The School of Salamanca in the sixteenth century and the way kingship is canvassed in Shakespeare's *Richard II*

Luis Javier Conejero-Magro
Universidad de Extremadura, Spain

ABSTRACT

Although there appears to be no direct evidence that Shakespeare had access to the relectiones taught in the School of Salamanca during the sixteenth century, this study demonstrates that, forty years after their dissemination, the theories of Francisco Vitoria and his disciples were probably in circulation throughout England. The methodology in this article juxtaposes Shakespeare's Richard II with one of Vitoria's relectiones. This relectio modified the medieval idea of the divine origin of kingship, and generated a discussion about the origin of royal power which is central to the plot of Shakespeare's play.

KEYWORDS: Shakespeare; School of Salamanca; Richard II; kingship; Anglo-Spanish textual relations.

La Escuela de Salamanca en el siglo XVI y el modo en que se obtiene la realeza en *Richard II,* de Shakespeare

RESUMEN: Aunque parece que no existen pruebas de que Shakespeare conociera las relectiones que se enseñaron en la Escuela de Salamanca en el siglo dieciséis, este estudio demuestra que, cuarenta años después de su divulgación, las teorías de Vitoria y de sus discípulos se encontraban en circulación por Europa. La metodología de este artículo yuxtapone la obra de Shakespeare, Richard II, con una de las relectiones de Vitoria. Esta relectio cambió la idea medieval del origen divino de la majestad y generó un debate sobre el origen del poder real, que resulta tan importante para la urdimbre dramática de Shakespeare.

A Escola de Salamanca no século XVI e a forma como a realeza é obtida em *Richard II,* de Shakespeare[*]

RESUMO: Apesar de parecer não haver provas diretas de que Shakespeare tenha conhecido as relectiones ensinadas na Escola de Salamanca durante o século XVI, este estudo demonstra que, quarenta anos após a sua divulgação, as teorias de Vitoria e dos seus discípulos provavelmente se encontravam a circular por toda a Inglaterra. A metodologia deste artigo justapõe Richard II de Shakespeare a uma das relectiones de Vitoria. Esta relectio alterou a ideia medieval da origem divina da realeza e gerou uma discussão sobre a origem do poder real que é central para o enredo da peça de Shakespeare.

[*] Translation into Portuguese by Miguel Ramalhete.

Sederi 30 (2020): 7–28
https://doi.org/10.34136/sederi.2020.1

PALABRAS CLAVE: Shakespeare; Escuela de Salamanca; Richard II; realeza; relaciones textuales anglo-españolas

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Shakespeare; Escola de Salamanca; Richard II; realeza; relações textuais anglo-espanholas.

1. Introduction

One of the most quoted historico-political anecdotes concerning Shakespeare's Richard II is the well-known controversy generated by the performance of the play on the eve of the Essex Rebellion during Elizabeth I's reign. As Paul E. J. Hammer recounts, "on the afternoon of 7 February 1601 […] the Lord Chamberlain's Men certainly staged a play 'of Kyng Harry […] and of the kyllyng of Kyng Richard the Second' at the insistence of certain gentlemen who" paid Shakespeare's company forty shillings above the normal rate to perform the play (2008, 1). The identity of the play in question remains uncertain. However, the collective beliefs and experiences represented on stage were clearly considered to carry such literary weight as to convey a convincing argument for the legitimacy of Essex's cause to the audience, and therefore ultimately to the English people. The play must have been understood as a paean to the earl of Essex. As it transpired, on February 8th, Essex unsuccessfully marched on London with hundreds of armed men and was later beheaded. Almost a century later, in the 1680s, Charles II would suppress the controversial play (Kantorowicz 1957, 41).

It is acknowledged that Shakespeare "was working within a tradition of English history writing" (Hadfield 2004, 55) and therefore it is not difficult to draw a "parallel between the events of Richard's last years and those of the ageing queen" (Moseley 2009, 95). It would be pointless here to reiterate the details of this issue, which have been more than amply explored. It is nevertheless common knowledge that, when "in 1601 the historian William Lambarde was showing Elizabeth the fruits of his researches in the royal archives and arrived at the time of Richard II, [Elizabeth I] broke in: 'I am Richard II. Know ye not that? […]'" (Moseley 2009, 95). Despite the rampant rumor that Elizabeth I had compared herself to Richard II, pace most scholars, this seems unlikely (Clegg 1999, 123).[1] This disputed event serves to illustrate the tortuous

[1] For an in-depth study upon the representation of history during the Renaissance, see Woolf (2000), especially pages 32–35.

paths of the knowledge transfer process, which can never be fully verified. As will be explained, this essay deals with comparative semiospherics in order to explain such knowledge transfer processes. What is not in question here is Shakespeare's interest in history and his concern with "the effects of government on the wider populace" (Hadfield 2004, 55). Indeed, his history plays frequently mirror current events. Richard II is a case in point, and a particularly revealing play as it "offers us a picture of an ideology of divine right kingship" when there was an "emerging divine right absolutist tone" (Lake 2016, 252 and 267) in England. As Richard van Oort affirms, "Shakespeare looks back to the old institution of kingship in order to look forward to the new social order in which each individual soul is elected" (2006, 330) and this is readily found at the core of Shakespeare's play.

As the dramatic scheme generally shows in Shakespeare's histories, the monarchs are in a quandary about their political attitudes, and their errors lead them to the realization that their ways of administering public policy are not entirely proper. For example, Richard II's form of government, and his belief in the teleological nature of power, shows that he firmly believes in the divine and unmediated right of kingship. This ideology of divine right arises at the very beginning of the play, when John of Gaunt, Richard's uncle, refers to the monarch as "God's substitute,| His deputy anointed in His sight" (1.2.37–38),[2] and also in terms of Richard's own approach to governing. Richard II is outstanding among Shakespeare's history plays for multiple and varied arguments. Nevertheless, the play has been chosen as the focus for this article for one simple reason: it is the only history play where a truly "anointed king" is represented, even if Richard's belief in his divine status from a Christian standpoint cannot save him from being deposed (Hadfield 2004, 40). Indeed, as is the case with Richard II, it is fairly safe to assume that literature somehow reacts or responds—or even shapes our understanding of—history, as is clearly illustrated by the wide-ranging sources Shakespeare used to write his histories.[3] This point

[2] All references to Richard II are from Charles R. Forker's The Third Arden Series Shakespeare edition (2002, 2014).

[3] It should be taken into consideration that there were multiple voices speaking from and about the past in the different texts where Shakespeare found inspiration for his plays. As Rackin states, "it is customary to speak of Shakespeare's sources by the names of individual authors (Hall, Holinshed, etc.) even though the chronicles

is of the utmost importance when the literary power of the representation, driven by dexterity of language, modifies or represents in a particular way concepts as important for the compelling force of history as "kingship." Thus, kingship in Richard II is projected as a motivating force for the action.

This essay focuses on the depiction of kingship in Shakespeare's Richard II. It is proposed here that the way in which it is portrayed responds to the marked influence of emergent ideas about potestas and auctoritas, which suggested that power, though ultimately depending on God, lies within the natural right of the people and the community.[4] These ideas were a product of the intellectual circle known as the School of Salamanca. In short, the new ideas formulated by this School in the sixteenth century on the origin of the authority of kingship had a strong influence on European culture. As a focus of scholastic thought, the Iberian Peninsula benefited from a number of university luminaries who were determined to challenge the political systems known up to that point. Most of these thinkers were disciples of Francisco de Vitoria (1483–1546), a Dominican friar who, alongside developing existing principles of natural justice, denounced the treatment inflicted by the European conquerors on the inhabitants of the newly discovered lands of the "Americas," and questioned the indisputable power of European rulers of the time through his ontological conception of the state. Ramón Hernández summarizes Vitoria's conception of the authority of kingship in the following terms:

> Although the supreme source of power and authority lies in God, Vitoria is careful to point out that this is true in the sense that all created perfection […] is a participation of the infinite perfection that is God [but] in nature lies the efficient cause or primary origin of all power, be it physical or moral, personal or social, or private or civil. (1991, 1042–43)

Hernández further states that

---

included the work of many writers-predecessors whose work was incorporated, successors who augmented the narratives after their authors' deaths, and collaborators at the time of their production" (1993, 23).

[4] For more information on the way Shakespeare treats politics in his plays see, in particular, Dollimore and Sinfield (1985); Spiekerman (2001); Alexander (2004); Hadfield (2004); Murley and Button (2006); Armitage, Condren and Fitzmaurice (2009); Green (2010) and Skinner (2014).

> Vitoria held firmly to the view that civil authority resides in the people and in the community [even though the] transmission or delegation of this power to the rulers is always problematic in cases in which broad popular participation is denied or not possible. (1991, 1043)

In other words, the result of Vitoria's line of thinking was a radical change in the notion of the origin of kingship and power: "the human race had the right to choose a single ruler […] as this power, as a natural right" belongs to the community or the res publica (1991, 1043–44).[5] As Hernández has noted, the transmission to rulers is "problematic." Richard II offers a clear opportunity to examine the pathways, lines, and figures by which such transmission takes place.

By introducing this possible source of Shakespeare's representation of the monarch in the first part of his second tetralogy as a chance discovery, this article does not intend to proceed as an exercise in New Historicism, but some of its terminology will be certainly alluded to, and a further theoretical perspective will be extracted from comparative semiospherics. Borrowing from Stephen Greenblatt's well-known New-Historicist methodology for analyzing cultural process helps "to look less at the presumed center of the literary domain than at its borders, to try to track what can only be glimpsed" (2001, 4). Otherwise stated, it considers how the theories about sovereignty proposed by the School of Salamanca, the intellectual pinnacle of which is to be found in Vitoria's lectures or relectiones, enticed Early Modern writers such as Shakespeare to see kingship in a new light. However, the essay does not aim to present two separate, autonomous systems (those of Shakespeare and Vitoria) and then attempt to gauge how one represents the other. Instead, it aims to explore the dynamic exchange involved in these two layers of similarity and homology. This "theory of exchange", as Frank Romany glosses it, is a "two-way flow between text and society", where the "cultural artifacts are produced by 'collective negotiation and exchange'," and where "the theatre enjoys a privileged ability to influence and shape the world it represents" (1989, 273). This collective negotiation and exchange of "powers," to use Greenblatt's term, which understands "power" as the mixed

[5] The Latin term res publica, as Hadfield correctly elaborates, "meant the 'public thing', but was most frequently translated as the 'common weal' or 'commonwealth'" (Hadfield 2004, 8).

motives of the Renaissance culture, reveals the "half-hidden cultural transactions through which great works of art are empowered," transactions which are described in terms of "the circulation of social energy" (Greenblatt 2001, 4–6).[6] However, unlike most New-Historicist studies, the current essay does not involve two clearly defined texts, ideally those of Shakespeare and Vitoria, but two distinct systems of signification, Shakespeare's play and Vitoria's postulate of the governing faculty of the people as opposed to a tyrant. It is therefore clearly beneficial here to bring comparative semiospherics into play.

The term semiospherics, borrowed from Yuri Lotman's study (2015), also in many ways broadly connected to the studies of New Historicism, encapsulates "communicative processes and the creation of a new information to be realized" (Lotman 2005, 207). This article uses the term semiosphere rather simplistically, if also intelligibly, to put into practice what Jonathan P. A. Sell casts as "the system of signification or meaning-making which is particular to a given group of individuals, united […] at a given time and in a given space, be it social, geographical, and so forth," which is "constitutive of and constituted by ideology and its forms in an ongoing, bi-directional process of semiotic symbiosis" (2018, 55–56). Thus, the semiospheres considered here involve, on the one hand, the School of Salamanca and Charles V's court, where Vitoria's theories were born, and on the other, the English court at the time Shakespeare's oeuvre was originated, before and after James I's accession to the throne of England. The collective beliefs and ideological elements involve auctoritas, potestas, kingship and sovereignty. While the point of departure of the present essay is Vitoria's intellectual circle (the School of Salamanca), the argument focuses on Shakespeare's Richard II and the semiosphere in which the dramatist worked. The doctrines put forth by the School of Salamanca form the basis for comparison in order to shed some new light upon Shakespeare's history plays and their context.

[6] Lucy Munro's "Shakespeare and the uses of the past: Critical approaches and current debates" (2011) reviews the different historicist approaches to studying Shakespeare in the first decade of the twenty-first century. Munro confronts and differentiates between presentist approaches or New-Historicism and Cultural Materialism.

2. The School of Salamanca and the English court

The approach accompanying the new vision Shakespeare introduces into his plays is as innovative, and as much in tune with the new waves of humanism sweeping Europe, as the new theories on the subject proposed by the School of Salamanca. Drawing particularly on the new doctrine proposed by the Dominican friar Francisco de Vitoria, this School is acknowledged to have embodied a Copernican-style reversal in terms of traditional thought on the divine origin of auctoritas.[7] Vitoria did not receive due acclaim or academic attention until the work of James Brown Scott in 1928, yet he is considered the father of the doctrine of popular sovereignty,[8] an idea proposed in the sixteenth century, by which the medieval concept of the divine origin of kingship was radically modified.[9] His conception of political power, mainly expressed in his relectio entitled De potestate civili (1528), reinterprets and clarifies the key issues binding the emerging Renaissance state. These include questions concerning necessity and autonomy, the origin and nature of the sovereign power, and the purposes or ends to which this power should aspire. According to Pablo Zapatero, who puts Vitoria's ideas about the origin of kingship in a nutshell, "the power of the monarch and that of the political community are not exclusive" because the "political power resides in the res publica while its exercise is vested in the monarch" and "the administration of power, or government, is conferred upon the ruler by the res publica." To put this another way, "power is limited" (Zapatero 2009, 225). It is precisely in this "mediation" of power, which is transferred from the res publica or the community to the ruler,[10] where Vitoria's

[7] According to Hernández (1991), Vitoria anticipated today's human rights and international law (1035–1042). Adolfo Sánchez Hidalgo recalls that "the importance of Francisco de Vitoria [lies in] the conceptualization of [the] subjective right, and consequentially, in the genesis of what would later be known as Human Rights" (2015, 181).

[8] For a recent monograph studying Vitoria, see Brunstetter and O'Driscoll (2017).

[9] For more information on Francisco de Vitoria and his theory on civil potestas and natural law, see Pugh (1953); Hernández (1991); Castilla Urbano (1992); Zapatero (2009); Iturbe (2012); Guzmán-Brito (2013); and Valenzuela-Vermehren (2013).

[10] Vitoria's conceptualization of the perfect or pure "community" is founded upon the "notion of self-sufficiency of political society" put forward by Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas (Valenzuela 2013, 98).

thesis is so subversive. The absolutist idea of the divine figure of the king becomes redundant as the "naturally and divinely appointed power rests in the commonwealth" or the "common good," so that "the primary bearer of the public authority is the social body itself, which has received it from God" (Valenzuela 2013, 95). Therefore, the "philosophical or ontological conception of the state […] is considered to arise from both natural and eternal laws," and is "the result of human will, consent, and legal enactment" (Valenzuela 2013, 83). Together with Vitoria, based on the tenets of the prestigious School of Salamanca, Domingo de Soto, Francisco Suárez and Luis de Molina taught that in the natural subject and the "subjective" right of the people, the res publica, reside the potestas and the dominium to bestow auctoritas on the prince (Cruz Cruz 2013, 40).

Earlier formulations of the concept of kingship (Coleman, 2000), prior to the School of Salamanca, clearly influenced Vitoria's analytical relectiones. Around the fifth and sixth centuries, Cassiodorus considered the role of governor an object of scrutiny, at a time when other philosophers did not question, or even think about, the pre-eminence of the ruler (Brown Scott 1928). In thirteenth-century Spain, more properly the kingdom of Castile at that time, the literary patronage of Alfonso X fostered works such as Siete Partidas (1256–1265) and Espéculo (1255–1260), which "examined the faculties of kings, counts and judges to enact legislation" and "emphasized the idea of kingly or princely power as […] an essential part or member of a greater whole" (Valenzuela 2013, 95–97). Alfonso X's statutory codes would clearly influence some of the intellectuals from the School of Salamanca, like Sebastián Fox Morcillo in his De regni regisque institutione (1556) and Soto in his De Iustitia et iure (1580). They were both disciples of Vitoria (Valenzuela 2013, 96). However, the most direct source of scholastic influence on Vitoria came from one of his teachers in Paris, Jacques Almain, who instructed Vitoria in Aquinas' ideas of kingship, which were collected and analysed in Almain's works De dominio naturali, civili et ecclesiastico and Tractatus de Libellus de auctoritate Ecclesia et Conciliorum generalim (1512–1516) (Urdánoz 1960, 112–13).

This melting pot helped the Dominican theologian to initiate a major shift not only in Spanish political thought, but also throughout Europe, prompting questions around issues associated with modern political statecraft. This article points to a number of instances of

confluence between the semiospheres of Vitoria's School of Salamanca on the one hand, and the English court at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries on the other. The first evidence of the dynamic transaction between these two semiospheres is closely related to the retinue of the Emperor Charles V. Indeed, it is accepted by most biographers of Vitoria that on June 19th, 1534, the Emperor attended one of his classes, while he was paying an imperial visit to the University of Salamanca (Castilla Urbano 1992, 366). The troubled relationship between Vitoria and the Emperor needs further explanation. After presenting his second *relectio* on the indigenous people of the "Indies," *De iure belli* or *De indis, pars posterior* (1539), which caused considerable tension at the court of Charles V, the Emperor "wrote a letter, dated November 10, 1539, to the prior of the Dominican monastery of Salamanca in which he expressed grave concern that some members of his community had called into question Spain's rights over the Indies." He "ordered the prior to collect the various writings and copies in question, send them to the court for further study, and [also] ordered that henceforth such matters were not to be raised or addressed in public" without his permission (Hernández 1991, 1040–41). In addition, Charles V had previously been familiar with Vitoria's texts by another route. Under the imperial auspices, on September 7th, 1530, the Empress had written to the Salamanca theologian on behalf of the Pope Clement VII, asking for advice and for an academic defense of the validity of the marriage between Catherine of Aragon (Charles V's aunt) and Henry VIII, who was gathering evidence to support the annulment of his marriage. This defense materialized some months later in the *relectio* Vitoria delivered in Salamanca, *De matrimonio* (1531) (Castilla Urbano 1992, 365–66). The paradoxical controversies around the relationship between Charles V and Vitoria would become less pronounced at the end of the Emperor's life, when Vitoria's disciple, Soto, became Charles V's confessor (Ramis Barceló 2018, 99). Vitoria's influence crossed the boundaries of Charles V's empire, and

> extended to the universities of Coimbra, with Pedro Barbosa; of Paris, with Juan Maldonado; of Louvain, with Leonardo Lessio; of Dilingen, with Pedro de Soto and Gregory of Valencia; of Rome, with Francisco Suárez; of Mexico, with Alonso Veracruz and Bartholomew de Ledesma; and of Lima, with Juan Ramírez. (Hernández 1991, 1032)

Furthermore, the principles discussed among the theologians of the School of Salamanca appear to have arrived in England in the first decades of the sixteenth century. Only three years after Vitoria's relectio, De potestate civili, was delivered in Salamanca (Castilla Urbano 1992, 365), sir Thomas Elyot practically rephrased the theologian's words in his well-known treatise The Boke Named the Governour (1531), dedicated to Henry VIII. In this work, the humanist "defines public weal," what we would call "commonwealth," as a "body living compact or made of sundry estates and degrees of men, which is disposed by the order of equity and governed by the rule of moderation of reason" (quoted in Moseley 1998, 74; emphasis added). It is worth noting that, at the exact time Elyot was composing the Governour, he was serving as the ambassador to the court of Charles V (Donner 1951, 56). As noted above, the Emperor had met Vitoria and read some of the theses emerging from the School of Salamanca. It seems likely that in this environment Elyot also would have encountered Vitoria's work. Thus, the ideas formulated by Vitoria about the origin of the power of kingship had also brought about a seismic shift in English politics.

The second instance of the point of confluence between the semiospheres of the School of Salamanca and the English court involves a triangular relationship between the humanist George Buchanan, the monarch James I and Vitoria himself. Neither theology nor traditional Christian catechism entertained the least doubt that the power of kings and rulers came from God, especially after James I's publication and distribution of his defense of monarchy in his treatises Basilikon Doron and The Trew Law of Free Monarchies (1598). In these works, the monarch affirmed that "a subject's duty was to obey the king because monarchy was the divinely ordained form of government" and "rebellion was never permitted" (1598, 165). Evidence that the situation in England in no way reflected James I's ideal conception of absolutist power includes the fact that he "made sure that his key works, […] Basilikon Doron and The Trew Law of Free Monarchies, were published in a new edition before he arrived in England in May 1603" (Hadfield 2003, 216). As a matter of fact, the monarch's "political reflections […] were written in response to the arguments for regicide of his former tutor, George Buchanan, articulated in De jure regni apud Scotos (published 1579)" (Hadfield 2004, 93). Indeed, James I's tutor in Scotland, Buchanan, is very likely to have met Vitoria when both of them attended John

Major's lectures on logic and theology at the University of Paris (Brodie 2012, 87–92). The Scottish humanist studied in Paris between the years 1520 and 1522, and later on between 1526 and 1537 (Brodie 2012, 40–46), and Vitoria lived in Paris between 1508 and 1522 (Castilla Urbano 1992, 364).

The third body of evidence indicating that the semiospheres of the School of Salamanca and the English court were in contact is provided by Francisco Suárez.[11] Probably the most international intellectual of the School of Salamanca (Houliston 2013, 83–86), and one of the most precocious of Vitoria's pupils, Suárez was "chosen by Pope Paul V to respond to James's Oath of Allegiance," and immediately found himself "at the center of the seventeenth-century crisis of sovereignty." His work, Defensio fidei Catholicae et Apostolicae (1613) justified tyrannicide, "along with that other Jesuit text, Juan de Mariana's On the King and the King's Education (De Rege et Regis Institutione)" (Lorenz 2013, 39). Valenzuela recalls that Mariana, following the doctrines of Suárez and Vitoria, "limits royal power and establishes that both natural and positive law restricts such power" (2013, 94). In fact, Suárez justified mediated power and the potestas of citizens—counter to the absolutist authority supported by James I—in the following terms:

> […] it may become necessary for this prince to be directed, aided, or corrected in his own field of activity by a higher power that governs men in relation to a more excellent and an eternal end. In that case, the dependence, since such a superior power is concerned with temporal affairs, not in themselves nor for their own sake, but [as if they were bestowed] indirectly; and often an account of some other factor. (Suárez 1613, 668)[12]

[11] It is pertinent here to pay attention to Philip Lorenz's article, "Christall Mirrors: Analogy and Onto-Theology in Shakespeare and Francisco Suárez" (2006), where he draws a close parallel between Suárez and Shakespeare.

[12] Although it seems that, for the purposes of this research, Suárez's Selections were published too late, as it is generally considered that most of Shakespeare's plays were written before 1610 and Richard II around the year 1595, "James knew of [Suárez's theses] beforehand through reports from his secret agent in Madrid, Sir John Digby" (Lorenz 2013, 39). It can therefore be concluded that the compelling force of Suárez's theories made it possible for his writings to circulate in society, even before they were published.

The circulation of social energy radiating from Paris and Salamanca to London[13] during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is confirmed and substantiated by James I's fear of regicide, based on Buchanan's arguments, as well as in his relentless persistence that the monarch was "divinely ordained" and that "rebellion" must not be "permitted." This was probably contrary to the situation in England in the decades before James's ascension to the English throne, as some texts attest, such as "An Homilie Against Disobedience and Wylful Rebellion." Part of the collection of Certain Sermons Appointed by the Queen's Majesty (1574), the Homily "adopts the absolutist position that no rebellion is ever permissible, however tyrannical the king" (Hadfield 2004, 43), an argument which was evidently adopted by James I later on. Actually, the Homily had been

> composed in response to a series of events that threatened the stability of Elizabethan government; the last Tudor rebellion, the Northern Rebellion (1569–70), in favour of Mary Stuart's claim to the throne; the papal bull declaring Elizabeth to be illegitimate; and the execution of Thomas Howard, fourth Duke of Norfolk (1536–72), the leading Catholic courtier, for his part in the Ridolfi plot which aimed to install Mary as queen. (Hadfield 2004, 43)

Often reproduced and read by parsons and vicars at Sunday services, the Homily declares that "a rebel is worse than the worst prince, and rebellion worse than the worst government of the worst prince that hitherto hath been" (1574, 557).

There appears to be no further textual evidence indicative of Vitoria's writings being known in England at the time Shakespeare was writing Richard II. However, as has been demonstrated so far, this cultural transaction can be understood in terms of how the essence of Vitoria's theories was already circulating in society. The presence of Vitoria's text in England seems unlikely, particularly if we take into account that Vitoria was the very theological "lawyer"

[13] Vitoria's relectiones not only reached English and Scottish scholastic circles, they also penetrated the circles of seventeenth-century Dutch intellectuals and, later, eighteenth-century English philosophers. Thus, the "Dutchman, Hugo Grotius, in particular in his De Jure et Pacis, published in 1625, refers extensively to Vitoria and transcribes many of his paragraphs." Moreover, the work of Grotius "would influence John Locke and Samuel Pufendorf, who themselves would mark the reflection of the Encyclopedists and journalists of the eighteenth century" (Hernández 1991, 1032).

who was charged with producing the document condemning Henry VIII's attempt to legitimize divorcing his wife to allow him to marry Anne Boleyn. Nevertheless, the doctrine set out in Vitoria's De potestate civili must have had the occasional defender in England such as, no doubt, London's Erasmian circle. After all, Erasmus of Rotterdam knew Vitoria through his friend Luis Vives, who had been in Paris at the same time as the Dominican before "lectur[ing] in philosophy at Corpus Christi College, Oxford" and being "appointed tutor of Princess Mary, daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon" (Morcillo et al. 2018, 121). This last evidence of the interconnected semiospheres of the School of Salamanca and the English court addresses the fact that Vitoria himself had been in contact with the circle of Erasmus when he became friends with Vives, who was in Paris between 1508 and 1512 (Hernández 1991, 1035). Indeed, Vives expressed his respect for Vitoria in a letter to Erasmus:

> [Diego] has a brother who is different from him, Francisco de Vitoria, who is also a Dominican, a theologian of Paris. He is an individual of the greatest renown and credit among his brethren. Remember that on more than one occasion he defended your cause before different assemblies of theologians in Paris. He is very skillful in these scholarly argumentations. He has been successfully cultivating good letters since he was a child. (Erasmus 1960, 83–85)

It was in the middle of this political and intellectual turmoil that the university luminaries from the School of Salamanca, never for one moment doubting the principle sanctioned by the sacred texts of the Old and New Testament, developed these ideas and brought them to fruition, claiming that potestas, although of divine origin, was conferred on social entities or on the "collectivity," as these were the natural seat of political power (Cruz Cruz 2013, 40–43). From this arose the belief that the power God confers on a person is based on a teleological purpose, which is none other than the common good of the community or political entity (Valenzuela 2013, 84). Consequently, this does not involve "unmediated," but rather "mediated" power.

3. Richard II, the perfect exemplum

It is quite clear that the new doctrine on kingship, put forward by the School of Salamanca, and worded in such simple terms, would have

consequences which would be characterized as "revolutionary."[14] This compelling force, and the circulation of the social energy of these doctrines, had an effect on the way kingship is represented and addressed in the first part of Shakespeare's second tetralogy, Richard II. Without jettisoning the spirit of historical drama, then, Richard II offers a complex view of kingship with broader historical implications. Here, Shakespeare superimposes a modern framework on a medieval setting, where the historical meaning can only be discerned in terms of a humanist perspective. He does this through a plot structure which is so close to the doctrine of Salamanca that the play will prove "revolutionary." It is not a coincidence that this play —or a very similar one, if it transpires that Shakespeare's Richard II was not the play in question—was chosen to be represented in London on the eve of the Essex Rebellion. As if it were extracted directly from the teaching of Vitoria's De potestate civili, which prefers a mediated power to a divine and unmediated authority, kingship at the end of Shakespeare's play is "no longer located in one place [or] one body" because "it is dispersed [as it] moves into mediation itself" (Lorenz 2006, 115). It is acknowledged that recognition of the mediating role, or the link between God as the source of all authority, and the king, the person with whom God deposits this authority, was a final blow to the medieval conception of kingship. It therefore also amounts to the end of one form of government and the beginning of a new one, or a change in the way politics is played, as we would say today. It goes without saying that all this has a corollary in the way the ruler relates to "the ruled," and in this deep transformation lies the key to explaining the dramatic representation of Richard II's attitude towards his subjects.[15] Jean E. Howard makes a point which probably has most relevance for anyone studying Richard II, as opposed to any other play. She notes that Shakespeare does not "reflect but refracts political thought" (2006, 109; emphasis added).

Shakespeare's Richard II was recorded in the Stationer's register in London in 1597, coincidentally the same year Suárez's Metaphysical Disputations was published, and is still considered a

[14] As a matter of fact, the theory of kingship proposed in the sixteenth century is an embryonic form of sovereignty of the people, or democracy.

[15] Zenón Luis-Martínez refers to the "time of mourning" as "an inherent condition of kingship" (2008, 694) when he explains the complex character of Richard II.

play which "posit[s] the theoretical and metaphorical crux of political-theological sovereignty" (Lorenz 2013, 34). The attitude and hence the language of Richard II is therefore commensurate with a monarch convinced of the validity of the old and widely accepted maxims that "the king is above the law" and "the king can do no wrong." However, although Richard is a tyrant at the beginning of the play, and thinks of himself as "the law-give[r] appointed by God, [who] therefore could not be subjected to the indignity of suit by his subjects" (Pugh 1953, 478–79),[16] after his cousin Henry Bolingbroke's uprising, Richard is "no longer like God" (Lorenz 2006, 113) but a victim of his own wrongdoings. As Robert Miola correctly says, "Shakespeare […] depicts Richard as both rightful anointed king as well as capricious tyrant" (2000, 46–47). In the first acts, when he assumes that his divine appointment exonerates him from responsibility, he actually believes that he is the "deputy elected by the Lord" (Richard II 3.2.57) because "Not all the water from the rough rude sea| Can wash away the balm off from an anointed king" (3.2.54–55). Not only does Richard see himself as a quasi-"almighty" ruler, but his relatives and members of the court corroborate this idea with their comments about the body of the king. His uncle York thinks of him as "the anointed King" (2.3.96), and the bishop of Carlisle, who is "a proponent of the ideology of sacred monarchy and divine right" (Lake 2016, 252), describes Richard as

> the figure of God's majesty
> His captain, steward, deputy elected,
> Anointed, crowned, planted many years. (4.1.126–8)

Regardless of the extent to which Richard appears to be "elected by the Lord" (3.2.57), the change in the concept of kingship brought about by the turn of events in act four would seem to be borrowed from the theories of the School of Salamanca. At this moment in the play, when the social order flocks to support his cousin, Richard, who is dragged into what seems like a milites ex machina, reminds the rebels of the unmediated divine and everlasting character of his appointment and anointment. His insistence on comparing himself to Christ reveals the views which have defined his performance as a monarch and is exactly what Vitoria criticizes in his De potestate civili.

[16] This is how Pugh summarizes the privileged status of the medieval monarch, as an absolutist monarchy of the nation state (1953, 478–79).

Convinced that a king answers to God only, he compares the treason of the nobility, the army and even the Church to that of Judas, and sees himself as Christ: "So Judas did to Christ, but He in twelve | Found truth in all but one; I, in twelve thousand, none." (4.1.171–72) Thus, Richard not only considers himself a victim of treason but also likens his situation to that of the Supreme Victim, going far as to compare his deposition to the sacrifice of Christ himself on the cross, suggesting even further that his experience surpasses Christ's betrayal because his enemies,

> some of you, with Pilate, wash your hands,
> Showing an outward pity, yet you Pilates
> Have here delivered me to my sour cross,
> And water cannot wash away your sin. (4.1.239–42)

By comparing the attitude and conduct of the rebels to the behavior of Judas and Pilate, and by comparing his own suffering to the passion of Jesus, he is suggesting clearly that the treason perpetrated against him is greater than the betrayal of Christ himself. In this way, not only is Richard justifying his view of kingship, he is also warning his enemies that regicide of this caliber almost amounts to deicide, something very similar to James I's conception of sovereignty.

This act, along with much of the play, could have been written with Vitoria's words in mind. The correspondence between the rebels who force Richard's deposition and the doctrine proposed by Vitoria could not be more patent. The master of the School of Salamanca suggested in 1528 that:

> civil laws are binding on legislators and principally on kings, [so that] a legislator who does not obey his own laws wrongs the res publica and all other citizens. […] Although the laws be issued by the king, they are equally binding upon the king himself. (1960, 150)

To draw another parallel between Shakespeare's play and Vitoria's treatise: the theologian illustrated his idea on kingship by pointing to the deposition of Peter of Castile—called either the Cruel or the Just, depending on the source—by his bastard brother, Henry of Trastámara, who would later become Henry II of Castile (Castilla Urbano 1992, 125–26).

4. Concluding remarks

The impact of the new political thought emanating from one of the most powerful countries in Europe at the time, and grounded in a naturalistic vision of political life, had an important bearing on how Shakespeare characterized his monarchs. This is particularly true of the protagonist of the first part of his second tetralogy, Richard II. The link between Shakespeare's play and this new doctrine of popular sovereignty developed in the School of Salamanca is not coincidental. As a matter of fact, both the intellectuals from Salamanca and Shakespeare himself focus their attention on texts or stories pertaining to the responsibility of the usurper or the tyrant, and this is directly related to Vitoria's conception of people's natural power over the king's alleged summa potestas. As van Oort suggests, "Shakespeare's kings are obsessed with the idea of their status as usurpers because they participate in the same resentment that makes it impossible for them to accept their invulnerability at the center." For Shakespeare, "usurpation is thus much more than a political category [as it] implies the awareness that the throne is in reality an 'aesthetic scene' that preexists the individual's place on it" (2006, 325). Both for Shakespeare and the School of Salamanca, the crucial deposition of the king points to a new political order and the decay of the Middle Ages. This change in how kingship is conceptualized is particularly evident in Shakespeare's history plays when, even from

> the moment the anointed king is deposed, the self-laceration of feudalism has begun [as the] overthrow of the sacred institution of monarchy, and the general disorder in the ancient, "nature-given" communal hierarchy which follows it, are the starting point of society's self-laceration. (Heller 1965, 20)

The supposed chaos followed by the deposition of a king is essential for the new era. There is little doubt that Shakespeare, "focusing on the highest matters of state in work after work, demonstrates a complex engagement with how the wheels of power turn" (DiMatteo 2011, 161), and this is very apparent in Richard II. This essay corroborates the fact that the link between Shakespeare's (re)presentation of kingship and the doctrine proposed by Vitoria and his disciples involves the new role given to the political community, the res publica and the state.

The findings of this article help to illustrate that Vitoria's conceptualization of kingship and the role of public authority were interlocking issues involving the semiospheres of the School of Salamanca and the English court at the time Richard II was composed. In the light of Vitoria's theories on potestas and auctoritas, Richard II can be seen not only as prefiguring but also as responding to the new ontology of kingship. The rendition of the monarch in Shakespeare's play, and the way he is deposed, are depicted as analogous to the School of Salamanca's thesis on divine-right sovereignty. Only in the light of the widely accepted medieval belief in the quasi-divine character of the monarch can the manner of discourse employed by Richard II be understood, as his royal monologue leaves no room for any dialogic interaction, let alone for any political dialogue. This is not to suggest that Shakespeare was cognizant of the relectiones brought forward by the School of Salamanca, or even of Francisco de Vitoria himself and his teachings in Paris or Salamanca. Instead we are faced with a "shared code, a set of interlocking tropes and similitudes that function not only as the objects but as the conditions of representation" (Greenblatt 1988, 277). Such "literary" space or the space of the trope is precisely what unites Shakespeare and Vitoria and where the concepts of auctoritas, potestas and dominium are conveyed. Where these two figures are held close in terms of each others' language demands further research and requires an even closer reading of their language.

The rhetorical and stylistic characterization of Richard II as a tyrant in the first three acts of the play, when he believes in his divine anointment, is what proves the social circulation of the theories of the School of Salamanca to be an essential component of the dramatic framework of Shakespeare's history. Simply put, this incipient and almost embryonic political dialogue resulting from the new doctrine proposed by the School of Salamanca entails an essential change in the mode of communication between political power and the political community, between rulers and ruled, between rex and res publica, and between monarchs and their subjects. The transformation of the concept of kingship is of such importance that it may even affect the language of literary works which represent the past, and whose representation is so relevant to the present.

References

Alexander, Catherine M. S., ed. 2004. Shakespeare and Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Armitage, David, Conal Condren, and Andrew Fitzmaurice, eds. 2009. Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brodie, Alexander. 2012. The Scottish Enlightenment. Edinburgh: Birlinn.

Brown Scott, James. 1928. El origen español del derecho internacional. Valladolid: Cuesta.

Brunstetter, Daniel R., and Cian O'Driscoll, eds. 2017. Just War Thinkers: From Cicero to the 21st Century. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

Castilla Urbano, Francisco. 1992. El pensamiento de Francisco de Vitoria: filosofía política e indio americano. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Clegg, Cyndia. 1999. "Archival Poetics and the Politics of Literature: Essex and Hayward Revisited." Studies in the Literary Imagination 32: 115–32.

Coleman, Janet. 2000. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity. Oxford: Blackwell.

Corrie, George Elwes, ed. (1574) 1850. "A Homilie Agaynst Disobedience and Wylful Rebellion." In Certain Sermons: Appointed by the Queen's Majesty. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruz Cruz, Juan. 2013. "La translatio del poder and soberano—una teoría jurídico-política en el Siglo de Oro." Medievalia 16 (2): 37–43.

DiMatteo, Anthony. 2011. "'Our sovereign process': Reading Shakespeare's Politics." College Literature 38 (2): 161–70.

Dollimore, Jonathan, and Alan Sinfield, eds. 1985. Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Donner, H. W. 1951. "The Emperor and Sir Thomas Elyot." The Review of English Studies 2 (5): 55–59.

Erasmus, Desiderius. (1960) 1992. Opus Epistolarum. Edited by P. S. Allen. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Forker, Charles R., ed. (2002) 2014. King Richard II. London: Bloomsbury, Arden Shakespeare Third Series, Thomson Learning.

Fox Morcillo, Sebastián. 1556. De regni regisque institutione. Antwerp: Gerard Speelman.

Green, Jeffrey. 2010. The Eyes of the People: Democracy in an Age of Spectatorship. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greenblatt, Stephen. (1988) 2001. Shakespearean Negotiations. Oxford: Oxford University Press and Clarendon Paperbacks.

Guzmán-Brito, Alejandro. 2013. “Breve relación histórica sobre la formación y el desarrollo de la noción de derecho definido como facultad o potestad (‘derecho subjetivo’).” Ars Iuris Salmanticensis Estudios 1: 69–91.

Hadfield, Andrew. 2003. “Timon of Athens and Jacobean Politics.” Shakespeare Survey 56: 215–26.

Hadfield, Andrew. 2004. Shakespeare and Renaissance Politics. London: Thomson Learning.

Hammer, Paul E. J. 2008. “Shakespeare’s Richard II, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising.” Shakespeare Quarterly 59 (1): 1–35.

Heller, Agnes. (1964) 1965. “Shakespeare and History” (review of Shakespeare Our Contemporary, edited by Jan Klott). New Left Review 1 (32): 16–23.

Hernández, Ramón. 1991. “The Internationalization of Francisco de Vitoria and Domingo de Soto.” Fordham International Law Journal 15 (4): 1031–59.

Houliston, Victor. 2013. Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Person’s Jesuit Polemic, 1580–1610. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Howard, Jean E. 2006. “Dramatic Traditions and Shakespeare’s Political Thought.” In British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory 1500–1800, edited by David Armitage, 129–44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iturbe, Mariano. 2012. “The Natural Law in the Times of St. Francis Xavier: Francisco de Vitoria (1492–1546).” In St Francis Xavier and the Jesuit Missionary Enterprise. Assimilations between Cultures, edited by Ignacio Arellano and Carlos Mata Induráin, 71–89. Pamplona: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra.

James VI and I. (1598, 1616) 1971. The Works. New York and Hildersheim: Georg Olms Verlag.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. 1957. The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Lake, Peter. 2016. How Shakespeare Put Politics on the Stage. London and New York: Yale University Press.

Lorenz, Philip. 2006. “Christall Mirrors: Analogy and Onto-theology in Shakespeare and Francisco Suárez.” Religion & Literature 38 (3): 101–19.

Lorenz, Philip. 2013. The Tears of Sovereignty: Perspectives of Power in Renaissance Drama. New York: Fordham University Press.

Lotman, Yuri. 2005. “On the Semiosphere.” Translated by Wilma Clark. Sign System Studies 33 (1): 205–26.

Luis-Martínez, Zenón. 2008. “Shakespeare’s Historical Drama as Trauerspiel: Richard II —And After.” ELH 75 (3): 673–705.

Morcillo, Aurora G., María Asunción Gómez, Paula de la Cruz-Fernández, and José Manuel Morcillo-Gómez, eds. 2018. The Modern Spain Sourcebook: A Cultural History from 1600 to the Present. London: Bloomsbury.

Moseley, Charles W. R. D. (1998) 2009. Shakespeare's History Plays: Richard II to Henry V, the Making of a King. London: Penguin Books and Humanities-Ebooks, LLP.

Munro, Lucy. 2011. "Shakespeare and the Uses of the Past: Critical Approaches and Current Debates." Shakespeare 7 (1): 102–25.

Murley, John A., and Sean Button, eds. 2006. Perspectives on Politics in Shakespeare. Oxford: Lexington Books.

Oort, Richard van. 2006. "Shakespeare and the Idea of the Modern." New Literary History, Critical Inquiries 37 (2): 319–39.

Pope, Alexander. (1742) 1743. The Dunciad. Edited by George Faulkner. London and Dublin: M. Cooper at the Globe in Paster-Noster-Row.

Pugh, George W. 1953. "Historical Approach to the Doctrine of Sovereign Immunity." Louisiana Law Review 13 (3): 476–94.

Rackin, Phyllis, and Jean E. Howard. 1997. Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories. London: Routledge.

Rackin, Phyllis. (1990) 1993. Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Ramis Barceló, Rafael. 2018. "La presencia de Erasmo en las obras de Vitoria y Soto." Relectiones 5: 93–114.

Romany, Frank. 1989. "Shakespeare and the New Historicism." Essays in Criticism, A Quarterly Journal 39 (4): 271–88.

Sánchez Hidalgo, Adolfo. 2015. "Voluntarism and Intellectualism in Francisco de Vitoria." Persona & Derecho 73: 181–202.

Sell, Jonathan P. A. 2018. "Sleep and the Shepherd-king in Quevedo and Shakespeare: An Essay in Comparative semiospherics." ELH 85: 55–84.

Skinner, Quentin. 2014. Forensic Shakespeare. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soto, Domingo de. 1580. De Iustitia et iure. Salamanca: Excudebat Ioannes Baptista a Terranova.

Spiekerman, Tim. 2001 Shakespeare's Political Realism. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Urdánoz, Teófilo, ed. 1960. Obras de Francisco de Vitoria. Relecciones Teológicas. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.

Valenzuela-Vermehren, Luis. 2013. "The Origin and Nature of the State in Francisco de Vitoria's Moral Philosophy." Ideas y Valores 62 (151): 81–103.

Vitoria, Francisco de. (1528) 1960. “De potestate civili, proposition 21.” In Obras de Francisco de Vitoria. Relecciones Teológicas, edited by Teófilo Urdánoz, 107–290. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.

Woolf, Daniel R. 2000. Reading History in Early Modern England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zapatero, Pablo. 2009. “Legal Imagination in Vitoria – The Power of Ideas.” Journal of the History of International Law 11 (2): 221–71.

How to cite this article:
Conejero-Magro, Luis Javier. “The School of Salamanca in the Sixteenth Century and the Way Kingship is Canvassed in Shakespeare’s Richard II.” SEDERI 30 (2020): 7–28.

https://doi.org/10.34136/sederi.2020.1

Author’s contact: conejeroluis@unex.es

Postal address: Dpto. Filología Inglesa – Universidad de Extremadura – Avda. Universidad, s/n. – 10071 Cáceres – Spain

Submission: 18/10/2019 Acceptance: 28/01/2020