Introduction

Jeanne Mathieu*

"Come, Mephistophilis, let us dispute again."[1] This injunction taken from Christopher Marlowe's *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* (1592) testifies to the enduring legacy of the medieval dispute or *disputatio* in a play obsessed with truth and knowledge and, more generally, in 16th- and 17th-century England. According to the *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (1584), the word "disputation" can be defined as follows: "a debating according to the law."[2] The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives this definition: "An exercise in which parties formally sustain, attack, and defend a question or thesis, as in the medieval schools and universities."[3] As for the word "dispute", the definition is as follows: "An oral or written discussion of a subject in which arguments for and against are set forth and examined."[4] Thus, when Marlowe's protagonist uses the verb "dispute", he refers to a tradition which can be traced back to Greek theatre and which consisted in staging agonistic dialogues. This tradition gave birth to the medieval academic *disputatio*. In the Middle Ages, that Greek form of debate became a didactic tool, a debate between a teacher and his students. These exercises

---

* English Department of the Université Toulouse Jean Jaurès, CAS EA 801.
[1] Marlowe, Christopher, "The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus," *Christopher Marlowe, The Complete Plays*, John B. Steane ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969), Act II, Scene i, Line 33.
[2] Cooper, Thomas, "Disputation," *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (London, 1584), http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/.
[3] *Oxford English Dictionary Online,* "Disputation, N. 1.c.," accessed 15th October 2023, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/disputation_n?tab=meaning_and_use#64495 38.
[4] *Oxford English Dictionary Online,* "Dispute, N. 2.b.," accessed 15th October 2023, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/dispute_n?tab=meaning_and_use#6450341

were extremely codified and obeyed strict rules.[5] The organisation of these sessions always followed the same pattern. According to Béatrice Périgot, the session started with an either/or question, a *pro* and *contra* debate would ensue and a conclusion would end the debate. Each participant was either a *respondens* or an *opponens* and had to stick to the assigned position. The *repondens* argued in favour of the main argument and the *opponens's* role was to give contrary arguments. The teacher then expounded his *solutio*. The conclusion was a compromise between the two opposed positions. However, the word "dispute" differs from "disputation" in that it may also refer to a violent encounter between two parties. According to the *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae*, the word "dispute" can be defined as follows: "To trie a quarrel by battaile or dint of sworde."[6] As for the *Oxford English Dictionary*, it gives the following definition of the term: "a difference of opinion; freq. with the added notion of vehemence, a heated contention, a quarrel."[7] The word "dispute" stands at the crossroads between very different expressions of a disagreement or a controversy involving two or more opponents. The exchange, whether it be written or oral, can be very rational and based on logic, in that it differs from words such as "quarrel" or "conflict", but it can also lead to verbal or physical violence.

The early modern period is a period which seems to have witnessed a transition from one aspect of the term to the other. However, the transition was not abrupt and, in Renaissance England, the exercise evolved, especially when it focused on theology. While public religious disputations were organised by the authorities nationwide, these sessions often lapsed into violence.[8] One of the best-known disputations of the early modern period

---

[5] For more on the medieval *disputatio* and its codes, see Weijers, Olga, *'Queritur Utrum': recherches sur la « disputatio » dans les universités médiévales* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009).

[6] Cooper, Thomas, "Dispute," *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (London, 1584), http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/.

[7] *Oxford English Dictionary*, "Dispute, N. 2.a.," accessed 15th October 2023, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/dispute_n?tab=meaning_and_use#6450341

[8] For a complete analysis of this practice in Elizabethan and Jacobean England, see Rodda, Joshua, *Public Religious Disputation in England, 1558-1626* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2014). For more on public religious disputation in France, see Hentz-Dubail, Isabelle, "De la Logique à la Civilité. Disputes et conférences des guerres de religion (1560-1610)," PhD dissertation, University of Grenoble 3, 1999. For a survey of the sessions organised in the Old Swiss Confederacy, see Flückiger, Fabrice, *Dire le vrai : une histoire de la dispute religieuse au début du XVIᵉ siècle : ancienne Confédération helvétique, 1523-1536* (Neuchâtel : Presses Universitaires Suisses, 2018

took place in 1581 at the Tower of London. It involved the Jesuit priest Edmund Campion and Protestant ministers such as Alexander Nowell, William Day, William Fulke or Roger Goad. An account of these four disputations was written and published by Alexander Nowell and the first impression which emerges is that of a very erudite or scholarly debate. The disputants explored very complex topics such as the authenticity of the Epistle of Saint James, the distinction that should be made between canonical and apocryphal texts, justification by faith alone or the characteristics of the true Church. However, if we take a closer look at the passage which recounts the debate regarding the authenticity of the Epistle of Saint James, we might notice jarring elements:

> But he [Campion] still charged *Luther* with blasphemie for saying that some doe very probably affirme, that the Epistle of James, was not written by the Apostle Saint James, nor worthie the spirite of an Apostle, and urged us to answere what opinion we had of that Epistle, meaning to intangle us with that *Dilemma* either to condemne Luther, or else to doubt of the Epistle, as Luther saith that some probablie doe. We answered that our Church doubteth not of that Epistle, but receiveth it as Canonical, readeth it in our Churches, expoundeth it in our scholes, and alleageth it for confirmation of doctrine. Notwithstanding for Luther or any other to say, that some have very probably affirmed that Epistle not to be written by Saint James nor to be worthie the spirite of an Apostle, is no blasphemie.
> It is blasphemie, blasphemie (quoth he) pronouncing those words with disdainefull countenance and voyce.
> It is soone said (quoth we) but not so easely proved.
> I will prove it (quoth he) to be blasphemie by two reasons, and thus he framed a syllogisme.
> The Gospell of Saint John, and the Epistle of Saint James, were written by the same spirite:
> But to say that some doe probably affirme the Gospell of Saint John not to be written by Saint John, nor to be worthie the spirite of an Apostle is blasphemie: Therefore to say the like of Saint James Epistle is blasphemy.
> Answere was made that the *Major* was *Petitio Principii* the challenging of the graunt of that which chiefly is in controversie. For those that so say of Saint James Epistle, doubt whether it was written by the same Spirite, that the Gospell of Saint John was or no: and that still resteth for you to prove said we.

> And here Master Campion when he coulde not denie, that he required
> that to be graunted to him which he should have proved, was put to
> silence, and had no more to replie.[9]

The text is replete with words such as "answered", "proved", "reason",
"syllogism", "but", "therefore", "the major", "denie" and "replie", which
points to the legacy of the traditional medieval *disputatio*. However, other
features emerge from this description. Although the account is biased since
it was written by one of the Protestant disputants, we might also notice the
presence of insults, an emphasis on paraverbal elements (the tone of the
disputants' voice in particular), on their body language or references to the
reactions of the audience. For instance, Campion's tone and attitude is
described as "disdainefull" and Fulke accuses the Jesuit of "slander". In
addition, during another exchange between Campion and Roger Goad,
Campion asks: "What now, shall we have hissing?" and Goad answers:
"Sure it is worthy of hissing, and of blushing too, if you had any feare of
God before your eyes, or conscience."[10] The intervention of the audience
here shows that the rules of the traditional *disputatio* are not followed
anymore and the ultimate goal of the dispute is to destroy the enemy even if
it means introducing disorder into a very codified exercise. This tension
between popular and elite tendencies can also be felt in the drama of the
period. Indeed, it is perfectly exemplified in Nathaniel Woodes' *The Conflict
of Conscience* (1581), a play written to be performed in private houses.
Unsurprisingly, therefore, the play contains many erudite dialogues between
the Catholic characters and the Protestant protagonist of the play,
Philologus. In Act IV, the characters debate over the authority of the Pope
and the dialogue begins as follows:

> *CARDINALL.* To begin therfore orderly: how say'st thou, Philologus,
> Have I authoritie to call thee me before?
> Or, to be short, I will object it thus:
> Whether hath the Pope which is Peter's successor,
> Than all other bishops preheminence more?
> If not, then it follow that neither he,
> Nor I which am his legate, to accompts may call thee.
> *PHILOLOGUS.* The question is perilous for me to determine,
> Chiefly when the party is judge in the cause;
> Yet, if the whole course of Scripture ye examine,

---

[9] Nowell, Alexander, *A true report of the disputation or rather priuate conference
had in the Tower of London, with Ed. Campion Iesuite, the last of August. 1581:*
(London, 1583), sig. C3[r].

[10] Nowell, *A true report*, sig L3[v].

And will be tried by God's holy laws,
Small help shall you find to defend the same cause,
But the contrary may be proved manifestly,
As I in short words will prove to you briefly.[11]

The exchange is close to a medieval *disputatio* in which the disputants exchange rational arguments to convince their opponent. As in Nowell's account, the dialogue includes words such as "therefore", "object", "then", "or", "whether", "if not", "nor", "determine", "yet" or "but". In the long cue which follows, Philologus also makes use of a syllogism and of various scriptural arguments to defend his point of view. However, the play also testifies to the failure of rational argumentative techniques. After Philologus's long demonstration, the Cardinal replies: "Ah, thou arrant heretic! I will thee remember."[12] This shows that the characters do not always rely on rational arguments and that the debate often degenerates into abuse.[13] Moreover, threats are not absent from the play either. At the end of the dispute, the Cardinal orders:

Nay if thou beest obstinate I will say no more.
Have him hence to prison, and keep him full sure:
I will make him set by my friendship more store:
But hearest thou, Zeal? go first and procure
Some kind of new torment which he may not indure.[14]

Philologus is first called an "obstinate" before being sent to jail and tortured. This threat to his physical integrity is not followed by any other argument and serves as the conclusion of the dispute.

This new way of envisaging the encounter with the religious enemy might reinforce the idea that dispute and toleration are two antithetical terms. However, the definition of the word "toleration", as it appears in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, might help solve this apparent contradiction: "Allowance (with or without limitations), by the ruling power, of the exercise of religion otherwise than in the form officially established or

---

[11] Woodes, Nathaniel, "The Conflict of Conscience," *A Select Collection of Old English Plays*, vol. 6, 4th ed., Robert Dodsley ed. (New York: B. Blom, 1964), Act IV, Scene I, Lines 36-42.
[12] Woodes, "The Conflict of Conscience," Act IV, Scene I, Line 91.
[13] For a survey of insults in the drama of the period, see Vienne-Guerrin, Nathalie, *Shakespeare's Insults: A Pragmatic Dictionary* (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2016).
[14] Woodes, "The Conflict of Conscience," Act IV, Scene I, Lines 161-165.

recognized."[15] What is important to notice here is the idea of limitations which appears in the definition. Indeed, tolerating one's religious enemy may entail limits.[16] This is why, in diplomatic terms, the concept of toleration must be viewed as a truce, rather than as a permanent peace settlement, in the early modern period. Faced with a society characterised by religious hybridity, Renaissance men and women, continually negotiated terms that would enable them to coexist with their religious enemy.[17] The early modern period is a period which saw the emergence of modern diplomacy and, if religion was the source of conflictual relationships between contemporaries, we should not ignore that the notion of appeasement is also crucial to understand the period. As Nathalie Rivère de Carles notices: "Monarchs, ambassadors, diplomatic figures of all creeds and nationalities struggled with fostering, or simply maintaining, peace."[18] This is well illustrated in Francis Savage's polemical dialogue entitled *A conference betvvixt a mother a devout recusant, and her sonne a zealous protestant: seeking by humble and dutifull satisfaction to winne her vnto the trueth, and publike worship of god established nowe in England. Gathered by him whose hearts desire is, that all may come to the knowledge of God, and be saued* (1600). Interestingly, in this text, the Protestant character says to his Catholic mother: "I wish that one of us would heare another more than we do. I see, I see it is profitable."[19] As a result of the dialogue between the

---

[15] *Oxford English Dictionary*, "Toleration, N. 4.a.," accessed 15th October 2023, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/dispute_n?tab=meaning_and_use#6450341

[16] For the various aspects covered by the term "toleration" in Renaissance England, see Coffey, John, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England: 1558-1689* (Harlow: Longman, 2000) and Walsham, Alexandra, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).

[17] I borrow the concept of "religious hybridity" from Jean-Christophe Mayer. See Mayer, Jean-Christophe, *Shakespeare's Hybrid Faith: History, Religion and the Stage* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006). For more on the importance of multiconfessionalism in the Renaissance, see Dumont, Martin, ed., *Coexistences confessionnelles en Europe à l'époque moderne: théories et pratiques, XVIe-XVIIe siècles* (Paris: les Éditions du Cerf, 2016) and Safley, Thomas Max ed., *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

[18] Rivère de Carles, Nathalie, "The Poetics of Diplomatic Appeasement in the Early Modern Era," *Early Modern Diplomacy, Theatre and Soft Power: The Making of Peace*, Nathalie Rivère de Carles ed. (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 2.

[19] Savage, Francis, *A conference betvvixt a mother a devout recusant, and her sonne a zealous protestant : seeking by humble and dutifull satisfaction to winne her vnto*

Son and his Mother, the latter abjures her Catholic faith and converts to Protestantism but there is no trace of insults or violence in the exchange. The dialogue can thus be regarded as a diplomatic exercise. The text is less about a confrontation than a negotiation which will help the characters find common ground and solve the conflict through confessional diplomacy. In that text as in various Elizabethan or Jacobean plays, including *The Conflict of Conscience*, the explicit references to the characters coming closer together before the dispute might be a way to signal one of the positive aspects of the exercise. The dispute brings them together on stage: "Go to, Master Zeal, bring forth that heretic,"[20] (IV.i.1-2). Even if the line contains an insult, getting closer together or assembling to exchange arguments implies that dispute and coexistence or co-presence are intertwined. In the play, it does not last long because of the actions of the Catholic characters, but the possibility to meet and parley exists and, subsequently, the arguments from both sides, and their voices, will be heard on stage.[21] The idea of toleration might therefore be fluid or transient but it can still be linked to religious disputation. This dichotomy, or rather balance of opposites or *discordia concors*, and the limits imposed on the concept of toleration through religious disputation is what the articles in this issue explore. In the Renaissance, the definition of the word "toleration" is not fixed and all the articles in this issue demonstrates the fluidity of the concept, sometimes its failure, but try to bring new light to this epistemological and religious debate. The tension between cacophony, polyphony and harmony is at the heart of this issue.

The topics examined in the essays of the first section deal with the national community and the challenge posed by the rise of religious hybridity, or plurality, in England and in Europe. The articles concentrate on the religious conflict, or dispute, within the nation and the dangers threatening the unity of the national community. They show that, in the Renaissance, the necessity to debate with one's neighbour arose. In her contribution, Monique Venuat explores the Eucharist controversy which involved Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner between 1549 and 1552 in England. Focusing on three texts written as a dialogue between the two men

---

the trueth, and publike worship of god established nowe in England. Gathered by him whose hearts desire is, that all may come to the knowledge of God, and be saued (Cambridge, 1600), 51.

[20] Woodes, "The Conflict of Conscience," Act IV, Scene I, Lines 1-2.

[21] For an in-depth analysis of the representation of religious tolerance on stage, see Walsh, Brian, *Unsettled Toleration: Religious Difference on the Shakespearean Stage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

in 1550-1551, she argues that traces of the medieval *disputatio* can be found in their writings, which testifies to a desire to find the truth and to render the polemical exchange fruitful. However, the stakes were simply too high to lead to a compromise which could have been regarded as the truth around which the Church of England could unite: "Avec la dénonciation du dogme de la transsubstantiation comme l'instrument du pouvoir diabolique et usurpé de l'Église romaine, la querelle eucharistique dépasse le conflit d'opinions, et se fait l'expression de l'affrontement entre deux forces dont une seule peut être du Christ." As a result, the dialogue only reasserted the dichotomy between truth and error or heresy (the technique of *reductio as heresiam* is constantly used by both polemicists). Ultimately, what emerges from these texts is a desire to defeat one's opponent. Daniel Bennett Page's essay investigates the ways in which the transitions between the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I (1553) and between Mary I and Elizabeth I (1558) affected the thirty-five singers of the English Chapel Royal. By analysing several examples, Daniel Bennett Page finds that many of these musicians managed to find a compromise between their personal beliefs and their role as official musicians at court. He shows how many musicians, whose beliefs ran contrary to that of their monarch, still managed to remain in office: "We can see, then, that even a fairly obvious Papist could find a berth at court if his conscience did not prick him to become a spectacle or openly subversive. This regime of toleration adds nuance to monochromatic pictures of relentless religious persecution of Britons of all ranks under Mary and Elizabeth." Because of the status and rank of these musicians, the English Chapel Royal may be said to exemplify the idea of religious hybridity which characterised English society in the 16th and 17th centuries, culminating perhaps with the emergence of Church Papistry under Elizabeth I, as suggested by Daniel Bennet Page at the end of his essay. In a contribution dedicated to fictional dialogues written by early Stuart ministers, Joshua Rodda argues that ministers took on a new mediating role in the period which consisted in reconciling parishioners with themselves and assuaging their fears and doubts. He contends that the literary dialogue, which finds its roots in the Humanist movement characterised by its emphasis on education both in its oral or written form, perfectly illustrates the religious diversity of the period thanks to its very form: "Though they invariably strive to push a specific theological position, the dialogues could not afford to be wholly monologic. To have the right effect, they had to depict contemporary anxieties and conflicts with an immediate, functional veracity." The texts contain "a cacophony of dissenting voices" but Joshua Rodda reasserts their power to defuse conflict: "They are targeted exercises in damage limitation,

conflict resolution, and community education." As Joshua Rodda concludes: "But beneath the armor, their methods speak to a preference for conversation over conflict." The importance of speaking with the enemy is also highlighted in Fabrice Flückiger's essay. His article focuses on religious disputations held in the 1520s and 1530s in Memmingen, Kaufbeuren, Nuremberg, Bern or Zurich. What was at stake in these disputations was restoring the religious but also the civic unity of the city: "Cette enquête veut montrer que les disputes répondent autant au souci de pacification d'une communauté déchirée par le conflit entre partisans et adversaires de la nouvelle foi qu'à la nécessité de retrouver le chemin de la Vérité." The essay shows that religion and politics were closely linked and that organising religious disputations was seen as a paradoxical tool, a *pharmakon*, to pacify the city, thus emphasising the positive impact of cross-confessional exchanges. However, the dual role of these disputes, restoring peace within the city and demonstrating the truth of one's beliefs by proving the enemy wrong, only resulted in an impossible agreement between the parties and the exercise only led to further religious tensions. The disputants could only agree on a truce. The tension between inclusion and exclusion is also visible in the three polemical dialogues on which Anne-Gaëlle Leterrier-Gagliano focuses. Her contribution analyses the writings of three French writers: Jean Gacy, Artus Désiré and Simon Poncet. She investigates the way these authors denounce the religious practices of the reformed Church in their works. The goal is not so much to convince the religious enemy as to preserve the unity of the Catholic community. Ultimately, the dialogue becomes a monologue because the enemy cannot be convinced. Reformed ideas are only presented to be better defeated: "Le dialogue polémique, à l'image des débats de controverse théologique, utilise la médiation d'un opposant pour mieux parler à son véritable auditoire : ce lecteur assailli par l'incertitude, dont il faut consolider l'appartenance confessionnelle." Finally, the author argues that these dialogues ask their readers to stop probing into matters of faith because they exceed their understanding and inevitably leads them to adhere to heretical doctrines. The goal of these polemical texts was to bring about peace but only after the destruction, or banishment, of the religious Other.

The articles contained in the second section also deal with peace and conflict-resolution. They focus on diplomacy and international relations in post-Reformation Europe. Blandine Demotz probes into the tension between religious polarisation and toleration as a political tool in an article exploring the diplomatic correspondence between Thomas Cromwell and three ambassadors, John Wallop, Gregorio De Casali and Eustace Chapuys. She

regards the exchanges between these ambassadors as a form of toleration through dialogue. Indeed, she sees toleration as a diplomatic strategy through the use of rhetoric with a view to maintaining peace in Europe : "En cela, la tolérance religieuse semble s'affirmer davantage comme une concession requise par la situation diplomatique, ce qui correspond à la façon dont la tolérance a pu être envisagée dans la première modernité." Making use of the concept of *consensus christianus*, she shows that a certain measure of toleration was introduced to maintain peace in Europe and this is what Cromwell's letters reflect. Jane Yeang Chui Wong's article offers new insight into the role of Spain in the Anglo-Irish conflict and its diplomatic dimension. It also sheds light on the influence of the Jesuits in the conflict. Her essay examines the interplay between politics, diplomacy and religion during the Nine Years War (1596-1603): "this essay explicates how the religious backdrop in Ireland formed the basis of a Catholic affinity that transformed Ireland into a diplomatic pawn where pan religious imperatives came to hinge on the broader international exigencies of the Anglo-Spanish conflict." The article focuses on negotiations between the leaders of the Irish Confederacy, Hugh O'Neill and Hugh O'Donnell, and Spain to form an alliance against England and the author contends that because Spanish support was irregular, the two leaders had to appear complacent to English authorities, thus maintaining communication with the English Protestant authorities as a political manoeuvre but arousing suspicions of double-dealing: "The exchanges between the confederate leaders and Philip II's representatives underscore the mutual distrust on both sides and how immensely difficult it must have been for them to communicate and coordinate effectively." In their letters to Philip III, the Confederate leaders used the religious conflict between England and Spain to convince Philip to lend them military support and to send an Armada to Ireland but with no success: "From the Spanish perspective, religion was subject to political calculations but the same applies to Rome, where politics is also subject to religion."

In the third and last section, the articles deal with the representation of the religious conflict on stage. Filip Krajník and Becky Friedman both address the issue of a minority religious group trying to find its place in English society. Filip Krajník analyses a Restoration religious play entitled *St. Cecily: or, The Converted Twins*. He argues that through the representation of the religious conflict and scenes of religious conversion, the play can paradoxically be regarded as a plea for toleration of the Catholic minority in England: "Indeed, although the play understandably never uses the terms "Catholic" or "Protestant", the polemical nature of its language

and the way in which it addresses religious topics clearly resonate with the then current (anti-)anti-popish controversies, which took the form of speeches, declarations, sermons, laws, letters and pamphlets." Krajník argues that the playwright (probably Matthew Medbourne) called on the twin motif, and used the conflict arising between the two brothers, to promote religious tolerance in England: "By presenting the two brothers as quarrelling twins, whose fights prove insignificant and who are ultimately reconciled in the common faith, the author of *St. Cecily* offers a parallel to the essentially "twin churches" that should live in peace and unity for the sake of their own welfare and prosperity." Finally, Becky Friedman's contribution sheds light on the way closet drama managed to adapt popular dramatic conventions to represent the opposition between Jews and Protestants in England. While Elizabeth Cary's *The Tragedy of Mariam* contains many scenes of dispute and agonistic dialogues, the play also testifies to a desire to learn more about the Jewish community and perhaps to establish a certain form of coexistence: "Thus, while engaging in popular insult culture linked to Jewish stage representation, made popular in canonical works like *The Jew of Malta* and *The Merchant of Venice*, *The Tragedy of Mariam* also participates in a contemporary intellectual practice which cultivated a curiosity in Jews and Jewishness."

Bibliography

Primary sources

MARLOWE, Christopher. "The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus." *Christopher Marlowe, The Complete Plays*. John B. Steane ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969.

NOWELL, Alexander. *A true report of the disputation or rather priuate conference had in the Tower of London, with Ed. Campion Iesuite, the last of August. 1581*: London, 1583.

SAVAGE, Francis. *A conference betvvixt a mother a devout recusant, and her sonne a zealous protestant : seeking by humble and dutifull satisfaction to winne her vnto the trueth, and publike worship of god established nowe in England. Gathered by him whose hearts desire is, that all may come to the knowledge of God, and be saued.* Cambridge, 1600.

WOODES, Nathaniel. "The Conflict of Conscience." *A Select Collection of Old English Plays*. Vol. 6. Robert Dodsley ed. New York: B. Blom, 1964.

Secondary sources

COFFEY, John. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England: 1558-1689*. Harlow: Longman, 2000.

DUMONT, Martin, ed. *Coexistences confessionnelles en Europe à l'époque moderne: théories et pratiques, XVIe-XVIIe siècles*. Paris: les Éditions du Cerf, 2016.

FLÜCKIGER, Fabrice. *Dire le vrai : une histoire de la dispute religieuse au début du XVIe siècle : ancienne Confédération helvétique, 1523-1536*. Neuchâtel : Presses Universitaires Suisses, 2018.

HENTZ-DUBAIL, Isabelle. "De la Logique à la Civilité. Disputes et conférences des guerres de religion (1560-1610)," PhD dissertation, University of Grenoble 3, 1999.

MAYER, Jean-Christophe. *Shakespeare's Hybrid Faith: History, Religion and the Stage*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

RIVÈRE DE CARLES, Nathalie. "The Poetics of Diplomatic Appeasement in the Early Modern Era." *Early Modern Diplomacy, Theatre and Soft Power: The Making of Peace*, Nathalie Rivère de Carles ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, 1-23.

RODDA, Joshua. *Public Religious Disputation in England, 1558-1626*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2014.

SAFLEY, Thomas Max ed. *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern* World. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

VIENNE-GUERRIN, Nathalie. *Shakespeare's Insults: A Pragmatic Dictionary*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2016.

WALSH, Brian. *Unsettled Toleration: Religious Difference on the Shakespearean Stage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

WALSHAM, Alexandra. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.

WEIJERS, Olga. *'Queritur Utrum': recherches sur la « disputatio » dans les universités médiévales*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009.

Dictionaries

COOPER, Thomas. *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (London, 1584), "Disputation." http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/.

COOPER, Thomas, *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (London, 1584), "Dispute." http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/.

Oxford English Dictionary Online, "Disputation, N. 1.c." https://www.oed.com/dictionary/disputation_n?tab=meaning_and_use#6449538.

Oxford English Dictionary, "Dispute, N. 2.a." https://www.oed.com/dictionary/dispute_n?tab=meaning_and_use#6450341.

Oxford English Dictionary Online, "Dispute, N. 2.b." https://www.oed.com/dictionary/dispute_n?tab=meaning_and_use#6450341.