offended conscience might have been important.[2]

The reference to Smith is to a definitive article by Lacey Baldwin Smith. This author concurs with Dr. Smith's basic proposition that the conscience of Henry VIII was very real and tender, so much so that he was willing to risk everything (even the damnation of his soul) in pursuing the controversial course he chose.[3]

---

[2]Miles F. Shore, "Henry VIII and the Crisis of Generativity," Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 2, (1972), p. 361.

[3]"A Matter of Conscience," in Theodore K. Rabb and J. E. Siegel (eds.), Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E. H. Harbison. (Princeton: University Press, 1969), pp. 32-51.

According to Smith, a number of alternatives were available to Henry which would have readily solved his personal and political problems. There was a political alternative, several papal proposals and a Machiavellian expediency to which he might have resorted.

Politically, Henry might have married the Princess Mary (Catherine's daughter) to her first cousin James V of Scotland. This would have brought about what later did occur in the time of Queen Anne in 1707. By the act of union, England and Scotland were joined in a common legislature and flag to create what has since been known as Great Britain. Conditions were favorable to such a union in Henry's time, and it could have been easily effected, as "forward looking men in both countries were eager for it."[4] But Henry would not consider it.

Papal proposals included a willingness on the part of Clement VII "to sanction royal bigamy, to permit adultery by legitimizing any children of the King and Anne Boleyn, or to bless the marriage of Henry's bastard, the Duke of Richmond, with the Princess Mary."[5] It was a

---

[4]Ibid, p. 32, quoting Garret Mattingly, Catherine of Aragon. (Boston, 1941), p. 246.

[5]Citing A. F. Pollard, Henry VIII (London: 1934), pp. 184, 206. Henry had had an affair with Elizabeth Blount, one of Catherine's ladies-in-waiting. The child born in 1519 was called Henry Fitzroy (which means in Norman French, the son of the King). He was created Duke

desperate situation, and the Pope was willing to find any solution other than divorce.

Moreover, had Henry been the totally unscrupulous monster he is sometimes pictures, he might have resorted to assassination, quietly murdering Catherine in her bed (or perhaps poisoning her) with no one the wiser. Smith points out that such clandestine violence was not unusual for the time, and Henry's ancestors included a number of extraordinarily vicious persons. Yet, there is no evidence that Henry ever entertained such possibilities, nor was there ever any whisper of suspicion about such things.

> Instead, Henry stood squarely on conscience, writing the Emperor Charles that he could not "quiet his conscience remaining longer with the Queen," whom, for her nobleness of blood and other virtues, he had loved entirely as his wife, until he saw that their union was forbidden in Scripture.[6]

What is particularly decisive for Smith is the fact that Henry was ready "...to risk his soul by defying the Pope and to cut off his kingdom from salvation. His soul alone would pay the price if he was wrong and the Christian-

---

of Richmond and Somerset in 1525 which indicated that the King intended a future for him. He died July 22, 1536.

[6]Smith, p. 33, quoting Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII, ed., J. S. Brewer et al., 21 vols. in 33 parts. (London, 1862-1910), IV, 6111, VI, 775.

Catholic world was right."[7] Smith concludes that "if we are willing to dignify Luther's will by calling it conscience, then it is time to take Henry VIII seriously and to stop dismissing his actions as those of a proud and willful man."[8]

There is an interesting contrast between the conscience of Henry and that of Luther. Smith applies to Henry the religious typology of William James in his Varieties of Religious Experience.[9] James spoke of two basic kinds of individuals, "the healthy minded" and "the sick soul." The former is characteristic of the "extrovert" who is optimistic and easy going, unreflective, often more liberal in theological perspective and having a background of steady and even religious experience (in contrast to a crisis type of conversion). The "sick soul" on the other hand tends to have just the opposite characteristics. He/she is an "introvert" who is characteristically introspective, pessimistic and tends toward a more demanding type of religious practice expressed in meditation and sudden flashes of spiritual revelation. W. H. Clark cites Norman

---

[7]Ibid, p. 34.

[8]Ibid, p. 35.

[9](New York: Random House, 1902), pp. 78-165.

Vincent Peale and Benjamin Franklin as examples of "healthy minded" persons, while Jonathan Edwards and Soren Kierkegaard illustrate "the sick soul."[10] One might add the observation that Martin Luther would seem to be an example of "the sick soul," while Henry would be "healthy minded." One should be careful to note that the terminology used is that of William James, which unfortunately suggests a value judgment that one kind of experience is better than the other. As a matter of fact, James expressed a preference for "the sick soul" rather than "the healthy minded" approach. The latter tends to break down in the face of the hard realities of life.[11] In evaluating James' view, Clark points out that pure specimens of either extreme are not available. Most persons tend to display some characteristics of each type, and are thus a blend of the two. He rightly poses the question as to "whether these categories, taken from a book written at the turn of the century, are not out of date."[12] From a descriptive standpoint, however, he finds the classification helpful in a very general way.

---

[10] The Psychology of Religion. (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1958), p. 157.

[11] Ibid, p. 172, quoting Varieties, p. 160.

[12] p. 155.

The concern at this point is with Smith's application of James' typology to Henry VIII. Henry belongs firmly in the came of the healthy minded, so Smith declares.[13]

> Healthy-mindedness...finds religion natural, easy and conductive of good cheer. People of the kind...see God not as a strict Judge, not as a glorious Potentate, but as the animating Spirit of a harmonious world, Beneficient and Kind, Merciful as well as Pure.
>
> ...The healthy-minded person tends to be concerned with what goes on outside rather than in himself. He consequently is not particularly concerned with sin, least of all his own, and when he cannot avoid giving it his attention, his tendency is to exteriorize and get rid of it. If it is not his own sin, he will attack it and pulverize it, so to speak, while the very activity will do his spirit no end of good.[14]

Applying this concept to Henry, Smith writes:

> Evil and sin for the King were real enough, but they always remained outside him and were either to be avoided or exorcised...When evil could not be willed out of existence, when he found it so close to him that he could not ignore it, then he pulverized it, thereby striking a blow for God and doing his spirit no end of good. During the very years that Henry's conscience became articulate and public, he lectured his sister Margaret on the "inevitable damnation" awaiting the adulteress. His sister had obtained a divorce from her second husband on...highly questionable grounds...He warned Margaret "what charge of conscience, what grudge and fretting, yea what damnation" she would bring

---

[13] p. 41.

[14] Clark, pp. 155-156.

upon her soul unless she, "as in conscience ye are bound under peril of God's everlasting indignation," relinquish the adulterer's company with him that is not nor may be of right your husband.

When evil could not be bullied or ignored, and when it entered his own life, Henry translated it into one of the most normal and universal of human reactions; he saw it in terms of personal persecution. Why has this happened to me? What have I done to deserve ill fortune, sickness and frustration? How have I erred to warrant God's wrath?

The King's healthy mindedness was doubtless a reflection of the happy knowledge that heaven smiled upon earth, but operating in him were two qualities peculiar to a spoiled and conventional thinking monarch: a tendency to place the blame for failure, misfortune and evil outside of himself, thereby throwing up immense walls to protect the inner man from the suggestion that sin lies within and the firm conviction that God can be coaxed by prayer or ritual into granting the wishes of men.

Throughout the divorce crisis Henry was clearly seeking to protect his tender conscience; it was necessary to his peace of mind that he rule out the possibility that God could be angry because of any innate sinfulness in himself. Both healthy mindedness and his position as God's viceroy on earth precluded that possibility. Therefore, evil had to lie in a misapplication of the mechanics of living. His dynasty was barren, his wife old and infertile, because he had inadvertently broken God's commandment and thereby incurred divine wrath. He had unconsciously sinned. Yet to make this admission was not the same as acknowledging the source of sinfulness to lie within himself. Obey God's laws, renounce the marriage, and follow in the path of duty, and

all would go as "merry as a marriage bell again."[15]

Henry's conscience, it would seem, was a special kind of conscience. It was not the melancholic desperation of a German monk seeking peace with God. Rather it was calculated and pragmatic, like an earthly child trying to regain privileges from a parent he had somehow managed to offend. The obvious contrast between Henry and Luther suggests a possible reason for the popular skepticism about Henry's motives. The broken and contrite spirit of a seeker after salvation seems somehow more worthy than the apparent self seeking spirit of a King trying to get rid of his wife in order to marry another woman!

It might be added in this connection that Henry's view of sin may have been related to his emphasis on the book of Leviticus. While the concept of sin as bad things people do is by no means absent, there is much emphasis in this book on sin as impurity, i.e., something in the environment has defiled the person and he has become unclean. Such defilement may be inadvertent or even unconscious, but guilt has nonetheless been incurred. Sin is thus something that has happened <u>to</u> the person and is a

---

[15] pp. 41-43.

result of the mechanics of the system, like friction in a machine.

All of this suggests once again the phenomenological principle. The meaning of behavior depends on the individual's perception and how he defines the situation. Traditional interpreters have tended to impose their own perspectives on the behavior of Henry VIII rather than attempting to capture the perspective of the King himself. Paul Tournier observes that "any interpretation depends as much on the psychological mechanisms at work in the interpreter himself as on those of his patient."[16] Those who refuse to take seriously the conscience of the King are thus saying something not so much about Henry VIII but about themselves. Phillip Hughes, for example, writing from a Roman Catholic perspective insists:

> No Catholic in good faith believes the church (and the papacy) to be what it claims to be and simultaneously claim that the church should endorse his own private judgment about a point of faith and morals as a service due to him in consideration of his own merits. Henry's conscience in this matter--supposing him still to be a Catholic--is not a genuine conscience, for it is not prepared to submit to the rule of what it acknowledges to be its

---

[16] The Naming of Persons. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1975), pp. 73, 74.

> authority, but from the first it is seeking to bend that authority to its own requirements.[17]

According to Hughes, the conscience of Henry was not a "genuine" conscience. What is a genuine conscience? What is conscience anyway? Such questions suggest the next topic--the concept of conscience in contemporary behavioral theory.

II. Contemporary Concepts of Conscience

Gordon W. Allport warns that "we must not reify conscience."[18] Conscience is not a thing like an appendix which can be dissected out. In particular, it is not a separate department of personality, "a little man within the breast." The Disney version of Pinocchio for example personified conscience in the character of Jiminy Crickett, another being alongside the wooden puppet. If one assumes "a little man within the breast," it will be necessary (in order to explain that little man) to assume another little man and so on back indefinitely. this is what the logician calls an infinite regression. In psychological terminology one can speak of conscience as a

---

[17] The Reformation of England, Volume I, "The King's Proceedings." (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1951), p. 161.

[18] Gordon W. Allport, The Individual and his Religion: A Psychological Interpretation. (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1950), p. 89.

construct. A construct is an entity that is assumed in order to explain observed phenomenon.[19] Intelligence is a construct, so also learning, the will and Freud's id, ego and superego. Constructs are not substantive entities but functional entities. That is, rather than being physical realities, they are ways of speaking about processes going on in the individual. Allport defines conscience as

> ...the indicator of the measure of agreement between our conduct and our values, whatever they be. It is like a burglar alarm in a bank vault that goes off when the system is violated. It normally acts only when our integrity is threatened by conduct incompatible with the essential structure.[20]

Summarizing significant psychological data, Allport writes:

> Important facts about conscience are, then, its universality in the human race (excepting in rare pathological instances), the variability of its dictates with cultural standards (though this variability may be currently overestimated), and the slow and frequently painful way in which it is acquired through the process of learning in childhood and adolescence.[21]

Allport's statement is basically in accord with Biblical teaching about conscience. The word conscience itself is

---

[19] A construct is "a concept used by a theory to explain behavior." L. S. Wrightsman et al., Social Psychology in the Seventies. (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1972), p. 603.

[20] p. 91.

[21] p. 88.

not found in the Old Testament, although the concept is there. Proverbs 28:1 observes: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth, but the righteous are as bold as a lion." David in the 32nd Psalm described his remorse when he refused to face up to the guilt of his clandestine affair with Bathsheba. In the New Testament the word occurs about thirty times, and there has been considerable discussion concerning the relationship of the idea to Stoic philosophy.

The second chapter of Romans seems to indicate the universality of conscience in the human race. In the first two chapters of the epistle, the apostle Paul has presented three witnesses of divine revelation, three ways by which the world has knowledge of God. Two of these are objective (or external) witnesses, and the third is a subjective (or internal) witness. Romans 1:20 gives the objective witness of creation. The physical universe gives evidence of a Creator back of it, calling men to acknowledge His sovereignty, to worship and serve Him. Chapter 2, verses 12-14, gives the objective witness of the Hebrew Scriptures, in particular the Law of Moses which the non-Jewish world did not have. Chapter 2, verse 15, gives the subjective witness, the innate moral consciousness of mankind, which is here referred to in connection with conscience. This innate moral

consciousness is an aspect of the image of God in which the race was created. Both Allport and Clark argue that conscience is not necessarily religious in nature. This passage would seem to teach the opposite, that universally humans have an innate belief in God which includes a sense of accountability to Him and this sense is linked to conscience. Rudolf Otto in The Idea of the Holy says: "In every highly developed religion the appreciation of moral obligation and duty ranking as a claim of the deity upon man has developed side by side with the religious feeling itself."[22]

Cultural variability of conscience is linked with the fact that individual conscience is acquired and influenced by learning. A key passage is Paul's discussion in I Corinthians 8-10 which deals with the problem of meat offered to idols. The apostle speaks of the "weak" and the "strong," suggesting that even among the Christians in the city individual consciences did not always agree. Heathen ceremonies customarily used meat in their idolatrous worship. After completion of the rites, some of the left over meat would be sold in the markets at a reduced rate. The meat was perfectly good, and Paul had no hang-up about eating it; but some of the more

---

[22]Translation by J. W. Harvey. (London: Oxford University Press, 1923), p. 53.

scrupulous Christians would be offended by its association with heathenism. These the apostle classed as "weak brothers" whose scruples were to be respected, even though they were misguided. One must not violate his conscience, however unrealistic its orientation. In another passage Paul writes about those whose consciences have been "seared with a hot iron." (I Timothy 4:2) This refers to the perversion of the moral sense due to miseducation and repeated disregard of one's scruples. Both the Corinthian passage and this one indicate that conscience can only prod the individual to do right as he views it, but cannot determine absolutely what right is. As Clark notes, "While the capacity for having a conscience may be God-given, the specific content of the individual's conscience is always learned."[23] This statement is in accord with a basic premise of this study which we previously established. We acquire our religious orientation like we acquire a Southern accent. It is something we learn from our cultural exposure.

The precise way in which we acquire conscience has long been a subject of interest to students of behavior. The Freudian teaching was that conscience (the super

---

[23]The Psychology of Religion, p. 97.

ego)[24] develops when the Oedipus complex is resolved and the child introjects the value system of the same-sexed parent.

> In one sense the child becomes the parent; he follows his conscience as though the commands were coming directly from the parent. The most important aspect of this notion of identification and introjection is that the standards embraced by the child continue to operate with all the force they possessed at the time of introjection. The period of introjection is usually a time of great anxiety for the child, and hence the conscience can be excessively severe and unyielding. The child can become excessively self-critical and equally critical of others.
>
> In the absence of adequate parental figures, the super-ego may fail to develop. According to psychoanalytic theory, children raised without adequate identification figures are likely to be deficient in the control of impulses and in concern for others; in extreme cases, the adult behavior becomes psychopathic.[25]

The careful student should be aware that present day psychoanalytic theory differs slightly from the original Freudian view. Parents, teachers, siblings and others in the environment contribute to the formation of the super-ego. Parents or others who threaten punishment control the anti-social impulses of the child, and the

---

[24]The super-ego contains the conscience of censorship function of personality. The super-ego also encompasses the ego ideal, or the child's perception of the kind of person he would like to be. Wrightsman, p. 103.

[25]Ibid.

child conforms because he fears punishment. Around the age of six or seven (if development is normal), the child comes to identify with the parents (powerful aggressors) and their standards become the child's own. In Freud's scheme, the child (the male child was his principal concern) identified with his father out of the fear of sexual mutilation. In both the original statement and the contemporary psychoanalytic approach, the basic mechanism involved is that of identification. Wrightsman observes that, "When we look for empirical support for the Freudian proposal...we find very little or no evidence. Widespread dissatisfaction with the Freudian theory... exists."[26] The student is referred to Wrightsman's discussion for elaboration of his criticism.

There are two other general points of view among theorists about how children acquire morality. One is represented by Jean Piaget, a Swiss student of child behavior, and L. H. Kohlberg of Harvard University, who stress development. According to Piaget, moral development is related to cognitive level. Children of different ages have qualitatively different ways of thinking which proceed in a regular order. Piaget is therefore not so much concerned with actions as with the

---

[26] p. 118.

kinds of judgment children make as they grow. Basically there is development from general and concrete to abstract and principled reasoning. Piaget speaks of two stages. In the stage of moral realism the child accepts rules on the basis of authority. He comes to modify rules to fit specific situations later on in the stage of moral relativism.

Building on the work of Piaget, Kohlberg has spelled out six states through which individual morality is supposed to pass.[27] In the first stage, the person behaves properly in order to avoid punishment (the premoral stage). In Stage Two, morality is pragmatic. Do right because it pays. This is the instrumental or hedonistic stage. Stage Three is that of conformity. Morality is what is approved by others. This may be termed the rule stage, because the subject does not decide for himself what is right but follows standards laid down by others. At Stage Four the individual assumes a law and order orientation characterized by respect for authority personified in parents, teachers, policemen and other powerful persons. One must do his duty to avoid dishonor and maintain the social order. In Kohlberg's fifth stage,

---

[27]Kohlberg speaks of three general stages, each of which has two subdivisions: the preconventional, the conventional, and the postconventional.

the individual reaches the autonomous level. In contrast to rules, he is guided by rationality and is able to think in terms of the relativism of personal values. Finally, the last stage of moral development involves internalized principles which guide the behavior such as the Golden Rule or the categorical imperative: Act as you would act considering how everyone should act were they in your situation. Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., are examples of this level, according to Kohlberg.

In contrast with Piaget and Kohlberg's developmentalism is the social learning view which utilizes the principles of learning theory and stresses the importance of observational learning and modeling. The child comes to behave morally because of the pleasure associated with parents' approval and the anxiety associated with punishment. This pleasure-pain principle operates through various cues related to a particular behavior in question. Cues may be external such as the chair used to reach a forbidden cookie jar, or they may be internal like thoughts and memories. Moreover, a child may watch someone (a model) do something and come to imitate the behavior, depending on how he perceives the model, whether powerful or competent, and how he judges the rewards and punishments he is likely to receive if he acts as the model does. The social learning view is associated

with Albert Bandura and J. Aaronfreed, among others. Much of the research that these theorists have conducted has involved studies of the resistance to temptation. The role of punishment has been stressed in these studies.[28]

While both the Piaget-Kohlberg developmental view and social learning theory have their ardent defenders, it would seem that:

> ...there is truth in both the cognitive-maturational view of the development of moral judgment and in a social learning view. Learning theorists focus on the potential malleability of children's morality but allow that the cumulative effects of learning can give the adult a different moral structure than the child's. Likewise cognitive-developmentalists focus on the stages that people's moral concepts pass through while recognizing the variability in moral situations that specific situations evoke.[29]

In the present study the writer maintains not an either/or but a both/and position. Many, if not most human behaviors, require a level of development before the appearance of a specific activity. Society recognizes this fact in a practical way, for example when a judge raises the question of whether a defendant is competent to stand trial. Does he understand the charge which has been

---

[28] J. Aaronfreed, Conduct and Conscience: The Socialization of Internalized Control over Behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

[29] Social Psychology: Explorations in Understanding, Kenneth Gergen, Chief Academic Advisor. (Del Mar, California CRN Books, 1974), p. 74.

brought against him? In particular, did he know the difference between right and wrong when he committed the act of which he has been accused? Among Baptists with whom the writer grew up, child evangelism workers frequently spoke of "the age of accountability." That is, the level of growth in a child must be achieved in order to understand the Gospel and profess personal salvation. Not only in court and church, but in many areas of life our culture recognizes that developmental considerations are important in dealing properly with individuals. Yet one also recognizes that gardens do not grow by themselves and if left unattended produce only weeds. There is not sufficient source material to investigate the moral development of Henry VIII in terms of the Piaget-Kohlberg framework. On a practical basis, it would seem that the social learning perspective is more pertinent to the King's behavior, as the writer assumes that the contents of individual conscience are acquired from the person's cultural exposure. At a later point the chapter will examine in detail the cue which, according to the King's claim, set off his moral anxiety and led to the chain of events historians speak of as the "King's Great Matter."

The question now arises about the relation of this discussion to Henry VIII. At a further point more direct

application will be made. In general, the following observations seem appropriate.

It will be observed that with the exception of the Freudian point of view, these theories do not speak of conscience as such but of moral development. This is due no doubt to the desire to eliminate constructs and avoid metaphysical assumptions about the nature of man.

A basic problem of the historical application of contemporary theories is that of time perspective. The theories which were examined reflect a twentieth century orientation. One cannot impose them on the sixteenth century and make them fit. This raises the question as to whether such views are cultural products of the modern age rather than the expression of hard-nosed, scientific fact. Wrightsman observes:

> The notion that the individual must pass through a series of stages in order to achieve moral maturity is quite an assumption, but a comparison of different theories...reveals that a variety of viewpoints arrive at the same position...a stage in which principles rather than rules are relied upon and action becomes autonomous. But the assumption that a principle-oriented morality is higher than a rules-oriented morality is laden with value judgments, and for this reason Kohlberg has received his share of criticisms...Few young adults achieve the highest stages of moral development, and Kohlberg himself recognizes the possibility that Stages 5 and 6 may not be the end point in moral development.[30]

---

[30] pp. 113, 124.

One's evaluation of the morality of Henry VIII therefore becomes a philosophic rather than a psychological issue. Who is to say what a mature morality is? Henry's behavior may seem quite childish to modern critics. But one's evaluation will depend upon his value assumptions, especially his attitude toward the Bible and the authority of Scripture, a topic to which the discussion now turns.

III. Leviticus 20:21, The Text That Started It All

Up to this point the writer has been talking in general terms about conscience. It is now necessary, in order to be more specific, to consider the special dynamics of the royal conscience in the King's Great Matter. The cue which originally stirred the moral sensibility of the King was a Scripture verse, Leviticus 20:21: "If a man takes his brother's wife, they shall die childless. He has done a ritually unclean thing and has disgraced his brother." (Good News Bible: The Bible in Today's English Version) How is it that an obscure verse in a less popular book of the Old Testament should come to have such historical significance? It certainly has to rank with Luther's verse, Romans 1:18, which sparked his doctrine of justification by faith and led to the Protestant Reformation. In Luther's case, the import of the verse seems reasonable. It is logically connected

with its context and the larger argument of Romans as a whole. Henry's verse, however, seems less pertinent. Certainly modern Christians, even the most ardent fundamentalists, do not linger long in the dusty pages of the Priestly legislation of he third book of the Pentateuch! In the previous section of this chapter, the principle was established that individual conscience develops in accord with the teaching it receives. While one cannot speak in detail of the religious education of Henry VIII, it is certain that he was indoctrinated with the conviction of the inspiration of Scripture as the Word of God. Moreover, the Catholic theologians of the time emphasized Leviticus because canon law (the law of the Church) regulated marriage, declaring who could and could not be united within acceptable "degrees of affinity."

The modern Christian finds problems in Henry's application of Leviticus 20:21. The legislation of this Old Testament book was addressed to an ancient people who had recently been liberated from slavery in Egypt. They were not yet a nation, just a loose confederation of tribes (an amphictyony). The domestic unit was not the nuclear family of the late twentieth century, but involved several generations living in close proximity, i.e., an extended family or tribe. In such a situation there would be considerable opportunity for incest. This had to be

guarded against in order to preserve harmonious interpersonal relationships within the group, as well as to avoid the unwholesome effects of genetic inbreeding (a danger of which the people of that time were of course not scientifically aware). Moreover, the New Testament book of Galatians makes it clear that the Christian believer in the present age is not under the law of Moses either for salvation or as a rule of life. Therefore, the directives of Leviticus are not directly applicable to the Church. Even if they had been binding in the case of Henry VIII, Henry did not understand what this verse really meant. According to Deuteronomy 25:5 a brother was obligated to marry his brother's widow if the union had been childless. The purpose was to perpetuate the family line. So Henry would have been required to marry Catherine of Aragon if he had not already done so.[31] What the Leviticus verse prohibited was the marriage of a brother to his brother's wife while the brother was still alive. A case directly in point was the union of Herod Antipas with his brother Phillip's wife, a situation condemned by John the Baptist and for which John lost his head. According to Leviticus

---

[31]The custom of the Levirate marriage is the background for the Sadducees' conundrum in Mark 12:18 et seq. A woman had been married successively to six brothers. Hence the question about whose wife she would be in resurrection.

congratulations on behalf of the doge of Venice. If the child had been a son, it would not have been fit to delay; but since it was only a daughter, it didn't make any difference. When finally the ambassador did get around to officially extending his greeting, he made it quite clear that the doge would have been happier with the birth of a boy.[32]

The objective facts about Leviticus 20:21 seem clear that Henry did not at all understand the text, and so misapplied it with what serious consequences history records. Moreover, Philip Hughes points out that Henry's misapplication of the text was one he need not have made. Henry had a near kinsman, Emmanuel of Portugal, who had also obtained a dispensation from the Pope to marry his sister-in-law. Both of Emmanuel's wives were sisters of Catherine of Aragon, and there was no calamity following Emmanuel's marriage. He had three sons by the sister-in-law, all of whom lived to manhood. Two of them produced families and two succeeded him on the throne. One of the latter was John III (1521-1557) who was reigning when Henry began his divorce proceedings. In Hughes' view, Henry ought to have known about Emmanuel, thus his

---

[32]Carolyn Erikson, Bloody Mary. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1978), p. 18.

misapplication of Leviticus was a farce.[33]

What is important for consideration here is not the objective reality behind the Leviticus verse but Henry's interpretation of the verse. The stimulus to his conscience was real, and the guilt he experienced was genuine despite the fact that the guilt had no objective basis in the teaching of the verse. Reality for the individual is not what is but what the individual perceives it to be, a principle especially pertinent in the area of conscience.

A point of criticism frequently leveled against Henry's citation of Leviticus 20:21 has to do with the theological assumptions involved in his use of the verse. L. B. Smith speaks of Leviticus as offering "the basic explanation of Christian causation in history."[34] It presents a black and white formula which states, if you will obey, you will have blessing, but if you disobey, you will be punished. Such a view one may speak of as Deuteronomic theology because of its emphasis in that part of Old Testament literature.[35] Deuteronomy 16:26-27 for

---

[33]The Reformation in England, p. 161.

[34]"A Case of Conscience," p. 46.

[35]"The principle of divine retribution is important. The righteous God rewards with temporal blessing those who obey him and punishes those who disobey. This is set forth fully in Chapter 28; it is a

example exhorts, "I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, and a curse if ye will not obey." (King James version) Smith speaks cynically of a "cause and effect approach to religion," which expects that

> When man has done all the right things and fulfilled his religious obligations, then it behooves God to fulfill his part of the bargain and bestow power, wealth and peace of mind upon his devoted followers.[36]

From one standpoint, Smith and the other critics have a valid point. The book of Job deals with the issue in detail. The friends of Job assumed that since Job was suffering, he must have sinned. This was of course not the case, as the book of Job makes clear. Sometimes good people suffer, and often the wicked prosper. Variables enter into the situation other than personal obedience or sin. A simple black and white, either/or formula is totally misleading. The cross of Christ is the supreme example here.

From another point of view, however, there is a basic validity in the Deuteronomic teaching. It has to be true in a general way that right living produces prosperity, and evil brings suffering. If this were not

---

basic principle of the Deuteronomic history." James Philip Hyatt, "Deuteronomy," Encyclopedia Brittanica, VII (1960), p. 322.

[36] p. 45.

the case, there would be no basis for morality in the universe. Go ahead and live just as you please, since it makes no real difference anyway! What is the point in pursuing right if right is not somehow better than evil?

It may be helpful at this point to recall Kohlberg's scheme of moral development. During the earlier stages, the individual behaves properly to avoid punishment. After awhile he comes to view morality in terms of the consequences of an act. Do right because it pays. Only later does he come to act in terms of internalized principles which guide his behavior rationally. In the book of Leviticus one sees the human race in an early period of development. Galatians points out that in the Gospel of Christ it has come to maturity which enables it to leave behind primitive restrictions once necessary because of childishness.[37] At the time, the Deuteronomic formula of blessing-prosperity and sin-punishment was appropriate for the people to whom Leviticus was addressed. Maturity, however, means one is able to think beyond the black and white dichotomy to discern the variables involved. The fact that he is able to think in a mature way does not mean that he totally abandon the principles of his earlier experience. As a

---

[37]Galatians 3:23--4:1-7. The term translated <u>schoolmaster</u> has significant implications here.

mature driver, the writer appreciates the necessity of traffic laws which insure his own safety and make possible order on the streets. Yet he is not beyond the thought when he notices a police car in his rearview mirror while driving, "I better take it easy. I certainly do not want to get a ticket today."

The point of this discussion is that much of the criticism of Henry VIII's interpretation of Leviticus 20:21 has been unfair. L. B. Smith, as the writer argued, convincingly makes the case that Henry's motive for the annulment of his marriage was not statecraft or sex, but conscience. He comes to the conclusion, however, that the religion of Henry VIII was basically a matter of cheap superstition.

> A deity who does not concern himself with the immediate well-being of his believers, who fails to give them victory in war, to answer their prayers, or to cure hoof and mouth disease in their cattle, isn't much of a god. Henry's God, it is true, could not be coerced, but he could be entreated; he had long since ceased to react to burnt offerings or the sacrifice of the first born, but there remained a tacit understanding that the deity could, and did, interfere in the affairs of man, and that he did so on the basis of a quid pro quo. Passionate supplication in prayer, flattering promises about going on a pilgrimate or crusade, sharp attention to ceremonial detail, and above all, absolute obedience to God's law could assure the scrupulous worshiper the good things of life.[38]

---

[38]"A Case of Conscience," p. 43.

The above quotation has a definite flavor of cynicism. It suggests that Henry's expectations were out of line. Smith seems to reject outright the Deuteronomic principle. Was Henry a conceited egoist to expect that the God of the universe should be concerned about the affairs of his life? In Matthew 10:29-30, Jesus taught that the very hairs of one's head are numbered, and not even the lowly sparrow falls to the ground without the concern of a loving heavenly Father. The problem of Henry VIII was not in his expectations, but in his failure to discern the inadequacy of a black-and-white approach to divine providence, the same mistake the friends of Job had made. Misfortune does not necessarily mean that one is "not living right," nor does prosperity mean that the approval of God is upon the life.

Psychologically, Henry experienced at this point what Leon Festinger called cognitive dissonance, a concept previously discussed. Cognitive dissonance occurs when an individual knows two things that do not fit together. It is a natural tendency for a person to strive to reduce dissonance or avoid it altogether. People desire consistency in their beliefs, and when there is inconsistency, they are motivated to do whatever is easiest to reduce the contradiction and to regain

consistency.[39] The resolution in Henry's case was simple. He had sinned in marrying his brother's widow, and that was the reason Catherine could not produce a male heir. There was only one thing to do. He must dissolve the illegitimate union as soon as possible at whatever cost it might require. It is the writer's conclusion that the behavior of Henry VIII at this point was essentially moral and religious and not political or dynastic primarily. However immature his religion may seem to his critics, it is his perspective one must entertain since his perspective determined his action.

IV. The King's Concern about Childlessness

This chapter has discussed two basic issues in regard to the conscience of Henry VIII. First, it has affirmed the fact of conscience as an important variable in human behavior, especially the behavior of the King. Second, it has dealt with the role of Leviticus 20:21 as the stimulus which aroused Henry's moral sensibilities and provoked the chain of events in the "King's Great Matter." There is a third consideration which must be dealt with if one is to completely understand the royal motivation of

---

[39] A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957). See also, "The Motivating Effects of Cognitive Dissonance." In G. L. Lindzey (Ed.), Assessment of Human Motives (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1958).

the middle years. The Leviticus text pronounces the penalty of childlessness on those who violate the prohibition of incest. It was this penalty which was the heart of Henry's concern. It is clear that he wanted a male heir to insure an orderly succession and avoid a return to the chaos of the War of the Roses. However, the writer believes there is much more to his motivation than dynastic considerations.

Miles F. Shore, a contemporary professor of psychiatry at Tufts University, has dealt with the later years of the life of Henry VIII in terms of "the crisis of generativity."[40] Generativity is a term borrowed from Erik Erikson who uses this expression to refer to developmental considerations of the early middle years of an individual's life.[41] Erikson accepts and builds on many of the basic tenets of Freudian psychology. Along with the stages of psychosexual development postulated by Freud (oral, anal, phallic, Oedipal, latency and genital), Erikson speaks of psychosocial stages in which the individual has to establish new orientations toward himself and his social world. The first four of these

---

[40]"Henry VIII and the Crisis of Generativity," Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 2 (1972), pp. 359-390.

[41]Childhood and Society (New York: Norton, 1950).

stages have to do with childhood; the fifth concerns adolescence; and the sixth, young adulthood. (Discussion of these stages is not pertinent to the writer's considerations at this point.) Generativity is the seventh in which the maturing individual comes to be concerned with "others beyond his immediate family, with future generations and the nature of the society in which those generations will live."[42] Individuals who fail the crisis of generativity fall into a state of self-absorption in which personal gratification is the pressing concern. Such an attitude is illustrated in Dickens' Scrooge in "A Christmas Carol." Scrooge is a self-centered, embittered old man with a one-sided concern about money and an utter disregard for the welfare of his employee, Bob Cratchet. Miles Shore applies Erikson's stage of generativity to Henry VIII in terms of the work of Elliot Jacques. Jacques has described certain psychological reactions of the fourth decade of life which we speak of as "the mid-life crisis."

> The take-off point for his [Jacques] paper is his observation that the work of creative artists changes in the mid 30's from a spontaneous outpouring to a more carefully

---

[42]David Elkind, "Erik Erikson's Eight Stages of Man." In the New York Times Magazine, April 5, 1970. Reprinted in Sociology 80/81, Jacqueline Scherer (ed.). (Guilford, Ct.: The Duskin Publishing Group, 1980), p. 81.

> worked over "sculpted" process. He sees the mid-life crisis as consisting of the working through of depression, which is set off by the failure of "manic defenses" (idealization, activity and denial) against the realization of aging and death, signaling the ultimate defeat for even healthy self love.
>
> For Henry VIII, the first seventeen years of his reign had seen the acting out of a series of grandiose, narcisstic fantasies. His crisis came when these had to be modified in the face of real events: his injuries, his military and political disappointments, and his inability to have a legitimate male heir. Biological factors and the erosive effect of real events on his grandiose fantasies were the major precipitant of his crisis. In Jacques' terms, there was a failure of the activities which had hitherto thrust aside the depressive activity.
>
> Jacques asserts that the resolution of the crisis depends upon the nature of previous object relations. Without a successful marital and occupational life, psychological disturbance or depression will result. Or there may be compulsive attempts to remain young with hypochondrical concerns, sexual promiscuity, and possibly real character deterioration.[43]

The writer's purpose in quoting Shore at length is to set the behavior of Henry VIII in a psychological context. Henry is at the point where he has become conscious of the failure of his life and the reality of his own mortality. He is reaching out to find meaning beyond himself in another generation, in the extension of

---

[43]Shore, pp. 388-389. Allusion to "Death and the Mid-life Crisis," International Journal of Psychoanalysis, VI (1965), 502-513.

himself in a son or heir. It is of course normal for a man to want a son to carry on his name. There is nothing unusual in a father desiring that his offspring should follow in his steps to continue what he has begun. The behavior of Henry VIII, however, was obsessive and in fact was the overriding fact which determined his place in history. There must be more to it than simply the desire for an orderly succession and the peace of the realm.

The experience of Henry VIII has an interesting parallel in the case of Napoleon Bonaparte. Afraid that he might die without a son and that his empire would crumble, Napoleon finally decided he would have to divorce his wife who proved unable to give him an heir. One night after dinner on November 30, 1809, in a celebrated scene described by his biographers, the Emperor told the unfortunate Josephine of his decision as gently as he could. They said their last goodbyes, and on December 15 she appeared before an assembly of high dignitaries to officially declare her consent. She retired with imperial honors to Malmaison, the small estate in Paris which Napoleon had bought for her. She was allowed to keep the title Empress and was granted a dowry. Shortly afterward in 1810, Napoleon married Marie Louise of Austria, who a year later presented him with the desired son. Josephine heard the cannon shots announcing

the birth, and Napoleon sent her a special message. When she begged to see the baby, he managed to sneak the child to Malmaison without its mother's knowledge. When Napoleon was exiled to Elba, Marie Louise was not allowed to go with him. Josephine sent a note asking permission to join him. He wrote that it was impossible, but before his letter arrived, Josephine had died.[44]

In other times and places the Henrican-Napoleonic scenario has been replayed with a variety of actors. In the Old Testament story of the birth of Ishmael, the same theme is in evidence although with an interesting variation. God had promised Abraham he would have a son in his old age. His wife, Sarah, had thus far not conceived and gave no promise of doing so. At Sarah's suggestion, Abraham took her servant girl, Hagar, by whom he was able to father a son. This was not according to the divine intent nor is it palatable to traditional Western morality. It was, however, according to the custom of the times. Mesopotamian law mandated that a wife unable to give her husband offspring was obligated to provide him with a surrogate through whom he might sire

---

[44]George Lefebvre, Napoleon: From Tilsit to Waterloo 1807-1855. Translated from the French by J. E. Anderson. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), p. 70.

children.[45] In all of these cases there is the common theme of generativity. The individual conscious of his failing life reaches out to find enduring meaning by identifying with the succeeding generation.

Closely related to generativity is the concept of "symbolic immortality" suggested by Robert Jay Lifton. Lifton's approach is that of "shared themes" which move outward from the individual in the direction of collective historical experience.[46] In contrast to Freud and Erikson who exemplify "the great man" approach, Lifton has attempted to "focus upon those themes, forms and images that are in significant ways shared, rather than upon the life of a single person as such."[47] One of history's oldest and most fundamental themes is that of death and man's reactions to it. Symbolic immortality concerns man's need in the face of inevitable biological death to maintain an inner sense of continuity with what has gone on before and what will go on after his own individual existence. Lifton distinguishes five general varieties of

---

[45] E. A. Speiser, "Nuzi," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, George Buttrich, Dictionary Editor, Volume 3. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 574.

[46] "The Sense of Immortality: On Death and the Continuity of Life." Explorations in Psychohistory: The Wellfleet Papers, Ed., Robert Jay Lifton and Eric Olson. (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1974), p. 31.

[47] p. 37.

the sense of immortality.[48] In the biologic mode the individual finds meaning through living on through one's descendants. Then, there is the theological idea of a life after death along with the idea of a release from profane life to existence on a higher plane here and now. Third is that kind of immortality achieved through one's works, the sense that one's influence, one's contributions, how ever great or small, will not die. A fourth concept is the "sense of immortality through being survived by nature itself, the theme of eternal nature prominent in the European Romantic movement and the Anglo-saxon cult of the great outdoors." Lastly, is the state of "experiential transcendence" in which one achieves a kind of mystical state "so intense that time and death disappear." When one achieves ecstasy or rapture, the restriction of the senses--including the sense of mortality--no longer exist. Poetically and religiously, this has been described as "losing one's self."

From one historical period to another, Lifton explains, there have been changes in cultural emphasis regarding attitudes toward death. With Darwin and evolutionary theory came a shift from a theological emphasis to a more biological one. In our own day society

---

[48]p. 277.

has moved in the direction of an extinction mentality. Because of the nuclear threat, many doubt whether they can live on in their children. Environmental destruction and the press of rising population pose a threat to the survival of nature itself, to say nothing of the continuation of our influence and work. Because of the uncertainty in our thinking, many, especially of the younger generation, have moved in the direction of experiential transcendence expressed in the drug culture and the popularity of Eastern religious cults.

While Henry VIII certainly embraced a theological view of immortality inherent in the religious culture of his time,his practical behavior moved in the direction of what Lifton calls "the biological mode," living on through and in one's sons and daughters and their sons and daughters.

> This has been a classical expression of symbolic immortality in East Asian culture, especially in traditional China, with its extraordinary emphasis on the family line. In Confucian ethics, the greatest of all unfilial acts is lack of posterity. But this mode never remains purely biological; it becomes simultaneously biosocial, and expresses itself in attachment to one's group, tribe, organization, people, nation or even species. Ultimately one can feel at least glimmerings of a sense of immortality in "living on" through and in mankind.[49]

---

[49] p. 276.

Such a concept as Lifton suggests readily relates to Old Testament teaching, especially in the first five books of the Bible. In the book of Genesis, for example, the promise to Abraham was not that he would have eternal life and go to heaven when he died. Rather, it was that his descendants would be as numerous as the sands of the sea shore and the stars of heaven, and that they would become a great nation which would ultimately inherit the land of Canaan as their permanent possession. Repetition of the promise to Isaac and Jacob was in the same vein, while the dying Joseph made his sons promise to carry his embalmed body with them out of Egypt and bury it when they settled in the Promised Land. (Genesis 50:24-26) Later on when David wished to build a house of worship to Jehovah and was refused divine permission to do so, the promise came that one of his sons would build the Temple and his dynasty would last forever. (2 Samuel 7:12-16) Before the New Testament revelation in a cross on a hill and an empty tomb in a garden, the spiritual hope of devout souls who trusted in God was identification with the on-going people of God through a continuing line of descendants. Bearing in mind this principle, one can perhaps incline toward a greater degree of patience with the dry-as-dust sections of the Old Testament which go on endlessly (so it seems) with the declaration that "so and-

so begat so-and-so who begat so-and-so."

Now in this light the Levitical legislation becomes meaningful. A strong family emphasis is in emphasis throughout, stressing the importance of the individual not as a lone entity but as a thinking unit in an enduring chain stretching across time. As was pointed out, the law of the Levirate marriage in Deuteronomy 25:5 provided that when a man died childless, his brother was obligated to marry his widow in order that the family line might flourish. Contrariwise, the brother who violated his brother's wife while the brother still lived was under the penalty of a childless union, which amounted to a kind of racial excommunication. In a culture which emphasized family solidarity for dynastic and political reasons, it was not unusual that the conscience of Henry VIII should be particularly sensitive at this point. All of the strands of generativity, symbolic immortality, Old Testament theology and dynastic demand come together to produce a kind of existential motivation which proves not to be so unusual after all.

V. Chapter Summation

This chapter has dealt with the conscience of Henry VIII. Henry persistently claimed that conscience

was his motivation in seeking the annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. The author examined the defense of this claim by Lacey Baldwin Smith in a definitive article. Although Smith took Henry's scruples seriously, he described Henry in terms of William James' "healthy-minded" type of individual who views sin as something exterior to him and which happens to him rather than something he commits.

Important psychological characteristics of conscience are its apparent universality and cultural variability. Although the capacity for conscience is innate, the content of individual conscience is acquired as a result of social exposure and thus differs from individual to individual. The author noted New Testament references to this fact, especially I Corinthians 8-10, which speaks of "strong" and "weak" consciences.

Contemporary behavioral theorists tend to speak not of conscience but of moral development, which places it in a context of behavior rather than one of theology or philosophy. Three major views of moral development were noted: The Freudian, the Cognitive-developmental scheme of Piaget and Kohlberg, and Social Learning Theory. The latter two, it was concluded, have points of validity, although for the purpose of this study, the social learning theory seems most applicable. All of the

theories represent a twentieth century orientation and cannot be applied completely to the sixteenth century.

Henry's understanding of Leviticus 20:21, it was noted, was deficient in terms of the context of Leviticus and the rest of the Bible, especially the book of Job. In particular, Henry did not understand the theological principle that the Old Testament Jewish Law is not binding on the Christian Church either for salvation or as a way of life. The book of Galatians, it was suggested, is especially pertinent in this connection. There is a principle of development which must be observed in a proper approach to Scripture teaching.

The penalty of childlessness which the Leviticus text pronounced upon violators of the incest prohibition seems to have been at the heart of Henry's anxiety. The chapter considered this anxiety in the light of Erik Erikson's stage of "generativity" as interpreted in an article by Miles F. Shore, a contemporary psychiatrist at Tufts University. The writer noted a parallel to Henry's experience in the life of Napoleon Bonaparte who also divorced his wife in order to marry a woman who could give him a son and heir. The Old Testament story of Abraham and Hagar is similar, although Abraham did not divorce his wife, but followed the Mesopotamian custom of fathering a child by a surrogate. In the conclusion of the chapter,

attention was called to Ralph Lifton's view of "symbolic immortality" which was found compatible with the concept of generativity and with the teaching of the Old Testament, in which prior to the Gospel of Christ, devout souls found spiritual fulfillment in living on through the community of the people of God.

CHAPTER VIII

THE KING'S PERSONALITY: A PSYCHOLOGICAL PROFILE

History textbooks often include a portrait of Henry VIII. Even those individuals of lesser academic background recognize the likeness at once. The fact that one knows so well the physical appearance of one who lived before the days of modern photography is due to the Renaissance stimulation of art. Henry himself loved artistic pursuits and subsidized foreign painters at his court. In the later part of the King's reign, the German Hans Holbein spent nearly thirty years in England and "has drawn the men of that age with...consummate technical skill."[1]

It is the purpose of this chapter to draw a psychological portrait of Henry VIII. After having viewed the King's life from various standpoints, the writer now proposes to draw up all of the facets of the life into a unity of interpretation, to deal with that complex of characteristics that distinguish a person called personality. How do the pieces fit together to make up the distinctive individual known to history as King Henry VIII of England? The writer will present some

---

[1]T. F. Tout, An Advanced History of Great Britain From the Earliest Times to 1923. (New York and London: Longman's, Green and Co., 1925), p. 415.

considerations from contemporary attitude theory to be assessed from the phenomenological approach with special attention to the place of religion in the King's experience.

I. A Proposed Psychological Model

In a previous section, this study has drawn upon insights from contemporary attitude theory as summarized by Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey. In particular, it noted three of their basic propositions: (1) Attitudes develop in the process of want satisfaction; (2) The group affiliations of the individual help determine the formation of his attitudes; and, (3) The attitudes of the individual are shaped by the information to which he is exposed.[2] In the recent chapter there is concern with a fourth proposition presented by these authors: "The attitudes of the individual reflect his personality."[3]

Few attitudes of any person exist as a single entity. They tend to form clusters with other attitudes, and the total set of the individual's attitudes make up his attitude constellation. Individuals differ in the

---

[2]David Krech, Richard S. Crutchfield, and Egerton L. Ballachey, Individual in Society: A Textbook of Social Psychology. (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1962), pp. 181, 186, 191.

[3]Ibid, p. 144.

complexity of the organization of their attitudes, but there are always some attitudes which are of secondary importance. A man may have a particular attitude toward mandatory seat belt laws, and he may be for or against enactment of a state income tax. Yet that point of view does not influence what he thinks about capital punishment or whether the country should send guns to anti-Communist rebels in Central America. If, however, he is a devout Roman Catholic or a militant Bible-belt Fundamentalist, many of his attitudes will be intertwined with a whole body of other attitudes which influence them and are influenced by them. What he thinks about welfare, about the Supreme Court, about the role of women in modern society, and a long list of other matters may tend to be organized and structured in a way highly interconnected with his attitude toward religious matters. In accord with this fact, Krech makes the observation:

> The individual tends to accept as his own those attitudes which are of a piece with his personality. This is true of such varied attitudes as...religious attitudes, political attitudes and attitudes toward foreign affairs.[4]

This author goes on, however, to point out:

> One should not assume that for every area of human life which we can label with a distinct name there necessarily exists for a given

---

[4]p. 212.

> person a corresponding cluster of homogeneous attitudes. It is more likely that for a given person any one cluster of attitudes will include heterogeneous attitudes, e.g., some religious, some political and some scientific attitudes.[5]
>
> The personality of the individual is not a perfectly integrated system, and the individual may take over attitudes that are inconsistent or contradictory because of the different teachings of his authorities in different areas, because of conflicting group affiliations, and because of conflicting wants.[6]

In other words, individuals differ in the degree of integration of the person's attitudes with his total personality makeup.

One of the best known studies of the relation between attitudes and personality structure is that of Adorno and his associates in their 1950 study known as The Authoritarian Personality.[7]

> Authoritarian attitudes are expressed in behavior variously described as dogmatic, rigid, strongly supportive of traditional values, and highly status-oriented behavior, in other words, that is submissive toward individuals possessing higher status and domineering where lower-status individuals are concerned. Also consistent with authoritarian attitudes are tendencies to endorse the use of power tactics, toughness in dealing with

---

[5] p. 145.

[6] p. 218.

[7] T. W. Adorno, L. Frankel-Brunswick, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality. (New York: Harper, 1950).

> failure and noncooperativeness, arbitrariness in decision making, and willingness to use drastic methods in dealing with deviant behavior. The activities of Nazis and other fascist groups are often cited as prime examples of authoritarianism, but any individual who uses or endorses harsh, punitive or violent methods is motivated by authoritarian attitudes.[8]

Conducted at the University of California at Berkley during the 1950s, the research of Adorno and his group was sponsored by the American Jewish Committee. It was a response to the rise of Hitler in Germany with a basic purpose to deter the development of a similar situation in the United States. Two thousand subjects were used in the study, including university students, public school teachers, prison inmates, patients of psychiatric clinics, veterans groups and Kiwanis Club members.

The investigation began with subjects asked to fill out questionnaires of a multiple choice type. They were to respond to a series of propositions by expressing their degree of agreement or disagreement. Six choices were possible: +1. slight agreement; +2. moderate agreement; +3. strong agreement; -1. slight disagreement; -2. moderate disagreement; and -3. strong disagreement.

---

[8]Henry Clay Lindgren, An Introduction to Social Psychology. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969), p. 76.

The questionnaires were scored by totaling the plus and minus values of each response. In each of the questionnaires statements were phrased to affirm a particular attitude. For example, "The trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they tend to stick together and connive, so that a Gentile doesn't have a fair chance in competition."

There were four types of questions devised for the study. One involved attitudes toward Jews (the Anti-Semitism or A-S Scale). A second involved attitudes toward Negroes, Japanese, religious minorities and culturally deviant groups in general (the Ethnocentrism or E Scale). The third type questionnaire dealt with conservatism viewed as resistance to social change (the Political and Economic Conservatism or PEC Scale). Finally, the Potentiality of Fascism or F Scale dealt with anti-democratic trends in a person which the investigators believed render him/her specially vulnerable to explicit Fascist propaganda. (This scale was also called the Implicit Anti-democratic Trends Scale, both terms being used interchangeably by the researchers.) Items in this section were subgrouped under nine general headings, including traditionalism, submission to authority, aggression and several others which we need not detail at this point. The Adorno researchers found that the four

scales were positively intercorrelated. That is, those persons who scored high on one of the scales tended to score high on all four, and persons who scored low on one scale scored low on all of them. For this reason discussions about authoritarian personality have often focused primarily on the F Scale, which dealt with more generalized attitudes of an individual.

In the second part of Adorno's study, those subjects who scored either very high or very low on the questionnaires were interviewed by clinicians. Where previously the subjects answered questions of fixed alternative type (they had to choose one of six possibilities), they were now confronted with open-ended type questions in which they were free to construct their own answers. Later,they were administered subjective personality tests, in some of which they were asked to make up a story about pictures which were shown them.

It is beyond the purpose of this chapter to detail the mechanics of the Adorno study. The concern is with the conclusions which the investigators reached. "The authors of The Authoritarian Personality discovered a number of personality characteristics that cluster together well enough in some persons to be called the

authoritarian personality type."[9] Among these characteristics are the following: The authoritarian is rigid and inflexible. He is moralistic, extremely conventional, and defends traditional values. He is ethnocentric, identifying uncritically with his own group and having an aggressive, punitive approach toward outsiders. Basically threat oriented, he is defensive and tends to attribute his own fears and hostilities to others. His childhood was likely to have been characterized by harsh parental discipline in which parental love was conditioned upon display of approved behavior. Family structure was hierarchical (of the Victorian "father knows best" type) with undue concern for family status, rather than what the individual might want. In his personal relationships, he tends to select friends because of their status or utility, and is chauvinistic towards the opposite sex. Archie Bunker and George Jefferson, his black neighbor, are popular television stereotypes reflecting the authoritarian personality concept.

As a contemporary personality theory, the authoritarian view is highly controversial. It has received considerable criticism from the standpoint of its

---

[9]Duane M. Belcher, Giving Psychology Away. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1973), p. 213.

methodology. Lindgren suggests that "...the researchers were not as meticulous as they should have been in maintaining the usual scientific controls."[10] The standard summary of criticism is the volume by Christie and Jehoda, and "the definitive critique of method is the paper in that volume by Hyman and Sheatsley."[11]

Among the criticism of Adorno's work is the fact that the subjects surveyed were all members of specialized groups and perhaps not representative of the population in general. Then, the phrasing of the items in the questionnaires was such as to encourage "yea-sayers" who tend consistently to agree with printed items regardless of content. When one later investigator reversed the form of assertion in the F Scale, he found that some test takers agreed with both the original statement and its reverse (or contradictory) form when the test was readministered.[12] Moreover, the researchers in this study were all psychoanalytic in their orientation. Their

---

[10] R. Christie and Marie Jehoda (Eds.), Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality. (New York: The Free Press, 1954).

[11] H. M. Hyman and P. B. Sheatsley, "The Authoritarian Personality--A Methodological Critique." In R. Christie and M. Jehoda (Eds.), pp. 50-122. Cited by Ray Brown, Social Psychology. (New York: Free Press, 1965), p. 509.

[12] B. M. Bass, "Authoritarianism or Acquiescence." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 613-623.

interpretation of the data was basically Freudian, and the acceptability of their theory depends on whether a particular theorist is comfortable with that perspective. Also, it is clear that the authors of The Authoritarian Personality did their work against the background of a particular period in American history when certain ideological points of view were taken for granted. Their research seems biased in the direction of their own personal values.

> The Soviet Union had been our ally in the war against fascism. American intellectuals generally accepted the Marxist interpretation of fascism as a movement of the extreme political right, as a conservatism driven to desperation by the economic problems of capitalism. The Equalitarian opposite to the Authoritarian held the leftist liberal views of a New Dealer in the 1930s. They were views common to humane liberals, to Henry Wallace's Progressive Party, the non-Stalinist Communists, the authors of The Authoritarian Personality, and most American social psychologists. The Equalitarian was ourselves and the Authoritarian the man in our society whom we feared and disliked.[13]

A basic fact here seems to be that The Authoritarian Personality deals with "right wing traditional authoritarianism only" and not with "left wing radical authoritarianism."[14] Thus, politically conservative or reactionary persons were given a "bad

---

[13]Ray Brown, Social Psychology, p. 478.

[14]Lindgren, pp. 78-79.

press," while persons with left wing political views were ignored. A mundane illustration is Archie Bunker and his "meathead" son-in-law Michael Stivik in "All in the Family." Archie typifies the right wing authoritarian, while Mike is just as pronounced a bigot in the opposite direction. In Adorno's research, Archie would show up as the "bad guy," while Mike would not. Both would seem to qualify as authoritarian individuals. It should be observed in this connection that later research has dealt with this issue and has shown that authoritarianism is not a monopoly of the political right, but is to be found on the left and even in the center as well.[15]

From the standpoint of the present study, it is the writer's conclusion that the authoritarian personality research as Adorno and his associates conducted it has theoretical difficulties about which psychologists have differing opinions. One does well to remember, however, that "theories in science are never correct or incorrect...They differ only in terms of their value or usefulness in predicting or controlling certain events."[16] Moreover, "...the lack of agreement...merely means that

---

[15] M. Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind. (New York: Basic Books, 1960).

[16] James O. Whittaker, Introduction to Psychology, 3rd Edition. (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1976), p. 483.

the same events can be construed in many different ways..."[17] The present writer tends to agree with the conclusions of Lindgren:

> In spite of methodological flaws, and in spite of questions raised about the validity of the F Scale, The Authoritarian Personality still remains an impressive work. Its main theses--that authoritarianism is a significant variable in social behavior, that it can be measured with a fair degree of accuracy, and that it is related to a large number of personality variables--have stood the test of much painstaking research.[18]

L. S. Wrightsman points out that one must distinguish between the concept of authoritarianism on one hand and the research carried on by Adorno and the various scales used to measure aspects of authoritarianism on the other.[19] The writer believes that the concept itself is a useful one, and the research regarding it is an imperfect effort to validate the concept.

Authoritarianism was dealt with in the late 1930s in a series of lectures by Eric Fromm, then of the International Institute of Social Research. Fromm's views

---

[17] W. Mischel, Introduction to Personality. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), cited by Whittaker, p. 483.

[18] p. 79.

[19] Social Psychology in the Seventies. (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1972), p. 375.

were published in his 1941 book Escape from Freedom.[20] Reacting to Fromm's presentation, Abraham Maslow wrote a definitive journal article in 1943, setting forth some of the characteristics of the authoritarian individual.[21] These characteristics were similar to those later described in Adorno's work. At a later point the discussion will return to the views of Fromm and Maslow. The point of concern here is that authoritarianism is a concept which predates Adorno's research, and the problems associated with Adorno do not necessarily invalidate the concept.

Wrightsman defines authoritarianism as a basic personality style that includes a set of organized beliefs, values and preferences, including submission to authority, identification with authority, denial of feelings, cynicism, and others.[22]

> A highly authoritarian person can demonstrate such an ideology in a variety of situations--in his preference for political candidates, in his unwillingness to trust another person in a cooperative task, or in the way he brings up his children. One of the possible behavioral manifestations of authoritarianism is an excessive degree of obedience to an authority

---

[20] New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

[21] "The Authoritarian Character Structure." Journal of Social Psychology, 18 (1943), 401-411.

[22] p. 602.

> figure, or obedience that is followed even when it requires harming another person.[23]

According to the California group, there were nine components of authoritarianism: conventionalism, authoritarian aggression, authoritarian submission, power and toughness, anti-intraception, superstition and stereotype destructiveness and cynicism, projectivity and over concern with sex.[24] The meaning of some of the more technical terms in this listing will become clearer as the discussion proceeds. For the sake of parsimony, the writer has reduced this rather lengthy enumeration to six basic propositions which outline his own approach to the authoritarian personality. This summary is indebted to the insights of Maslow and Fromm, as well as Adorno.

First, the authoritarian individual is power oriented in his relations with other persons, acting with exaggerated submission to those perceived as superior (or more powerful) and acting with domination toward those perceived as inferior (or weak).

Second, the authoritarian individual is threat oriented, identifying uncritically with his own reference group, and viewing with suspicion all outsiders. He/she is basically insecure and distrusts people generally.

---

[23] Ibid, p. 373.

[24] Ibid, p. 375.

Third, the authoritarian individual has a cognitive style characterized by an intolerance of ambiguity; i.e., he tends to think in simplistic, black and white, either/or categories. This is what the California group called stereotypy.

In the fourth place, the authoritarian individual rejects responsibility for the consequences of his behavior, attributing personal weakness and failure to circumstances and the actions of other people or forces. He assumes what some have called an external locus of control.

Fifth, the authoritarian individual is moralistic, especially in matters of sex, assuming the worst about other people's morals and acting with punitiveness toward violators of his standards of "decency." He may be chauvinistic toward women whom he classifies as either madonnas or prostitutes. The former are good but non-sexual, and the latter sexual but bad. Conversely, he exhibits the tendency to exalt masculinity which he defines in terms of power, harshness and cruelty. Anti-intraception is the term applied to this latter tendency, which involves the rejection of feelings and tender-minded phenomena.

Finally, the authoritarian individual is ultra-conservative or tradition oriented, a characteristic which

follows as an expression of several of the other characteristics which were listed. A power orientation and a threat orientation gear one to preserve the status quo. Hindsight is safer than foresight, especially when one is not in control of his own life. If there are only two kinds of persons in the world, the strong and the weak, then he who is strong must at all costs maintain his position. Morality is a defense of the old-fashioned ways which it is in his interest to preserve. Since traditionally woman has been regarded as the weaker sex, he must reject this role for himself by an exaggerated masculinity and exploitation of the opposite sex.

II. Authoritarian Episodes in the Life of the King

The question now comes concerning the relationship of all this to Henry VIII. It would seem that Henry fits the description of the kind of person portrayed in the authoritarian personality studies. This section will present some examples of this from the life of the King. The presentation at this point is basically descriptive, although at a later point consideration will be given to the dynamics of authoritarian behavior in relation to a phenomenological approach.

The reader will recall in Henry's treatise against Martin Luther his subservient posture toward the Pope in

his expressed willingness to kiss the blessed papal feet. He rejected the advice of Thomas More cautioning moderation, saying, "We can not do too much to honor [the See of Rome]."[25] Of course such authoritarian submission did not last long! As Henry's power orientation grew, he came to recognize no superior, and at length his authoritarian aggression made those closest to him learn all too well that "the wrath of the King means death."

> He was a formidable, captivating man who wore royalty with a splendid conviction. But easily and unpredictably his great charm could turn into anger and shouting. When (as was alleged) he hit Thomas Cromwell round the head and swore at him, or addressed a lord chancellor (Wriothesly) as my pig, his mood may have been amiable enough, but More knew that the Master who put his arm lovingly round his neck would have his head if it "could win him a castle in France." He was highly strung and unstable...and possessed of a strong streak of cruelty.[26]

More's prophecy was strikingly fulfilled. When More refused to sign the petition acknowledging Henry's supremacy over the English church in place of the Pope, his head was impaled on London Bridge as a warning to all who thought of defying the King's will.

One ghoulish expression of the King's cruelty was to order a dreadful punishment, let the unhappy victim

---

[25] H. M. Smith, Henry VIII and the Reformation. (N. Y.: Russel and Russel, Inc., 1962), p. 68.

[26] J. J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, pp. 34-35.

suffer the pangs of anticipation and then at the last minute set him free. On one occasion a servant was to be hanged for stealing a purse. As the noose was placed around the boy's neck and the hangman was just about to take the ladder from the gallows, the King sent his pardon freeing the prisoner. Another time a courtier was sentenced to have his hand amputated for striking another man. The chopping block was brought; the hand was bound to it, and the executioner was sharpening his hatchet. Meanwhile, irons were placed in a fire to sear the wound after mutilation, and the surgeon prepared a roll of gauze to stop the blood. When all of this was ready, Henry suddenly ordered the amputation postponed until after dinner. Several hours passed with the unhappy prisoner waiting for the worst, when the King suddenly pardoned him.[27]

Although authoritarian trends were not absent in the earlier years, they grew more pronounced as the King became older. Two developments illustrate such trends, the dissolution of the monasteries and his dealing with the only armed uprising of his reign known as the Pilgrimage of Grace.

---

[27]Carroly Erikson, Bloody Mary. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1978), p. 162.

Following the break with Rome, Henry entered upon what historians speak of as the period of Royal Supremacy when he faced the problem of enforcing his authority. He created a new ministerial post called the King's vicar-general in general matters ecclesiastical to which he appointed one of Thomas Wolsey's former aides, Thomas Cromwell.

> Cromwell as a strong, able and far-seeing man, who had neither doubts nor scruples, but devoted all his cunning and resource to carrying out the caprices of the despot. He was just the clever tool who could strike the bold strokes that Henry was now meditating. Between 1535 and 1539 he carried out such a revolutionary change that the abolition of the papal power seemed but a small matter beside it.[28]

One of Cromwell's targets was the monasteries which in an earlier time had served a useful humanitarian function but had now fallen into popular disfavor. For some time the monasteries had been the subject of much criticism. There was an attitude of indifference, if not criticism. There was an attitude of indifference, if not contempt, for the monks and very few young people were moved to enter monastic life. There was always the rumor of immorality, while many looked with suspicion on the wealth tied up in the property of the monastic lands. As

---

[28] T. F. Tout, An Advanced History of Great Britain, p. 342.

far back as John Wycliffe in the fourteenth century there had been the suggestion that such properties ought to be sold and the money given to help the poor or to establish educational institutions. Under Thomas Wolsey there had actually been the dissolution of a few small monasteries with the revenue gained being used to establish what was later called Christ College at Oxford, Wolsey's alma mater. The mechanics of the dissolution, it is interesting to note, were handled by Cromwell.

When Henry broke with Rome, the monasteries presented a double challenge which Cromwell was quick to exploit. On the one hand, the monasteries were centers of papal loyalty answerable directly to Rome, not to local authorities. Moreover, the country was in poor shape financially, and the monastic lands were tempting sources of revenue. In 1535 Cromwell sent out inspectors to look into the condition of the monasteries, and from time to time they sent back reports known as comperta. The reports were filled with accounts of the "enormities" of immorality going on in the religious houses. It is reported that when the comperta were read publicly in Parliament, the accounts of alleged sexual immorality were interrupted with shouts of "Down with them!"[29] A part of

---

[29]G. H. Cook, Letters to Cromwell and Others on the Suppression of the Monasteries. (Pall Mall, London,

Cromwell's policy was to promote popular ill will toward the monasteries by sending out preachers among the people who denounced the monks by spreading gossip against them. It is now generally recognized that "the monasteries were in much better shape in terms of morality and learning than Tudor propaganda and the report of Cromwell's inspectors suggest."[30] The reports of the visitors and the charges of vice and iniquity were "far from the truth and in many cases greatly exaggerated."[31]

In February, 1536, Parliament passed the first Act of Dissolution which mandated the closing of the lesser religious houses, those abbeys, priories and nunneries whose revenue did not exceed two hundred pounds a year. The reason for the closing was stated in the preamble to the Act: The smaller houses were "abodes of vicious living."[32] At the same time there was established the

---

S.W.I.: John Baker Publishers, Ltd., 1965), p. 6, quoting Bishop Latimer preaching before Edward VI in 1549.

[30]Lewis Spitz, The Protestant Reformation. (New York: Harper & Row, 1985), p. 260.

[31]G. H. Cook, Letters to Cromwell, p. 6. Among the several historical interpretations of the secularization of the monasteries is the work referred to by Spitz as the "definitive study". Dean David Knowles, The Religious Orders in England, 3 vols. (Cambridge: 1948-49).

[32]Cook, p. 6, citing the Act of Dissolution: "...manifest sin, vicious, carnal and abominable living is daily used and committed among the little and small abbeys."

Court of Augmentations transferring the wealth of the houses to the royal coffers.

> The Court of Augmentation provided for the award of pensions to the heads of the suppressed convents, and the other brethren were to be granted capacities or be transferred to one of the greater monasteries of their order.[33]

There were several of the religious houses which escaped closing at this time by the purchase of a license to continue. The Act of Dissolution provided that the King at his discretion could spare those houses which he deemed worthy of survival. Many of those that were granted temporary exemption were nunneries.

The closing of the smaller monasteries was preliminary to what was to be the fate of all of them. Some months after the first Act of Dissolution, Cromwell issued orders for the visitation of the larger houses. Although there was no legal basis for suppressing these, many of the abbots were bullied into the voluntary surrender of their properties. When further pressure failed to convince enough of them, resisters were charged with treason and their lands confiscated. In 1539 Parliament passed the second Act of Dissolution which suppressed all English religious houses, including those

---

[33]A capacity was a license to serve as secular priest and become the parson of a parish church.

that had survived the first Act. The abbots of Glastonbury, Reading and Colchester were executed by hanging, and by March 23, 1540, the last monastery, Waltham Abbey in Essex, had gone down. The abolition of English monasticism was now complete. Neither Cromwell nor Henry were satisfied, however.

> The King's despotism and ruthlessness of Cromwell...reached a grotesque high point in the trial against Thomas a Becket, an English prelate who had opposed his monarch, dead nearly four hundred years. His body was taken from its grave, his name removed from the calendar, and the treasures adorning his tomb were taken to London, all on the order of the King. Other shrines were despoiled...and the wealth of the shrines coveted.[34]

Henry's action in looting the larger monasteries was no doubt in part motivated by economic considerations. Invasion was a genuine threat since he had finally been excommunicated by Clement VII, and the Holy Roman Emperor and the French King were maneuvering to bring back the schismatic English ruler into the Catholic fold. The situation increased the desperation of the government for money which had already been bad enough without the necessity of a military build-up.

Henry's secularization of the monastic lands had various effects on the country. Needless to say, there were those who applauded it, especially the businessmen of

---

[34]Spitz, p. 261.

the time who stood with ready cash anxious to buy up the confiscated real estate at bargain prices.

> The new owners understandably became the strongest supporters of the new order...Not only nobility but also the gentry benefited by the dissolution, contributing to the rise of that class and to its involvement in national government. On a lower level the enriched squires dominated local government more than ever.[35]

With the disappearance of monasticism in the country, the House of Lords for the first time contained no abbots in its makeup.[36]

While some thus approved of what was happening, opposition was also brewing. It came to a head while Cromwell was gathering the spoils of the first Act of Dissolution. It broke out in October 1536 in Lincolnshire, in the northern part of the land where the peasantry were heavily dependent on the monastic farms for their living. Under the leadership of the abbot of Barlings, they rose up in open rebellion, which proved to be of but short duration. It was over in less than three weeks. Immediately, however, there followed the more serious uprising known as the Pilgrimage of Grace, originating in Yorkshire under the leadership of Robert

---

[35]Spitz, p. 261.

[36]Robert Ergang, Europe from the Renaissance to Waterloo. (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1954), p. 230.

Aske, a land owner and London lawyer, along with Lord Darcy. Aske was able to muster a force of 40,000 men, which included many of the nobility and gentry of the area. Not only were they able to take over several settlements in the northern part of the country, but they expelled the new tenants from three religious houses and reinstated the monks who had been driven out. Lacey Baldwin Smith suggests that the immediate cause of this uprising was the publication of Henry's Ten Articles, also known as the Bishops' Book, in which the King set forth official standards for religious belief. In place of the seven traditional sacraments, the document mentioned only three and seemed to lean toward the Protestant view which questioned the value of prayers for souls in purgatory.[37] Accordingly, the rebels in the Pilgrimage of Grace demanded that the dissolution of the monasteries must stop, Cromwell must be dismissed from his post, and the Pope must be restored to his former position of supremacy in England.

The situation was of crisis proportions, demanding firm and immediate action from the government. Henry reacted by sending a strong force headed by the Duke of Norfolk to meet the mob head-on. Sending instructions in

---

[37] This Realm of England. (Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath & Co., 1976), 127.

a letter to the Earl of Derby on October 28, 1536, the King wrote that if he found the monks of Sawley had returned to their abbey after having been dispossessed,

> You shall then without further delay cause the said abbot and certain chief of the monks to be hanged upon the long pieces of timber, or otherwise, out of the steeple; and the rest to be put to execution in such sundry places as you shall think meet for the example of others.[38]

Neither Norfolk nor Aske wanted to enter into armed conflict unless absolutely necessary. After a meeting of the two leaders privately, it was agreed that a list of the rebels' grievances should be submitted to the King, and peace would be maintained until the King's answer was given. Norfolk persuaded the rioters to go home, promising that their demands would be given consideration and they themselves would be given amnesty. This broke the back of the rebellion. Aske was given safe conduct to court where Henry granted him a personal interview and renewed the promises given in his name by Norfolk. Whether Henry intended to keep those promises is open to doubt; for although Aske was convinced of the King's sincerity, he was not able to convince the people when he returned to Yorkshire. In January of the following year,

---

[38] M. St. Clare Byrne, The Letters of King Henry VIII. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1936, reprinted 1968), p. 149.

violence broke out again which Aske was able to bring under control, but not before Henry had a good excuse not to honor his word. The rebels had not kept theirs! So the royal pardon must be withdrawn and the leaders of the rebellion punished. Darby and Aske were arrested and detained in the Tower of London. Darcy was beheaded since he was of noble lineage, but Aske was hanged as a commoner along with several abbots, friars and gentry who had participated in the uprising.

Of special interest to us in connection with our consideration of authoritarianism is the written response of Henry VIII prepared to be read to the rioters in response to their petition of grievances. One long document survives, the exact date of which is uncertain. It may be the response addressed to the uprising in Lincolnshire, or it may be the one intended for Yorkshire. Perhaps the same text was used for both situations. At any rate, we have only one letter. G. R. Elton describes it as a "vigorous denunciation of the impudence of the commons in rising up against their anointed head and a total refusal to listen to any of their complaints."[39]

---

[39] Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell. (Cambridge: University Press, 1972), p. 200.

For example, in answering the complaints about the closing of the monasteries, Henry wrote:

> For there be no houses suppressed where God was well served, but where most vice, mischief and abomination of living was used; and that doth well appear by their own confessions, subscribed with their own hands, in the time of our visitation...And as for their hospitality, for the relief of poor people, we wonder ye be not ashamed to affirm that they have been a great relief to our people, when a great many, on the most part, hath not past four or five religious persons in them, and divers but one, which spent the substance of the goods of their houses in nourishing of vice and abominable living. Now, what unkindness and unnaturality may we impute to you, all our subjects that be of that mind, that we liefer such an unthrifty sort of vicious persons should enjoy such possessions, profits and emoluments, as grow of the said houses, to the maintenance of their unthrifty life, than we your natural Prince, sovereign Lord and King, which doth and hath spent more in your defenses of his own, than six times they be worth it.[40]

The old-fashioned English perhaps in some degree blunts the full force of Henry's response. Yet the underlying tone comes through clear enough. The power orientation of the authoritarian personality involves a relationship between persons regarded as of unequal value. Only two relations are possible: authoritarian submission to one perceived as greater or more powerful and authoritarian domination of one perceived as lesser or weaker.

---

[40] M. Byrne, The Letters of King Henry VIII, p. 141, quoting Letters and Papers.

Closely related to the power orientation of the authoritarian individual is a threat orientation.[41] Since he can never be sure of his position, he must view all people with suspicion, supposing them to be slighting him or working against him.

> To bolster up his feeble self esteem, he will assume that he and his in-group are superior, while others whom he classifies as belonging to the out-group are inferior...He prefers to believe the worst about them, to treat them all alike without awareness of individual differences, and to condemn and oppose them regardless of the truth or logic of the situation.[42]

The term ethnocentrism is often applied to this posture. Unfortunately, it is all too often used in the behavioral literature to refer to race prejudice primarily. While it includes that, it is a much broader concept which covers a basic orientation of hostility and defensiveness against an entire group or against its individual members. Maslow has pointed out that the object of hostility is an accidental or fortuitous choice.

> For instance, anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism or anti-negroism are none of them theoretically necessary attributes of authoritarianism. What <u>is</u> necessary is hatred and hostility against <u>some</u> group or other,

---

[41] Paul E. Johnson, <u>Personality and Religion</u>. (N. Y.: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 189. The term "threat oriented" is attributed to T. M. Newcomb, <u>Social Psychology</u>. (N. Y.: Dryden Press, 1950), p. 588.

[42] Paul E. Johnson, p. 189.

> whichever happens to be most convenient. Theoretically, it might just as easily be people with long ears, or blue-eyed people, or poets, or butchers, or bald men. Only hatred for a scapegoat is constant here, not the choice of the scapegoat.[43]

In 1539 Parliament passed the Act for the Abolishing of Diversity of Opinion, also known as the Act of Six Articles. It affirmed transubstantiation (the change of the bread and wine in the Eucharist into the literal body and blood of Christ), the celibacy of the clergy, the need of private confession to a priest, the sufficiency for the laity of receiving the bread without the wine in Holy Communion, the validity of private masses and the permanence of vows of chastity. Among Protestants, the legislation became known as "whip with six strings," since it meant the reaffirmation of the medieval church and active persecution of dissenters with whom the jails now became full.

This legislation was the product of Henry's concern for uniformity among his subjects on doctrinal matters. In May of 1539 the Lord Chancellor informed both Houses of Parliament that His Majesty desired above all things "that diversity of opinion should be banished from his dominion."[44] A committee was formed which debated for ten

---

[43]"The Authoritarian Character Structure," p. 406.

[44]L. B. Smith, Mask of Royalty. (Boston:

days, during which time Henry gave considerable input, and the group agreed on a course of action "to end the shrill scolding of so many tongues and reestablish sobriety of mind and action in the King's subjects." There was one lone dissenter, Bishop Saxton of Salisbury, "that lewd fool who was kept from the House on the day of the final vote on the excuse that his household was infested with the plague." According to the Act that was passed, death at the stake without choice of recantation was the penalty for denying transubstantiation whether by word of mouth or in writing. Imprisonment and confiscation of property was the penalty for those who violated the other provisions of the law, with burning the penalty for those convicted of a second offense. On November 22nd of the year of passage, John Lambert, an outspoken and dogmatic Lutheran, met death by a slow fire, the first of several royal warnings that "living in a commonwealth, men must conform themselves to the more part in authority."[45] An interesting result of Henry's enforcement was the fact that now both Catholics and Protestants faced persecution, Catholics for denying the Royal Supremacy (Henry's headship of the Church of England in place of the Pope)

Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1971), p. 152. The writer is indebted to Smith for the material of this section. All quotations are from the work and page cited.

[45]Ibid.

and Protestants for denying the doctrine of the real Presence in the Mass.

From what has been thus far described, one can see that authoritarianism is not only a life orientation but a distinctive way of thinking, a characteristic cognitive style.

> [The authoritarian individual] has learned to dechotomize in sharp contrasts as, "there are only two kinds of people, the weak and the strong," with no intermediate degrees between such extremes. He has a strong need for definiteness and does not tolerate ambiguity, but he insists that everything must be categorized either/or and all or none.[46]

> People who are intolerant of ambiguity are relatively "closed" to new information which would increase the multiplexity of a cognitive system. Their cognitive palette contains only blacks and whites. Simplified, good/evil solutions to complex social, political and economic issues--"devil theories" will be sought by those who cannot tolerate ambiguity.[47]

In short, the authoritarian individual tends to be closed minded, to seek simple rather than complex solutions to difficulties and to avoid novel and strange problems. Such seems to have been Henry's approach to the English Reformation.

> The break with Rome involved few doctrinal or ceremonial changes. Except for omitting the name of the Pope in their prayers, Englishmen

---

[46]Paul Johnson, Personality and Religion, p. 190.

[47]Krech et al., Individual in Society, p. 46.

> continued to pray and kneel for worship and to think in old familiar ways. In fact, it is quite possible that in the more distant shires humble folk were unaware that any Reformation had taken place at all.[48]

In this context the writer goes on to point out that Henry's policy was simply a matter of "Catholicism without the Pope," a situation in which he was like "one that would throw down a man headlong from the top of a high tower and bid him stop when he was half way down."[49]

> In maintaining Catholicism without the Pope and in demanding that the man cast down from the high tower stop halfway, Henry was confronted with a serious dilemma: Was not the Pope's doctrine the Pope? Was not all that had been sanctioned and exploited by the papacy corrupted and desecrated by that association? If the Pope had been proved false and satanic, how could Englishmen be sure that such an anti-Christ had not also been leading men into damnation by preaching a false doctrine about such matters as purgatory, the sacrificial mass, and the veneration of saints and images? "The Pope's doctrine is the Pope," said William Turner to Bishop Gardiner, "and ye hold still the Pope's doctrine, ergo ye hold still the Pope." Henry VIII had no intention of accepting the doubtful logic of such a syllogism or of permitting inquiry as to whether the "state of our religion after 1500 years be established in mere idolatry."[50]

---

[48] L. B. Smith, This Realm of England, p. 118.

[49] Ibid.

[50] L. B. Smith, This Realm of England, p. 126.

M. Rokeach has discussed this phase of the authoritarian disposition in his work on dogmatism.[51]

> The highly dogmatic individual has a set of tightly organized beliefs usually drawn from authority. A feature of dogmatism is rigidity in the psychological field which takes the form of resistance to the acceptance of information which is contradictory to the individual's system of beliefs...[Such a] narrow, unsophisticated perspective leads an individual to experience threat to his closed system when he encounters...outsiders...[One] may be dogmatic irrespective of a particular ideology. He can be dogmatic about many things.[52]

While authoritarianism was originally studied in terms of those inclined toward the political right, Rokeach has shown that the dogmatic individual can lean toward either a leftist or a rightist viewpoint in an extreme way. Rokeach has developed a forty-item dogmatism scale which has been found to have a significant positive relationship with the F Scale and other measures of a similar kind.[53] It should be pointed out in the interest of accuracy that Rokeach distinguished authoritarianism from dogmatism. The former term he reserved for prejudice inclined to the

---

[51]"The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism." Psychological Review, 61 (1954), 194-205. See also The Open and Closed Mind. (N. Y.: Basic Books, 1960).

[52]Edwin P. Hollander, Principles and Methods of Social Psychology. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 294-295, citing Rokeach.

[53]Ibid, p. 295.

right, while the latter he used to indicate a tendency which could be expressed either toward a rightist or leftist viewpoint. This distinction it would seem is a technicality which has little practical significance for this presentation.

Describing another authoritarian characteristic of Henry VIII, Lacey Baldwin Smith has spoken of "the King's least attractive quality, his refusal to accept responsibility for his behavior."[54]

> [This type individual] develops in a family setting where a relationship of power rather than love prevails. Obedience is demanded; otherwise he is threatened with punishment and rejection. He tends to operate from a rigid moralistic code in which he is quick to condemn minor faults, intolerant of his mistakes and unable to live with his own impulses...In the repression of tendencies he must deny in himself, he is likely to project upon others what he does not approve, and to externalize the problems of life as things that happen to me rather than for which I am responsible.[55]

One observes this tendency often in the life of Henry VIII as frequently he found cause to shift the blame for what happened on to others. The fault was never his but always that of a trusted servant who had told him "all

---

[54] The Mask of Royalty, p. 88.

[55] Paul Johnson, Personality and Religion, p. 129. William James discussed this tendency in the so-called "healthy minded" individual. See Chapter VII, p. 226.

these things contrary."[56] The Wolsey years were dismissed in terms that "those who had the reigns of government in their hands deceived me; many things were done without my knowledge." Such a statement was false, Smith points out, since Henry had to know and approve the things his Cardinal did.[57] Later on, when he began to regret the execution of Cromwell, Henry sidestepped responsibility for the action by placing it upon the shoulders of his council who "upon light pretext, by false accusations, had made him put to death the most faithful servant he ever had."[58] In the matter of his several marital ventures, these too were none of the King's doing but were expressions of "ill luck in meeting with such ill-conditioned women."[59] Anne Boleyn tricked him into marriage through witchcraft, and "with tears running down his face, he accused his council of having urged him into marriage with Catherine Howard." All such efforts to "pass the buck," Smith suggests, were fortified by Henry's religion.

> Surely the cause of such matrimonial misalliance must be in evil counsel; it could

---

[56] Mask of Royalty, p. 88.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid, p. 89.

[59] Ibid.

> not reside in God's vicar on earth...Certainly the need to blame others...and the necessity of transferring responsibility to God are unmistakable. What kind of inner anguish the divine right King who could do no wrong may have suffered no one can say. The miracle is that he was capable of making decisions at all, if every royal decision had by definition to be right.[60]

According to the psychoanalytic interpretation, such behavior can be explained in general terms by the defense mechanism of projection--the individual attributes to others characteristics that are in reality his own but which he cannot face.[61] Such action is true of most persons at times. It is a way of coping with the minor frustrations of life. The student who fails a test blames the teacher who "never liked him anyway." Or else the test was just plain stupid! The frustrated golfer blames his club which he examines for the fatal flaw or perhaps breaks in half over his knee. In the Adorno research, projection is related to parental expectations: acceptance depends on performance, and failure means rejection. It is but a step from parental regard to divine approval. Since disapproval is anxiety provoking, the fault must be transferred on to someone or something else. Not inconceivably, God Himself may be the object of

---

[60] Ibid.

[61] Krech, et al., Individual in Society, p. 123.

blame. The traditional story of the failure of our first parents is an oft cited illustration. The woman blamed the serpent who tricked her, and the man defended himself saying, "The woman whom you gave to be with me gave me the fruit and I ate of it." (Genesis 3:12) In the case of Henry VIII there was not only the expectation of God but the expectation of society. Failure of one who ruled by the grace of God meant loss of status among devoutly religious subjects.

While the psychoanalytic interpretation is suggestive and has merit from at least a descriptive standpoint, some psychologists have proposed another approach. There are, it has been suggested, two basically different ways of understanding the world. Some people tend to attribute events to their own action, while others are inclined to see what happens as beyond their control. "Psychologists generally refer to this trait dimension as internal-external control or locus of control following Julian Rotter."[62] Internally oriented individuals seem to feel that what they do can and does make a difference, while externally oriented individuals have concluded, "You can't beat the system!" Whereas the psychoanalytic

---

[62] Social Psychology: Explorations in Understanding, Kenneth Gergen, Chief Academic Advisor. (Del Mar, California: CRN Books, 1976), p. 122.

approach tends to explain behavior after the fact, the locus of control concept has been found useful for the prediction of behavior. For example, in a study by James Coleman and his associates, it was found that internal orientation tends to be associated with success in school.

> Evidently internally oriented students seem to feel that they can get by trying, and they devote themselves energetically to improving conditions. Externally oriented students, on the other hand, seem to think that their efforts make little difference and therefore do not seem to try hard.[63]

A significant application of the locus of control concept has been in relation to social problems, especially those having to do with ethnic and social group memberships. Greater externality seems more prevalent among blacks than whites in the United States. Also, socially lower-class persons tend to be more externally oriented than middle-class persons.

> A black person from the ghetto will no doubt find it more difficult to get ahead on his own than will a black resident of a middle-class suburb, regardless of what either one does.[64]

In relation to Henry VIII, one would have to conclude that Henry was an externally oriented individual. He had characteristics that most persons at times manifest

---

[63]Ibid, p. 124.

[64]Ibid, p. 125.

in varying degrees.[65] Not many would feel that they are altogether victimized and can do nothing to influence their situation. Yet they realistically admit that there are limitations placed upon them and they cannot always attain exactly what they strive for. The behavior of the authoritarian individual, however, is a characteristic orientation which views the world in its black and white categories of victim and victor. Henry's behavior suggests a kind of cognitive dissonance about the events of his life in general.[66] He was the great King who had power and could do anything! How was it then that things turned out so negatively? It must be that somebody else must be at fault, that circumstances were lined up against him. Such a rationalization is not just a temporary coping technique on the part of an authoritarian individual. It is a basic way of thinking about oneself and the world. In the Adorno study the researchers related externality to superstition, in which the individual seeks to shift responsibility for his life not

---

[65]"I think rather than genuine externality, authoritarians have what is referred to lately as 'defensive' or 'incongruent' externality. They take credit for their successes and feel internal about many (most?) things, but blame failures on external events." Dr. Larry Morris, Middle Tennessee State University Department of Psychology, in a personal communication, January, 1987.

[66]See Chapter VI, p. 206.

only to other persons or circumstances but on to supernatural forces beyond his control. The popularity of the occult is an expression of this tendency. The consulting of horoscopes for example, as in the practice of witchcraft (which goes on even in this enlightened twentieth century!). It is significant that Henry had astrologers in residence at his court, and when the English bishops in 1537 published the Bishops' Book, Henry cut out a section condemning astrology.[67]

In the following dramatic excerpt Carroly Erikson captured something of the superstitious flavor of the personality of Henry VIII.

> Before the high altar at Peterborough the monks were reporting a miracle. The candles near the grave of Catherine of Aragon were lighting and extinguishing themselves of their own accord. The King was notified, and thirty men from his court arrived to witness the remarkable event. When they reported the sign to Henry, he chose to interpret it as an occult confirmation, from the one she had wronged most grievously, of the justice of Anne's execution. In some macabre way, the King believed he was receiving permission from his first wife to carry out the ultimate punishment of his second.[68]

There is one final personality characteristic about which the writer must say a word before leaving this

---

[67] Scarisbrick, p. 406.

[68] Bloody Mary. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1978), p. 156.

section. One need not dwell long upon the self-righteous moralism of Henry VIII and his chauvinistic attitude towards the opposite sex. Indeed, this is an area to which an entire dissertation could well be devoted. It is the heart of the popular stereotype to speak of the English "Blue-beard" who went through six wives in the same way a man goes through clean socks in a week! There was in the suppression of the monasteries the prominence of the argument that it was justified because of "the manifest sin, vicious, carnal and abominable living," a charge it was noticed which was in many cases untrue and in any case was greatly exaggerated. In his earlier years Henry had preached to his sister concerning the inevitable damnation awaiting all adulterers and adulteresses,[69] while in his later years after beheading two of his wives for unfaithfulness, he led Parliament to pass legislation making it an act of treason for any woman not a virgin to marry the King, a provision which the French ambassador noted would disqualify most of the ladies of the court![70] In his personal life, however, Henry had reserved the prerogative of a double standard which permitted his own liaison with a number of mistresses, one of which bore him

---

[69]Byrne, The Letters of King Henry VIII, p. 65.

[70]Smith, This Realm of England, p. 132.

an illegitimate son whom he openly and proudly acknowledged.

A special insight into the King's beliefs about women is provided in the views of Juan Vives, a Spanish humanist whom Henry brought to England as the special tutor of the Princess Mary. Vives wrote several pedagogical works, one of which he dedicated to Catherine of Aragon. His views were based on the works of the fifth century Latin Father Jerome, who started with the assumption that women were inferior to men. While Adam was made directly by God, woman was made indirectly from Adam's side. Eve was thus made not in God's image but Adam's. Moreover, it was Eve who tempted Adam to sin and was therefore responsible for the fall of the human race. It was debated whether in the resurrection women would rise as women or whether they would be raised in perfect form as men. The Biblical basis for such teaching seemed evident, especially in the Pauline teaching about the man being the head of the wife as Christ was the head of the man.[71] (I Corinthians 11:3 and following)

Mary Louise Bruce finds one source of Henry's chauvinism in the influence of his early tudor John Skelton, who in taking holy orders had taken a vow of

---

[71] C. Erikson, Bloody Mary, p. 44.

celibacy. Skelton "was always ready to see the blemish in the forbidden fruit," and his poems which were sung at court were filled with themes of fornication and adultery.[72] He seemed to delight in showing up respectable women as immoral ones. On one occasion an indignant female sent him a dead man's head, and Bruce suggests that young Henry may have been present when the package was opened. "King Henry VIII's treatment of his wives," concludes this author, "clearly owes much to Skelton's influence on him as a child."[73] Henry was exposed to Skelton's influence from the age of seven to eleven years old. Skelton was finally dismissed from his post when it was decided that his behavior was not a wholesome example for a future king.

III. The Dynamics of Authoritarianism

Such then is the picture of Henry VIII viewed under the spotlight of authoritarian personality theory. It is now in order to critically analyze the picture which does not present Henry in his most photogenic aspects. The discussion to this point has been primarily descriptive. It is now in order to deal with

---

[72] The Making of Henry VIII. (N. Y.: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1977), p. 95.

[73] Ibid, p. 138.

the dynamics of authoritarian behavior. The Adorno researchers were from a psychoanalytic background. It was observed that they explained authoritarianism as the result of the child's experience in a family where a power orientation prevailed rather than a love orientation. Obedience was demanded, and the child was threatened with punishment and rejection. While consciously idealizing his parents, he unconsciously resented them and came to displace his hostile feelings on to others, especially weaker individuals and groups who in some way posed a threat. In the present study the writer believes that one need not commit himself to a psychoanalytic orientation in order to find the authoritarian model useful. He has often leaned in his interpretations toward the phenomenological approach, and he believes that orientation is applicable in this connection.

In his definitive paper on authoritarian character structure, Abraham Maslow spoke of authoritarianism as a world view or Weltanschauung.[74] That is, it is a particular way of life. Very often authoritarian prone persons have been considered eccentric or "crazy." Not so, says Maslow.

---

[74]"The Authoritarian Character Structure," Journal of Social Psychology, 18 (1943), 401-411.

> Such people have a logic of their own which integrates all of life for them in such a way as to make their actions not only understandable but from their own point of view quite justifiable.[75]

Maslow then goes on to explain the special way in which the authoritarian perceives the world. The world is a jungle. Every man is necessarily set against every other man. The whole world is dangerous, threatening, challenging. This means that people are primarily selfish, evil or stupid. Now, in a literal jungle, animals either eat or are eaten. So to be safe one must be strong enough to dominate, and if one is not strong, he must find a strong protector who can be relied upon. The authoritarian never loves or respects other human beings any more than animals in the jungle can be said to love or respect each other.

> In the last analysis the alternatives are either fear or be feared. Once granted this view, everything that the authoritarian does is logical and sensible...If the world is actually jungle-like for an individual, and if human beings have behaved to him as wild animals behave, then the authoritarian is perfectly justified in all his suspicions, hostilities and anxieties.[76]

Citing the work of N. B. Jones, E. P. Hollander explains.

---

[75]Ibid, p. 402.

[76]Ibid, p. 403.

> Some basis exists...for considering authoritarianism to be essentially perceptual, as Maslow (1943) pointed out when he characterized it as a Weltanschauung, or "world view." However, there is still little evidence of any direct experimental verification of a relationship between authoritarian attitudes and social behavior. It would seem that authoritarianism is therefore not a trait, in the same way as "ascendence," but is more of a disposition toward the world. And this of course is the point of greatest interest here, namely that personality may be described as the individual's construction of the world which may vary as a result of different situational circumstances. This accounts for the fact that, in Fromm's (1941) original conception of authoritarianism, he described the authoritarian person as being both dominant and submissive--dominant to those whom he perceives as weaker, and submissive to those whom he perceives to be more powerful than himself. Thus, the influence of the situation, as the individual construes it, remains an important determiner of interaction patterns.[77]

Now if one grants this premise that authoritarianism is largely a matter of perception, the question remains as to how and why the individual develops such perceptions. Maslow explains that:

> The character structure has...to be understood as a final crystallization of many forces. Of all these forces, it is conceded that the most important is probably all the situations or fields through which the organism has passed in its life history. That is the character

---

[77] Principles and Methods of Social Psychology, p. 294, citing M. B. Jones, "Authoritarianism and Intolerance of Fluctuation." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 50, (1955), 125-126.

> structure may be considered to be largely (though not altogether) the reflection in the individual of all the environmental forces that have ever impinged upon him.[78]

Such a statement is of course very general; but it has the merit of including the total life experience of the individual and does not confine itself to early childhood. In the psychoanalytic interpretation, the child reacts to the expectations of parents and so comes to view himself in a special way. So the authoritarian individual perceives not only the world but likewise comes to see himself in a distinctive manner. Duane Belcher has suggested that authoritarian behavior may be related to how the person reacts to the expectations of society as he sees himself in relation to such expectations.

> In growing up every person adopts a series of social roles which in part comprise his distinct identity. These roles depend on the various levels of status he occupies in the social structure, such as his occupation, age, parenthood and leadership.[79]

This author explains that it is the essence of social roles to prescribe how the individual is supposed to behave toward others in particular relationships. So persons in behaving like authoritarian personalities may do so for many different reasons. They are conforming,

---

[78]"The Authoritarian Character Structure," p. 402.

[79]Giving Psychology Away. (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1972), p. 214.

acting out roles expected of them in a particular social situation. Thus, the governor of Alabama was acting out his identification with his prescribed social role (as he saw it) when he stood in the doorway of the State University to oppose Federal Marshals in their effort to integrate the institution. Some years later he was acting in the same capacity when he crowned a black young lady as homecoming queen during half-time ceremonies on the football field. The behavior itself was quite different, but in both cases it reflected an identification with the expectations of the social order at the time as he viewed them.

This concept is useful in understanding the behavior of Henry VIII. In the sixteenth century authoritarianism was as much the norm of society as democratic ideals are in our own. Henry by no means had a monopoly on the authoritarian approach, as the behavior of others of the time will amply illustrate. John Calvin's execution of the heretic Serventus is just one case in point. Even Thomas More, often cited for his unusual liberal insights in Utopia, exhibited a rather pronounced degree of intolerance in his denunciation of the views of Martin Luther. Henry's own in-laws, Ferdinand and Isabella, pursued a quite ruthless policy toward Moors and Jews in their native Spain. So it was that at age

eighteen Prince Henry Tudor stood at the death bed of his father, Henry VII, who counselled him to "fight the infidel." He soon found himself head of state in a land where a power orientation had brought law and order out of the chaos of long years of civil war. A threat orientation was the atmosphere of his early years when there was not only the possibility of the overthrow and assassination of his father but always the sure prospect of his own elimination as one in direct line to inherit the throne. As a loyal Catholic, Henry wore the title Defender of the Faith owning the obligation to keep the purity of the faith and to resist its unholy detractors. Even his quarrel with the Pope was not a denial of faith but a claim to get beyond its aberration and back to a time when Christian Emperors like Constantine called ecumenical councils to clarify the doctrine.[80] When he secularized the monasteries and looted their treasures, he was reacting to the threat of invasion by loyal Catholics who felt an obligation to bring the schismatic English King back into the fold of Mother Church. In the phenomenological perspective, the basic motivation is to preserve and enhance the phenomenal self. Behavior

---

[80] F. Smith Fussner, Tudor History and Historians. (N. Y. and London: Basic Books, Inc., Publisher, 1970), p. 7.

accordingly must be viewed in terms of how the actor perceived himself and how he defined the situation. In the light of the social climate of the time, what options were available to Henry VIII?

> To emerge as a leader a person must be capable of being perceived by the group members as "one of us," as "the most of us," and as "the best of us." Moreover, the leader must fit the followers' expectations and wants. Thus, democratic followers tend to demand democratic leaders: authoritarian followers, authoritarian leaders.[81]

In the California study the researchers spoke of both authoritarian domination <u>and</u> submission. In the sixteenth century, as now, a "law and order" policy had its supporters who made possible, and even necessary, the reign of a strong monarch both willing and able to carry out such a policy. A. F. Pollard concluded that Henry's iron hand tactics had a positive value in that they probably kept England from the wars of religion that ravaged the continent a century later.[82]

In this connection it is significant that the picture Maslow gives of the authoritarian's perception of the world as a jungle is exactly that presented by Thomas Hobbes in his Leviathin (1651).

---

[81] Krech, et al., p. 446.

[82] <u>Henry VIII</u>. (London, New York and Toronto: Longman's Green and Co., 1905), p. 352.

> Writing in the midst of civil war, Hobbes pictured the life of man without government as "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short." Without some authority to enforce law, there is no society, no order, only a "war of every man against every man." Men in general are inclined to "a perpetual and restless desire of power after power." So they set up a sovereign power by agreement or contract...by which all men agree to obey the sovereign, but only as long as he is able to maintain order. The sovereign is not bound by anything in the contract. No clearer argument for might as the necessary basis of all right had ever been written. Hobbes...[work is] a justification of arbitrary power.[83]

Pollard maintains that Hobbes' Leviathin is the best political commentary on the Tudor system. Although writing a good century after Henry VIII, Hobbes defends the Tudor monarchy with its strong law and order orientation. He longs for it in the midst of the chaos of revolution about him. In fact, it was Hobbes' glorification of the Tudors that brought him into conflict with the Cavaliers.[84] The point here is that authoritarian leadership presupposes authoritarian followers of which there was no shortage in the days of Henry VIII. John Bowles well summarizes:

---

[83]Joseph R. Strayer, Hans W. Gatzke, E. Harris Harbison and Edwin L. Dunbaugh, The Mainstream of Civilization, Part I to 1715. (N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1969), p. 438.

[84]Henry VIII. (London: Longman's Green and Co., 1905), p. 348.

> Henry VIII was born to the summit of power in hard precarious times, to which the battered and wary faces even of the successful bear witness. Conscious that his dynasty and people depended upon his sole cunning and will to foresee and make circumstance and choice, he used his subjects with instinctive and successful opportunism. He paid the price of demoralization which always affects the wielder and the victim of arbitrary power. What other fate could he have but to become scarred, carapaced and corrupted in the egotism that alone could master the demands of his royal predicament.[85]

IV. Chapter Summation

This section has attempted to draw together the various facets of the life of Henry VIII into a single, composite profile. The frame of reference has been attitude theory, assuming the premise that the attitudes of the individual tend to reflect his basic personality orientation. The major portion of the chapter has dealt with the research of Adorno and his associates in their 1950 work entitled The Authoritarian Personality. Previously Abraham Maslow had set forth the concept of "authoritarian character structure" in a definitive paper in 1943. Adorno's study was in effect (though not the stated objective of the researchers themselves) an effort to validate empirically what Maslow had described earlier. While Adorno's conclusions are controversial and are still

---

[85] Henry VIII: A Biography. (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1964), pp. 19, 20.

being debated, the fact of authoritarian behavior itself seems evident. A special point of emphasis in Adorno was the fact that in some persons a number of personality characteristics seem to cluster together well enough to be called the authoritarian personality type. After reviewing the methodology of Adorno and some of the criticisms of his work, the chapter attempted to illustrate authoritarian characteristics in the behavior of Henry VIII at various periods of his life.

An important objection to the Adorno study has been its psychoanalytic orientation. It was the author's conclusion that the psychoanalytic background of this theory does not invalidate its usefulness. It has value from a descriptive standpoint at least, and Maslow has given a rationale for considering authoritarianism as a particular kind of perception which is compatible with a phenomenological interpretation.

From the standpoint of Henry VIII, the King's authoritarianism must be viewed in historical perspective. His role as monarch demanded the expression of power, and the turbulence of the times called for a "law and order" policy which Henry was both willing and able to provide. Such a policy proved so efficient that it provided the inspiration for Thomas Hobbes' views expressed in the Leviathin almost a century later.

While the reign of Henry VIII may seem in this sense to have been a successful one, the personal life of the King seems rather depressing and unattractive. It suggests the verdict of Lord Acton: "Power tends to corrupt. Absolute power corrupts absolutely."[86]

It remains now to offer some suggestions regarding modern manifestations of authoritarianism which will be treated in the concluding section.

---

[86] MaGill's Quotations in Context. Frank N. MaGill (ed.). (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1965), p. 794. The statement was made in a letter to Bishop Mandel Creighton, April 5, 1887.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

At the conclusion of this study, many issues must remain untreated, many questions unresolved. Robert Ergang has facetiously commented that the historian can expect not only to be held responsible for everything he has said but also for everything he has not said.[1] It was the purpose of this study not to be exhaustive but illustrative, suggesting a few of the possible directions in which an interdisciplinary interpretation of Henry VIII might proceed.

At this point a summation is in order. Three questions will be in focus in this closing section: (1) What are the conclusions of this study about the religion of Henry VIII? (2) What contemporary applications can be made? (3) What classroom benefits emerge from this study for the enhancement of teaching and learning?

I. Conclusions About the Religion of Henry VIII

This study began with the problem of the dual character of Henry VIII. Evidence is not lacking for the

---

[1] Europe from the Renaissance to Waterloo. (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1954), p. vi, quoting Voltaire, original source not documented.

picture of a ruthless tyrant who let nothing and no one stand as an obstacle to having his own way. At the same time this violent and bloody Blue-beard quoted Scripture, argued theology, went faithfully to Mass and proudly acclaimed himself Defender of the Faith. Rejecting the accusation that Henry was a hypocrite who merely used religion as a front, the writer was motivated to investigate what religion meant personally to Henry VIII.

The writer assumed in this study the principle of phenomenology. Reality for the individual is not what exists but how he/she interprets the meaning of a situation in relation to those concerns most basic to the life. Accordingly, one must let the religion of Henry VIII _be_ the religion of Henry VIII and not that of historical interpreters who would make him over in their own image. One case in point is the series of events connected with the "King's Great Matter," when Henry sought to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon in order to marry Anne Boleyn. Many, if not most, interpreters have concluded that the middle-aged King had grown tired of his fat-and-forty wife and wanted to discard her in favor of a younger, more desirable consort. His quoting the Bible, it has been alleged, was simply a pretext to justify this carnal desire. The writer concurs in the judgment of L. B. Smith that one is obliged to take

Henry's appeal to conscience at face value. Henry was willing to risk everything including the loss of his kingdom and the damnation of his soul on the rightness of the course he pursued. In his Will, the King left instructions (which were finally carried out) that he was to be buried with Jane Seymour, the mother of Edward his long-desired heir. Jane was his rightful Queen, not Catherine!

The writer also assumed in this study the social science principle of behavioral causation. Behavior is caused, and the causes of behavior can be discovered and understood. Applying this concept to Henry VIII, the student can avoid both hero worship and condemnation, seeing the King as a human being like one's self whose life was affected by the same forces which make life what it is in every age. Applying this concept to religious behavior, one can avoid the naive explanations, "God told me," and "the Devil made me do it." While not denying the supernatural, the writer maintains that the working of God (and of the Devil too) is usually through the operation of lawful factors humans can know and understand. The effort throughout the study was to isolate and comprehend the variables which influenced the religious behavior of Henry VIII and which continue to operate in one's own experience.

The writer rejected the psychoanalytic interpretation which attempted to explain the entire adult life of Henry VIII in terms of an unresolved Oedipus complex. It has by no means been established that the Oedipus complex is universal as that view assumed. Even if it were universal, it is simplistic to employ this single factor as the sole explanation of everything else in the King's life. Moreover, the writer objected to this particular psychoanalytic approach as being reductionist. It explains away religious behavior as not being religious at all but something else altogether different.

Opposition to this one psychoanalytic interpretation does not mean the entire system is without value. Freud gave an important emphasis in stressing the role of the father in the development of a son or daughter. By the principle of identification the child assumes many of the characteristics of the parents and others whom he/she regards as parent substitutes. W. H. Clark gives the example of a child who consistently refused to pray the Lord's Prayer. It was later discovered that the youngster came from a home where the father acted abusively toward the family. The child saw in "Our Father which art in heaven" his own inadequate

parent on earth with whom he could not relate.[2] The relationship of Henry VIII with his father seems to have been an amicable one and not one of hostility. The young Henry's concern about the succession was one of determination that he would be able to transmit to his own son in good order that which had been transmitted to him from his father.

Another principle assumed in this study is that religious behavior is not instinctive but is acquired by the individual through learning. Such learning is an aspect of the larger process called socialization which involves all of those subtle influences both formal and informal which act upon persons to make them into the kind of people they become. The writer found helpful John F. Cuber's concept that socialization operates in terms of the interaction of original nature, cultural exposure and unique experience. Original nature involves all of those qualities with which the individual is endowed at birth, such as heredity, physical constitution, temperament and many other such like. Cultural exposure involves the social setting in which the individual lives, while unique experience involves what happens to the person as he/she acts and reacts to persons and situations in his personal

---

[2] Psychology of Religion. (N. Y.: MacMillan, 1958), p. 88.

world. Religious development, it was noted, does not take place in isolation but occurs in the same context with other kinds of behavior which color and shape it. Accordingly, the religious behavior of Henry VIII is intimately bound up with the historical circumstances of the sixteenth century which provided conditions of socialization which did not exist before and which will never exist again. This principle in some degree helps in understanding the propensity of the King for violence. Henry VIII was socialized in a culture of violence. His father won his crown on the field of battle, and although the victory of Bosworth brought an official end to thirty years of civil war, it did not bring the cessation of strife. Violence was a part of the young prince's life as he grew up, and it was part of the role requirement he inherited when he became King. After the victory of Flodden in 1513 where an English army defeated a Scottish force, killing ten thousand men, Henry wrote the Pope that just as God had granted Saul power to slay a thousand and David was granted strength to kill ten thousand, so God had also made him strong.[3]

---

[3]L. B. Smith, "A Matter of Conscience." In Theodore K. Rabb and J. E. Siegel (eds.), Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E. H. Harbison. (Princeton: University Press, 1969, p. 45.)

Henry's treatise against Martin Luther presented the earliest written expression of his religious views. Among other characteristics, the treatise was a thoroughly conservative document defending the Catholic status quo. The views Luther challenged were old, very old, and thus had the accreditation of time. "Give me that old time religion," Henry urged in effect and with great passion, "It's good enough for me!"

Henry's conservatism here is understandable in the light of the political situation of the sixteenth century. Separation of church and state was unheard of. There was no practical difference between the sacred and the secular. Henry's reaction to Luther was thus something like a modern head of state would have upon discovering a treason plot. Luther had attacked the Pope who had been the consistent supporter of Henry's father. After Bosworth, the Pope had recognized Henry VII's dubious claim to the throne and excommunicated pretenders. The son as well as the father had continued on good terms with the See of Rome, each regarding the other as allies in a divinely ordained partnership. Now with Luther's challenge of the Church, no ruler in Christendom was safe from insurrection, a possibility which became reality in the Peasant's War which broke out in 1524 as a result of Luther's teaching. Henry's conservatism in The Assertio

is explainable (like some modern conservatism perhaps) as a defensive posture in the face of threat.

Henry's conservatism in The Assertio was also associated with his copious appeal to Scripture. Like many modern religious faiths, the religion of Henry VIII claimed to be based on the Bible. According to Louis O'Donovan, the King quoted the Old Testament forty-two times as follows: Genesis 5 references, Exodus 3, Leviticus 1, Numbers 1, Deuteronomy 3, I Kings 2, Proverbs 3, Wisdom 3, Ecclesiasticus 2, Ecclesiastes 1, Ezekiel 4, Isaiah 3, and Zechariah 1. (Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are books from the Apocrypha not recognized as canonical by Protestants.) It will be observed that the numbers given do not add up to 42, but to 39. O'Donovan probably miscounted, but the discrepancy is not significant. Of the 101 times Henry quoted from the New Testament in The Assertio, O'Donovan's breakdown is as follows: Matthew 11, Mark 3, Luke 10, John 18, Acts 4, Romans 7, I Corinthians 12, Galatians 1, I Thessalonians 1, Colossians 1, Ephesians 3, I Timothy 10, II Timothy 2, Titus 2, Hebrews 4, James 8, I Peter 2, I John 1, and Apocalypse (Revelation) 1. All together Henry quoted from or referred to the Bible in The Assertio some 140 times.[4]

---

[4]Assertio Septem Sacramentorum, (ed.), Louis O'Donovan. (N. Y.: Benziger Brothers, 1908), p. 128.

Along with the Scripture quotations, Henry also appealed to the Church Fathers like Augustine and Jerome and many others in defense of the sacramental system of the sixteenth century. The religion of Henry VIII was sacerdotal, i.e., Salvation was in a system. The grace of God was mediated to the individual through religious rites (sacraments) which were intrinsically efficient for the purpose. However, the validity of sacraments depended on their administration by a priest ordained in the proper line of ecclesiastical succession. As a result of the Reformation, a cleavage came between two basically different concepts of the Christian faith: that of sacerdotalism on the one hand, and that which taught immediate and direct access of the individual to God apart from any human mediation.

In later years Henry VIII changed some of his views expressed in The Assertio, especially his view of the Papacy. This suggests that religious behavior is influenced by developmental considerations. Following Daniel Katz' functional view, the writer suggested that one's attitudes are influenced by one's needs. People react positively to those persons and things that satisfy their needs, and they react negatively to those that frustrate their needs. In his middle years Henry's pressing desire was for a son to succeed him on the

throne. Such a desire was not just political. It was, the writer believes, an expression of the stage of life described by Erik Erikson as "generativity." The individual reaches out to find meaning through the next generation which will carry on one's achievements and fulfill one's dreams. Both Abraham in the Old Testament and Napoleon Bonaparte illustrated this need by their behavior in seeking to have a son through women other than their wives. The concept of "symbolic immortality" is suggestive in this connection. Different cultures have varying reactions to death. One such is that in which the individual finds fulfillment through one's biological descendants who continue the family line. Such a faith, it was suggested, was meaningful to Abraham in a day before the concept of life after death had been revealed. To Henry also such an idea would have been appealing, since one finds little in the King's writings on immortality and the hope of heaven. Henry's religion seems to have centered (like Old Testament believers) on the rewards of faith in this life here and now.

In seeking a son and heir to succeed him on the throne, Henry's desire had to be expressed in terms of the social context of the time. It was not sufficient just to have a descendant. He already had a legitimate daughter as well as an illegitimate son. But these would not do.

The social norms of the time were against the succession of a woman, and the questionable lineage of a son "born on the wrong side of the blanket" could reopen the strife on the Wars of the Roses. Although Henry was a monarch who ruled with an absolute despotism, he found himself bound by the social norms of the time. Not even a king could do just as he pleased! The keeper of the social norms about marriage and family relationships was the Pope who interpreted them according to the law of the Church called canon law. At this point there emerged another variable in the changing character of the King's religion, the conflict between Henry's conscience and the authority of the Pope. This conflict the writer described in terms of the psychological concept of cognitive dissonance. All human beings have a drive for consistency, and when a person encounters new information which does not fit with past experience, he is motivated to resolve the inconsistency in some way.

The writer has already expressed agreement with L. B. Smith's argument that we must take Henry's conscience seriously. What is important at this point is to note the source of Henry's aroused feelings, a Bible verse, Leviticus 20:21. Henry was convinced that he had sinned in marrying his brother's widow, and the Pope had erred in approving what the Word of God prohibited. It

was pointed out that Henry's interpretation of this Scripture was faulty. Marriage to a brother's wife was prohibited only while the brother still lived. Moreover, the directive was addressed to ancient Israel and not the Christian church. In any event, the penalty pronounced was childlessness, a situation not strictly true of Henry and Catherine. They had had a daughter, the Princess Mary, but she did not count. Henry must have a son to secure the succession. The fact of Henry's misinterpretation highlights the role of perception in behavior. Despite Henry's misunderstanding, his behavior changed history. It was not what the Bible said but what he thought it said!

In this connection a word of caution is in order concerning the espousal of the phenomenological approach. Phenomenology as it has been presented is psychological and not philosophical. The writer does not advocate an unbridled relativism which would eliminate absolutes and affirm that "it all depends on how you look at it." Two students in a classroom have the same teacher. One perceives the teacher as an adversary to be resisted, while the other sees him/her as a friend with whom to share. The teacher of course remains whatever he/she is and does not change. So the world out there is what it is. Reality itself is not affected by what a particular

individual thinks of it. Each person, however, will see it differently because he views it through his own unique set of glasses. In Henry's interpretation of Leviticus 20:21, he misinterpreted the passage with important historical consequences. Yet the passage itself had a basic message intended by the original writer. One can only speculate about how the King's life (and the world too!) might have been different if he had had a more objective understanding of what the passage really taught.

In connection with Henry's use of Leviticus 20:21, there emerged the problem of what was designated as Deuteronomic theology. In simple terms this involves the concept that obedience brings blessing and disobedience brings punishment. Critics of Henry VIII have tended to equate the Deuteronomic principle with superstition. The King's religion was, so it has been alleged, a pragmatic thing in which he had a kind of "slot machine" arrangement. One does all the right things and fulfills his obligations. Then it is up to God to fulfill his part of the bargain and deliver prosperity, peace and power!

From one standpoint, the Deuteronomic formula has validity. It is a form of the stimulus-response pattern of reward and punishment, involving the well-known principles of reinforcement and avoidance learning. It is

one way in which animals and young children learn. If it were not true that in the long run goodness has better consequences than evil, there would be no realistic basis for morality in the universe. On the other hand, the Deuteronomic formula is a black and white statement which fails to take into account other possible variables in the equation. It sometimes happens that good people suffer and evil men prosper. The book of Job deals with this problem as do certain of the Psalms, for example Psalms 37. In Henry's case the fact of childlessness meant only one thing. He had sinned, and this was the punishment as Leviticus 20:21 "clearly" showed. Henry's misunderstanding was related to his failure to view the verse not only in the context of Leviticus but in the context of the whole Bible. His religion was characterized by what can be called "proof text theology." He missed the "big picture!"

It is of course easy for moderns at this distance to be critical of Henry's Biblical exegesis. It is easy to take the Scriptures for granted with easy access to one's personal copies of the English Bible in several different versions, along with a multitude of books, church facilities and other avenues of interpretive aid. The Bible of Henry VIII was not a leather-bound volume with gold leaf pages. Henry's Bible was not even in

English, but in Latin, and the interpretation was stereotyped in the categories of the Scholastic system with no Sunday School discussion groups to debate the meaning of a passage.

Whatever his deficiencies of understanding, it seems clear that Henry VIII did reverence the Bible as the Word of God. In 1538 he ordered that every parish church should own a copy of the edition called the Great Bible, which was issued by Archbishop Cranmer. During this period Henry reversed a long-time trend and allowed the English Bible to be printed and circulated. More than a century earlier John Wycliffe (1324-1384), an Oxford University professor, had made a translation from the Latin and instituted an organization of lay preachers to circulate copies among the people. Because of his criticism of the Roman Church, Wycliffe was repudiated as a heretic and his translation banned. In 1408 an act was passed forbidding any translation of the Bible into English without the approval of the ecclesiastical authorities, and a short time later the mere reading of the English Scriptures was prohibited. It is interesting that at the same time Henry was pursuing his more liberal policy toward circulation of the English Scriptures, he cooperated with the Emperor to seek out William Tyndale in the Netherlands and execute him for heresy. Tyndale had

made a translation of the New Testament from Erasmus' edition of the Greek text of 1524. When authorities sought to suppress it, he fled to the continent where he was eventually arrested. Cranmer's Great Bible had incorporated much of Tyndale's translation as well as the earlier work of Wycliffe. Opposition to Bible translations was not so much to the Bible itself as to the inflammatory marginal comments which satirized the ecclesiastical establishment.

In his last address to the nation before Parliament on Christmas Eve, 1545, Henry spoke of that "precious jewel of the Word of God." He decried the perversion of its authority by heretical sects and uncouth persons. "...It is disputed, rimed, sung and jingled in every alehouse and tavern, contrary to the true meaning and doctrine of the same."[5] That was not the purpose for which the people had been given the privilege of having the Word in their own tongue, not to dispute and wrangle but to enlighten their consciences so that all might live a quiet and orderly life.

In the concluding chapter of this study, the writer attempted to summarize the religion of Henry VIII in terms of the King's personality orientation. After all, a major

---

[5]M. St. Clare Byrne (ed.), The Letters of Henry VIII. (New York: Funk & Wagnall's, 1936), p. 421.

test of anyone's religion is the kind of human being it has produced. The frame of reference was "the authoritarian personality" concept as developed by Abraham Maslow and T. W. Adorno. Although the concept is controversial, the writer found it useful in describing the basic kind of individual Henry seems to have become. A leading idea of this approach is that in many persons a number of personality characteristics seem to cluster together often enough to constitute a distinct and recognizable personality pattern. The authoritarian individual exhibits a power orientation, a threat orientation, a cognitive style intolerant of ambiguity, an external locus of control which tends to evade responsibility for one's actions and a self-righteous moralism.

A power orientation sees all interpersonal encounters in terms of personal competition. One must dominate and one must submit. No other relationship is possible. A threat orientation views the world as a jungle where one must either kill or be killed. One must stay on guard at all times, and you can afford to trust no one! Intolerance of ambiguity means that the individual tends to think in black and white terms with no room for degrees of gray between the extremes. The authoritarian seeks simple solutions for complex problems. External

orientation means that the individual tends to explain his failures in terms of circumstances and other persons' lapses rather than his own personal weakness. Self-righteous moralism means that authoritarian persons value conformity to conventional standards and assume a harsh, punitive approach toward the failure of others. Such persons often have a "prudish" attitude toward sex.

Application of the authoritarian model to Henry VIII must in fairness be kept in historical perspective. It was an authoritarian age, and many, if not most persons were of this lifestyle. A power orientation was intrinsic to the role of king, and a threat orientation was inevitable in an age where kingdoms were lost and won not on the field of battle alone but on the basis of who could outsmart whom. The fact that a man like Henry VIII could occupy the throne with the continuing allegiance of the people bears witness to the fact that authoritarianism seeks its own level. Authoritarian followers will have authoritarian leadership. Henry was both willing and able to provide "law and order" for a people who demanded it. A century later Thomas Hobbes, looking back on Tudor times, glorified absolute monarchy as the only basis for stability in a chaotic world.

The authoritarianism of Henry VIII raises the problem of the relation of personality to religious orientation. Ideally religion ought to shape personality, but all too often just the opposite is true. One tends to interpret religion in terms of the kind of person he/she is. Perception is again the key. The authoritarian sees the world as a violent, threatening place where power is the ultimate value. It is not surprising that he/she interprets religion in this light. The issue is basically theological. How do you perceive God? Just as authoritarian followers gravitate to an authoritarian leader, so the authoritarian religious person tends to seek an authoritarian deity. One is reminded of the comment of an unknown writer, "God made man in his own image, and man has been returning the favor ever since."

At the beginning of this study, attention was called to the Imago Dei concept of Genesis 1:26. Man's consciousness of a Creator is rooted in the fact of his original nature. A companion concept in Romans 1:20 and following is now appropriate.

> ...When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were they thankful. But they became vain in their imagination, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man.

The passage then goes on to indicate the results of humanity's apostasy from God in disordered religion (v. 23), disordered sexuality (vss. 24-27), and disordered inter-personal relationships (vss. 28-31). In the latter section violence is a one-word summary which covers the whole range of behaviors which are detailed. It should be observed that the import of this passage is corporate and not individual. Not every individual manifests the anti-social activities which the passage describes. The basic idea is that there is in human life in general a disorder principle which impels mankind downward, so that even religion becomes a source of corruption.

II. Some Contemporary Applications

Up to this point the chapter has been concerned chiefly with the past. It has attempted to summarize some observations about a man who lived over four hundred years ago. It is in order to return now to the twentieth century. What present day applications can be made of this study? A few basic principles seem to be evident.

In the first place, it does make a difference what one believes. Since beliefs influence behavior, some beliefs are better than others. In order to change belief, however, it is necessary to view the position of

another from his vantage point and not our own. Understanding must precede evaluation.

Since religious behavior is caused like other kinds of behavior, religion is not an untouchable area. It is important, therefore, to assume a critical stance toward religion, especially one's own. Why do you believe as you do? Not to deal with such a question is to have a religion based on ignorance rather than choice, a form of religious roulette!

The religion of Henry VIII was a product of sixteenth century Catholic culture. Culture may be compatible with religion, contrary to it or neutral. In any event, it is easy to confuse culture with religion rather than seeing the culture as the swaddling clothes of faith. Generations of Southern Christians taught race prejudice as a part of their faith, and the same situation is being re-enacted in South Africa at the present time.[6] Bill Leonard has pointed out that many have tended to confuse the issue in evangelism, being more concerned with cultural forms rather than the true Biblical conversion. He speaks facetiously of "the sacrament of the aisle."[7]

---

[6]Beth Spring, "The Rationalization of Racism," Christianity Today, 4 October, 1985, p. 18.

[7]"Getting Saved in America: Conversion Event in a Pluralistic Culture," Review and Expositor, Vol. LXXXII, No. 1, Winter 1985, pp. 111-127.

The religion of Henry VIII highlighted the tension between the old and the new. Many still believe as a television evangelist exhorted, "If it's new, it's not true, and if it's true, it's not new." A point of view must be evaluated on its own merits, rather than its antiquity. On the one hand, the philosophers whom the Apostle Paul encountered in Athens "spent their time in nothing except telling or hearing something new." On the other hand, the ministry of Jesus found major opposition from "the traditions of the elders," and the Apostle Paul's steps were dogged by the Judaizers who contended for the law of Moses. Some present-day fundamentalists argue for the infallibility of the King James Version on the basis of what was Henry's contention that God would not have permitted the survival of error for so long.

The union of church and state was an integral factor in the religion of Henry VIII. The Reformation was therefore not a religious movement only but a political one as well. The issue is far from dead today. A free church in a free state must continue to be the ideal. The sixteenth century demonstrates the unmitigated evil which results when religion is dominated by the political and vice versa. Some "right-wing" religious movements may

possibly be moving in the latter direction in America at the present time.[8]

The use of the Bible by Henry VIII suggests the importance of intelligent interpretation. The writer recalls the statement of an ultraconservative speaker who piously insisted, "Don't interpret the Bible; just believe it!" Such a statement is itself an interpretation. The history of the Reformation (as indeed the history of Christianity itself) amply demonstrates that the meaning of Scripture is far from self-evident. Scripture must be interpreted in context. New Testament meanings must not be imposed on Old Testament circumstances, and cultural background must be understood and allowed for. Exegesis rather than eisegesis must be the objective; i.e., do not impose a preconceived meaning on a passage, but rather seek to discover a writer's original intent.

The religion of Henry VIII was polemical, a term coming from a Greek word meaning "war." In The Assertio Henry had vowed to defend the Faith with physical violence if necessary. Not only Henry, but others of the time were violent at least in their use of language as they

---

[8]For a contemporary discussion of church-state relations in modern Britain (their attitude toward Establishment), see Leslie S. Hunter (ed.), The English Church: A New Look. (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1966).

discussed religion. Many today follow their example, although a few are moving in the direction of healing the old Reformation wounds. A recent Protestant preacher whom the writer saw on a television presentation delivered a gracious address on "What I like about the Catholics," after which he proceeded in a positive manner to indicate some areas of difference. In the call of Isaiah, to be a prophet, it is significant that he confessed, "I am a man of unclean lips and dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips," (Isaiah 6:5) after which preliminary to his ministry, a live coal from off the altar touched his mouth in a symbolic act of cleansing. It is a message which many today are only slowly beginning to comprehend.

The conscience of Henry VIII, as the writer dealt with it in this study, suggests the motivating power of guilt. New Testament teaching distinguishes "the weak conscience" and "the strong conscience." One must not violate his conscience even though it may be misguided. Henry's understanding of his situation was incorrect, but the consequences of his guilt were none-the-less real. The role of conscience as a major factor in mental maladjustment is the basis of the behavioral approach of O. H. Mowrer whose position has been followed and modified to some degree by Donald R. Tweedie in The Christian and

the Couch.[9,10] Mowrer's view is a minority position which many psychologists reject. Christian therapists like Tweedie, however, find it attractive since it seems friendly to the basic religious ideas of sin and accountability. Although Mowrer uses the word "sin," it should be noted that his system is humanistic in its basis and not theistic. Whatever may be one's evaluation of Mowrer's viewpoint, the emphasis in this section is on the importance of taking one's conscience seriously along with the necessity of having a mature, enlightened conscience.

In coming to deal with the authoritarian personality concept, there is perhaps an objection that all of that was "back there." Surely no twentieth century individual, not even the most bigoted in the society, would want to emulate the behavior of a medieval despot. On one hand, one can perhaps agree that some progress has been made in these four hundred years. The writer recalls when the Revised Standard Version of the Bible came out several years ago, a reactionary religionist burned a part of the publication to express his disapproval. Someone remarked at the time, "At least we have come upon a day

---

[9]See Richard H. Price, Abnormal Behavior Perspectives in Conflict. (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972), ch. 6, "The Moral Perspective."

[10]Grand Rapids: Baker, 1963.

when we burn translations instead of translators!" On the other hand, one must be quick to recall that Hitler's holocaust, with the extermination of six million Jewish persons, took place in the twentieth century, and the works of Adorno and Maslow came as a reaction to it.

> The comparison between Henry's government and modern totalitarian regimes has often been made and rejected. Most modern historians have taken the view that though there may be superficial similarities, the differences are fundamental. It might also be said that the differences are superficial and the similarities fundamental, according to what we believe to be the fundamental and the superficial aspects of the regimes. In general it is probably true to say that the differences are in the systems of administration and the similarities in the personal and psychological reactions of the individuals affected.[11]

In this connection Maslow has pointed out that "(i)n Western civilisation there are strong cultural forces that foster both authoritarian and democratic characters." As a result, the average authoritarian faces conflict (what the writer in this study previously labeled cognitive dissonance). Very often he resolves the conflict by

> ...reinterpreting all the pressures at odds with his philosophy, forcing into the democratic forms an authoritarian content. (See, for instance, how often the Christian ideal has been corrupted and perverted by

---

[11] James Ridley, Henry VIII. (New York: Viking, 1985), p. 10.

various churches and other organized forces.)[12]

The writer recalls a curious situation on a television newscast some years back. Peace demonstrators carried signs urging the need of "love" to solve the world's problems. A riot broke out, and the demonstrators clubbed their opponents with their love signs! Less humorously, one thinks of the statement of Jesus to His disciples on one occasion: "The time will come when they will think they do God service by killing you." (John 16:2)

The bottom line as far as the present study is concerned is that the authoritarian model as it was summarized based on the works of Adorno, Fromm and Maslow has contemporary relevance. Authoritarianism is a behavioral orientation which finds expression in a wide area of thought and action. It provides us with a frame of reference for understanding such varied social movements as the witch trials of early colonial New England, the McCarthy anti-communist hysteria of the 1950s in American politics, the rise of the Shiite regime of Ayatollah Khomeni in Iran, as well as the proliferation of militant Protestant fundamentalist groups in our own country. A case could probably be made also for

---

[12] p. 410.

authoritarian trends in certain popular political philosophies of the last few years.

In conclusion, a word of caution is appropriate as H. C. Lindgren suggests. There is a tendency to speak of the authoritarian personality as though it were an absolute entity. There is the danger of thinking in black and white terms, of dividing the world into two distinct types of persons. In actuality, authoritarian behavior occurs on a continuum, i.e., on a scale ranging from extremely authoritarian to extremely democratic.

> Such behavior and attitudes can be referred to positions on such a scale to determine whether they are more or less authoritarian. Similarly, individuals can be rated on such a scale in terms of the kind of behavior they usually or most characteristically display, keeping in mind that people may vary somewhat from one social situation to another, but also recognizing that there tends to be a mode or a norm that most of us conform to in our relations with others...(B)oth "authoritarian" and "democratic" represent extreme polar positions and...most people would be grouped around the middle of such a scale.[13]

The issue is one of degree as well as of frequency.

To these characteristics a third may be added, that of realistic orientation. A threat orientation for example is appropriate in the presence of danger, but it becomes pathological otherwise. A person may fear disease

---

[13] M. C. Lindgren, An Introduction to Social Psychology, p. 77.

germs and wash his hands before eating. He is quite different, however, from the neurotic who compulsively washes his hands every fifteen minutes, wears gloves to avoid contamination, and never shakes hands for fear of "catching something." Similarly, everyone has loyalty to his own group, a reality that becomes apparent during a political campaign. Yet the normal person does not magnify his loyalties out of proportion. He does not carry on mountain feuds in which he shoots the opposition on sight or refuses to let his daughters marry their sons. Most persons at times will exhibit some of the behavioral characteristics described by the personality researchers. That does not make one authoritarian, though it is well to apply the tests of degree, frequency and reality orientation. Also, in Adorno's scheme, the clustering of traits is an important consideration.

The picture presented in this section is not at all a flattering one. But it is not the prerogative of the social scientist to whitewash or condemn, but rather to understand. If history is philosophy teaching by example, let the student be careful not to miss the lesson.

III. Classroom Benefits from this Study

It but remains now to suggest the classroom benefits which emerge from this study for the enhancement

of teaching. In the first place, this study has been a project in psychohistory. The classroom teacher can use this approach to stir up the interest of students. He/she can call attention to psychohistory journals available in the school library. If there are no such journals available, perhaps a subscription may be entered. From time to time attention can be called to pertinent articles with assignments, parallel reading reports and class discussion. Interested students may be encouraged to write the International Psychohistory Association for literature and information. Perhaps a student branch of the Association (or other such group) could be established on the campus, or at least a psychohistory club.

A second emphasis of this study has been the interdisciplinary approach. Too often the college curriculum tends to erect rigid barriers separating academic fields. The interdisciplinary approach stresses that knowledge is unitary and that learners should be permitted to pursue their interests regardless of where they lead. The life of Henry VIII (and the entire Tudor age) can profitably be approached from several different standpoints, depending on individual interest and orientation. An English major may want to give attention to Shakespeare's plays, Richard III and Henry VIII. A female student may find Catherine of Aragon's defense

before the papal commission in the latter play worthy of presentation as a dramatic monologue. Henry's tutor, John Skelton, has contemporary importance for his poetry, which has social and political significance as well as literary merit. Whatever one's specialized field, Thomas More's Utopia is a piece of writing to which every educated person should have some exposure.

For the student of religion, Henry VIII offers a wealth of possibilities for exploration. The Scriptures cited by the King in his treatise have a history of interpretation which the Bible student cannot ignore: John 3:5 (born of water and Spirit), Acts 2:38 (baptized for the remission of sins), Matthew 16:8 and following (Upon this rock I will build my church...I give unto you the keys of the kingdom), John 20:23 (Whosoever sins you forgive, they are forgiven them) and a great many more which were noted in Henry's defense of the sacraments against Martin Luther. The fact that Henry quoted from the Apocrypha may stir the interest of some to ask why he would quote from a book that "was not really a part of the Bible." Moreover, the emergence of Bible translations in the Renaissance-Reformation period may stir the interest of some in the history of the English Bible.

For the student of psychology, a seminar format may be appropriate with weekly discussions of journal articles

such as the writer has dealt with in this dissertation, e.g., Flugel, Smith, Miles F. Shore, William James' typology of the "sin sick soul vs. the healthy minded individual." Mary Louise Bruce's The Making of Henry VIII could profitably be used in this connection, along with Price's Abnormal Behavior: Perspectives in Conflict. This study has dealt with but one personality of the sixteenth century among many possibilities. Thomas Wolsey, Thomas More, Archbishop Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell are suggestive for psychohistory investigation. The student should be encouraged to pursue interpretation from some of the other theoretical perspectives not dealt with in this study.

The history teacher may approach the life of Henry VIII from the standpoint of contemporary issues which relate to it. The women's movement is an "in thing" these days, and a study of the place of women in Tudor society would be of interest. Capital punishment is an issue which emerges frequently in today's society. Since this was a marked feature of all the Tudor regimes, an examination of it in historical perspective would be appropriate and relevant. The ecumenical movement stressing Christian unity and the hope of the eventual reunion of a divided Christendom comes up frequently in the news of the day. An understanding of the issues

involved demands a re-examination of the historical roots which extend back to the Reformation. By contrast, one is reminded of the nineteenth century conversion of John Henry Newman from the Anglican Church to the Roman communion in which he subsequently became a Cardinal. How does Newman's experience compare with that of Henry VIII? What are the present day attitudes of the British people toward Roman Catholics, as for example in their reception of the Pope who a few years back made a historic visit to their country? And what of the tensions between Catholics and Protestants, which are still very evident in Northern Ireland? The writer noted in his treatment in this study the impact of childlessness in the experience of Henry VIII, especially his frustration in not procuring a male heir. What is now known that the people of Henry's time did not know about genetics and human reproduction? It is appropriate to consider the biological variables which may have been involved in "The King's Great Matter." Social implications are involved here also, since childlessness is having an effect on the character of American domestic life.

All of the foregoing are but a few examples of possible approaches to the study of Henry VIII and the Tudor period. In conclusion, the writer would like to suggest that more important than a body of data which

teachers seek to transmit to students is the approach to learning which they can stimulate by an emphasis on critical thinking and the search for principles which are of contemporary relevance. Both content and process are of importance for the education enterprise.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources, Collections of Documents

Byrne, M. St. Clare (ed.). The Letters of Henry VIII: A Selection With a Few Other Documents. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1936.

Cook, G. H. Letters to Cromwell and Others on the Suppression of the Monasteries. Pall Mall, London: S. W. I. : John Bole, Publisher, 1965.

Elton, G. R. The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1962.

Henry VIII, Assertio Septem Sacramentorum. Louis O'Donovan (ed.). New York: Benziger Brothers, 1962.

Hillebrand, Hans J. The Reformation: A Narrative History Related by Contemporary Observers and Participants. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII. J. S. Brewer et al. (eds.). 21 volumes in 33 parts. London: n.n., 1862-1910.

Pollard, A. F. Tudor Tracts 1532-1588. New York: Cooper Square Publications, Inc., 1964.

Read, Conyers. Bibliography of British History-Tudor Period 1485-1603. Second edition. Oxford, 1959.

Williams, C. H. English Historical Documents 1485-1558. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Biographies

Bowles, John. Henry VIII: A Biography. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1965.

Bruce, Mary Louise. The Making of Henry VIII. New York: McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1977.

Cavendish, George. The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey. Richard S. Sylvester (ed.). Published for the Early English Text Society, London: Oxford University, 1954.

Chrimes, S. B. Henry VII. Berkley and L. A.: The University of California Press, 1972.

Dictionary of National Biography. Leslie Stephens and Sidney Lee (eds.). 63 volumes. London: Smith, Elder and Company, 1885-1901.

Erikson, Carroly. Bloody Mary. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1978.

Marius, Richard. Luther. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1974.

_____. Thomas More: A Biography. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

Mattingly, Garrett. Catherine of Aragon. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1941.

Pollard, A. F. Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation 1489-1556. Hamden, Connecticut: Anchor Books, 1965. Reprint from original edition 1905.

_____. Henry VIII. London: Longmans Green & Company, 1905.

_____. Wolsey: Church and State in Sixteenth Century England. New York: Harpers Publishers, 1966.

Ridley, James. Henry VIII. New York: Viking, 1985.

Scarisbrick, J. Henry VIII. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

Smith, Lacey Baldwin. Henry VIII: The Mask of Royalty. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971.

Storey, R. L. The Reign of Henry VII. New York: Walker and Company, 1968.

Historical Background Materials

Addison, James Thayer. The Episcopal Church in the United States. n.p., Archon Books, 1967.

Bagley, J. J. Historical Interpretation: Sources of English Medieval History 1066-1540. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972.

Bainton, Roland H. Erasmus of Christendom. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1959.

_____. Studies on the Reformation. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

_____. Women of the Reformation in France and England. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1973.

Baker, Robert A. The Baptist March Through History. Nashville: Convention Press, 1955.

Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr. A Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Berringer, Richard. Approaches to Clio's Craft. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Churchhill, Winston. A History of the English Speaking Peoples. Volume two. The New World. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1956.

Coulton, G. C. Medieval Panorama. Cambridge: University Press, 1939.

Doernberg, Eerwin. Henry VIII and Luther. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1961.

Donovan, Paul. Historical Thought in America: Post-war Patterns. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma.

Elton, G. R. England Under the Tudors. New York: Putnam, 1955.

_____. Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Cromwell. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1972.

_____. Reform and Reformation in England 1509-1558. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Press, 1977.

Ergang, Robert. Europe from Renaissance to Waterloo. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1954.

Fichtenau, Heinrich. The Carolingian Empire: The Age of Charlemagne. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Fussner, F. Smith. Tudor History and Historians. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Hughes, Philip. The Reformation in England. New York: The McMillan Company, 1951.

Johnson, Alan. The Historian and Historical Evidence. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1926.

Knowles, Dean David. The Religious Orders in England. 3 volumes. Cambridge: University Press, 1948-49.

LeFebvre, George. Napoleon: From Tilsit to Waterloo 1807-1815. Translated fromthe French by J. E. Anderson. New York: Columbia University, 1969.

Lehmberg, S. E. "Provisos of the Reformation Parliament." English Historical Review. 85 (1970) 1-10.

Paget, Hugh. "The Youth of Anne Boleyn." Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research. 98, 54(130), 162-170.

Pastor, Ludwig. The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages. Volume X. Wilmington, N.C.: Consortium Books, 1972.

Plowden, Allison. The House of Tudor. New York: Stein and Day Publishers, 1976.

_____. Tudor Women: Queens and Commoners. New York: Atheneum, 1979.

Smith, H. Maynard. Pre-Reformation England. London: McMillan and Company, Limited, 1938.

_____. Henry VIII and the Reformation. New York: Russel & Russel, 1962.

Smith, Lacy Baldwin. This Realm of England 1399-1688. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1976.

_____. "A Matter of Conscience," in Theodore K. Rabb and J. B. Siegel (eds.). Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe. Essays in memory of E. H. Harbison. Princeton: University Press, 1969, pp. 32-51.

Spitz, Lewis W. The Protestant Reformation. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.

Strayer, Joseph R., Gatzke, Hans W., Harbison, E. Harris, and Dunbaugh, Edwin L. The Mainstream of Civilization. Part I to 1715. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1969.

Taylor, J.A.P. The Origins of the Second World War. New York: Atheneum, 1962.

Tout, T. F. An Advanced History of Great Britain from the Earliest Times to 1923. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925.

Wallbank, T. Walter, Taylor, A. M., and Bailkey, N. M. Western Civilization: People and Progress. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company, 1977.

Warner, George T., and Marten, C. H. The Groundwork of British History. London and Glasgow: Blackie and Son, Limited, 1934.

Psychological and Psychohistory Materials

Aaronfreed, J. Conduct and Conscience: The Socialization of Internalized Control Over Behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Adorno, T. W., Frankel-Brunswick, L. W., Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, R. N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Africa, Thomas W., Sullivan, Richard E., and Sewards, J. K. Critical Issues in History. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1967.

Anderson, Terry H. "Becoming Sane with Psychohistory." The Historian. XLI, #1 (Nov., 1978).

Bandura, A. "Vicarious Processes: A No-Trial Learning," in L. Berkowitz, (ed.). Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. Volume II. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Barbu, Zevedi. Problems in Historical Psychology. New York: Press, Inc., 1960.

Bass, B. N. "Authoritarianism of Acquiescence." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 51 (1955) 616-623.

Belcher, Duane M. Giving Psychology Away. Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1973.

Brown, Ray. Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Chomsky, N. Language and Mind. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovitch, 1972.

Christie, R., and Jehoda, Marie (eds.). Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality. New York: The Free Press, 1954.

Clark, Ronald W. Freud: The Man and the Cause. New York: Random House, 1980.

Clinch, Nancy Cager. The Kennedy Neurosis. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1973.

Combs, Arthur W., and Snygg, Donald. Individual Behavior. Revised edition. New York: Harpers, 1959.

Cuber, John F. Sociology: A Synopsis of Principles. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc., 1963.

Elkind, David. "Erik Erikson's Eight Ages of Man," Sociology 80-81. Sluice Dock Ct. 06437: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 1980.

Elkins, Stanley M. Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life. 3rd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Erikson, Erik. Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History. New York: Norton, 1958.

_____. Ghandi's Truth: On the Origin of Militant Nonviolence. New York: Norton, 1970.

_____. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton, 1950.

Explorations in Psychohistory: The Wellfleet Papers. Robert Jay Lifton and Eric Olson (eds.). New York: Simon and Shuster, 1974.

Festinger, Leon, Riecken, Henry W., and Schacter, Stanley. When Prophecy Fails. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1956.

Festinger, Leon. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Flugel, J. C. "On the Character and Married Life of Henry VIII." International Journal of Psychoanalysis. I (1920) 24-55.

The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud. Translated and edited by A. A. Brill. New York: Modern Library, 1938.

Freud, Sigmund, and Bullitt, William C. Thomas Woodrow Wilson, Twenty-Eighth President of the United States: A Psychological Study. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967.

Fromm, Eric. Man for Himself. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1947.

Genovese, Eugene D. Roll Jordon Roll: The World the Slaves Made. New York: Pantheon, 1974.

Glueck, Sheldon. "The Home, the School and Delinquency." Harvard Educational Review XXIII. (Winter 1953) 17-33.

Goldensen, Robert M. (ed.). The Encyclopedia of Human Behavior: Psychology, Psychiatry and Mental Health. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970.

Hall, Calvin S. A Primer of Freudian Psychology. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1954.

Hollander, Edwin. Principles and Methods of Social Psychology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Janis, Irving L. Victims of Groupthink. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Jones, M. B. "Authoritarianism and Intolerance of Fluctuation." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 50 (1955) 125-126.

Kagan, Jerome, and Haverman, Ernest. Psychology: An Introduction. Second edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovitch, 1972.

Katz, Daniel. "The Functional Approach to the Study of ATtitudes." Public Opinion Quarterly. 24 (1960) 163-204.

Kessing, Felix M. Cultural Anthropology. New York: Rinehart, 1958.

Kohlberg, L. "The Development of Modes of Moral Thinking and Choice in the Years Ten to Sixteen." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.

Krech, David, Crutchfield, Richard S., and Ballachey, Egerton L. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.

Kren, George M., and Rapport, Leon H. (eds.). Varieties of Psychohistory. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1976.

Kupperman, Karen Ordal. "Apathy and Death in Early Jamestown." Journal of American History. 66 #1 (June, 1975) 24-40.

Lange, Walter C. The Mind of Adolph Hitler: The Secret Wartime Report. New York: W. W. Norton, 1985.

Leigh, Denis. "George III, King of England and Ireland 1738-1820." American Journal of Social Psychiatry. 2 (Summer 1982) 17-24.

Lindghen, Henry Clay. An Introduction to Social Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

Loree, M. R. Psychology of Education. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1965.

Maslow, Abraham. "The Authoritarian Character Structure." Journal of Social Psychology. 18 (1943) 401-41.

Mazlish, Bruce. In Search of Nixon: A Psychological Inquiry. New York: Basic Books,1972.

_____. Psychoanalysis and History. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1913.

Mischel, W. Introduction to Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Morris, Charles G. Psychology: An Introduction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Packard, Vance. The Hidden Persuaders. New York: David McKay Co., 1957.

Piaget, Jean. The Moral Judgment of the Child. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Price, Richard H. Abnormal Behavior Perspectives in Conflict. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Psychology 73-74: Text. Guilford, Connecticut: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 1973.

Raach, Richard C. "When Plans Fail: Small Group Behavior and Decision Making." Conflict Resolution. 14 (March 1970) 3-19.

Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

_____. "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," Psychological Review. 61 (1954) 194-205.

Ruch, Floyd. L. Psychology of Life. 7th edition. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman, 1967.

Sears, R. R. Survey of Objective Studies of Psychoanalytic Concepts. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1943.

Sheldon, William. The Varieties of Human Physique. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940.

_____. The Varieties of Human Temperament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944.

Shore, Miles F. "Henry VIII and the Crisis of Generativity." Journal of Interdisciplinary History. 2 (1972) 359-90.

Sinofsky, F. et al. "A Bibliography of Psychohistory." The Journal of Childhood Quarterly: The Journal of Psychohistory. 2 (Spring 1975) 517 et seq.

Skinner, B. F. Verbal Behavior. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1957.

_____. Beyond Freedom and Dignity. New York: Knopf, 1947.

Smith, Elsdon C. The Story of our Names. New York: Harper, 1950.

Tournier, Paul. The Naming of Persons. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Weinstein, Edward. "Woodrow Wilson's Neurologic Illness." Journal of American History. 57 (Sept. 1970) 324-336.

Whittaker, James O. Introduction to Psychology. 3rd edition. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1976.

Wrightsman, Lawrence S. Social Psychology in the Seventies. In Collaboration with others. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1972.

Religious References

Allport, Gordon W. The Individual and His Religion: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1950.

Bertocci, Peter A. (ed.). Waiting for the Lord: 33 Meditations on God and Man - Gordon Allport. New York: MacMillan Publishers, 1978.

Bruce, F. F. The English Bible: A History of Translations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Clark, Walter Houston. The Psychology of Religion. New York: MacMillan, 1958.

Davis, David Brian. "Some Themes of Counter Subversion: An Analysis of Anti-Mason, Anti-Catholic, and Anti-Mormon Literature." Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLVII. (September, 1960) 205-224.

Hunter, Leslie S. (ed.). The English Church: A New Look. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966.

Hyatt, James Philip. "Deuteronomy." Encyclopedia Brittanica. Volume 7. Chicago: William Barton Publisher, 1960.

James, William. Essays in Pragmatism. New York: Hafner, 1948.

_____. Varieties of Religious Experience. New York: Random House, 1902.

Jastrow, Morris. The Study of Religion. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1902.

Johnson, Paul E. Personality and Religion. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.

Lambert, J. C. "Sacraments." International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. James Orr, general editor. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1937. Volume IV, p. 2636.

Leonard, Bill. "Getting Saved in America: Conversion Event in a Pluralistic Culture." Review and Exposition. LXXXXII, #1 (Winter 1985) 111-127.

Luther, Martin. The Bondage of the Will. (1525). Translated by Henry Cole. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1931.

Mowrer, O. Hobart. The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion. Princeton: Van Nostrand Company, 1961.

Oates, Wayne. The Psychology of Religion. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1973.

Otto, Rudolf. The Idea of the Holy. Translated by J. W. Harvey. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.

Smith, Ralph L. Israel's Period of Progress. Nashville, Tennessee: Convention Press, 1970.

Speiser, E. "Nuzi." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Volume 3. George Buttrick, Dictionary Editor. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Spring, Beth. "The Rationalization of Racism." Christianity Today. 4 (October 1985) 118.

Tweedie, Donald F., Jr. The Christian and the Couch. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1963.

Miscellaneous References

Copi, Irving M. Introduction to Logic. 3rd edition. London: The MacMillan Company, 1968.

Durrant, Will and Ariel. The Age of Voltaire. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1965.

Gentler, Frederich, and Stenfield, Melvin (eds.) Hang-ups from Way Back. Volume II. San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1974.

Good News Bible: The Bible in Today's English Version. New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1976.

Knight, Walter B. Knight's Master Book of New Illustrations. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1956.

Mair, Alexander W. "Polybius." Encyclopedia Brittanica. Volume 18. Chicago: William Burton Publisher, 1960.

Schlesinger, A. M., Jr., and White, Martin (eds.). Patterns of American Thought. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

Stumpf, Samuel E. Socrates to Sarte: A History of Philosophy. Second Edition. New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1975.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Henry Bosley Woolf, editor in chief. Springfield, Mass.: G & C Merriam Company, 1975.

Winston, John. Sir Walter Raleigh. New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1975.