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Chapter Six

The foundation for History: Annotations in the Manuscripts belonging to John Bale, Matthew Parker, and John Foxe

these writers while they shew vs one halfe of the Bishop of Rome, the other halfe of him they leave vnperfect, and utterly vntold.¹

When writing these words in 1570 against monastic chroniclers, John Foxe believed that he had now told the full, ‘vntold’ story. Foxe’s history had revealed the ‘other halfe’, by examining a diverse collection of manuscripts and printed books through a specific interpretative and methodological interrogation. He had largely achieved these aims through the support offered by Matthew Parker. As the previous two chapters have indicated many of the manuscripts Parker provided formed a new and, for Foxe, unchallengeable basis for his depiction of past events and his argument. Manuscript copies of chronicles compiled by John Brompton, Gervase of Canterbury, Matthew Paris, Walter of Guisborough and Thomas Walsingham were granted clear priority over other sources at particular points in Foxe’s narrative; other manuscripts such as the Annals compiled by Nicholas Trivet and the Flores Historiarum attributed to Matthew of Westminster provided a supporting range of evidence vital to authenticating the overarching argument. Individual extracts such as King Edgar’s oration, Augustine’s questions to Pope Gregory the Great and the anti-fraternal tract Jack Upland, provided additional flavour and colour. However, the picture of Parker’s vital support to the Acts and Monuments is not as straightforward or as one-way as it might at first appear. Much of the complexity directs our attention to John Bale and in particular to the

¹ A&M, 1570, A Protestation to the whole Church of England [Prefaces], p. 2.
location and transmission, at his death in 1563, of those manuscripts which he had at one time owned or at least consulted in some detail. Here we are not necessarily talking about Bale's lost library, but the remnants which he managed to save, with Parker's help. As indicated by William O'Sullivan, Bale had lost his library in Ireland when forced to flee persecution upon the accession of Mary I in England.² In chapter three of this thesis, we briefly touched upon how Parker had attempted to help Bale find these lost books, but to little avail. Based at Canterbury, Bale helped the Archbishop acquire a range of books that he had found elsewhere or had obtained since his sojourn across the seas.

Many of the manuscripts from Parker's collection contain annotations in Bale's hand. Furthermore, some of the manuscripts which link Foxe to Parker, are also linked to Bale. Is it right for us then to presume that Foxe obtained these manuscripts from the Archbishop simply because that is where these manuscripts ended up at Bale's death? Or is it more plausible that Parker supplied Foxe with only some of these manuscripts and that others came only later to Parker's hands, via Foxe. Only direct examination of the manuscripts that we now know Foxe used, and which have since ended up in Parker's collection, can provide an answer to these questions. The answer has a direct impact on our understanding of collaboration between Foxe and Parker and can provide another perspective on the use of source material in the first two editions of the *Acts and Monuments*. Although it is the manuscript sources used in the *Acts and Monuments* and known to have belonged at some point to Matthew Parker that we are primarily interested in, we cannot examine them in isolation. First, we must gain an understanding of how Parker, his household of scholars, and Foxe generally annotated

their manuscripts. We can identify similar processes of thought and investigation behind the annotations and a variety of purposes with which these scholars deployed their pens. As signified by William H. Sherman these ‘active’ marks of reception upon the manuscripts, helped scholars to make sense of their texts and to personalise their contents.\(^3\) Second, we must compare Foxe’s annotations there to his annotations in manuscripts, which we know he himself owned. This is important as it can tell us if he treated his own manuscripts differently than those owned by Parker. We can learn, for instance, what type of notes Foxe left for himself, and what annotations he might have left for others. Annotations in the manuscripts were not always intended solely for the hand that wrote them. Third, we must examine with particular care the manuscripts used for the Acts and Monuments and contained in Parker’s library with annotations made by John Bale. This should allow us to gain at least a partial understanding of the transmission of these texts in Elizabethan England and provide some answers as to the direction of collaboration between Parker and Foxe.

1. The Parker Collection

   i. The John Bale connection

Foxe and Parker share an intellectual legacy in Bale, which should not be undervalued. Their researches constantly relied and built upon his notes, publications and, no doubt, while he was still alive, his own oral testimonies. As we have previously discussed, John Joscelyn’s lists of old manuscripts were at first formed from Bale’s 1560 letter and

entries from his *Catalogus*. These lists were intended as the foundation for Parker’s attempt to discover and collect manuscripts. Many of the later insertions that Joscelyn made to the lists were the names of private individuals who became known to the circle as owners of a text. Bale’s influence is therefore to be seen in the composition of Parker’s collection. Some of the manuscripts had once belonged to Bale himself, others Bale had at one time or another consulted and, on occasions where Bale had not seen the manuscript, he was then able to inform the Archbishop of its whereabouts. Therefore, a large portion of Parker’s collection derived from information provided by Bale. It is indeed astounding just how much of the dispersed monastic collections Bale appears to have located in the hands of private individuals and how important that knowledge became for Parker’s household. Bale’s death in 1563 must have been a great loss to Parker’s manuscript searches.

References to Bale can also be found from Parkerian annotations on the manuscripts themselves. Various annotations refer back to the *Catalogus*. These references and extracts were almost certainly the work of Parker, Joscelyn or another household member. On the few occasions where Foxe has added an annotation he also often inserted the relevant folio reference to ‘Baleus’. These references are, however, just the beginning of Foxe’s continued connection to Bale’s researches. The discussions in chapters four and five of this thesis have further emphasised what Thomas Freeman has already shown; that Foxe relied heavily on Bale’s *Catalogus* for his history of the papacy in the *Acts and Monuments*. We have also further indicated that Freeman is correct in his theory that Bale was at least involved in the production of the account of

---

4 For more details on the lists of John Jocelyn see G&W and the previous chapter of this thesis.
6 Thomas S. Freeman, “‘St Peter Did not Do Thus’: Papal History in the Acts and Monuments”, *VE* (3 pts, Sheffield 2004).
King John for the 1563 edition. As an extension of this research the previous two chapters of this thesis have revealed that the Catalogus, whilst not necessarily the direct source for Foxe's text, became his Bible for drawing together his history and his arguments. As hinted in chapter two our portrayal of Foxe and Bale in Edwardian England and again in exile during the Marian persecutions, strongly suggests that he was closely involved in Bale's compilation of his catalogue, just as Pantaleon's preface to the Rerum pars Secunda proves that Bale was involved in Foxe's research. Foxe also built upon Bale's apocalyptic patterning of history which, in the 1570 edition of the Acts and Monuments became a discursive framework for his evidence and arguments. Bale's other publications such as the examinations of Anne Askew and John Oldcastle also found their way into the text. Foxe too must have missed his old friend when extending his ecclesiastical history back to the foundation of Christendom and in tracing the decline of right religion and the rise of the Antichrist in the past. One wonders what the Acts and Monuments might have looked like if Bale had lived a few years longer.

### ii. Annotations and Marginalia

The various methodologies that Bale, Parker's household and Foxe employed when examining manuscripts for their respective publications can tell us much about their working practices, their purposes and their process of compilation. A useful example can be found in the Corpus Christi Library, Cambridge copy of Nicholas Trivet's Annales sex regum Anglie which has been bound with a handwritten transcript of the

---

letters and works of Carmelite friars (most particularly those of Arnold Bostius). This manuscript of fifteenth century origin was once owned by Bale and bears evidence of his examination in black, pink and possibly red ink. He added an index at the end of the Trivet part of the manuscript in black and pink ink, underlined the first words of a new paragraph and the first word in each item of the various lists to be found in the text. He also marked out names, locations and important events. With a ‘+’ sign Bale marked in the margin significant changes in topic.

Beyond the obvious annotations belonging to Bale are a series of others in yellow and brown ink, but also in red crayon. These red crayon (ochre) markings are uniquely Parkerian; they provide for us a clear ‘symbol’ to Parker’s purposes and to how he directed the scholarly work of others in his household. They appear throughout Parker’s manuscripts in a myriad of forms and with a variety of purposes, providing for us a marker, just as an official seal or stamp might do on official documents. For Parker, it would seem that these red ochre markings were intended as a way of unifying his household’s research on finding evidence for the antiquity of the English Church. It was probably a practice designed to allow Parker – with the limited time that he could spare for historical researches – to pick up a manuscript previously annotated by himself or his staff, so that he could find the most relevant passages and sections at a glance. The use of red crayon also set apart certain Parkerian annotations from other markings – sanctioning those statements as an authorised and agreeable opinion. In this particular

---

9 This is CCCC MS 152, which contains Nicholas Trivet’s *Annales sex regum Angliae* in the first half and then material on the Carmelites in the second half. For details on *Arnoldus Bostius* see P.S. Allen, ‘Letters of Arnoldus Bostius’, *The English Historical Review*, 34:134 (1919), pp. 225-246. It is possible that this second portion of the manuscript was written by John Bale himself and added at a later date than his original annotations to Trivet. The Carmelite folio pages have a red ink underlining throughout, which does also appear on the odd occasion in the Trivet portion of the text to add some extra underlining of words and to make a few corrections to the original text. This appears to be a later imposition than Bale’s black and pink ink annotations.
manuscript, Parker’s crayon took various forms and its mark was made for an assortment of purposes. It was used to underline interesting text and to denote the mention of names, places and dates. Symbols, such as diagonal dashes and hashes, were also inserted in the margins to highlight interesting text. Such annotations conform to signs and symbols that have been recognised in other manuscripts including those that had belonged to Parker. William H. Sherman has recorded their meanings as signifying points of interest. Diagonal dashes, crosses, and hashes amongst many other symbols acted as generic codes for annotating manuscripts and printed books. As Sherman explicitly states such annotation were not only an accepted practice in the sixteenth century but also one that was highly recommended.

Evidence for Foxe’s examination of this manuscript is less intrusive but nonetheless provides a representative example of his handling of various manuscripts owned by Parker. His only annotation in this particular work can be found on a blank sheet at the end of the manuscript (see figure 3 below). It is a list of cross-references to other chronicles, which Foxe has recognised as being used by Nicholas Trivet to construct his account or as oppositional statements to the subsequent Carmelite texts. The annotation states that ‘this English History is collected from Geoffrey of Monmouth, Bede,
William Malmesbury, Peter of Poitiers [Petro Pictavensi], Martin the penitentiary, who was the chaplain to the pope and Henry Huntingdon which Mr. Horton has. This book does not agree with the sacred words of Holy Scripture'.

The last statement was recorded for the benefit of other readers, warning them that they should be careful when reading the Carmelite texts, as they were not always reliable in their use of Scripture. However, Trivet's *Annals* was a more trusted source as evidenced by Foxe's use of it in his *Acts and Monuments*. Like Bale and Parker, Foxe displays here an interest in noting the ownership of these chronicles presumably for others to follow up. ‘Mr. Horton’ is almost certainly Thomas Horton, Rector of St Magnus in London until his death in 1564. It would appear that Foxe knew Horton

---

13 Historia(m) de gestis Angloru(m) collecta(m) ex Galfridi Monumetensi; Beda, Will(el)mo Malmesberiens, Petro Pictavensi, fratre Martino Penitentiano et capellano papae et Henrico Huntentunensi habet mr. Horton. Liber incipit Non solu(m) audie(n)dis scripturae sacrae verbis. Translated from the original Latin from CCCC MS 152, f. 108v. Most of these references are self-explanatory however Peter of Poitiers was a thirteenth-century scholar who wrote *Compilatio praesens, a summa de confessione*.

14 Provided here by the courtesy of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge and with grateful thanks to Gill Cannell in particular for her help in procuring the image.

from his days in exile and on this note is imparting his own knowledge of the location of manuscripts perhaps for Parker’s attention. Also attached to Foxe’s cross-reference is an entry on Peter of Ickham that is mentioned in Bale’s *Catalogus*: ‘Baleo 327’.16 This additional note referred the reader to an entry, which suggested that Ickham had also written a history containing Monmouth, Bede, Malmesbury and Poitiers. This note might also be by Foxe, although the hand differs slightly. Either way it appears to be a later imposition and perhaps related to Foxe’s handing over the manuscript into Parker’s hands.

Evidence from other manuscripts that had once belonged to Parker’s collection, bear similar annotations by Bale, Foxe and the often unidentified members of Parker’s household. The annotations and other text interventions vary from basic examination (highlighting useful evidence) to providing an interpretative framework (such as indexes, background information and illumination of paragraph and topic breaks), or imposing a re-structuring and fabrication of a completion to the manuscript (counterfeiting text, adding or subtracting leaves, or inserting text lifted from elsewhere). Of course, most of the annotations to be found on the Parker manuscripts cannot, with certainty, be confirmed as Parkerian interactions as they are of a generic character. However, the use of red ink underlining is so common in the Parker manuscripts that one suspects, although rarely can it be confirmed, a connection to

---

16 The account of Peter of Ickham (d. 1295) does indeed appear in the *Catalogus*, p. 327-8. It was believed that Peter had produced a Latin chronicle of the kings of England from Brutus to Edward I. Peter of Ickham was a monk of Christ Church Cathedral Priory, Canterbury and may have spent some time in Paris. For more details see Nigel Ramsay, ‘Ickham, Peter of (d. 1295)’, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004).
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Parker. If annotations such as these, which like Bale’s provided an interpretative framework by highlighting the beginning of new topics, important information and names, dates and places of interest, then the working methodology being carried out at Parker’s Lambeth Palace residence was almost always detailed and extensive.

The most helpful identifying mark is the prevalence of pointing hands drawn into the margins. These ‘manicules’, as William H. Sherman calls them, were a popular annotation mark in the sixteenth century. Like dashes and hash marks, the manicule was often used to denote noteworthy passages, but as Sherman has shown there were many other uses for it and it was also perhaps one of the most personalised annotation markings available to a reader. In particular Sherman has identified Matthew Parker’s

---

17 A variety of inks can possibly, but not with certainty, be ascribed to Parker’s household. For example Kate McLoughlin, ‘Magdalene College MS Pepys 2498 and Stephen Batman’s reading practices’, TCBS, 10, edited by D. J. McKitterick and E. Leedham-Green (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 525-534 have confirmed that a variety of brown ink annotations in MS Pepys 2498 and other manuscripts in Parker’s collection such as Trinity College MS B.2.7, belonged to Stephen Batman, Parker’s expert on Middle English texts. Mildred Budny, Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: An Illustrated Catalogue (Cambridge, 1992), pp. xlv-xliv has listed confirmed instances of John Parker and John Joscelin’s hands in Parker’s manuscripts. For John Parker, Budny lists King Athelstan’s presentation copy of Bede’s Vita Sancti Cuthberti (CCCC MS 183), The Red Book of Darley (CCCC MS 22 pt. 2) and possibly a Wulfstanian Ecclesiastical and secular handbook (CCCC MS 201 pt. 1) and an ecclesiastical handbook from Exeter (CCCC MS 190). For John Joscelyn, Budny lists the Corpus Glossary (CCCC MS 144), The so-called Parker Chronicle and Laws (CCCC MS 173 pt. 1), a copy of Alferd’s Pastoral Care (CCCC MS 12), the aforementioned Wulfstanian ecclesiastical and secular handbook (CCCC MS 201 pt. 1), the Old English Bede (CCCC MS 41), the aforementioned ecclesiastical handbook from Exeter (CCCC MS 190), an Ecclesiastical handbook from Worcester (CCCC MS 265 pt. 1) and perhaps the altered Hexameron (CCCC MS 193).

18 The belief that Parker’s scholarly work was predominately carried out at Lambeth Palace is a generally held assumption but based on limited facts. It is true that much of Parker’s surviving correspondence published by J. Bruce and Perowne T. Thomson (eds), Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D., archbishop of Canterbury, comprising letters written by and to him, from AD 1535 to his death, AD 1575 (Parker Society, 1853), confirm that Lambeth was Parker’s favoured residence and that he often wrote about scholarly matters whilst there. However, a collection of books was mentioned in Parker’s will as residing at Bekesbourne House (another of the Archbishops residence) and it is also true that Lambeth was undergoing renovation work throughout the 1560s, which meant that Parker’s full household did not reside there until 1570. Such building work does not of course deny Parker’s ability to base his scholarly activities at Lambeth and the fact that this was his most common residence still carries more weight.

19 See Sherman, Used Books, ch. 2 and especially pp. 33-4. There is no standardised name for these markings, although Sherman’s use of the term ‘manicule’ (derived from the Latin maniculum, meaning ‘a little hand’) does indeed seem the most neutral. Other names for it are hand, hand director, pointing hand, pointing finger, pointer, digit, fist, mutton fist, bishop’s fist, index, indicator, indicule, maniple, and pilcrow.

20 Ibid., p. 45-52.
particular manicule as portraying ‘simple lines of a cartoon…they become as much of a visual signature as the famous silhouette of Alfred Hitchcock in profile’ (see figure 4 below).\(^{21}\) Parker’s pointing hand can therefore be identified in manuscripts as divergent as Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum Historiale*, Simeon of Durham’s *Historia Regum*, and Richard FitzRalph’s *De pauperie Salvatoris*.\(^{22}\)

![Figure 4: Matthew Parker’s manicule in CCCC MS 139, f. 76v (Simeon of Durham, *Historia Regum*).](image)

Whilst annotations in red, brown and black ink or pencil are always open to various authorial possibilities those in red crayon (ochre) have, as already stated, provided undoubted witness to the Parker household’s activities. For most of Parker’s manuscripts the red crayon appears less often than other inks and pencils but they are nevertheless a frequent presence throughout the collection donated by Parker to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge and in those manuscripts still known to have passed through the archbishop’s hands, that now reside in other collections.\(^{24}\) As identified and

---


\(^{22}\) CCCC MS 13 f. 279v of Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum Historiale*, CCCC MS 139, f. 76v of Simeon of Durham’s *Historia Regum*, and CCCC MS 180 f. 62r of Richard FitzRalph’s *De pauperie Salvatoris*.


\(^{24}\) For a list of the manuscripts in the Corpus Christi Library (also named the Parker Library) see M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1912).
described by Mildred Budny, not long before his death in 1575 Parker began dividing up his manuscript collection between those that he wished to donate to Corpus Christi, those that he wished his sons, Matthew and John to inherit, and those that were to go to others.\textsuperscript{25} For instance in a copy of \textit{Trinity Amalarius} and two copies of Bede’s \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica}, Parker wrote John Parker’s name, whilst in various other manuscripts the initials ‘TW’ probably denote John Twyne or Thomas Wotton.\textsuperscript{26} These markings are perhaps Parker’s final annotation to these manuscripts, but there are many more instances of various forms throughout the collection. Red crayon annotation appears throughout Parker’s manuscript collection ranging from medieval chronicles to theological texts, sermons, glossaries and cartularies. Their purpose, for the most part, was to highlight important paragraphs and evidence and to comment either positively or negatively on their content. The red crayon took various forms. Most often it was used to underline the relevant piece of text, but it was also used occasionally to highlight important parts of the manuscript by adding a hash or diagonal dash stroke in the margin. As discussed on a few occasions it was also used to add a manicule.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example_red_crayon.png}
\caption{Example of Parkerian red crayon in CCCC MS 43, f. 27r (William of Malmesbury, \textit{Gesta Pontificum Anglorum}).\textsuperscript{27}}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{26} The manuscripts named to John Parker mentioned here are Cambridge Trinity College MSS B.11.2, Trinity College R. 7.5 and Trinity College R.5.22, f. 1-44. This was recognised by Budny, \textit{Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge}, p. xlv. The notation ‘TW’ appears in various manuscripts such as CCCC MSS 260, 374, 425 and 441.

\textsuperscript{27} Taken from Parker Library on the Web [Accessed: 2008].
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The red crayon was also used on a regular basis to add folio or page numbers while, on occasion, it was used to insert titles where none had previously been written. Where an index was already provided in the chronicle, corrections and amendments are often to be found. Whilst most of these annotations cannot with certainty be ascribed to Parker, his copy of Peter of Blois' works has been augmented with relevant page numbers in Parkerian red crayon. Where no index existed Parker occasionally added his own. For instance in a manuscript containing various Old English homilies, a Parkerian scribe has added an index in a neat black ink with red crayon used as division lines. In a composite manuscript containing the foundation charters of various cathedrals and monastic houses Parker has amended and augmented the index in several places – prominently entering omitted items at the foot of the first column.

Parkerian glosses on the manuscripts also appear at the beginning of many manuscripts (often on the flyleaf), providing background information on the manuscript, its contents and its prescribed author. Often these took the form of brief paragraphs noting that the chronicle ended abruptly, was in some way incomplete or inaccurate, or providing some detail on its provenance. Parker's copy of Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Historiale* has one such annotation in red crayon explaining that the seventh book is mutilated

28 Parkerian manuscripts in the Corpus Christi collection contain various examples with page numbers inserted in red crayon on the top right corner of the recto page, as was the general custom of the time. This occurs for instance in a copy of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* (CCCC MS 21), a composite manuscript of British medieval charters, chronicles and letters (CCCC MS 101), Arnold of Bonneval's theological tract (CCCC MS 103) and a collection of Ælfric's homilies (CCCC MS 198). On at least one occasion, a copy of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* (CCCC MS 43), Parkerian red crayon is used to insert both book and chapter references rather than page or folio numbers. There are a variety of manuscripts at Corpus Christi containing titles in a sixteenth-century hand, however most cannot, with certainty, be identified as Parkerian. However, on occasion red crayon was used to insert the title for example in CCCC MS 132.

29 Peter of Blois' Letters and other works in CCCC MS 266.

30 CCCC MS 421, f. iiir

31 For this last item see Catherine Hall, 'Matthew Parker as annotator: the case of Winchester Cathedral MS XXB', *TCBS*, 10, edited by D. J. McKitterick and E. Leedham-Green (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 642-645.
[malio] whilst Parker’s edition of Ivo of Chartres’ *Panormia* has a Parkerian note that it came from the twelfth-century Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore.\(^{32}\) These annotations can also be more detailed. Two manuscripts of Stephen Langton’s works (his *Old Testament* and his *Commentary on Ecclesiasticus*) share an identical note on their first recto folio in the same hand and in black ink.\(^{33}\) The note records that Langton flourished in the year 1200 and that he was Archbishop in 1207. It also refers the reader to John Bale’s *Catalogus* for details of Langton’s other texts.\(^{34}\)

Reference to Bale’s *Catalogus* appears periodically in Parker’s collection in several Parkerian hands, often at the beginning of the manuscript. A copy of Thomas Bradwardine’s *De causa Dei contra Pelagium* provides a brief summary of Bradwardine and reference to the relevant page in ‘Baleus’, whilst the aforementioned collection of Ælfric’s homilies contains a series of notes on the flyleaf about Baldwin which references ‘vide Bale. 227’. Both references to Bale are in the same hand, although the supporting information on Baldwin agrees in style with the annotations in Langton’s works and a copy of a commentary by William of Nottingham.\(^{35}\) In Parker’s copy of John of Tynemouth, Walter of Coventry, and Henry of Huntingdon, yet another

\(^{32}\) Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale* in CCCC MS 13 and Ivo of Chartres, *Panormia* in CCCC MS 94. These types of annotations related to the manuscript’s origins can be found throughout Parker’s collection. Another example is CCCC MS 197 (no. 3) as described in Budny, *Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, vol. 1, pp. 55-73, the Cambridge portion of the Cambridge-London Gospels, which are ascribed as having belonged to St Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury.

\(^{33}\) Stephen Langton, *Old Testament* in CCCC MS 55 and his *Commentary on Ecclesiasticus* in CCCC MS 58.

\(^{34}\) ‘Scripsit multa ut Baleus pag. 273 et floruit anno 1200’.

\(^{35}\) For example, the annotation in Stephen Langton’s manuscripts (CCCC MS 55 and CCCC MS 58) are in the same hand as the annotation on CCCC MS 305 f. iv (a copy of William of Nottingham’s Commentary) and Baldwin of Ford’s *De Sacramento altaris* (CCCC MS 200), although in the latter case the reference to Bale is in another hand more similar to the annotation to Thomas Bradwardine (CCCC MS 24).
Parkerian hand has duplicated the entire entry for the author from Bale’s *Catalogus* (see figure 6 below). 36

![Figure 6: A page copied from John Bale’s *Catalogus* by a Parkerian scribe. This example is taken from Henry of Huntingdon, CCCC MS 280, f. 5r.](image)

In the copy of Ranulf Higden’s *Polychronicon* that Parker gained from Bale, Parkerian annotations have been made not just to the text itself but also to Bale’s previous annotations. 37 What had interested Bale was also of interest to the Parker household. A Parkerian hand has also highlighted a previous annotation in a copy of Peter of Blois’

---

36 Compare CCCC MS 5, f. ix of John of Tynemouth with *Catalogus*, pp. 466-7, CCCC MS 175 f. 1r of Walter of Coventry to *Catalogus*, p. 264 and CCCC MS 280 f. 5r of Henry of Huntingdon to *Catalogus*, p. 192.

37 This is CCCC MS 259. Such building upon previous annotations was not uncommon. See Sherman, *Used Books*, p. 6.
works. This annotation appears to represent an interesting numerical system of identification first written in black ink in the margins and then overwritten in Parkerian red crayon.\(^{38}\) Catherine Hall’s analysis of annotations in Parker’s copy of a letter concerning the marriage of priests sent by St Ulric to either Pope Nicholas I (if one was to go with Bale and Parker) or Pope Nicholas II (if one was to go with Foxe), reveal a similar story.\(^{39}\) Annotations by both Bale and Parker reveal that both were independently verifying the location of the letter in time.\(^{40}\) Bale’s annotations noted the dates for the pontificate of Nicholas I from the Liber Conciliorum, as a means of establishing the dating of the letter. Parker checked Bale’s reference and added that the Liber Conciliorum dated Nicholas I to AD 859 whilst other sources that he investigated suggested AD 862, 858, 867 or 858. Parker also noted his preference for the year AD 860.\(^{41}\) He then made a similar judgement from various sources for Nicholas I’s death. As can often be shown, Parker began his researches with Bale’s thoughts and arguments and then expanded upon them. In Bale’s letter of 1560 to Parker, he suggested that Pope Pius II (Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini) had initiated the error in his reading of the letter, and that he had identified an earlier ‘Huldricus’ (Ulric).\(^{42}\) Parker was not entirely convinced and therefore expanded upon Bale’s researches to come to his own conclusion. Foxe did much the same, although there is no sign of his annotations on either Parker’s original copy of the letter or his transcript.

---

\(^{38}\) This is CCCC MS 266, ff. 131 and 137 where the numbers 7 and 94 respectively have been inserted in black ink and then overwritten in red crayon. According to Neil R. Ker, ‘The Library of John Jewel’, Bodleian Library Record, 9:5 (1977), pp. 256-265 and repeated by Sherman, Used Books, p. 27, a number system like this was used by John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury and author of the Apologia. Perhaps these are signs of his annotation or perhaps someone using a similar system. Numbers also appear independently in red crayon in CCCC MS 282 (Robert of Greatham’s The Mirror) and CCCC MS 290 (Ado of Vienne’s Chronica), suggesting that at least one Parkerian scribe was using such a system.


\(^{40}\) The original pamphlet containing this letter and annotated by both Bale and Parker is now part of Gonville and Caius MS 427, whilst the non-annotated transcript, which Parker presented to Corpus Christi, is now CCCC MS 101.

\(^{41}\) Gonville and Caius MS 427, ff. 98-99 as analysed by Hall, ‘The one-way trail’, p. 278.

\(^{42}\) G&W, p. 28 as researched by Hall, ‘The one-way trail’, p. 279.
Besides these annotations, John Parker, John Joscelyn and Stephen Batman's hands can be found providing glosses of Old English words into their sixteenth-century equivalents in several Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. Batman produced a glossary as part of his translation of Batholomaeus entitled 'A necessarie Catalogue, of the most hardest olde English words, how they maye be truly understood after our usuall speaking, as well as in all other old copies, as in this booke: next vnto euery such word, is the knowen English'. Such glosses represent a growing confidence and accuracy in the Parker household concerning Anglo-Saxon scholarship, which also resulted in the production of a manuscript lexicon by John Parker and John Joscelyn that replaced the one produced by Laurence Nowell in the early 1560s.

### iii. Perfecting England's manuscript heritage

Marginalia and other annotations are, however, only one part of Parker's interaction with his manuscript collection. Parker also adapted manuscripts in a belief that he was completing or perfecting their contents. A case in point can be found in CCCC MS 173, a copy of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle and associated Anglo-Saxon law codes. Parker removed the first two pages containing a writ of William the Conqueror because he perceived the writ to be a later corrupt insertion that was unnecessary to the cohesiveness of the manuscript. In another case a more extensive reformatting took place. Parker broke apart two manuscripts containing collections of Old English

---

43 These instances have been described in Graham, 'Matthew Parker and the Conservation of Manuscripts', pp. 630-41 and McLoughlin, 'Stephen Batman's Reading Practices', pp. 525-534.

44 See Budny, *Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, p. xlv. This lexicon is now BL Cotton MSS Titus A, ff. xv-xvi.

45 See R. I. Page, 'The Parker Register and Matthew Parker's Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts', *TCBS*, 8, edited by Brian Jenkins and David McKitterick (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 1-17, in which it is suggested that CCCC MS 173 came to Parker as loose leaves and in a confused state.
Homilies so that he could produce an alternative framework for them both. The *Interrogatio Sigeuulfi* was removed from the *Hexameron* so that Alcuin’s preface (the *Albini in genesim questiones prefatio*) could be inserted as a new introduction to the *Interrogatio*. It has also been well documented that Parker employed a counterfeiter—apparently named Lyly—to restore to damaged, incomplete and illegible manuscripts the appearance of completion. Perhaps the most relevant example of this type of work for this discussion is the counterfeit pages in Matthew Paris’ *Chronica Majora*. Eightfolio pages were inserted after the third folio in a counterfeited hand, presumably copied from one of the other copies in Parker’s collection. Parker also had paste slips inserted over damaged text with counterfeit writing to replace the missing words. As observed by Benedict Scott Robinson and others, Parker often treated his manuscripts as draft copies; marking them up ready for the printed edition. This is most notably observed in Parker’s treatment of CCCC MS 195, which he primarily used for his edition of Thomas Walsingham’s *Historia Breuis*. Parker annotated the margins, 

---

46 The *Hexameron* and *Interrogatio* were originally in what is known as CCCC MS 178. Parker moved the *Interrogatio* into CCCC MS 162 and pasted over the original ending of the *Hexameron* with a transcription of Alcuin’s preface. This is discussed in more detail in R. I. Page, ‘Anglo-Saxon Texts in Early Modern Transcripts’, *TCBS*, 6, edited by John Harnson and Nigel Hancock (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 69-83. In the same page, Page has described another composite manuscript that had received similar treatment in the 1550s by Robert Recorde. This is further evidence that Parker’s editorial practice, when dealing with manuscripts, was not unusual but rather a standard practice of the day.

47 These counterfeited pages appear in CCCC MS 16, the second part of the *Chronica Majora*. Another example can be found in a copy of Ralph of Diceto (CCCMS 76) in which two counterfeited folios were inserted after f. 18.

48 For instance in Matthew Paris’ *Chronica Majora*: CCCC MS 16, f. 38v. Other examples where paste slips have been inserted includes Cotton MS Otho A. XII of *Asser’s Life of Alfred* and CUL MS F, f. 1.25 of William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*. See Graham, ‘Matthew Parker and the conservation of manuscripts’, pp. 630-641.

49 See Benedict Scott Robinson, “‘Darke Speech’: Matthew Parker and the Reforming of History’, *SCJ*, 29:4 (1998), p. 1077 where the Walsingham example is explained in this manner. Robinson has rightly defended Parker’s annotation of the manuscript from remarks such as V. H. Galbraith (ed.), *The St. Albans Chronicle 1406-1420* (Oxford, 1937), who accused Parker of ‘defacing’ the manuscript and ‘treat[ing] it like copy for a printer’. This of course is an accurate observation but an anachronistic opinion about the integrity of the manuscript. Sixteenth-century manuscripts could legitimately be used as copy texts just as easily as they could be used and presented as completed texts. Parker appears to have done both with his collection. Another example of Parker’s preparation of manuscripts for a published edition can be found in his treatment of Ælfric’s Easter Homily in CCCC MS 198. For details see John Bromwich, ‘The First Book Printed in Anglo-Saxon Types’, *TCBS*, 3, edited by Bruce Dickins and A.N.L. Munby (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 265-291.
crossed out words, inserted headings, brackets and page numbers for the purpose of publication.

The treatment of these manuscripts, by Parker and his household staff, was becoming a common practice in the sixteenth-century. William H. Sherman has suggested that readers in this period regularly transformed one printed book into another via the introduction of marginalia, the rebinding of sections from one book with sections from another book and so on.\(^5^0\) In this early stage of printing, readers appear to have continued to treat printed books as they had manuscripts. Text and argument were malleable to the concerns and interests of the reader. In Parker’s case this is clearly demonstrated by his treatment of a manuscript from the former Cistercian Abbey of Sawley, which contained Æthilwulf’s *De Abbatibus*, Bedan chronological matter and Simeon of Durham’s *Historia Dunelmensis Ecclesie*. Parker removed Æthilwulf’s poem on his monastery from the manuscript and rebound it with other material such as a description of a cell in Lindisfarne, and an account of Hexham church by Richard of Hexham.\(^5^1\) The purpose of doing so, according to David N. Dumville, was to create a manuscript describing northern churches. Similarly, Parker gathered extra material about Exeter Cathedral, which he could insert into a manuscript that he had borrowed

\(^{50}\) Sherman, *Used Books*, pp. 7-9 produces several examples including a seventeenth-century example where the third and fourth books of John Bate’s *Mysteries of Nature, and Art* (1635), has been rebound with books one and two of Henry Peacham’s *Gentleman’s Exercise* (1612), and book four replaced by nine pages of manuscript notes. Thus, Bate’s encyclopaedic text is transformed into a narrowly focused anthology on drawing and painting. From Parker’s collection CCCC MS 139, is a collection of texts that were put together to deal principally with the north of England. See David N. Dumville, ‘The Sixteenth-Century History of two Cambridge Books from Sawley’, *TCBS*, 7, edited by Brian Jenkins and David McKitterick (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 427-444. CCCC MS 101, principally a transcript of Bishop Leofric’s procurements for Exeter Cathedral has been expanded with other material about Exeter for a similar purpose. See Timothy Graham, ‘A Parkerian Transcript of the List of Bishop Leofric’s Procurements for Exeter Cathedral: Matthew Parker, The Exeter Book, and Cambridge University Library MS ii. 2.11’, *TCBS*, 10, edited by David McKitterick and E. Leedham-Green (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 421-455.

\(^{51}\) Parker’s treatment of these manuscripts has been discussed in more detail in Dumville, ‘Cambridge Books from Sawley’, pp. 427-445 and Page, ‘The Parker Register’, pp. 1-17.
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from there. He also created a similar composition for Bath. Parker also shows no sign of distinguishing between written matter and print. In the case of CCCC MS 148, a composite manuscript which began with Prosper's *Epigrammata*, Isidore's *Synonyma* and various other religious tracts, Parker inserted a printed edition of another of Prosper's texts, the *Versus ad coniugem*. One piece of evidence from the contents of Parker's bequest to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge has been noted by Catherine Hall as another sign of Parker's concern to present his manuscripts in a particular fashion. Parker gave Corpus Christi his unadorned transcript of St Ulric's letter to Nicholas I (or Nicholas II), but disposed of the more interesting original that contained his and Bale's attempt to work out the origin of the letter. Parker, it seems, felt that his published argument in *A Testimonie of Antiquitie* replaced the usefulness of the annotations, providing a clearer version for prosperity.

It would appear therefore that Parker's household was engaged in a very coherent analysis of England's manuscript heritage; one that automatically made systematic assumptions about the content and nature of text based within the confines of humanist and reformist methodology. It is likely that part of Parker's purpose was to make his manuscripts 'aesthetically pleasing'. A function of his 'completion' process was to

---

53 Ibid. In this instance, Parker inserted two leaves concerning Bath from CCCC MS 140 to CCCC MS 111 along with a cartulary and various sixteenth-century transcripts.
54 R. I. Page, 'Matthew Parker's Copy of Prosper his meditation with his wife', *TCBS*, 8, edited by Brian Jenkins and D. J. McKitterick (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 434-349. Other examples include Cambridge University Library II.4.6, where Parker has inserted a printed transcript of the first four pages of Ælfric's Homily with the manuscript version and Cambridge University Library II.2.4, where Parker has inserted two letters from Bishop John Jewel, which discussed the transmission of the manuscript (the Old English *Regula Pastoralis*) to his collection. See Page, 'Matthew Parker's Copy of Prosper', pp. 343-349 and Graham, 'Matthew Parker and the conservation of Manuscripts', pp. 638-9. Parker's lack of distinction between print and manuscript has also been noted by Sherman, *Used Books*, p. 20. From Sherman's examination of Parkerian manuscript annotations it would appear that he made a much larger distinction between the size of his books. For example Parker's characteristic initials and the summaries that he produced at the beginning of books are entirely missing from his folio-sized volumes but can be found on the majority of his smaller books.
55 Hall, 'The One-way trail'.
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satisfy his obsession with orderliness. However, it was also a methodological imposition intended to forge the diverse manuscript heritage into a unified picture of the past in a ‘protestant’ mould. Many of the old monastic manuscripts had come to Parker’s hand in a warn or damaged state, some had never been bound whilst others were little more than a collection of random leaves. If these manuscripts were to be the ‘monuments’ from which certain truth-claims could be deduced then they would also need to be presented in a form that returned to them some kind of authority and usefulness. Through examination of the marginalia and treatment of manuscripts it would appear also that Parker and his scholars paid a great amount of attention to highlighting useful statements, evidence and arguments as well as providing interpretative frameworks such as page numbers, indexes and word glosses. It was therefore in this form that John Foxe would have examined many of Parker’s manuscripts; the attempt to unify England’s past was a shared concern and would have appealed to Foxe and in turn, influenced his interpretations.

2. John Foxe and Parker’s Manuscript collection

i. Marginalia in Parker’s collection

In his preface to Matthew Parker’s The Gospels of the fower Euangelistes, John Foxe praised Matthew Parker ‘by whose industrious diligence & learned labours, this booke,

56 Thomas S. Freeman and Elizabeth Evenden, Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe’s Book of Martyrs (forthcoming), chapter entitled ‘Fayre pictures and painted pageants’: the illustrations of the “Book of Martyrs”.
with others moe, hath bene collected & searched out of the Saxons Monume(n)tes'. 57

That Parker asked Foxe to write the preface to a work concerning Old English (a language Foxe almost certainly did not know how to read) may well support our argument for this emerging scholarly affinity. Foxe's renown in 1571 as a direct result of the *Acts and Monuments* would no doubt have helped sales of Parker's latest scholarly text but it also provides for us a glimpse into their affinity. Foxe had relied heavily on Parker's household for his Anglo-Saxon history and particularly in his use of Ælfric's Homily, yet it was Foxe's name rather than his own that Parker felt would help sell his edition of Old English gospels. 58 Theirs was therefore a two-way relationship – each helping the other with their publications but also, it would seem, with the research as well. Foxe's annotations in Parker's manuscripts and references in his *Acts and Monuments* hint at this relationship.

Let us begin with the *Acts and Monuments*. Foxe recorded that 'Doctour Parker, Archbishop of Canterburye', was a witness at 'the brunyng of [Thomas] Bilney'. In his narrative on John Wyclif, Foxe noted that Matthew Parker provided material from the Monastery of St Albans. 59 Although Foxe never made similar statements when dealing with the pre-reformation history his debt to the Archbishop for the earlier period is also undoubted and the evidence is available on several of the manuscripts themselves. 60 As already stated there is little direct evidence for Foxe's use of Parker's manuscripts

---

57 John Foxe, *The Gospels of the fower Evangelistes translated in the olde Saxons tyme out of Latin into the vulgare toung of the Saxons, newly collected out of Auncient Monumentes of the sayd Saxons, and now published for testimonie of the same* (John Day, London, 1571). It should be noted that Foxe almost certainly only provided the preface. The work itself is not his but that of the Parker household as described in Elizabeth Evenden, 'Biography of John Day', *VE* (2004).

58 See Rosemond Tuve, 'Ancients, Moderns, and Saxons', *English Literary History*, 6:3 (1939), pp. 165-190 for details of Foxe's use of Parker's research.


within their folio pages. However, there is enough to make some deductions about Foxe’s methodology, his working assumptions and his relationship to the Parker household. First we should note that the outline of Parkerian methodology related above, reflects similarly on Foxe. He too shared a similar approach to manuscript and printed text, he would also have understood the meaning of various annotations and of course he shared the connection to John Bale. Of the last item, it is interesting to note that where Foxe has annotated a manuscript it was generally one that Bale had once owned or at least examined himself. This is true of the Nicholas Trivet manuscript aforementioned, but also true of several others where Foxe’s annotations take a similar form.

One of the manuscripts that Bale had either owned or borrowed indefinitely is the only copy of the chronicle attributed to John Brompton. As we have already discussed in chapter four, this manuscript (now CCCC MS 96), played an important role in the compilation of Foxe’s Anglo-Saxon history. Although strangely absent from Bale’s printed catalogues, he referred to it in his letter to Parker in 1560 and in his private notebook. Bale told Parker that Brompton’s Chronicon contained ‘manye epistles and synodall actes of kynges afore the conquest’ also stating that it belonged to ‘Maistre Peter Osburne’.61 He further noted that the Chronicon was complete from St Augustine to the first year of King John and, again, that it was obtained from ‘Petro Osburne’, as were two other texts.62 On the manuscript itself, Bale has inserted the same information, providing the title as ‘Chronicon Joa(n)nis Bromton, abbatis Ioreualensis,

61 G&W, p. 21.
62 Index Britanniae Scriptorum: John Bale’s Index of British and other writers, edited by Reginald Lane Poole and Mary Bateson (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1990), p. 185. In the notebook, Mr Osborne is also mentioned as the owner of John Chekes Cantabrigiensis (p. 191) and a manuscript written by King Edmund, son of Ethelstan (p. 473).
Peter Osborne (1521-1592) was a member of Lincoln’s Inn and Keeper of the Privy Purse during the reign of Edward VI. He was also connected to Sir John Cheke (1514-1557) through marriage to his niece and to Sir William Cecil who acted as his patron. It would appear that Osborne’s ownership of manuscripts was largely the result of his being one of the executors for John Cheke in 1557 (Parker was another). According to one of Joscelyn’s list of manuscripts (J2) and to Bale’s letter of 1560 a copy of William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* was in the hands of Cheke’s executors, in this case Peter Osborne. May McKisack has also recognised that as Keeper of the Privy Purse, Osborne had access to archives, such as the Kentish

---

63 CCCC MS 96, f. 1.
64 *Ibid.*, flyleaf and f. 1. James Catalogue, vol. 1, p. 183 has identified these annotations as early sixteenth-century. The note on the flyleaf in black ink states ‘(H)ec Chronica comparata est a Mr Petro Osburne pro Chronica Ranulphi Cestrensis siue polichronicon in mango volumine’, whilst the pencil annotation on f. 1 only gives the name ‘Mr Osborne’. The second of these hands can be identified elsewhere in the manuscript such as ff. 137r and 140r.
65 Taken from Parker Library on the Web [Accessed: 2008].
67 G&W, p. 18.
subsidiary rolls, which he is known to have compiled for William Lambarde in 1582. Osborne is an obvious contact for Bale. Sir John Cheke had inherited John Leland’s books and Osborne had in turn inherited many of Cheke’s books. Bale, who earlier in life was an apprentice to Leland, was therefore part of the same circle as Osborne, probably brought even closer due to their joint relationship to William Cecil. A connection to Lambarde and Parker after Bale’s death again identifies Osborne as a contact for the archbishop’s household endeavours. It is interesting to note that Parker would later make Osborne one of his own executors.

On Bale’s 1560 letter to Parker, a pencil line has been drawn under the name ‘Johan Bometon’ and in the outer margin a horizontal pencil line has been added. Graham and Watson have suggested that these pencil annotations are in Parker’s own hand, whilst Joscelyn probably produced ink annotations in the letter. It would seem conceivable, although unproven at this time, that Parker’s horizontal line was intended as a confirmation of Osborne’s ownership, or perhaps an indication of Parker’s acquisition of the manuscript from him.

It is unclear whether Parker obtained the manuscript directly from Osborne and then passed it to Foxe, or whether Foxe obtained it directly from Osborne. As stated in chapter four of this thesis, there is some evidence that Foxe had access to the manuscript for his 1563 edition of the Acts and Monuments, although he might well have been relying on Bale’s notes in these instances. Perhaps more adequate justification for the case that Foxe obtained the manuscript directly from Osborne

---

69 G&W, p. 21. Further analysis of the manuscript copy of Bale’s 1560 letter (now Cambridge University Library MS Additional 7489, ff. 1r-4v) would prove beneficial, although there was not time here to examine it in detail.
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(probably with Parker's permission) is that Foxe has left a significant mark on the manuscript itself. On the flyleaf there is a long list, scribbled by Foxe, noting various chronicles that Brompton's Chronicon had used as source material (see figure 8 below). This list is interesting as it includes Asser's Life of Alfred; a text that appears to have been rediscovered too late for Foxe to include properly in his Anglo-Saxon history. Either Foxe gained this reference from the Brompton manuscript itself without confirmation from Asser, or he wrote this cross-reference at a later date than when he was preparing the early books of his 1570 edition. It is also interesting that Foxe has recognised the inter-connectivity between Brompton and a set of particular chronicles. In one instance, Foxe stressed his use of both chronicles compiled by John Brompton and Henry of Huntingdon when he laid out the idea of 'five plagues' as representing the invasions of primitive England. Later in the text Foxe compared Brompton with William of Malmesbury on a dispute over investment between Henry II and Pope Urban III. Both of these chronicles appear in Foxe's list.

70 The Chronicle attributed to John Brompton is CCCC MS 96 (see chapter four of this thesis for more details). Foxe's note is on f. 2v, a blank leaf except for another note in an unidentified hand, which states that the manuscript belonged to a Mr. Peter Osborne and that it bare a relationship to Ranulf Higden's Polychronicon. Foxe listed the following authors: William Malmesbury, Gerald of Wales, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Henry Huntingdon, Ælred of Rievaulx, Ranulph Castrensis (Polychronicon), Asser's history of Alfred, Simeon of Durham, Alfred of Beverley, Osborne's Life of Dunstan, Wulfstan's Life of St. Æthelwold.

71 See chapter four of this thesis.

Foxe has also provided a few other annotations in this manuscript all of which highlight in the margin the names of various Anglo-Saxon kings. When Brompton discusses the battles between Cuthred (d. 756), King of Wessex and Æthelbald (d. 757), King of Mercia, Foxe provided for himself a note to their first mention. Another contemporary note, possibly by Bale, emphasises the reference to the Britons being entirely subdued by their Anglo-Saxon overlords. Foxe has also listed the names of Sigeberht, King of Wessex (reigned 756-757), Ceolwulf I, King of Mercia (reigned 821-823), Beornwulf, King of Mercia (823-826), and King Athelstan (d. 939). In most instances a connection to the Acts and Monuments can be found. Foxe discussed the battle between Cuthred and Æthelbald as an example of a more favourable king (Cuthred) defeating the ‘proude’ Æthelbald and as part of a wider discussion on a letter sent by Boniface Archbishop of Mentz to Æthelbald concerning the corrupt life of Nuns. Although Foxe’s account of Sigeberht and Ceolwulf were largely taken out of

73 Taken from Parker Library on the Web [Accessed: 2008].
74 CCCC MS 96, ff. 17v-18r.
75 Ibid., f. 17v. Bale writes ‘redus Britannorum’.
76 Ibid., ff. 17v-18r, 46r.
77 Compare Ibid., ff. 17v-18r and Brompton, cols 767-775 with A&M, 1570, bk. 2, p. 171.
Fabyan’s chronicle, an element of Brompton cannot be dismissed especially considering Foxe’s highlighting of that portion of the manuscript. More certain is Foxe’s reference to ‘Athelstanus’ in the manuscript, which directly relates to his account in Book Three of the *Acts and Monuments*.

These annotations tell us much about Foxe’s working practices and his treatment of this particular manuscript. Foxe was providing cross-referencing details and highlighting particular characters and events from the past which he found interesting or useful. The presence of his hand also suggests that, in this instance Foxe was not concerned with defacing the archbishop’s property – something that might explain the absence of annotations in Parker’s copy of the *Chronica Majora* and other important texts used in the *Acts and Monuments*. Whether or not he obtained it from the archbishop’s household or via Peter Osborne it would seem that Foxe treated the manuscript differently than he did many other Parkerian books.

The same argument could possibly be put forward for CCCC MS 135, the copy of St Anselm’s letters that Foxe used to great effect in his account of Anselm’s controversies and disputes. The manuscript had once been in Bale’s hands and bears several annotations that can be identified as either his or Foxe’s (probably both). Bale briefly mentions this manuscript in his notebook and in his *Catalogus*. However it is not mentioned in his letter to Parker dated 1560 nor in Joscelyn’s lists. The epistles have been numbered and ordered into sets of a hundred by a sixteenth-century hand, quite

---

78 Compare CCCC MS 96, f. 18r and Brompton, cols 769-770 with *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 172-3.
79 Compare CCCC MS 96, f. 46r and Brompton, cols 837-8 with *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 195.
probably Parkerian. In all there are three layers of annotations. The most prominent are a series of lead pencil markings, which contain manicules, underlining of words, hash marks, and the occasional Latin comment. These appear to be Parkerian. Subsequent to the pencil annotations are a variety of red crayon Parkerian markings, which include underlining, manicules and diagonal lines. Then there are a series of black ink annotations belonging to Bale and Foxe. On the flyleaf, Foxe has noted a correlation between epistles in this manuscript and 'in another book' [in alio lib. Epist.] where there is another 'series' [ordine] of epistles. For several of the letters Foxe or Bale provide annotations which are intended to correlate with topics dealt with elsewhere in the manuscript. On one occasion Foxe or Bale noted that two epistles on the same subject appear in Eadmer (presumably his life of Anselm). Another list of epistles has been added to the endleaf in Bale's hand. All of these annotations are primarily concerned with cross-referencing the content and chronology of Anselm's epistles.

Foxe has left evidence of his research in two copies of the Memoriale by Walter of Coventry (CCCC MS 175 and Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 36). Joscelyn's list (J2.69) reveals that he was aware of two copies of the Memoriale: one belonging to John Cheke and one to Foxe. Graham and Watson suggest that Cheke's copy was

---

81 The annotated copy of James Catalogue, vol. 1, p. 308 strongly suggests that these additions are Parkerian, if not Parker himself.
82 James Catalogue, vol. 1, p. 308. These occur on numerous pages including CCCC MS 135, ff. 40v, 43r, 45r, 52r, 54v, 62r, 65r, 73r, 83v, 91r, 117r, 120r, 123r, 127r, 128r, 136r, 137r, and 143r.
83 The basis for my assertion that the red crayon annotations are subsequent to the pencil annotations rests on two annotations on CCCC MS 135, f. 110r where the red crayon markings appear to be written on top of the lead marginalia. Red crayon also occurs on ff. 16v, 47r, 51r, 78r, 79r, 83r, 102r, and 103r.
84 CCCC MS 135, flyleaf.
85 Ibid., f. 122r. Foxe references Eadmer, lib. 4 cap. 2. This manuscript is mentioned by Joscelyn in one of his lists (J2.35). See G&W, p. 72. It is probable that Foxe annotations can also be found on ff. 116v, 136r and 163r where Foxe has generally stated a corresponding epistle. Black ink annotations that might be Foxe or Bale can also be found on ff. 38r, 42r, 50v, 116v, 122r, 136r, 163r and the endleaf.
CCCC MS 175 (having derived from his role as executor to Leland), whilst Foxe's copy they claim as unidentified. It would seem, however that Foxe's copy was derived from Bale, whose annotations also appear within the pages of the Magdalen copy. The 'Cheke' manuscript, though not owned by Bale, is referred to in his notebook. Bale mentions that he had seen it in the possession of John Leland. Thus the two manuscript versions that Foxe used can both be linked to Bale to varying degrees.

In his Catalogus, Bale only gave a short description of Walter of Coventry, noting that he is recommended by Leland and that he was an honest and educated man whose work is to be largely trusted. Bale also recognised that it chiefly followed English authors listed as Geoffrey of Monmouth, Roger Hoveden and Henry Huntingdon. This is interesting as Foxe's annotations in CCCC MS 175 highlight similar information. Firstly, Foxe has inserted several notes that cross-refer to Henry of Huntingdon. In the second annotation Foxe also compares the script to Roger of Hoveden and the aforementioned chronicle ascribed to John Brompton. 'Hoveden', Foxe stated was a 'lofty' (ediam) work but only used partially by Walter of Coventry. Brompton's Chronicon, meanwhile is simply described as an old text. Foxe is not the only annotator to make such notes in this manuscript. There are a variety of hands, each attempting to clarify the origin of each segment of writing. Some are probably Parkerian; certainly, a handwritten copy of Bale's description of Walter of Coventry copied from the Catalogus and inserted on the flyleaf is in the same hand as the Catalogus extract in Henry of Huntingdon (CCCC MS 280) and Ranulf Higden (CCCC MS 259). These all

---

88 Bale, Index, pp. 103-4.
89 Catalogus, p. 164.
90 Walter of Coventry's Memoriale in CCCC MS 175, ff. 36r and 43v.
91 Ibid., f. 43v.
derive from Parker’s household. Various red crayon annotations in the first half of the
manuscript are also undoubtedly Parkerian.92

Foxe’s engagement with this manuscript must be set alongside his annotations in
Magdalen College, Oxford Latin MS 36. The annotations here, produced by Bale and
Foxe, are largely contained in the first half of the manuscript which details the pre-
Norman past.93 Unlike Foxe’s annotations in Parker’s manuscripts, even those with a
connection to Bale, the annotations here are more extensive. Foxe highlights the
beginning of a new monarch’s reign in the margin, but he also makes comments. Upon
the death of Edward the Martyr, Foxe highlights the epitaph.94 On at least one occasion
Foxe also notes where he feels something is good (bello).95 He later notes that in 1132
there were two popes.96 There are also various manicules, hash marks and crosses.
Many of these are probably Bale’s, but some of the manicules in particular do
correspond closely to Foxe’s known form. Together these two manuscripts of Walter of
Coventry suggest that Foxe was comparing Parker’s manuscript to his own to check for
discrepancies and perhaps to assimilate his own knowledge of the manuscript to Parker.

Foxe’s concern with cross-referencing between variant manuscripts is again visible in
Foxe’s own copy of a Brut (now attached to the Battle Chronicle).97 The annotation
occurs on the first page of an incomplete manuscript (beginning with the reign of

92 These are numerous. Although Parkerian crayon runs throughout the manuscript, with the final mark
on f. 135r (final page is f. 166r), interest actually dissipates after f. 107r. This suggests that Parker’s main
interest was in the earlier portion of the manuscript. The red crayon annotations are more interested in
highlighting the various archbishops, suggesting that this manuscript was examined in part for Parker’s
history of the Archbishopric of Canterbury.
93 The annotations mainly appear between ff. 1-35r of Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 36.
94 Ibid., f. 7r.
95 Ibid., f. 20v.
96 Ibid., f. 22r.
97 Now BL Cotton Domitian E VIII.
Sigebert and continued to 1292). Foxe has noted the mention of ‘historiae Britanniae’ in the text and recognised it as the same in the chronicle attributed to John Brompton.

There is further evidence that Foxe inherited some of Bale’s manuscripts, as can be verified in the collection of books donated to Magdalen College, Oxford by Foxe’s son, Samuel, sometime after his father’s death. Alongside the previously discussed copy of Walter of Coventry’s Memoriale, is Foxe’s copy of Walter of Guisborough’s chronicle (Magdalen College Oxford, Latin MS 53). Like the Memoriale, this too had once belonged to Bale, and still bears his annotations alongside Foxe’s. There is little doubt that it was this manuscript which Foxe used to compile events during the reign of Edward III. However, this was a complicated compendium. Bale had taken it from a mixture of leaves from a continuation of Guisborough and supplemented them with forged pages in his own hand (or that of a scribe). He also added an index and underlined and annotated items of interest in the same pink ink that he had used for the manuscript of Nicholas Trivet. On several occasions Foxe has provided supplementary annotations to those already scribbled by Bale. On one occasion, where Bale has placed a hash and cross in pink ink, Foxe has added ‘foneta aut alios’ [spin or changed], perhaps suggesting that he has noted a variance between this manuscript and another (possibly Parker’s copy of Walter of Guisborough found in CCCC MS 250).

On the first leaf not to be taken up fully with text (other than the flyleaf), Bale, Foxe and an unidentified brown ink (possibly, but not certainly, Foxe) were unable to resist

---

99 For instance, on Madgalen College Oxford Latin MS 53, pp. 82-3, Bale has inserted hashes and crosses in the margin to denote an interest in the contents. Pink ink occurs on various pages, but always in the first half of the manuscript, suggesting that Bale probably bound the two halves together at a later date.
100 Ibid., p. 101.
adding their own comments. These are largely concerned with noting the corrupted religion depicted in the manuscript, although the brown ink annotation appears to be an attempt to confirm the authorship of the chronicle as Walter of Guisborough and to link several other scholars to the work such as Adam Murimuth (c. 1274-1347) and the Annals of Neot. Other annotations by Bale and Foxe are again concerned with authorship of each section of the chronicle. Where Adam Murimuth is mentioned, Bale has written ‘aut(h)or’ in pink ink. In pencil (possibly Foxe) an annotation notes that the same information on Baldwin III can be found in ‘Hemingsford fo. 421’. This is possibly a reference to Parker’s manuscript copy (CCCC MS 250). Many of the annotations which could well be Foxe, simply highlight the date or name of a person particularly important at that point in the account. This sign-posting, as already discussed, was a simple means of making the manuscript more manageable.

All of these manuscripts have strong connections to John Bale and were used extensively as source material for the 1570 edition of the Acts and Monuments. Brompton for Anglo-Saxon material, Trivet for the last years of Henry III and the early part of Edward I, Walter of Coventry for the Third Crusade, St Anselm in his account of that Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Guisborough continuation for Edward III. However, other manuscripts from Parker’s collection that we know Foxe extensively consulted for the Acts and Monuments bore no annotations by him at all. The two manuscripts of Matthew Paris’ Chronica Majora are empty of Foxe’s annotations as is Gervase of Canterbury’s chronicle. Yet, Foxe inserted numerous accounts from both.

Our comparison with Foxe’s own manuscript collection, such as the Guisborough

101 Ibid., p. 5.
102 As in Ibid., pp. 88 and 93.
103 These are numerous. For example Ibid., pp. 117, 122, 256, and 258.
104 The two copies of Matthew Paris’ Chronica Majora are CCCC MS 26 and CCCC MS 16. Gervase of Canterbury comes from CCCC MS 438.
manuscript mentioned above, confirms the conclusion that in many cases Foxe annotated his own books more than those that he borrowed, but this is not always the case.

Foxe's copy of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* provides an example. Foxe was fortunate to own William's autograph copy (now Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 172). This is a small pocket-sized volume of approximately 106 folio pages, contained in the original binding with which it was presented to the college. The only annotations in the manuscript belong to Foxe; they amount to approximately fifty separate notes, most of which highlight the name of kings and bishops. Where letters have faded, Foxe has taken the time to draw them back in. He has also 'corrected' or re-labelled material. On one occasion Foxe crossed out the Latin words that numbered a list of nine items, and replaced them with roman numerals. Further into the manuscript, when William of Malmesbury came to write about the archbishopric of Winchester, Foxe scribbled the genealogy of archbishops in a margin. In the majority of cases, Foxe's annotations provide a guide to reading the manuscript by highlighting the general subject under discussion. It is largely on the endleaf that Foxe scribbles other types of notes including a warning as to the 'truthfulness' of William of Malmesbury. A copy of the *Flores Historiarum* (possibly Foxe's own) contains similar annotations, which follow the same pattern of interest in highlighting points of interest and making the manuscript more manageable.
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106 Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 172, f. 3v.
108 These notes are rather lengthy and difficult to read. See *Ibid.*, f. 106v.
109 Now BL Cotton Claudius E VIII.
In another example however, Foxe was more forthcoming with his comments and views. Foxe's copy of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* has various annotations in its margins (most of which are probably Foxe's, although some might be Bale's). The word 'nota' is often used to denote information of interest, while words underlined highlight the specific person or event that has solicited that interest. Again Foxe has filled the endleaf with notes. Two pages of jottings attempt to list information gleaned from the manuscript into chronological order. The foundation of abbeys is listed, given dates and folio number, whilst additional information on historical characters such as St Hilda's daughter provides an approximate timeline, which could be used alongside the equally annotated index.

As a reversal of the above, Foxe's copy of Robert de Avesbury contains no annotations at all by Foxe, but there are plenty by a Parkerian red crayon and by William Lambarde (who appears to have owned the manuscript after Foxe). By good fortune we are able to also examine a couple of printed books, known to have belonged to Foxe. In one case, a copy of Marsilius of Padua's *Defensor Pacis* (that well-known fourteenth-century anticlerical assault, censured by the papacy), Foxe has not left any annotations other than inserting his name on the front page. However, Foxe's copy of Jan Hus' *Historia et Monumen*ta has various annotations belonging to Foxe. The annotations conform to the same pattern that we have described for many of Foxe's manuscripts. They are largely concerned with highlighting chronological details (both months and
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110 This is Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 181.
112 The annotated index appears in *Ibid.*, ff. 113r-118v.
113 This is now Douce MS 128. Lambarde has written on the flyleaf that this manuscript had once belonged to 'Foxus' and that he had used it in his *Acts and Monuments*.
114 This copy is now Pembroke College Cambridge 3.11.22.
115 Jan Hus, *Historia et Monumenta* (Nuremberg, 1558), 2 vols. This is now Pembroke College Cambridge 4.11.22-3.
years when events took place), as well as the occasional highlighting of specific events and persons discussed in the text. Foxe also uses a manicule on several occasions. Foxe has provided an index to both volumes, and on the endleaf of the second volume he provides a brief note delineating Hus’ description of Bohemia.

These examples of annotation by Foxe on those manuscripts that we have identified as having been consulted for use in the *Acts and Monuments* combine to prove several things. First, Foxe was not a great annotator. At best he would scribble a note on a blank piece of paper attached to the manuscript and cross-reference the chronicle to other texts. Often he would ‘improve’ the manuscript’s readability by adding subheadings, underlining the beginning of new subjects and inserting relevant dates or names in the margins. Such a course of action is most clearly revealed to us in Foxe’s handling of William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, in which he highlighted the names of each archbishop and the change between bishoprics under discussion. The insertion of an apparatus to make the text more accessible to the reader and researcher appears to be a common feature of sixteenth-century scholarship. Bale’s interactions with the Nicholas Trivet manuscript were largely to make the manuscript accessible; so too was much of the Parker household scholarly activity that we have discussed. The second feature of Foxe’s annotations is the difference between the amount of annotation on the manuscripts that he owned compared to those that he borrowed. Unlike some scholars of his day, Foxe rarely wrote on other people’s property. Where he does, it was usually for the benefit of the manuscript owner. For instance, the note in Brompton’s *Chronicon* appears to be partly for Parker’s benefit rather than his own. The possible exceptions to this, are those manuscripts owned by
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116 Such as in Pembroke College Cambridge 4.11.22 (vol. 1), ff. 20, 39, 155, 184, 187 and 260 where the manicule is upside down, 301, and 317.
Chapter Six

Bale. This thesis has argued that Foxe and Bale collaborated not only on the *Acts and Monuments* and its predecessors, but also on the *Catalogus* and other such works. Thus it is not surprising to find that several of the manuscripts that Bale owned have markings by Foxe. Neither is it surprising that Foxe sought these manuscripts for use in the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* after Bale's death. These were manuscripts that he was already familiar with. Several, such as the chronicles belonging to Walter of Guisborough, Nicholas Trivet, John Brompton, Robert de Avesbury and Thomas Walsingham might well have been provided to Foxe by Bale upon or near to his death. Some of these Foxe passed on to Parker, others, which were of little use to the archbishop, he kept. It is noticeable that Foxe held on to his copies of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* and Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, both of which Parker already had as his own copies.117

One important question remains. If Foxe generally annotated for the sole purpose of providing an accessible apparatus to manage the manuscript contents and to provide cross-references to other chronicles, then where did he work out his arguments and how did he link together all the variant evidence? The pre-reformation history in the *Acts and Monuments* reveals a complex engagement with variant sources, and although some of these can be put down to a particular source (such as Fabyan noting a divergence of his sources), most appear to be Foxe's own work. This question is easily answered. Foxe followed the humanist method of gathering and ordering material: the commonplace book. Commonplace books can be characterised as a collection of excerpts culled from other writings and ordered under sub-headings determined by a simple or complex apparatus. Commonplaces were a form of extended memory: a

117 Parker's copies were CCCC MS 43 (*Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*) and CCCC MS 259 (*Polychronicon*).
database which a trained humanist could draw upon at a moment's notice to say anything on any particular subject. William H. Sherman has noted that it had become increasingly common in the late sixteenth century for readers to take notes by such a method, rather than by scribbling on the manuscripts themselves.\(^{118}\) The rise of the notebook combined with a carefully orchestrated insertion of excerpts and information obtained from manuscript and printed texts enabled researchers to compose the 'bare bones' of an argument based upon a variety of sources without the need to consult a source more than once. Material extracted from any one source would be reorganised and inserted under a variety of headings, providing a framework in which an argument could be made; the humanist scholar needed to only interpret that material and replicate it into a rhetorical and elegant style. John Bale, amongst others, has left us evidence of these practices.\(^{119}\)

Foxe has not left us such a useful commodity as his working commonplace books. However his belief in the commonplace method is evident. In 1557, whilst Foxe was in exile at Basel, he published *Locorum communium tituli et ordines quinquaginta, ad seriem praedicamentorum decem descripti* (fifty headings and divisions of Common Places, arranged according to the series of Ten Predicaments).\(^{120}\) He later reprinted it in 1572, through the print house of John Day, as *Pandectae locorum communium* (A comprehensive collection of commonplaces).\(^{121}\) This second edition provided 1,208 blank pages intended to be filled in by the purchaser with appropriate material. John G. Rechtien has made a detailed study of Foxe's commonplace book, describing it as 'an
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119 Most specifically for John Bale is his notebook used for preparation of his catalogues of English writers now published with a scholarly apparatus in Bale, *Index*.
anthology without contents, as a manuscript in printed form'. 122 Foxe provided sub-headings, an index and a preface that instructed students on how to use the book. In this preface, Foxe described the commonplace as a ‘storeroom of memory’; it was to be an extension of the self and a response to the legacy of print and the overabundance of books. 123 Although Foxe’s published commonplace book appears to have been a commercial failure, it was taken up enthusiastically by at least one person of note, one of England’s leading lawyers, Sir Julius Caesar (1558-1636). 124 More essential to our discussion here, however, is that Foxe claimed the commonplace as a useful apparatus for the study of history. The commonplace provides an explanation for Foxe’s manuscript annotations, as well as many of the other annotations which we have discussed belonging to John Bale and Parker’s household. Sixteenth-century annotation of manuscripts was largely a practice of providing an apparatus with which the commonplace method of research could efficiently function. The addition of indices, sub-headings, and the highlighting of dates, people and places, as well as the provision of cross-references to other chronicles with the same text, provided the basis in which material could easily be extracted and placed into a commonplace apparatus.

3. Conclusion

This thesis began with the concept and formation of collaborative research, which was then put into practice through a study of the sources used by that collaborative body to

compile the pre-reformation portion of the first two editions of the *Acts and Monuments*. This subsequent enquiry into the manuscript basis - linked to an examination of the methodologies employed in lifting material from old writings into a useable form - completes this research. Foxe’s annotations in Parker’s collection reveal a concern for cross-referencing chronicles to their sources – thus tracing evidence through the textual accounts. It was perhaps used to find the earliest instance where the material occurred, but also so that a variety of references to sources could be extrapolated to back up the arguments. This appears strongly in the *Acts and Monuments*, where on numerous occasions Foxe has listed several chronicles that substantiate his version of events. The provision of indices, sub-headings, biographical information (such as the replica accounts lifted from Bale’s *Catalogus*) and the highlighting of important information often through the use of manicules served to make the manuscripts accessible to humanist research. In particular, the manuscripts, where possible, were updated to contemporary conventions which had often resulted from the invention of print. The use of notebooks combined with a commonplace apparatus, furnished Foxe and his collaborators with the means of producing an argument rich in biographical and bibliographical detail. Through such means they were able to view the textual variances displayed in old histories – they could recognise inconsistencies, uncertain and weak evidence, as well as strong evidence corroborated by various authorities.

The annotations in Parker’s collection made by Bale, Joscelyn, Parker, Foxe and various others provide a foundation to all their publications. Foxe’s cross-referencing is explained in the references he makes in his *Acts and Monuments*, whilst Parker’s ‘completion’ of manuscripts and provision of interpretative frameworks paid off in the
complex arrangement of his *De Antiquitate Britannicae*. The detailed research into Old English, the provision of glossaries and the comparison of variant editions of text all resulted in the publication of *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*; a text portraying not only Protestant opinion on the Mass but also accusing the previous regime of historical erasure and manipulation. None of this would have been possible without first gathering together England’s dispersed manuscript heritage, and then overlaying a specific methodological examination set within the confines of various assumptions and beliefs.

The specific collection of historical manuscripts that Parker made available to Foxe for the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* was therefore essential to the final form and size of the pre-reformation history, as were the methodological assumptions that these reformers found implicit within the collection. However, analysis of the annotations and transmission of these manuscripts denotes the importance of Bale as the provider and interpreter of these texts. Parker and Foxe were, in part, simply conduits for Bale’s ideas. Such a statement is of course too harsh. Both Parker and Foxe were independent and vital contributors to Elizabethan historical research and essential to subsequent scholarly endeavours. However, Bale was the key factor. Many of the vital manuscripts used to compile the pre-reformation history in the *Acts and Monuments*, derive from Bale’s researches and collections. The foundation of Parker’s activities is more of an expansion of Bale’s project, than a beginning for the reclamation of England’s manuscript heritage. More often than not, we need to look to Bale to understand the root-cause behind the Elizabethan engagement with its history. Bale, albeit in collusion with the Magdeburg Centuriators, provided the foundations of Elizabethan Protestant scholarship. Parker gathered and prepared England’s manuscript
heritage for use. Foxe extrapolated the discoveries, reprocessed them under a reformist methodological apparatus and elegantly presented the findings as a means of advertising their church to the Christian people. The *Acts and Monuments* was formed by a combination of collaboration and of a culmination of humanist and reformist scholarly activity.
Conclusion

The primary task of this thesis has been to examine the attempt, by sixteenth-century protestant scholars, to rectify what they saw as the 'ignoraunce of history'. We have done this through a detailed study of the sources used to compile a revised understanding of, in particular, England's past, as it appeared in the first two editions of the *Acts and Monuments*. We have asked what authority was accredited to certain types of sources and what methodologies and interpretations were applied to them, both at the stage of consulting the manuscripts and printed texts and at the stage of forming an argument. In turn, this examination has engaged with the nature of collaboration, in particular how the pre-reformation history in the *Acts and Monuments* was formed and sustained in co-operation and conjunction with, in particular, John Bale, John Day, the Magdeburg Centuriators and Matthew Parker's household and scholarly 'circle'.¹ In the process of these investigations we have travelled from London to Basel, sidestepped to Magdeburg and Jena, and paused briefly in Canterbury, Oxford and Cambridge. We have explored a variety of chronicles in manuscript form with an eye to identifying evidence for the reformist appropriation of the chronicle traditions. These manuscripts, now housed in the archives largely in London, Cambridge and Oxford stand as a testimony to their own histories and mark one moment in time when their services to historiography were reshaped and reorganised.

The first chapter of this thesis ended with a discussion concerning nineteenth and twentieth-century misunderstandings over the intention behind the *Acts and

¹ John Foxe often used the word 'Sustainers' to describe those men and women who helped to support the martyrs and exiled Protestants. My use of it here is in recognition that Foxe and his project was similarly sustained via a collaborative network. A useful examination of these 'sustainers' can be found in Brett Usher, 'Foxe in London, 1550-87', *VE* (2004).
Monuments, as opposed to its reception as the Book of Martyrs. Specifically, we highlighted a theme in recent historiography that suggests the Acts and Monuments was compiled not by John Foxe as author but by a collaborative team, in which Foxe should be considered as chief editor or director of the project. In general, this thesis has tested that proposition. The analysis of the Anglo-Saxon and medieval accounts has supported but also challenged the term “Foxe” as ‘a methodological response to an epistemic challenge’. That theory, put forward most specifically by Jesse Lander and Devorah Greenberg, while providing a useful starting point for this study, threatens to distort the results if not partially re-evaluated to accept the new evidence. Although the concept of “Foxe” is a reflexive term intended to illuminate the multiple relations of authorship, text and readership, and beyond the sixteenth century, the abridgements, re-appropriations, denouncements and influences, our challenge here is to a limited reading of this methodological response. In particular our focus is upon the idea of “Foxe” as the constituent author of the first two editions of the Acts and Monuments.

We are especially concerned with the evidence drawn out of collaboration and the community involved in the compilation of the pre-reformation element of the history. In her article “‘Foxe’ as a Methodological Response’, Devorah Greenberg has highlighted the Marian exile community as performing an extensive collaborative role in the production of the first two editions of the Acts and Monuments. Most specifically Greenberg lists John Foxe, John Bale (1495-1563), Laurence Humphrey (1525/7-1589) and Edmund Grindal (1516/20-1583) alongside various ‘clerics, printers and lay folk’ who collaborated together. As we discussed in chapter two, Edmund Grindal and his

---

Conclusion

‘Martyrum historia’ project provided Foxe with material, interpretation, guidance, and support for the enlargement and re-application of his smaller Commentarii into an exile collaborative enterprise. Grindal acted as the key conduit for the supply of smuggled materials from England to Strasbourg and then to Foxe and those living in the Clarakloster in Basel; most especially John Bale and Laurence Humphrey. The experience of working in collegio on collaborative projects, which resulted in publications such as Foxe’s Rerum and Bale’s Catalogus, was subsequently transported back into England upon the accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558.

For the compilation of the 1563 edition John Foxe worked in close co-operation with John Day (1521/2-1584) at his print house in Aldersgate. The evidence, both internal and external to the Acts and Monuments suggests that this relationship was exceptionally collaborative; Day not only dedicated most of his resources to the project but he also provided evidence and guidance as to its organisation and structure. Although their common patron appears to have been William Cecil, he does not seem to have had any direct influence on the text. Grindal, now fully consecrated as Bishop of London, similarly does not seem to have had much of a continuing impact beyond the probable setting up of the project as an intended vernacular version of his ‘Martyrum historia’. Grindal’s hand may have been revealed in the close co-operation between John Foxe and Henry Bull in preparing the martyr accounts together. However they were already friends from their Edwardian days so that interpretation must remain tentative. Beyond Grindal, we have highlighted Laurence Humphrey as another essential element of “Foxe” in the compilation of the 1563 and 1570 editions. As
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3 This thesis has not been able to treat as fully such characters as Henry Bull, Laurence Humphrey and John Stow partly because their involvement is often more recognisable in the contemporary portions of the Acts and Monuments, but also because, by necessity, this thesis has concentrated on the main conduits of collaboration for the pre-reformation portion of the text.
Conclusion

both critic and supporter interacting with the older “Foxe” to reshape what was essentially a history of the reformation with an historical preface, into a fully-fledged ecclesiastical history. “Foxe” had evolved and its collaborative foundation shifted. In alliance with the household and contact network of the Archbishop of Canterbury, “Foxe” was drawn further into a re-appropriation of England’s past, and especially into a reassessment of its manuscript heritage. Matthew Parker provided access to a host of rediscovered and rare materials, which drew “Foxe” into a cutting-edge reassessment of England’s past. From the ‘suppressed’ Chronica Majora compiled by Matthew Paris to the translation of Old English Anglo-Saxon monuments in support of the evangelical movement, Parker directed “Foxe” onto a trajectory established by Bale, furthered by Parker himself, and finally epitomised in the contents of the Acts and Monuments.

These ‘communities’ or ‘authors’, as Lander and Greenberg theorise, were all linked through similar historical, religious, political and academic sensibilities and tied together by one “event”; that is the Acts and Monuments in all its forms. Yet, there is another collaborative element which we have thus far ignored and which fits uneasily into this paradigm. What of the relationship of all of these ‘communities’ of “Foxe” to the Magdeburg Centuriators? In this thesis we have argued that both Bale and Foxe played a role, however large or small, in the compilation of the early ‘Centuries’ and that upon their return to England they were viewed as the English repositories of that project. Furthermore, we have argued that Parker’s great endeavour to rediscover and gather England’s scattered textual past was inspired and activated by a request by the Centuriators for English materials. The conjoining of Parker’s enterprise with “Foxe” and the transformation of the Acts and Monuments from reformation commentary to ecclesiastical history has been presented as an attempt to produce an English version of
the Magdeburg Centuries. Even the use of Eusebian methodology can legitimately be associated with the Centuries. Foxe certainly used Eusebius but it was in conjunction with and often acting only as an addition to Eusebian evidence extracted from the Magdeburg history.⁴ If, in that case, the Acts and Monuments is the English equivalent of a German Lutheran ecclesiastical history then should we not instead use the term "Flacius" or perhaps "Nidbruck"? Matthias Flacius Illyricus and Casper von Nidbruck gave birth to the Magdeburg Centuries and in turn paved the way for a similar collaborative venture in England. Through that lens, “Foxe” is a comparative aspect of a larger scholarly body. A similar argument can also be made for “Bale”. John Bale had enlisted Foxe to write the necessary history that he felt unable to produce himself.

In his account of John Oldcastle, published from exile in 1544, Bale outlined his wish for

some lerned Englyshe manne (as there are now most excellent fresh wyttes) to set forth the Englyshe chronycles in theyr ryght shappe as certen other landes hath done afore them all affeccyo(n)s set a part. I can not thynke a more necessarye thynge to be laboured to the honour of God, bewtye of the realme, rudicyon of the people, and commodite of other landes, next the sacred scripture of the Byble, than that worke wolde be.⁵

John Foxe became that ‘lerned Englyshe manne’. Bale also inspired the apocalyptic framework, most notably through his publication of the Image of Bothe Churches and guided the argument and use of source material through his Catalogus and via the vast repository of knowledge that he had accumulated through his life. He expressed that knowledge, no doubt, through conversations, as well as through his letter dated 30 July 1560 to Archbishop Parker. Much of the essential source material used for both the

⁴ As discussed in chapter one of this thesis.
⁵ John Bale, A brefe chronicle concernyng the examinacyon and death of the blessed martyre of Christ syr Iohan Oldecastell the lorde Cobham (Antwerp, 1544), p. 5.
Conclusion

pre-reformation and reformation portions of the text derived from Bale. Perhaps, in terms of the first two editions of the *Acts and Monuments* we should consider revising "Foxe" to reflect the umbrella organisations of Bale, Flacius and Nidbruck in which John Foxe operated. The use of a name in quotation marks is therefore misleading in this context as it directs our thoughts to a one-way focus reaching outward from only one particular person. Instead I would suggest that "Foxe" would best be understood in terms of a nexus; meaning 'a connected group or series; a network' and 'a central point or point of convergence; a focus'. 6 This term clearly denotes the multitude of collaborative inter-connections without placing undue attention on any one element.

This discussion of the collaborative paradigm is a helpful means to extract new understandings of how and why such a project as the *Acts and Monuments* came about but it is also in danger of ignoring the individual in such a process. John Foxe is the name assigned to the *Acts and Monuments*. It was his project and his life's work. John Bale may have instigated it, but Foxe undertook it. The Magdeberg Centuriators might have inspired Foxe and Parker to take the project in a new direction, but it was Foxe who worked out the structure and basic arrangement of materials. Although large portions of the text were 'authored' by others, these were the raw materials from which Foxe put together his masterpiece. The creative talent of weaving together the various strands of history; of linking together the masses of martyr accounts into a unified chronology; and the emphasis on a revised apocalyptic pattern of history confirm that Foxe remained the guiding spirit and the most prominent voice with which the revised story of Christian history was told. There are then, two sides to a discussion of collaboration as the predominant focus of research into the *Acts and Monuments*.


324
Conclusion

Although we can no longer simply refer to the book as the authored work of one man, we can still see Foxe as our narrator and our guide. On the other hand “Foxe” or the idea of a scholarly nexus provides a construct, which allows us to see more clearly the inter-relationships and contesting judgements of scholars in the second half of the sixteenth century and in the second phase of the reformation.

A more concise understanding of collaboration is, of course, only one benefit to be derived from a study of Foxe’s pre-reformation narrative. Through a detailed analysis of the manuscript and printed sources used to compile the account in the 1563 and 1570 editions, this thesis has increased our understanding of how Foxe worked. In chapters four and five we focused our attention upon Foxe’s pre-reformation narrative, revealing how Foxe preferred to follow one or two particular sources upon which he would add additional material from elsewhere. Most specifically that study illuminated an element of the Acts and Monuments often forgotten. As historians we rarely find anything that is new or forgotten; our task is predominantly that of revision, re-analysis or representation, which itself tends to reflect our own times as much as it reflects the period of our interest. So it comes almost as a surprise to find that this was not the same for Foxe and his contemporaries.

Humanist learning and reformation hegemony had re-orientated the questions that were asked of the past, but it had also focused attention onto alternative materials. Particularly in England the dissolution of the monasteries provided an opportunity to rediscover texts that had long lain dormant on dusty shelves. The pre-reformation history in the 1570 edition of the Acts and Monuments reflects this process of rediscovery and the ‘cutting-edge’ nature of the research. Foxe and his collaborators
Conclusion

were the first in at least a century to use Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora* to write history. They drew out an alternative interpretation of the past through the harsh criticisms of this one English monk to compare with and judge the more widely acknowledged histories associated with the Roman Catholic Church. As displayed by the comparison of genealogy lists in the *Breviat*, and John Stow's *A summary of English Chronicles*, knowledge of the order and ascension of Anglo-Saxon monarchs was rudimentary at best; the nexus of protestant scholars sought to advance the understanding of individual kingdoms, their kings and their interaction with one another. Encompassing the work of Bale and Flacius the basis of research for various 'heretical' groups such as the Waldensians, Albigensians, Hussites and Lollards was gathered and examined for what it could tell them about their real beliefs, rather than relying on the often-unfounded accusations recorded in papal records and Roman Catholic histories. Both Flacius and Bale had gained an early interest in the medieval past, seeing the potential benefit from which a polemical attack on the Roman Catholic Church could be made. Oliver K. Olson credits Flacius with laying the foundations for a reformist interest in the middle ages and for linking together all the statements concerning the Antichrist from Joachim Calaber to Martin Luther. Such a statement should however be qualified; John Bale also identified the middle ages as the connecting conduit between the purity of the church and the reformation of the sixteenth century. Their meeting whilst Bale was on his first exile from England linked their purposes together – one learnt from the other and vice versa. Furthermore, the gathering campaign of Matthew Parker and the extensive analysis of those monuments by his household staff (including John Joscelyn), brought to light over a period of some twelve years, elements of the past previously forgotten and ignored by later historians.

The evidence that these discoveries were occurring as Foxe was compiling his accounts is scattered throughout the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. From the late inclusion of King Edgar's oration, which Foxe stated was 'better...out of order, then out of the booke' to the reluctant admission that 'much more might haue bene writen of that matter [of William the Conqueror], if the boke had come sooner to my handes whiche afterward I saw', we have key evidence that Foxe and Day were contending with a constantly changing and expanding historical landscape. This is nowhere more apparent than in Books Two and Three, where Foxe is clearly trying to do more than just reappraise the history of Anglo-Saxon England. Foxe's account, in part, attempts to re-analyse the Anglo-Saxons to search for signs of hidden and submerged evidence for his 'true church' and for proof that the Roman church was already showing signs of corruption. Its contents also signify that Foxe was concerned with unscrambling what was often confused and uncertain about the period.

The two variant stories for the epistle of St Ulric in Books Two and Six are particularly illuminating as evidence that Foxe was re-assessing the origin of the letter as connected to Nicholas II rather than Nicholas I, because of the parallel research carried out by Matthew Parker. Foxe's engagement with the King Lucius story appears intricately linked with the equivalent research being carried out by Laurence Nowell and William Lambarde. Foxe also paused at various events to compare evidence from variant sources in order to straighten out confusion amongst later medieval and sixteenth-century chronicles. Foxe's attempt to confirm the date when St Augustine died was in part to show that he was indeed involved in the murder of monks at Bangor but it also
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8 *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 236. The book that Foxe refers to remains unidentified.
represents an attempt by Foxe to come to some kind of conclusion on the divergence of evidence in his sources.  

9 Foxe admitted that 'of vncertayne thinges I haue nothing certainlye to say, lesse to iudge', yet he did judge.  

10 Although Foxe presented his findings as uncertainties, he clearly favoured the assertion that Augustine was still alive when the monks were slaughtered.

The Anglo-Saxon account is particularly representative of a first wave of research on the period and its sources. The inclusion of materials such as Edgar's oration and Asser's epitaph of King Alfred, confirms that Foxe was drawing upon evidence as it became available. It also suggests that Foxe was aware that his account could not be the final word on the subject. In combination with Lambarde's *Archaionomia* and Parker's publication programme, Books Two and Three were Foxe's contribution to an emerging field of research; one which was evolving. This is very different from the development of his post-Conquest account in Book Four. Although Foxe was engaging with materials that had long been underused or forgotten – most specifically Matthew Paris – he did so largely as a reappraisal of an established history. Foxe was revising that period so that it could be understood from a 'protestant' viewpoint. Much of the work produced by Foxe provided a new emphasis on contemporary, or near contemporary sources, as a challenge to the generalised accounts in earlier histories.

Together chapters four and five of this thesis underline that the choice of sources, the development of an overarching argument and the inter-linking of English with continental topics, were decisions that were not necessarily assured when the project began. The heightened interest in the traditions of chronicle writing at St Albans during
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9 This story can be found in *A&I*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 160.

the thirteenth century, over that of the fourteenth-century *Polychronicon*, emphasises that the reform of England's past also necessitated a reform of the historical sources upon which it was based. The emphasis on those manuscripts again brings us to Matthew Parker. The importance of Foxe's involvement in Parker's circle has been emphasised in this thesis but only as far as the evidence allows. The close analysis in chapter six of the manuscripts Foxe is now known to have used, helps to confirm that Foxe was aware of what he was doing and how he was doing it, and that he was often willing to tell us, either through an explanation to his readers, or via annotations in his manuscripts. Foxe's cross-references between divergent chronicles confirm that he was comparing divergent accounts and not accepting wholesale anything that he read. The lack of Foxe's annotations in Parker's manuscripts and his preference for those previously associated with John Bale is suggestive of the co-operation between all of these scholars.

One question remains, which was proposed at the beginning of this thesis. Thomas S. Freeman has suggested that the potential of a study such as this, is that it can inform us of Foxe's working methods and accuracy in the contemporary portion of the *Acts and Monuments*. In answer, it would seem that Foxe was a compiler who would begin his assessment of an event, person or period from one or two sources and then compare and contrast those accounts with contemporary discourses and other historical documents. Foxe tended to work backwards from a contemporary or near-contemporary source until he came to the earliest occurrence. It is significant that Foxe did not necessarily accept the original rendition of a story but made up his own mind, influenced by what seemed to be most congenial to his argument.

---

11 See the preface for this thesis and Thomas S. Freeman, "St Peter Did not Do Thus": Papal History in the Acts and Monuments*, VE* (3 parts, 2004), pt. 1.
From our study of the pre-reformation text, it is also clear that Foxe was fascinated by the compilation of information in tabular form. Time and again, Foxe produced genealogical tables, petitions, and lists in support of his wider arguments. These were put to various purposes. It is clear that the genealogical tables for the Anglo-Saxon kings were the result of extensive and quite complex readings of the evidence. Together they represented quite a leap of understanding from what even Foxe's own contemporaries were producing (including John Stow). For the first time the kings for each of the seven kingdoms were clarified and placed into a relatively correct order. The reason behind the inclusion of a list of the barons who came over to England with William the Conqueror is less clear. Its inclusion was not necessary to a religious history, but perhaps helpful in selling the book to aristocratic families keen to augment the prestige of their family. The inclusion of a list of monastic orders existing in the thirteenth century has a more obvious purpose; it allowed Foxe to clarify his point that their diffusion, especially when they were at loggerheads with one-another, was another sign of decay and corruption. Finally, the list of Canterbury's archbishops at the end of each Book was an evident acknowledgement of the patronage afforded by Matthew Parker.

This evidence relates well to the contemporary portions of the text. The Kalendar of protestant martyrs, which fronted the 1563 and 1583 editions of the Acts and Monuments, suggests a similarly keen interest in tables. Near the beginning of Book Seven, Foxe included a brief table to illustrate the 'great alterations, troubles, and turnes
Conclusion

of Religion' current at the time of Henry VIII's accession as King of England. Near
the end of the same Book a series of lists appeared, this time describing the martyrs of
Germany, France, the Netherlands, Spain, and Italy, taken out of Heinrich Pantaleon's
*Rerum pars Secunda* and other similar sources. When dealing with the death of
Queen Mary, Foxe provided several short tables listing those 'persecuting' bishops that
had died before and soon after the Queen or who had soon after been put in prison.
Foxe also included several tables directly taken out of Episcopal registers, such as a
table describing the crimes listed in Lincolnshire, whilst under the control of Bishop
John Longland (1473-1547) in 1521. More 'persecution' records from Lincoln begin
Book Eight and various martyr stories included tabulated information from the
registers. Foxe also inserted a list of all the books banned in England in the 1520s
(including the New Testament in English and various Protestant books). One wonders
if Foxe had taken to heart certain ideas emerging from the *ars historia*, which promoted
the use of chronological tables to make histories more accessible. The tables were
there to clarify his wider discussions and to make his points more vivid.

There are certainly many more comparisons that can be made between the use of
sources, methods and purposes in the pre-reformation portion of the *Acts and
Monuments* and in the contemporary portions. However such detailed examination is
another project in itself. So too is the comparative study between Foxe's *Acts and

12 *A&M*, 1570, bk. 7, p. 927. This table provided the names and dates upon which European princes
ascended to their crowns, within a few years of Henry VIII's coronation.
13 *A&M*, 1570, bk. 7, pp. 1019-1028 [German martyrs], 1029-1060 [French martyrs], 1060 [Dutch
martyrs], 1060-1065 [Spanish martyrs], 1066-1074 [Italian martyrs].
15 Ibid., bk. 7, p. 947-961.
16 Such as the articles against Thomas Bilney in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, pp. 1134-1138. The general
Lincolnshire archives are recorded in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, pp. 1118-1120.
17 *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, pp. 1157-8.
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Monuments and Heinrich Pantaleon's Rerum pars Secunda. A full list of Foxe's borrowings from the Rerum pars Secunda into the Acts and Monuments has never been attempted. Neither has anyone directly compared the two texts for evidence of shared sources, agendas or methodologies. This foreshadows further research to be undertaken, such as a more sustained examination of Matthew Parker's household. So too, for John Bale. Plenty of attention has already been awarded to this intriguing figure. Yet, as has been undertaken here for Foxe, the identification of the sources behind Bale's historical works would be highly useful. Which sources did he most rely upon? When did he get access to them? What were his methods of information extraction? Most importantly, how did he go about compiling a list of English writers from the earliest written records to those of his own day? As has been shown in this thesis, through the lens of the Acts and Monuments, Bale's work formed the basis of most of Elizabethan historical and ecclesiastical scholarship. Therefore, a study of Bale's historical work has the potential to underpin a variety of research into Tudor and indeed continental historiography in the sixteenth century.

In attempting to rectify the 'ignoraunce of history' a nexus of scholars, printers, and churchmen engaged with their past with a revised conception of what it should be and how it should mirror their own times. This thesis has examined this collaborative reformation of England's past. The focal point of this study has been the pre-reformation history largely contained in Book One of the 1563 edition and Books Two to Four of the 1570 edition. The recognition that there were a variety of over-lapping networks both informing and determining the form and purpose of these Books is not a new idea, yet it has never really received the attention that it deserves. For John Foxe

---

19 A&M, 1570, To the true and faithful congregation [Prefaces], p. 2.
himself it must have felt at times as if the *Acts and Monuments* was his own private punishment from God, and that he alone had been required to shoulder the huge responsibility for its creation and completion. In listening to Foxe's agonised complaints littered throughout the prefaces of the *Acts and Monuments* and in his own private letters it is no wonder that it is only now, some 400 years later, that we have begun to unearth the role of his collaborators and sustainers.
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Contents and layout of the *Acts and Monuments* (1563 and 1570 editions)

1563 Edition

**Kalander**  
1-6

**Prefaces**  
1-2 Ad Dominum Jesum Christum  
3-4 Eucharisticon  
5-8 Almanacke  
9-11 The Preface to the Quene  
12-14 Ad doctum Lectorem  
15-16 To the Persecutors of Gods truth, commonlye called Papistes  
15-16 The vtility of this history.

**Book 1**  
[Pre-Lollard History of the Church]  
1-84

**Book 2**  
[The Bohemian church]  
85-346

**Book 3**  
[The Lollards]  
347-683

**Book 4**  
[The reign of Edward VI]  
684-888

**Book 5**  
[The Marian Persecution]  
889-1758

**Index**  
1-39
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1570 Edition

Prefaces
1 To the True and faithfull congregation of Christes vniversall Church
2-6 A Protestation to the whole Church of England.
7-10 The Epistle dedicatory to the Queenes Maiestie.
11-12 To the true Christian reader, what vtilitie is to be taken by readyng of these Historyes.
13-15 To all the professed frendes and folowers of the Popes procedynges.
16 The names of the authors alleged in this Booke
17-19 The names of the Martyrs in this booke conteined
20-21 Dedicatory poems
22-23 Errata

Prologue [The Primitive church compared to the Elizabthan church]
1-36

Book 1 [The Ten Persecutions of the Primitive Church]
37-144 The first booke, conteining the. 300. yeares next after Christ.

Book 2 [The Anglo-Saxon heptarchy]
145-179 The second booke contayning the next. 300. yeres following, with such thinges specially touched, as haue bene done in England, from the tyme of Kyng Lucius, to Gregorius, and so after to the tyme of Kyng Egebert.

Book 3 [The Anglo-Saxons]
180-221 The thirde booke conteynyng the next. 300 yeares, frō the raigne of K. Egbertus to the time of W. Conquerour.

Book 4 [From the Norman Conquest to the Lollards]
222-492 The fourth booke conteynyng other. 300. yeares, from VV. Conquerour to the tyme of John VVickleffe, vverin is described the proud and misorderd raigne of Antichrist, begynnyng to styrre in the church of Christ.

Book 5 [From Edward III to Henry V: The Bohemian Church]
493-779 The fift booke conteynyng the last 300. yeares from the loosyng out of Satan.

Book 6 [Henry VI to Henry VII: The Lollards]
780-922 The sixte parte or Section, perteynyng to the last. 300. yeares, mentioned in the begynnyng of the fift booke before.

Book 7 [Henry VIII and the Break from Rome]
923-1106 Here foloweth the second volume and the seuenthe booke begynnyng with the reigne of kyng Henry the eight.
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Book 8  [Henry VIII and the martyrs]
1107-1482 The eight booke continuynge the history of Englishe matters apperteinyng to both the states, as well ecclesiasticall, as ciuill and temporall.

Book 9  [Edward VI]
1483-1566 The ninth booke containyng the Actes and thyges done in the reigne of kyng Edvvard the 6.

Book 10  [Mary I]
1567-1655 The fyrst entring of Queene Mary to the crowne, with the alteration of Religion, and other perturbations happening the same tyme in thys Realme of England.

Book 11  [The Marian Persecution]
1656-2141 Here begynneth the xj. booke wherin is discoursed the bloudy murderyng of Gods Saintes, with the particular processes and names of such good Martyrs, both men and women, as in this tyme of Queene Mary were put to death.

Book 12  [The Marian Persecution]
2142-2314 Here begynneth the xij. booke conteinyng the bloudy doynges and persecutions of the aduersaries agaynst the faithfull and true seruauntes of Christ, with the particular processes, and names of such as were put to slaughter from the begynnynge of January, Anno. 1557. and the fift of Queene Mary.

Index
1-29
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**A: The division of time as laid out in the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 1: Biblical Times</th>
<th>300 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Pre-Christianity)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates:</strong> Creation-30 AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key moment:</strong> Life of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> The time of the Apostles up until the passion of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 2: The Suffering Time</th>
<th>300 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Satan deceiving the world)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates:</strong> c. 30-324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key moment:</strong> Christ crucified and resurrected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Ten persecutions of the primitive church (Book One)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 3: The Flourishing and Growing Time</th>
<th>300 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Binding up of Satan)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates:</strong> c. 324-666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key moment:</strong> Emperor Constantine converted to Christianity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> England invaded and ruled by Saxons (Book One &amp; Two)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 4: The Declining Time</th>
<th>300 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Number of the Beast)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates:</strong> c. 666-1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key moment:</strong> Boniface III declared universal Bishop for the first time and superstitions develop in the church. Rise of Islam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Saxon Kings of England. (Book Two &amp; Three)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 5: The Time of Antichrist</th>
<th>400 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates:</strong> c. 1000-1324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key moment:</strong> Corrupt doctrines of Gregory VII (Hildebrand)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Corruption of the Medieval Church (Book Four)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 6: Reforming Time</th>
<th>260 years thus far</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Loosening of Satan)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates:</strong> c. 1324-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key moment:</strong> John Huss, Wyclif, Luther.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Reformation (Books Five-Twelve)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 7: The Apocalypse</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates:</strong> unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key moment:</strong> The Day of Judgement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**B: The structure of pre-reformation history in Book One of the 1563 Edition of the *Acts and Monuments.***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of this history</strong></td>
<td>(p. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A comparison between the primitive and contemporary church</strong></td>
<td>(pp. 1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The four ages of the Church</strong></td>
<td>(pp. 7-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The First Age of the Church</em> (<strong>p. 7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Second Age of the Church</em> (<strong>p. 7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Flourishing Age of the Church</em> (<strong>p. 8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Middle Age of the Church</em> (<strong>pp. 8-10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Third Age of the Church</em> (<strong>pp. 10-16)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contention between Archbishop’s Lanfranc (Canterbury) and Thomas (York)</td>
<td>1070-1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp. 16-20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tragic history of Gregory VII (Hildebrand)</td>
<td>1073-1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp. 20-29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentions between Pope’s and Emperor’s</td>
<td>1087-1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp. 30-41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Frederick Barbarossa</em> (<strong>pp. 35-41</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Waldensians</td>
<td>1170-1391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp. 41-46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Becket</td>
<td>1162-1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp. 46-85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supremacy of the Bishop of Rome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp. 85-120)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Reign of King Richard</em> (<strong>pp. 90-93</strong>)</td>
<td>1189-1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Reign of King John</em> (<strong>pp. 93-109</strong>)</td>
<td>1199-1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Orders of Monks</em> (<strong>pp. 109-110</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Prophesy of Hildegard</em> (<strong>pp. 111-113</strong>)</td>
<td>c. 1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Reign of Henry III</em> (<strong>pp. 114-120</strong>)</td>
<td>1216-1272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Yateses</th>
<th>CTV (1556)</th>
<th>CTV (1563)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>King Jude does not favour the Popery</td>
<td>1, 127</td>
<td>1, 127</td>
<td>164-3</td>
<td>II.97</td>
<td>366-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>An lion against Pope Paschal</td>
<td>1, 234</td>
<td>1, 234</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>II.103</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Legate Joan Comyn against Conches</td>
<td>1, 259</td>
<td>1, 259</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>III.105</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>King Stephen and Emperor Louis receive right of bestowal of ecclesiastical honours</td>
<td>1, 478-9</td>
<td>1, 478-9</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Stephen Langton and the controversy over the election for Canterbury</td>
<td>1, 493-4, 503-10</td>
<td>1, 104-12</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>590-600</td>
<td>368-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Innocent III deprives John and his heirs the French to invade England</td>
<td>1, 526-7, 576</td>
<td>1, 330</td>
<td>1, 110-9</td>
<td>590-600</td>
<td>368-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>English navy captures 302 French ships</td>
<td>1, 540-1, 560-71</td>
<td>1, 469</td>
<td>1, 469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Legate report that King John was not following the new rules properly</td>
<td>1, 615-17, 633-4</td>
<td>1, 161-173</td>
<td>1, 161-173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Eamon, earl of Hereford</td>
<td>1, 620-2, 633-4</td>
<td>1, 155-161</td>
<td>1, 155-161-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>King John returns to Isle of Wight</td>
<td>1, 628-9</td>
<td>1, 155-161-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Simon Langton, brother of Archbishops elected to York but is rejected</td>
<td>1, 644-7</td>
<td>1, 187-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Vacant of Melrose to Ewan the Frenchman</td>
<td>1, 652-3, 643-67</td>
<td>1, 189-218</td>
<td>1, 189-218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>King John at war with Europe</td>
<td>1, 185</td>
<td>1, 218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Death of Innocent III</td>
<td>1, 545</td>
<td>1, 545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Story of John making the Mass</td>
<td>1, 647-8</td>
<td>1, 647-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Death of John - poisoned by a dish of poisons</td>
<td>1, 650-1</td>
<td>1, 650-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>The English bishops refuse to pay men taxes to the Pope and draw up a movement of their position</td>
<td>2, 110-2</td>
<td>2, 370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Through Legate Gino, Hierarchy set on men proceeds by every cathedral</td>
<td>3, 370-9, 399</td>
<td>3, 370-9, 399</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Legate Otto calls a council at St Pauls and is sworn to go</td>
<td>4, 418-424</td>
<td>4, 418-424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Statutes expressed at Council of St Pauls</td>
<td>4, 424-30</td>
<td>4, 424-30</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Bishop is exiled by Pope Innocent III</td>
<td>4, 424-30</td>
<td>4, 424-30</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Reason for the bishops refuse to pay</td>
<td>4, 424-30</td>
<td>4, 424-30</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Seven articles proposed at the Council of London with the bishops went now</td>
<td>4, 424-30</td>
<td>4, 424-30</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>The Pope threaten to interdict the pope if the bishops do not pay. Henry III gives in.</td>
<td>4, 650, 650-1, 680</td>
<td>4, 650, 650-1, 680</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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D: Transition of Book One (1563 edition) into Book Four (1570 edition)

The following table provides a simplified overview of how Book One of the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* was broken up and reinserted into Books Two to Four of the 1570 edition. Each coloured square represents a page number (or series of page numbers). For the 1563 edition text if the square is orange then this denotes that the entire page from 1563 appears in the 1570 edition. If the square is yellow then only a portion of the text derives from the 1563 edition. This could represent anything from one sentence to several paragraphs. The table also shows whether or not the 1563 text has been inserted into the 1570 text in order, or out of order. If the coloured square appears on the left side of the table then this means that it is in the original order. If it appears on the right side then this denotes that the text is out of its original order as it had appeared in 1563.

### Key to the Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1570 edition</th>
<th>1563 edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 3</td>
<td>Part page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controversy between Canterbury and York</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early reign of Henry III</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Religious Orders</td>
<td>109-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophesy of Hildegard</td>
<td>110-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Chaucer's Jack Upland</td>
<td>112-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The oppression of the Pope in England</td>
<td>113-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albagensian Crusade</td>
<td>118-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert de Burge</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory XI</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division between Greek and Latin church</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papal Extractions from England</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick II</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opponents of the Papacy</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Grosseteste</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry III and the Barons</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis IX on Crusade</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Probable sources for the compilation of Books Two to Four for the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*

Printed

Anon, *A Breuyat chronicle containing al the kynges from Brute to this daye* (London, 1556).

Anon, *Quadrilogus [Vita et processus S. Thomae a Becket super libertate ecclesiastica* (Paris 1495).


Bale, John, *The first two partes of the Actes or unchaste examples of the Englyshe votaryes, gathered out of theyr owne legendes and chronycales* (London, 1551, 1560).


Capgrave, John, *Nova Legenda Angliae* (London, 1516)


Fabyan, Robert, *Fabyan’s cronycle newly printed with the cronycle, actes, and dedes in the tyme of the regne of the moste excellent prynce kyngge Henry the VII, father unto our most drad soverayne lord kyngge Henry the VIII* (London, 1533, 1542, 1559).

Flacius, Matthias, *Catalogus Testium Veritatis, qui ante nostram aetatem Pontifici Romano, eiusque erroribus reclamarunt: iam denuo longe quam antea & emendatior & auctior editus* (Basel, 1556, 1562).

Flacius, Matthias, Wigand, Johann, Judix, Mattheus, and Köppe, Martin, *Ecclesiastica Historia, integram Ecclesie Christi ideam, quantum ad Locum, Propagationem, Persecutionem, Tranquillitatem, Doctrinam, Haereses, Ceremonias, Gubernationem, Schismata, Synodos, Personas, Miracula, Martyria, Religiones extra Ecclesiam, et statum Imperii politicum attinet, secundum singulas Centurias, perspicuo ordine complectens: singulari diligentia et fide ex vetustissimis et optimis historicis, patribus, et aliis scriptoribus congesta: Per aliquot studiosos et pios*

---

1 This source is uncertain. The evidence seemingly derived from John Capgrave’s *Nova Legenda Angliae* could have come from Bale, in particular from his *Catalogus*. See chapter 4 of this thesis for further details.


Gratius, Ortwin, Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum et Fugiendarum (Cologne, 1535).


Lambert of Hersfeld, Annals (1522)

Nauclerus, John, Memorabilium omnis aetatis et omnium gentium chronici commentarii (Tubingen, 1516).

Panvinio, Onofrio, Bartolomeo Sacchi de Platina, De vitis pontificum Romanorum (Venice, 1562)

Parker, Matthew, De Antiquitate Britannicae (London, 1572).4

Picciomini, Aeneas Sylvius, History of Bohemia (Basel, 1489)

Pier della Vigne, Epistolarum Petrie Vineis, ed. Simon Schard (Basel, 1566).

Rastell, John, The Pastime of People or the Chronicles of Divers Realms and most especially of the realm of England (London, 1559)

Stella, Giovanni, Vitae ducentorum et triginta summarum pontifictatum beato petro apostolo ad Julium secundum modernum pontificem (Basel, 1507)

Stow, John, A Summary of Chronicles (London, 1565).

Vergil, Polydore, Anglica Historia (Basel, 1534, 1546, 1555, 1556, 1570/1; Ghent, 1556/7).

Manuscript

Arundel MS 5 – ‘Scala Mundi’ (version of Polychronicon)

Arundel MS 7 – Thomas Walsingham, Historia Anglicana

Arundel MS 10 – The Barnwell Chronicle (used for account of King John).5

3 As argued in chapter four of this thesis, Foxe may have gathered of this material through his contacts before the Archaionomia was published.

4 Foxe might have gathered much of his information either by himself or from borrowing material that would eventually appear in Parker’s publication two years later.

Arundel MS 16 - Osbern *vitae St Dunstan*


BL Cotton Domitian E VIII – Battle Chronicle/Brut

BL Cotton Nero C XI – *The Great London Chronicle*

BL Cotton Otho A XII – Asser, *Life of Alfred*


BL Cotton Tiberius B IV – Anglo-Saxon chronicle

BL Harley MS 3634 – *Chronicon Angliae*

CCCC MS 13 - Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*


CCCC MS 59 - *Chronica Martini Poloni and misc.*

CCCC MS 96 – John Brompton, *Chronicon*.

CCCC MS 100 – transcript of Asser, *Life of Alfred*

CCCC MS 103 – Arnold of Bonneval, William of St Amour

CCCC MS 135 – St Anselm’s letters

CCCC MS 139 - Simeon of Durham, *Historia Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*

CCCC MS 152 – Nicholas Trivet, *Annales sex regum Angliae*

---

6 This is uncertain. Foxe certainly owned this manuscript at some point, as he has left markings in it. However, there is no direct evidence that it was used in Books Two to Four.

7 It is unlikely that Foxe had extensive access to Asser. Indeed, the epitaph is probably the only use of it in the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.

8 Used only for the account of King John. See Freeman, ‘Bale’s Book of Martyrs?’, p. 189.

9 Although there is some evidence that Foxe might have used the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, it is probable that he got his information second-hand, either through other sources or Parker’s household.

10 This is uncertain.

11 Use of this manuscript is uncertain. The oration of King Edgar appears to come from the end of the manuscript, however this might have been provided by Matthew Parker without Foxe having seen the manuscript.

12 It is unlikely that Foxe saw Asser himself, except for the epitaph to King Alfred, borrowed from Matthew Parker.

13 This is a possible source but it cannot be confirmed with certainty.

14 This is uncertain.
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CCCC MS 175 - Walter of Coventry, *Memoriale*

CCCC MS 250 – Walter of Guisborough

CCCC MS 318 – Eadmer, *vita St Anselm*

CCCC MS 320 – possible source for Augustine’s *Interrogations*

CCCC MS 341 – Eadmer, *Historia Novorum Anglia*

CCCC MS 359 - Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*

CCCC MS 371 - Eadmer *vitae St Dunstan*

CCCC MS 438 - Gervase of Canterbury

CCCC MS 452 – Eadmer, *Historia Novorum Anglia*

Cambridge University Library MS DD 2.5 – Walter of Guisborough

Douce MS 128 – Robert of Avesbury

Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 36 – Walter of Coventry, *Memoriale*

Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 53 – continuation of Walter of Guisborough

Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 172 – William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*

Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 181 – Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon*

Archives

French Royal Archives on Pope Boniface VIII and Philip IV

Archival research at Bury and Hereford

---

15 Foxe has his own copy of Walter of Coventry (Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 36) but it does seem probable that he used a copy from Matthew Parker as well. The evidence in Books Two to Four is uncertain for the use of this source.

16 This is uncertain. See the discussion in chapter five of this thesis.

17 This is uncertain. Foxe might have used a printed copy published in Antwerp in 1551.

18 Foxe would have derived this material from a manuscript copy and the material in this manuscript does fit, although it is in a slightly different order than Foxe gives it to us. Therefore, this is not certain.

19 It is uncertain if Foxe used this manuscript or another source (such as CCCC MS 452).

20 This is highly uncertain. Foxe did have some material from Bede but might not have had access to an actual manuscript copy. See chapter four of this thesis.

21 It is uncertain if Foxe used this manuscript or another source (such as CCCC MS 341).

22 This is uncertain.

23 Possibly obtained from Matthias Flacius Illyricus.
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Miscellaneous Manuscript Documents

Anon, *Eulogium*\(^{24}\)

Anon, *Historia Cariana*\(^{25}\)

Anon, *Jack Upland.*\(^{26}\)

Anon, *The Winchester Annals.*\(^{27}\)

Cisner, Nicholas, *De Frederico II. Imp. Oratio*

Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*\(^{28}\)

Hieronymus Massarius, *Eusebius captivus*\(^{29}\)

Jacobus De Voragine, *The Golden Legend*\(^{30}\)

Roger of Hoveden, *Annals*\(^{31}\)

Sigebert of Gemblaux, *Chronicon sive Chronographia*\(^{32}\)

Ursperg Chronicle, *Burchardi et Conradi Urspergensium Chronicon*\(^{33}\)

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*\(^{34}\)

\(^{24}\) Uncertain which manuscript copy Foxe used.

\(^{25}\) This is Foxe's name for manuscript(s) borrowed from William Carye. See the discussion in chapter four of this thesis.

\(^{26}\) This tract was provided by John Day. See chapter five of this thesis for a discussion of this.

\(^{27}\) Used only for the account of King John. See Freeman, 'Bale's Book of Martyrs?', p. 183. These are now published as *Annales Monastici*, ed. Henry R. Luard (RS, London, 1865), vol. 2.

\(^{28}\) It is uncertain which manuscript Foxe used. Foxe apparently owned a copy, as listed in the list of his books in Lansdowne 819 f. 95r and G&W, J2.39, p. 74.

\(^{29}\) From an unidentified manuscript copy.

\(^{30}\) Foxe could have obtained this in a printed or manuscript form. Foxe did definitely use a version.

\(^{31}\) It is uncertain which manuscript Foxe used. Foxe apparently owned a copy — as referenced in G&W, J2.61, p. 82.

\(^{32}\) From an unidentified manuscript copy.

\(^{33}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{34}\) It is uncertain which manuscript Foxe used. Foxe apparently owned a copy, as listed in the list of his books in Lansdowne 819, f. 95r.
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The Pre-Reformation sources in the 1570 edition of the Acts and Monuments

The basis for the division and titles of each section is derived from the Commentary Blocks used by the John Foxe Project to interpret and examine the Acts and Monuments. Although this appendix only focuses on the 1570 edition (with the occasional reference to the 1563 edition), and upon only Books Two to Four (as this is the focus for this thesis) all the page numbers for each edition have been retained in the hope that these will be helpful to other researchers. The research below is my own, unless otherwise stated. However, my research owes a great debt to the John Foxe Project and to the project's Commentary preparation, which has been carried out in great detail.

It should also be noted that, while some sources are readily identifiable, others are more obscure. It will never be possible to identify with absolute certainty many of the sources, as many of the manuscripts and printed books that Foxe consulted contained the same information. Therefore, the following information reflects the grey areas as much as it highlights the certainties. Finally, it should be noted that the evidence below is only a summary of more detailed work, much of which will appear in the Foxe Commentaries, and which is too lengthy to contain in full in an appendix.

Book Two

   - A list of seven authorities who describe possible pre-Augustinian conversions of Britain. Taken from Cent. I-III (mainly vol. 2, chs 2-3).
   - The fictitious British King, Lucius and his request to the Bishop of Rome, Elutherius to be baptised into the Roman church. Taken from Cent. II, pp. 8-9, Catalogus, p. 23; Fabyan, lib. 3 caps 58-9 and lib. 5 cap. 119; and possibly Flores I, pp. 146-9. The letter written to King Lucius was probably retrieved from the researches of Laurence Nowell and William Lambarde and would eventually appear in Lambarde's Archaionomia (1568).
   - Genealogy Table of British Kings. Probably researched from a mixture of English chronicles, the Breviat and John Stow's A Summary of English Chronicles (1565).
   - Reiteration of events in Book One, especially concerned with Emperor Diocletian's persecution of Christians and how it came to Britain. This could be taken in part from Huntingdon, lib. 1 cap. 36 combined, perhaps with Cent. III col. 318; Catalogus, pp. 17-8; Votaryes, pp. 14-15; Polychronicon, lib. 4 cap. 16. This is uncertain.
   - Constantine the Great and his governance of Britain. Again the source for this is uncertain. It could derive from the Centuries, from one of the catalogues or English chronicles.
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- The Romans leave Britain. Most details can be found in Fabyan, lib. 4 cap. 75 except for the Latin citations from Gildas. The origin of these citations remains uncertain as this could be from Gildas or another of Foxe’s sources.

- The first coming of the Anglo-Saxons most closely fits with Malmesbury, GR, lib. 1, with additional details probably derived from the Catalogus, p. 42 and Foxe’s other main sources (possibly Henry of Huntingdon, Robert Fabyan and Ranulf Higden)
- Genealogy Tables of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy. The Heptarchy was first described by Huntingdon, lib. 2 cap. 4, however there is no reason to specifically suspect this as Foxe’s source. These genealogy tables probably derive from a combination of Foxe’s sources including the Breviat and John Stow’s A Summary of English Chronicles (1565).
- The last of the British kings are described including Hengist, Uter Pendragon and Arthur. This is largely taken from English chronicles including, amongst others, Fabyan, lib. 5 and Flores I, pp. 252-7, 433-5. Foxe has also used an unidentified manuscript borrowed from William Carye (Historia Cariana). This manuscript(s) might be the source for evidence from Geoffrey of Monmouth and Gildas, although this is only an assumption. Although Polydore Vergil is mentioned, his Historia Anglica is not actually used.

- The story of Pope Gregory encountering English children at the Market place of Rome appears to be taken from a variety of sources including Huntingdon, lib. 3 cap. 1; Brompton, col. 726; Fabyan, lib. 5 cap. 119; Polychronicon, lib. 4 cap. 6 (not lib. 5 cap. 8 as Foxe stated) and possibly Votaryes, pp. 22-23. The original account in Bede, HE, lib. 2 cap. 1 may have been used (see chapter 4 of this thesis).
- The epistles of Gregory to Augustine before he arrives in England are taken verbatim from Huntingdon, lib. 3 cap. 2.
- Augustine’s arrival onto the Isle of Thanet and his meeting with King Æthelbert of Kent is taken from Fabyan, lib. 5 cap. 119 and Huntingdon, lib. 3 caps 3-5. Bede, HE, lib. 1 caps 25-6 is also a possible source.
- The interrogations of Augustine sent to Gregory and his response. This does not appear to have been taken from Bede, HE, lib. 1 cap. 27, but a manuscript or archival source.
- Further epistles between Gregory and Augustine are taken from a mixture of Bede, HE, lib. 1 caps 29-32 and Huntingdon, lib. 3 caps 6-9.
- Augustine organises a meeting at a place now named ‘Augustine’s oak’. Paraphrased from Brompton, cols 735, 743 and Fabyan, lib. 5 cap. 119.
- The synod of Bangor might have been derived from the Catalogus, pp. 63-4; 66 with additional consultation of Huntingdon, lib. 3 caps 25-26. The story is also in
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Bede, *HE*, lib. 2 cap. 2 and Fabyan, lib. 5 cap. 119 but are less likely to be the source.

- The death of Gregory the Great is probably taken from *Catalogus*, pp. 62-65.
- Foxe makes an effort to judge the exact date of Augustine's death so that he can make a point about his involvement in the slaughter of monks at Bangor. Foxe cites his sources as Geoffrey of Monmouth, Henry of Huntingdon and the Ranulf Higden, although most of the discussion probably derives from *Catalogus*, pp. 65-6 (which refers to Monmouth) with additional evidence from Huntingdon, lib. 3 cap. 17 and *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 caps 9-10.
- The Acts of Pope Gregory are derived from *Catalogus*, p. 65.

4. Pope Sabinian to dispute over Easter (1583, pp. 120-3; 1576, pp. 121-4; 1570, pp. 161-5).

- The account of Pope Sabinian and Boniface III derives from *Catalogus*, pp. 63, 69.
- The building of St Paul's and St Peter's by Æthelbert, King of Kent was obtained from Fabyan, lib. 5 cap. 120 with additional material taken from Malmesbury, *GP*, lib. 2 cap. 225; Huntingdon, lib. 3 cap. 20; and perhaps Bede, *HE*, lib. 2 cap. 3.
- The story of King Edwin is taken from Fabyan, lib. 5 caps 128-130. However, Foxe appears to have checked Fabyan's sources, especially Huntingdon, Malmesbury and Higden.
- The reign of Oswald of Northumbria is also taken from Fabyan, lib. 5 caps 130-134 but this time it is definitely supported by other sources; most prominently from Brompton, cols 784-8; Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 49; and *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 cap. 12.
- The story that St Benedict taught Bede is derived from Fabyan, lib. 5 cap. 134 but might be supported by other texts.
- Discussion on Bishops that were against keeping Easter on the day ordered by Rome. This most closely follows Brompton, cols 785-790, probably confirmed by other sources.

5. Dispute over Easter (1583, pp. 123-6; 1576, pp. 124-7; 1570, pp. 165-8).

- The Synod at Whitby is almost entirely taken from a word-for-word translation from Bede, *HE*, lib. 3 caps 25-6 with introduction information probably from *Catalogus*, pp. 81-87; Brompton, col. 790; or *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 cap. 17.
- The reigns of Egfrid and Alfred of Northumbria is probably derived from Fabyan, lib. 5 caps 133-5.
- The foundation of Islam by Mohammed, which Foxe associates with the number of the Beast could be derived from any number of sources or, perhaps one particular source that is not yet identified. Foxe's references are confused and do not correlate with the book and chapter numbers in the manuscripts.
- Synod at Thetford is probably taken from Bede, *HE*, lib. 4 cap. 5 as Foxe states.
- The telling of miracles by St Cuthbert and John of Beverley could be taken from any number of sources such as Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 141; Brompton, col. 794; *Catalogus*, pp. 83-4, 89; *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 caps 21-3.
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- Reign of Ine and the decision over Easter probably comes from *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 caps 17, 22 as stated by Foxe. The reference to Bede can also be found in the *Polychronicon*.

6. Priest's tonsures to end of kingdom of Northumbria (1583, pp. 126-31; 1576, pp. 127-33; 1570, pp. 168-75).
   - The story of Priest's tonsures is derived from a word-for-word translation of Bede, *HE*, lib. 5 cap. 21. This is one of the few instances when we can be almost certain that the account derives directly from Bede.
   - Reign of Ine probably derives from various sources including Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 36; Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 141. The law codes are derived from Brompton, cols 759-761.
   - The life and works of Bede is almost certainly taken from Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 caps 53-4 and *HE*, lib. 5 cap. 24. Bede's fabled trip to Rome could have been taken from any number of sources.
   - Celulfus, Monk of Wire derived from Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 caps 58-60.
   - The decrees of Cuthbert's synod are taken directly from Malmesbury, *GP*, lib. 1 caps 5-6.
   - The reign of Æthelbald of Mercia is taken from Brompton, cols 774-775 not Bede as Foxe claims.
   - The letter of Boniface, Archbishop of Mainz to Æthelbald, King of Mercia is taken from Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 caps 80-1.
   - The account of the reigns of various kings' of Wessex is derived entirely from Fabyan, lib. 6 caps 150-1. Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 cap. 210 is also used for Offa's role in the murder of Æthelbert of East Anglia and Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 94 for the story of Offa's son.
   - The imprisonment of Egbert, King of Kent is mainly derived from Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 151, but as Foxe says, there is doubt over Fabyan's account. Foxe checks Malmesbury, *GR*, lib 1 cap. 95 and *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 cap. 27.
   - Account of various Popes taken entirely from *Catalogus*, pp. 105-6.
   - Tale of Gregory I taken out of the *Golden Legend*, vol. 1, pp. 182-3. Foxe then goes on to discredit the *Golden Legend*.
   - The account on Emperor Carolus Magnus is taken directly out of *Catalogus*, pp. 105-6 and the letter to King Offa from *Flores I*, p. 387.
   - The decisions of the Council of Nice, which Foxe says is against the true faith, are taken out of *Catalogus*, p. 148 and Hoveden I, p. 13.
   - The final kings of Northumbria are taken from Hoveden I, p. 8 and Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 74.
   - The writings of Alcuin are taken from Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 caps 70-2.
   - The second council of Nice is probably taken from *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 cap. 27.
   - The end of Mercia is taken from Brompton, cols 776-779.
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7. Remainder of Book II (1583, pp. 131-4; 1576, pp. 133-36; 1570, pp. 175-9).
   - Summary of religious buildings are taken from a mixture of sources.
   - The donation and privileges donated by King Æthelbald to religious men is taken from Malmesbury, GR, lib. 1 cap. 84, as are the daughters of kings, who are made Nuns in this period.
   - The list of Archbishops of Canterbury probably derives from the work of Matthew Parker (De Antiquitate Britannicae).

Book Three

1. Egbert and his successors (1583, pp. 135-7; 1576, pp. 136-8; 1570, pp. 180-2).
   - Genealogy Table of Anglo-Saxon kings. Probably researched from a mixture of English chronicles, the Breviary and John Stow’s A Summary of English Chronicles (1565).
   - Reign of King Egbert taken from Fabyan, lib. 6 caps 157-8 and supported with additional material from Hoveden I, pp. 26-33 (possibility guided by Catalogus, p. 113).
   - Reign of King Æthelwulf is derived mainly from Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 162; Flores I, pp. 423-6; Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 cap. 108; and Malmesbury, GP, lib. 2 cap. 75. Foxe also borrows from Catalogus, pp. 113, 116, 125.
   - The story of Judith, daughter of Charles the Bold is taken from Fabyan, lib. 6 caps 160-6 with additional details from Catalogus, p. 116; Malmesbury, GP, lib. 1 cap. 6; and Polychronicon, lib. 1 cap. 6. Although Fabyan references both William of Malmesbury and Ranulf Higden, Foxe’s references and text suggest that he did look at the sources themselves.
   - Brief discussion of Pope’s from Gregory IV to Nicholas I taken entirely from Catalogus, pp. 114-118. This includes the myth of the female Pope Joan.

   - Although Foxe produces this letter from Bishop Ulrich of Augsburg to Pope Nicholas I here, in Book Six, he would later claim that the letter was sent to Nicholas II. In this instance Foxe has taken the epistle from CTV, pp. 101-9.

3. The Danish invasions to Alfred the Great (1583, pp. 139-41; 1576, pp. 140-2; 1570, pp. 185-7).
   - Brief discussion of Pope’s Nicholas I to Stephen V taken from Catalogus, pp. 118-9.
   - The war between King Æthelwulf and the Danes appears to have been taken from an unidentified chronicle owned by William Carye (Foxe named Historia Cariana).
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In this instance the material agrees with accounts in CM I, pp. 377-8; Flores I, pp. 416-7; and Huntingdon, pp. 274-5.

- The war against the Danes continues with Osberht, King of Northumbria. Foxe references this account to John Brompton. Therefore, it is probably derived from Brompton, cols 802-4. Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 169, is another possibility.
- The battle against the Danes continues through the reigns of Æthelbert and Æthelred of Wessex, and Edmund of Northumbria. Taken primarily from Fabyan, lib. 6 caps 169-170 with additions possibly from Catalogus, p. 116; Hoveden I, pp. 37-9; Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 caps 117-119 and Brompton, cols 805, 809.

- Foxe refers to Hoveden, Huntingdon, Higden, Fabyan, Malmesbury and Brompton for this account. The text closely agrees to Fabyan, lib. 6 caps 171-3 in most instances and references Malmesbury and the Polychronicon. Foxe certainly compared Fabyan’s account to Huntingdon, lib. 5 caps 7-13 and Hoveden I, p. 41 as he claims that they follow Fabyan. Foxe probably also used Brompton, cols 809-818; Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 caps 121-4 and Polychronicon, lib. 6 cap. 1. The reference to Bede for the learning displayed in previous monarch’s reigns is probably derived from Brompton, col. 814 rather than the Historia Ecclesiastica itself.
- Description of John Scotus taken from Hoveden I, pp. 46-7 with his epitaph taken from Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 cap. 122.
- The memorial of Alfred’s life is taken from Asser’s Life of Alfred. This is the only use of that source and is most likely derived from the household of Matthew Parker. The subsequent epitaph on Alfred is taken from Foxe’s own source; Huntingdon, lib. 5 cap. 13.

- Turbulence over papal elections at the time of Pope Formosus taken from Catalogus, pp. 119-120 with additional material from Sigebert Gemblaux, p. 345 (see Freeman, ‘Papal History’).
- As a sign of how the Papacy had fallen, Foxe describes how there were nine Popes in nine years. Taken entirely from Catalogus, pp. 120-1.

- Reign of Edward the Elder and his battles with the Danes appears to follow Brompton, cols 831-3 and Polychronicon, lib. 6 cap. 4. Only the first few lines and a Latin quote are taken from the source Foxe references in the margins (Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 cap. 125).
- Building work under Edward the Elder is taken from Brompton, cols 833-835.
- Laws of King Alfred and Edward the Elder are taken from Brompton, cols 823-830.
- The reign of King Athelstan appears to be derived from various sources but mainly from Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 caps 131,137; Brompton, cols 837-8; Fabyan, lib. 6
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cap. 184. The victory over Athelstan by Constantine, King of Scots mainly follows Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 184, which cites Polychronicon. From Foxe's references it seems possible that he also examined Henry of Huntingdon.

- Story of the Bishop of Winchester claiming to hear souls praying could be from Brompton, col. 338; Malmesbury, GP, lib. 2 cap. 24; Polychronicon, lib. 6 cap. 6 or Hoveden VI, p. 54.
- Battle of Brunanburh is most likely from Hoveden VI, p. 54 but other sources are possible. The verse on the battle is derived from Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 cap. 135.
- The drowning of Athelstan's brother, Edwin appears to be derived from Flores I, pp. 493-4, which could also be Foxe's source for the subsequent account of the building of monasteries at this time.
- Finances and laws of Athelstan are derived from Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 cap. 135 and Brompton, cols 840-841, 845 respectively.
- The reign of King Edmund is referenced to the unidentified manuscript belonging to William Carye.
- The Rule of Benedict might also be from William Carye. Alternatively the information appears in Catalogus, p. 131; Votaryes, pp. 77-8; and Malmesbury, GP, lib. 3 caps 114-5.
- Stories about Dunstan are taken from Catalogus, p. 137 then added to from Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 cap. 114 and Malmesbury, GP, lib. 1 cap. 20.
- The variance in stories about King Edmund's death, appear to follow Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 cap. 145 and Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 189.
- The laws of King Edmund are taken from Brompton, cols 858-862.
- Details on Archbishop Odo of Canterbury are taken from Malmesbury, GP, lib. 1 caps 14, 16. The death of Odo's successor on route to Rome is derived from Malmesbury, GP, lib. 1 cap. 17.
- The banishment of Dunstan by King Edwin agrees with the account in Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 192 with added details from Brompton, col. 863. The summarisation of Edwin's reign appears to follow Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 192.

7. Edgar and Edward the Martyr (1583, pp. 152-9; 1576, pp. 153-61; 1570, pp. 201-8).

- The first account of the reign of King Edgar is derived from Hoveden I, pp. 61-2 with evidence from Catalogus, pp. 137-141 and Votaryes, pp. 61-6 likely. Edgar's prophecies are taken from Malmesbury, GP, lib. 2 cap. 75 and possibly Bede, HE, lib. 3 cap. 19. The expansion of secular priests taken from monasteries (according to Foxe's citations) derive from Hoveden I, p. 62; Brompton, col. 867; Malmesbury, GP, lib. 1 cap. 18.
- Foxe claims that a brief excursus on the Church Fathers view of monks is derived from a lengthy list of classical sources (Cassianus, Augustus, Sozomen etc) alongside Malmesbury, Brompton and Huntingdon. The account, largely, derives from Cent. V, presumably with additions from the English chronicles.
- The second account on the reign of King Edgar is derived from Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 caps 148, 155 perhaps with Hoveden I, p. 64 and Brompton, col. 869 in support.
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- Foxe states that he obtained the account on Edgar’s vices from Eadmer, Malmesbury, Matthew Paris, Osbern and Hoveden. Foxe had access to all of these sources, so his references here are probable. Fabyan, lib. 6 cap 193 includes some information on the first and second vices.

- The penance of King Edgar enforced by Dunstan has a reference to the Anglo-Saxon chronicle. This is not generally one of Foxe’s sources and might therefore indicate material borrowed from the Parker household.

- Miracles attributed to Dunstan could have been derived from any number of sources. Foxe cites Malmesbury and Capgrave’s Nova Legenda. Foxe does not generally consult Capgrave, but Bale regularly does, suggesting that Foxe at least looked at Votaryes, pp. 64-5 and the Catalogus.

- The epitaph for King Edgar is, as Foxe claims, Huntingdon, lib. 5 cap. 26.

- The law that Sunday should be solemnised from Saturday at 9 o’clock in the morning is taken from Brompton, col. 871 (number 6 on the list).

- The controversy over succession after Edgar’s death is referenced to Simeon of Durham and Hoveden. It is not impossible that Foxe consulted Simeon, but there is little evidence for it. None of Foxe’s main sources appear to be acting as an intermediary here either. Perhaps this is again derived from the household of Matthew Parker. This possibility is further supported by the following account on the writings of Dunstan, which again is referred to sources that Foxe does not usually use. Some of this subsequent account does, however, derive from Catalogus, pp. 139-141.

- Foxe’s excursus onto the topic of priests’ marriage appears to be largely derived from his reference: Brompton, cols 768, 870. Perhaps with the addition of other sources some of which, might again have been borrowed from Parker’s household.

- The miracle of the rood that spoke to Dunstan is almost entirely derived from Brompton, col. 870 but with additions from Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 cap. 161 and Polydore Vergil, lib. 6 cap. 15.

- The death of King Edward is taken from various English chronicles.

- The brief summaries of Pope’s from John XIII to Gregory V and their relationship to the Emperors of Germany are taken from Catalogus, pp. 131-9.

8. Æthelred through Harold (1583, pp. 159-67; 1576, pp. 161-8; 1570, pp. 208-17).

- The reign of Æthelred is taken from various English chronicles including Malmesbury, GR, lib. 2 cap. 164; Hoveden I, p. 66; Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 197. The death of Dunstan is taken from Malmesbury, GP, lib. 1 cap. 26; Brompton, col. 879; and Polydore Vergil, p. 263.

- Evidence for the misery caused by the Danish invasions taken from a mixture of sources. The opening sentences are word-for-word from Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 197, the Danegelt from Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 198 or Brompton, col. 879.

- The marriage of Eglred, to the daughter of Richard Duke of Normandy is referenced and taken from Huntingdon, lib. 6 cap. 1 (although Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 198 is another possibility).
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- The Danes begin to colonise parts of England. This might be taken from Polychronicon VII, lib. 6 caps 15-16, which has all the details. Elements can also be found in other sources. The closest are Brompton, col. 885 and Hoveden I, p. 75.
- The reign of Edmund Ironside and his battles with Cnut agree with Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 204 and Brompton, cols 906-8.
- Cnut II, King of Denmark made King of England probably from Brompton, cols 932-944.
- A series of material follows on whether Danes should continue to be made king of England. This appears to be taken from material borrowed from Parker’s Household.
- The tale of Cnut trying to push back the sea is referenced to Huntingdon, lib. 6 (cap. 17) and Polydore Vergil, lib. 7 (pp. 276-277).
- The laws of Cnut probably from Brompton, cols 918-932.
- Duke William of Normandy arrives in England to see King Edward and upon a visit to France by Edward, is promised the crown of England after Edward’s death. This account agrees with Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 212 and might also be taken from Polydore Vergil, p. 291-5 and Huntingdon, lib. 6 cap. 25.
- The death of Earl Godwin is referenced to various English chronicles and could be from any one of them (or all).
- Prophecies and death of Edward the Confessor could be from any number of sources, although it appears to greatly follow Catalogus, p. 164 with additions from those sources.
- Laws of Edward the Confessor from Brompton, col. 957.
- The battle of Stamford Bridge and Hastings could be from any number of sources. Several sentences do, however, fit the structure and are word-for-word from Fabyan, lib. 6 caps 216-7.
- The list of Archbishop’s of Canterbury either derives from the work of Matthew Parker (De Antiquitate Britannicae) or from Malmesbury, GP, lib. 1 caps 21-24.

- The schisms and contentions by the Pope’s, especially Sylvester II, have been researched by Freeman, ‘Papal History’. This material derives from CTV and Catalogus with additions from Malmesbury, GP.
- The oration of King Edgar to the clergy is derived from Ælred of Rievaulx, ch. 17, pp. 98-102. This is probably derived through a manuscript in Parker’s collection. Possibly CCCC MS 59 (item 56).
- The list of Archbishops of Canterbury probably derives from the work of Matthew Parker (De Antiquitate Britannicae).
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Book Four

1. Lanfranc (1583, pp. 171-4; 1576, pp. 173-6; 1570, pp. 222-6).
   - He introduction to William the Conqueror is probably taken from a combination of Fabyan, lib. 7 cap. 219 and Brompton, cols 961-2, 965-6.
   - The ‘five plagues’ originates with Huntingdon, lib. 1 cap. 4. Foxe also references Brompton (Cols 961-2).
   - Council at Westminster in 1070 is taken almost word-for-word from Fabyan, lib. 7 cap. 220. The names of the Cardinals are derived from Hoveden I, pp. 122-3.
   - Confirmation of the Pall of York is taken from Ortwin Gratius, Fasciculus Rerum Expetenbarum et Fugiendarum and Aeneas Sylvius Picciomini, History of Bohemia.
   - The brief history of Canterbury archbishopric might be borrowed from Catalogus, pt. 2, p. 145 in combination with other sources. Most of the account can be found in Malmesbury, GR, lib. 1 cap. 20 and CTV (1562), p. 216.
   - Conflict between the Bishop of Hildesheime and Fulda is taken from Lambert of Hersfeld’s Annals (MGH, Scriptorum V [Hanover, 1845]).
   - Segments of epistles from Lanfranc to Pope Alexander over primacy. Taken from Malmesbury, GP, lib. 1 cap. 29.
   - The uncertainty over the location of Dorobernia appears to be Foxe’s own thoughts after careful consideration of the evidence in English chronicles.
   - The nine acts from a Council at London is paraphrased from Malmesbury, GP, lib. 1 cap. 42-4.

   - The account of Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand), including the letters by Cardinal Benno are almost entirely extracted from CTV (1556), pp. 205-6, 211-2, 220-5, 236, 239 with additional material from Lambert of Hersfeld’s Annals (MGH, Scriptorum V [Hanover, 1845]), pp. 217-8, 230; Platina, ff. 131r-135v.
   - Gregory’s supposed repentance on his deathbed, which ends this account, is taken word-for-word from a translation of Catalogus, p. 160.

   - Foxe obtained his account for William the Conqueror from a mixture of sources. Fabyan, lib. 7 appears to be the main origin of the material, but this is extensively added to from Brompton, Malmesbury GR, Catalogus, Flores Historiarum and Eulogium.
   - The table, which names the Norman Barons who came to England with King William, is unidentified. This could derive from archival material.

   - The reign of William Rufus is derived from the same set of sources as used for William the Conqueror. However, Fabyan ceases to be the main source, seemingly
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replaced by Malmesbury, GR, lib. 4. There is also a strong presence from the Catalogus, and Hoveden.

- The death of Lanfranc is derived from the same chronicles but with the addition of Polydore Vergil, lib. 9 cap. 5.
- The short section on Pope Victor is taken from Catalogus, p. 160.
- The First Crusade might derive from various sources. However, Foxe references Henry of Huntingdon, suggesting that this was his main source and that he paraphrased from Huntingdon, lib. 7 caps 6-19.
- The laws of Pope Urban II derive from Giovanni Stella, Vitae ducentorum et triginta summarum pontificatum beato petro apostolo ad Julium secundum modernum pontificem (Basel, 1507), sig. G2r and Johannes Nauclerus, Memorabilium omnis aetatis et omnium gentium chronici commentarii (Tubingen, 1516), f. 164r. (Researched by Freeman, ‘Papal History’).
- The account of Archbishop Anselm is derived largely from Malmesbury, GP; The Letters of St Anselm of Canterbury, in Walter Fröhlich (ed. & trans.), 3 vols. (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1990-4); and R.W. Southern, Eadmer, The life of St Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury (London, 1962). Other English chronicles are also occasionally used.
- For the Council of Baron on the East and West churches, Foxe presents evidence from Hereford archives.


- The reign of Henry I appears to be set up through the use of various English chronicles including Hoveden I, p. 157; Eulogium III, pp. 56-7; Fabyan, lib. 7 cap. 226; Huntingdon, lib. 7 cap. 24 and Flores II, p. 35.
- The story of Anselm in the reign of Henry I is again taken from Malmesbury, GP; The Letters of St Anselm (ed. by Walter Fröhlich, 1990-4) and Eadmer’s vitae St Anselm. Foxe has also used Votaryes, pp. 64-5; Polydore Vergil, lib. 11 cap. 3; Brompton, cols 999-1001; and Catalogus, pp. 170-5.
- Contentions in Canterbury after Anselm’s death is derived from WG, pp. 25-6; Brompton, cols 1003-4 and Hoveden I, pp. 167-9.
- The contention over investiture of Thurstin best fits Hoveden I, p. 169 or Brompton, cols 1005-6.
- The three visions of Henry I are probably derived from the sources Foxe references: Polychronicon, lib. 7, pp. 470-473; Brompton, col. 1018; Polydore Vergil, lib. 11 cap. 17.
- The section including the tale of Arnulphus, and other stories are taken from CTV (1562), pp. 386-7, 400-402.
- The pontificate of Innocent II is referenced to WG (p. 34). Foxe also appears to have used Catalogus, p. 176 for this information. (see Freeman, ‘Papal History’).
- The death of Henry I could be from any number of sources.
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   • The reign of King Stephen is short and rushed. It appears to be made up from various sources including Hoveden, Huntingdon, Malmesbury, Flores, Trivet, Fabyan and Brompton.
   • The summary of Pope’s and Emperors is derived from Catalogus, p. 177 (See Freeman, ‘Papal History’).
   • The brief mention – and variance over dates - for the suppression of the Waldensians is derived from CTV (1562), pp. 504-5 and WG, pp. 56-7 as Foxe indicates.

   • The story of Barbarossa is derived entirely from Catalogus, pp. 178-80, 200-202 and CTV (1562), pp. 369-377. (This was entirely researched by Freeman, ‘Papal History’).

8. Thomas Becket (1583, pp. 205-14; 1576, pp. 225-29; 1570, pp. 263-73; 1563, p. 46-fo. 54v).
   • Almost entirely taken from the Quadrilogus (Vita et processus S. Thomae a Becket super libertate ecclesiastica (Paris, 1495). (Freeman, ‘Papal History’). Foxe has inserted a few elements from his other sources, but these are minor.

   • The same as Block 4.8. Foxe has used the Quadrilogus (Freeman, ‘Papal History’). Foxe has also added material from an unidentified anonymous chronicle for opinions against Becket’s sainthood.

    • The same as Blocks 4.8-9. Foxe has used the Quadrilogus (Freeman, ‘Papal History’).

    • The first part of a brief summarisation of events occurring during these years is derived from a mixture of sources that were available for the 1563 edition. Foxe has possibly used Hoveden II, pp. 22-3, 141-3 and Catalogus, p. 202 amongst those sources.
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- The second portion, first compiled for the 1570 edition are referenced to Brompton (Col. 1143) and Hoveden II, pp. 141-3. Other events in the list might have been derived from *Polychronicon VIII*, caps 22-4.

- The account of the Waldensians entirely taken from the 1563 edition was derived either from *CTV* or the *Magdeburg Centuries* (Freeman, ‘Papal History’).

13. Other incidents of Henry II's reign (1583, pp. 233-4; 1576, pp. 236-8; 1570, pp. 298-300; 1563, fos. 68v-69v).
- A miscellaneous compilation of details about the reign of Henry II taken from a mixture of Brompton, cols 1050, 1137-8; the *Historia Cariana* (an anonymous manuscript belonging to William Carye); *Catalogus*, pp. 203-4; Trivet, pp. 81-2, 88; *Flores II*, pp. 97-8; and a manuscript, which Foxe has named *Scala Mundi* (Arundel MS 5).

14. First year of Richard I's reign (1583, pp. 234-6; 1576, pp. 238-9; 1570, pp. 300-2).
- The coronation of Richard I and the riots involving the Jews agrees with Brompton, cols 1159-1160; Hoveden III, pp. 12-13; *Polychronicon VIII*, pp. 82-5. Foxe also references the Chronicle of Westminster. This is not a chronicle which Foxe generally uses, and might signify information passed to him from Parker's household.
- Richard I prepares for a crusade to take back the holy land. Derived from a mixture of sources probably including Hoveden III, p. 15; *Polychronicon VIII*, pp. 90-7; GC I, p. 422.
- Contention between the Archbishop of York and his Dean. This story could have been taken from any number of sources. Foxe simply references the material to an old chronicle (*verteri chronico*).
- Richard goes on crusade leaving William, Bishop of Ely in charge of the country. He goes first to France. This material is probably extracted from a number of sources. Most likely is Hoveden III, pp. 32-3; *Polychronicon VIII*, pp. 100-1; or Walter of Coventry I, p. 390.

- This Block is almost entirely derived from Gervase of Canterbury's chronicle. It deals with various contentions involving Canterbury Cathedral and St Augustine's Abbey. Some of the material has been confirmed by Freeman, 'Papal History'. In addition the list of Archbishop's of Canterbury is from GC I, pp. 147-8; the controversy over the succession after Thomas Becket's death is from GC I, p. 241; The kings involvement in that dispute is from GC I, pp. 302-3; The contention between Archbishop Baldwin and the monks over a new church is derived from GC I, pp. 332-369; the letter of the Pope to Baldwin ordering him to demolish the new
church is from GC I, pp. 383-8; and the succession of Pope Gregory VIII from GC I, pp. 388-392.

- The account ends with the death of Baldwin. This is taken from GC I, pp. 480-1, 483-4 and CM V, p. 180; CM IV, pp. 251-3.

16. Richard I and Third Crusade (1583, pp. 242-6; 1576, pp. 245-9; 1570, pp. 313-21; 1563, fos. 69v-70v).
- For the story of Richard I and the Third Crusade, Freeman, 'Papal History' suggests that Foxe's reference 'Ex veteri chronico manuscripto anonymo de gestis Richardi Regis cum initium' refers to the *Memoriale* of Walter of Coventry I, pp. 389-464. This is still, however, an assumption. The material is similar to Hoveden III, pp. 36-75, 92-133, which Walter of Coventry followed. Some material might also have been extracted from Walter of Guisborough's chronicle (Heminford I, pp. 151-171); and *Polychronicon* VIII, lib. 7 caps 26-8.

17. William Longchamp (1583, pp. 246-9; 1576, pp. 249-52; 1570, pp. 321-6; 1563, fos. 70v-71r).
- For the controversy caused by William Longchamp (Bishop of Ely), the imprisonment of Richard I and the invasion attempt of England by Earl John, Foxe took the *Eulogium* III, pp. 174-186, 195-233 as a main source. Foxe also used Hoveden III, pp. 134-154; Hoveden IV, p. 77; WG, pp. 171-3 and other material from other English chronicles.
- Foxe appears to have used Walter of Coventry I, p. 142 for the death of King Richard alongside other numerous sources.

18. King John (1583, pp. 249-57; 1576, pp. 252-60; 1570, pp. 326-36; 1563, fos. 71v-69v)

- The rivalry for the throne between Henry and Louis, son of the King of France, is mainly taken from WG, pp. 157-9 and CM III, pp. 1-31. Foxe also references 'florilego' for the confession of the Viscount of Meluns. See *Flores* II, p. 163.
- Legate Swalo gathering money is taken from CM III, pp. 31-2.
- Death of Innocent III and the succession of Honorius III is taken from CM III, p. 25.
- The tale of a strange premonition before Honorius was made Pope is taken from *Burchardi et Conradi Urspergensium Chronicon*, ed. O. Abel, and L. Weiland *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores* (Hanover, 1874), pp. 104-6.
- The Parliament of 1218 is taken from Arundel MS 5, which Foxe named *Scala Mundi*.
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- The order to remove foreigners from England after the failed rebellion of Faukes De Breute is taken from CM III, pp. 83-7.

20. Innocent III and mendicant orders [1583, pp. 259-64; 1576, pp. 261-8; 1570, pp. 338-45; 1563, fos. (70)v-(71)v].

- The life and acts of Innocent III is derived from Catalogus, pp. 234-5 (Freeman, ‘Papal History’).
- The origin for the list of 101 Monastic Orders remains undetermined. Some of the background material can be found in Catalogus, pp. 234-5 and WG, pp. 150-1. Although Foxe references the list to Martin Luther and ‘an English book’, none of Luther’s works contain the material. It is possible, although this is an assumption, that Foxe is borrowing the material second-hand, possibly from John Bale.
- The prophecy of Hildegard is taken from Catalogus, p. 168; CTV (1562), pp. 391-3 and a manuscript of the prophecies – perhaps CCCC MS 404.
- The section on the Cathars could be derived from any number of sources. A possibility is CM III, pp. 78-9.
- The anti-fraternal tract entitled Jack Upland is taken from an early publication by John Day.

21. Papal oppression of the English Church [1583, pp. 265-71; 1576, pp. 268-73; 1570, pp. 345-9; 1563, fos. (71)v-(73)r].

- On the surface the entire account is derived from CM III, pp. 97, 102-3, 412, 414-7, 419-441, 473; CM IV, pp. 6-10, 31-2. However, as discussed in chapter five of this thesis, some elements might derive from other sources, which borrow from Matthew Paris.

22. Albigensian Crusade [1583, pp. 271-6; 1576, pp. 273-86; 1570, pp. 349-54; 1563, fo. (71)v]

- For the Albigensian Crusade, Foxe used CM III, pp. 51-7, and for the history of the Cathars, CM III, pp. 57, 105-119.
- In-between the account of the Crusade and the history of the Cathars, Foxe inserted material on English and French history. The arrival of the Minorites to England was referenced to Trivet, p. 211 and Flores II, pp. 187-8. Foxe might also have used CM III, pp. 60-1. Stephen Langton’s council at Oxford is derived from Trivet, p. 210 whilst the building of Salisbury Minster is from ‘Scala Mundi’ (Arundel MS 5).
- The wrestling match in London is told through CM III, pp. 71-3, 291, while a conflict between the bishops of London and Westminster is derived from CM III, p. 75 and Flores II, pp. 172-5.
- Louis IX becoming king of France is derived from CM III, p. 77, Flores II, pp. 177-8 and Trivet, p. 212 as Foxe cited.
- The reconfirmation of Magna Carta is derived from WG, pp. 162-173. Fabyan, p. 326 acts as a corrective for the date.
23. Hubert de Burgh (1583, pp. 276-81; 1576, pp. 286-5; 1570, p. 354-fo. 363r).
   - Other than two insertions from Fabyan, p. 327 on the liberties and franchises of the City of London, and a biography of Stephen Langton from Trivet, p. 216, this entire account is derived from CM III, pp. 113-296.

   - Pope Gregory IX and the introduction to the variance between the East and West churches are derived from CM III, pp. 303-5.

   - The discussion of the schism between the Greek Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church is all derived from CM III, pp. 113-4, 145, 169-72, 307-8, 313-7, 431-2, 463, 448-55, 455-9, 518-9, 553; CM IV, pp. 431-2.


27. Louis IX on Crusade (1583, pp. 292-6; 1576, pp. 296-301; 1570, fos. 370r-372v).
   - The seventh crusade is entirely borrowed from CM IV, pp. 397-8, 406-7, 502-3, 561-2, 607-8, 629-630, 989-990; CM V, pp. 3-5, 22-5, 70-1, 87-8, 92-3, 105-9, 130-4, 139-144, 148-155, 160-164.

28. Frederick II [1583, pp. 296-316; 1576, pp. 301-21; 1570, pp. 373-97; 1563, pp. 730-74].
   - Foxe almost entirely reprints Nicholas Cisner, De Frederico II. Imp. Oratio (Strasburg, 1608) for his account of Frederick II. This tract is added to with a few bits of information from CM III, pp. 151-3 and Pier della Vigne, Epistolarum Petrie Vineis, ed. Simon Schard (Basel, 1566), pp. 204-15, 128-30 (researched in Freeman, ‘Papal History’).
   - Foxe lists various scholars in this section who wrote against the papacy in the thirteenth century. These are taken from *CTV* (1556), pp. 856-7, 799-801.
   - The background story to William de Amour of Paris are derived from *CTV* (1556), pp. 801-5, which mentions Matthew Paris. Foxe might have also consulted *CM V*, pp. 598-600 as a result.
   - The 39 Arguments of William de Amour, which play a role in the anti-fraternal traditions, are probably taken from a manuscript. In Parker’s collection CCCC MS 103 (no. 8) is a possibility, although this remains uncertain.
   - Other books to be burnt at this time and those opposed to the church are taken again from *CTV* (1556), pp. 803-4, 806, 872-3 and possibly *CM V*, pp. 599-600.
   - The prophecies of Robert Gallus are also from *CTV* (1556), pp. 840-3.

   - The education and learning of Robert Grosseteste is taken from Trivet, pp. 242-3.
   - The story of how Robert Grosseteste stood up to the Pope is derived from *CM V*, pp. 389-93; *CM VI*, pp. 229-31 (Freeman, ‘Papal History’). Part of the narrative is also referenced to *Flores* II, p. 391.
   - The death of Grosseteste is taken from *CM V*, pp. 400-401 or *Flores* II, pp. 392-3.

   - The 16 Aphorisms (Grosseteste’s arguments) are taken from *CM V*, pp. 402-7.
   - The tale of Gregory IX having a vision, where Grosseteste attacked him is almost certainly derived from *Catalogus*, p. 288 with added details from *CM V*, pp. 429-430, 471-2; *Flores* II, pp. 391-2, 404; Trivet, p. 244 as indicated by Foxe’s references.
   - The contention over the bishopric after Grosseteste’s death is taken from Trivet, p. 243.

   - Examples of various acts of murder and torture by the Jews in England leading to a voluntary evacuation. In France the Jews are forcibly removed. Individual stories taken from *Flores* II, pp. 381, 397, 406-9; *WG*, p. 185; *CM III*, pp. 305-6; *Polychronicon* VIII, p. 249; *Eulogium* III, p. 120.

33. Papal oppression and Alexander IV (1583, pp. 327-8; 1576, pp. 331-2; 1570, pp. 410-12).
   - From *Flores* II, pp. 444-6, Foxe tells of how the Pope placed his favourites into English bishoprics without consulting the king.
   - The gathering of revenues by Henry III in return for his confirming Magna Carta is also taken from *Flores* II, pp. 384, 399, 406-8.
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- For the Pope’s failed attempt to destroy the city of Michera compare Foxe’s account to *CM V*, pp. 497-8 (as researched by Freeman, ‘Papal History’). Foxe also cites *Flores II*, p. 409.

- The famine in England is derived from sources that Foxe cites: *Eulogium III*, p. 120; *Polychronicon VIII*, pp. 270-1.

- Peace agreement between Henry III and King Louis IX of France is derived from Trivet, pp. 247-8 and *WG*, p. 184, as stated by Foxe.

34. Conflicts in universities and mendicant orders (1583, pp. 328-9; 1576, pp. 332-3; 1570, p. 412).
   - Foxe cites *Flores* (II, p. 424) and *CM V*, pp. 743-5 for the fight at Oxford in 1259.

35. Henry III and the barons (1583, pp. 329-31; 1576, pp. 333-7; 1570, pp. 412-17).
   - The council at Oxford and French Kings’ attempted mediation of the dispute ends with Henry III’s breaking of his oath after the council had broken apart. This is derived from *WG*, pp. 187-8 and *Flores II*, p. 475.
   - The build up to the baronial war and the failure of further attempts at peace are derived from a mixture of *WG*, pp. 185-193 and *Flores II*, pp. 463-492.

   - The Battle of Lewes (14 May 1264) is derived from *WG*, pp. 191-8.
   - An account of how Jews were slain in England at this time might be derived from *Flores II*, p. 489.
   - The death of Urban IV and the succession of Clement IV is taken from *Trivet*, pp. 262-3 (Freeman, ‘Papal History’).

37. Battle of Evesham (1583, pp. 333-4; 1576, pp. 338-9; 1570, pp. 419-20).
   - The Battle of Evesham, including the slaughter of Simon de Montfort and a tale that Henry III was almost killed only to be saved by Lord Adam Monhaut and Prince Edward, is derived from *WG*, pp. 198-202.
   - Parliament at Winchester in which Henry III is again restored to the throne is possibly taken from *Trivet*, p. 266.

38. End of baronial war (1583, pp. 334-5; 1576, pp. 339-40; 1570, pp. 420-1).
   - The conclusion to Foxe’s ‘secular’ excursus emphasised the danger of rebellion by listing the number of Barons slaughtered at Kenilworth Castle and elsewhere. This is taken from *WG*, pp. 203-5 and according to Foxe the ‘*Scala Mundi*’ (Arundel MS 5).
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   - The Parliament held at Marlborough can be found in Trivet, pp. 272-4 as can the death of Clement IV and his replacement, Gregory X.
   - Various events noted in around 1270 including when Prince Edward goes on crusade. This could be from Flores III, p. 19; Trivet, p. 275; or Eulogium III, p. 136.
   - For the story of Prince Edward on Crusade, Foxe lists WG, pp. 204-212, Flores III, pp. 19-21; and ‘Scala Mundi’ (Arundel MS 5) as his sources. These are likely accurate.

40. Foreign events in Henry III’s reign (1583, pp. 338-9; 1576, p. 343; 1570, pp. 423-4).
   - Gregory X calls a general council at Lyons in 1273 about the Eastern Orthodox Church. Probably taken from Flores III, pp. 29, 33.
   - Various events listed to take the account to the end of the reign of Henry III. This could be taken from various sources. Most likely is Flores III, pp. 21-29 or perhaps Walsingham I, p. 7, which is about to become an important source.

41. First seven years of Edward I’s reign (1583, p. 339; 1576, p. 343; 1570, pp. 424-5).
   - Edward I puts down a rebellion in Wales probably taken from Walsingham I, pp. 12-22.
   - Various events from first seven years of Edward I, which include the foundation of the Black Friars. This is taken from various sources.

42. War with Scotland (1583, pp. 339-42; 1576, pp. 343-6; 1570, pp. 425-9).
   - Foxe’s discussion on the right of English kings to the crown of Scotland is derived from Walsingham I, p. 32; WG, pp. 232-5 and Fabyan.
   - The Pope interfering in the conflict is taken from Trivet, pp. 379-94. This account is in many chronicles, but Foxe follows Trivet almost word-for-word.
   - William Wallace executed in London could derive from various sources.

43. Philip IV and Boniface VIII (1583, pp. 342-9; 1576, 346-53; 1570, pp. 429-37).
   - The stories of King Philip IV of France and Pope Boniface VIII has been researched by Freeman, ‘Papal History’. The account is taken from a mixture of Catalogus, pp. 331-2; CTV (1556), p. 577; Trivet, pp. 378-9; Walsingham I, pp. 100-4.
   - The general council to settle matters is derived from French archival sources, possibly obtained with help from Matthias Flacius Illyricus. This material was not
published until the mid-seventeenth century: Pierre Dupuy, *Historie du differend entre le pape Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel...* (Paris, 1655), pp. 56-9, 101-9, 112. (see Freeman, 'Papal History').

44. Events of 1305-7 (1583, pp.349-52; 1576, pp. 353-6; 1570, pp. 437-41).
- Foxe began this section with his own words – reminding the reader of the servitude of England in the thirteenth century. This acted as a context for material, largely from Walsingham I, pp. 19-20, 27, 106-112.
- The Pope setting up a candidate for Canterbury and ignoring the king’s choice is taken from Walsingham I, p. 19 (Freeman, 'Papal History').
- Boniface IX’s Bull declaring that no church should yield tributes to secular princes was taken from Hemingford II, pp. 66-7.
- Conflict over sells to Flanders and a reassessment of Magna Carta and Charta de Foresta might be from Eulogium III, p. 204 or Walsingham I, pp. 64, 66-72. It could also be WG, pp. 309-313.
- The Papal Court is moved to Avignon. This is taken from Catalogus, pp. 333-4, 367-8 (Freeman, 'Papal History').
- The story of Legate William Testa is taken from Trivet, pp. 407-411 as stated by Foxe. The story is also in Walsingham I, p. 112.

45. Cassiodorus’s letter (1583, pp. 352-3; 1576, pp. 356-7; 1570, pp. 441-2).
- The epistle of Cassiodorus, which was presented at the Parliament of 1307 as a protest to the collection of papal annates is derived from John Bale, *Acta Romanum Pontificum*, pp. 338-344 (Freeman, 'Papal History').

- The debate between Perrie Bertrand and Pierre de Cugnières is taken from Bertrand’s perspective and argued against by Foxe. The entire account derives from Perrie Bertrand, *Libellus de iurisdictione ecclesiastica contra Petrum d Cugnieres* (Paris, 1495).

- Upon coming to the death of Edward I, Foxe produces that monarch’s good credentials. This is taken from various sources, but most particularly from Walsingham I, pp. 114-7.

- The bad character of Edward II is described from Walsingham I, pp. 119-126.
- The Order of the Templars, who are slain in France are condemned by the Pope. Again taken from Walsingham I, pp. 127-8.
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- A tale from Sabellia that Clement V excommunicated the Venetians is the only part of this section not taken from Walsingham. Instead, Foxe has taken material word-for-word from Sabellia’s Enneads II, cols 790-2 (See Freeman, ‘Papal History’).
- The story of Piers Gaveston is taken from Walsingham I, pp. 126, 129-135. Foxe mistakenly references it to Robert de Avesbury.
- Queen Isabel gives birth to a son, but the Lords refuse to allow her to name him Louis (after Isabel’s father, the king of France). Taken from Walsingham I, p. 134.
- Foxe shows his dislike of Edward II by describing how he listened to foreign advisors who enacted the will of Satan. The story is derived from Walsingham I, pp. 135-6.

   - The rebellion of Robert Bruce is derived from Walsingham I, pp. 137, 139-142, 144-7, and 152-6.
   - Foxe briefly touches upon the death of Pope Clement and how the papacy stood void for two years. Taken from Walsingham I, pp. 138, 143.
   - The role of the Spenser family in the Scottish rebellion is borrowed from Walsingham I, pp. 150-1, 158-165.
   - Foxe attacks Polydore Vergil, lib. 18 cap. 9 on his telling of the English dealings with the French over English held Aquitaine. Foxe uses the unidentified Historia Cariana, supplied by William Carye and Walsingham I, pp. 171-180 to denounce Vergil’s opinion.

50. John XXIII and Clement VI (1583, pp. 373-4; 1576, pp. 377-78; 1570, pp. 466-8).
   - The story of John XXII is derived from Catalogus, pp. 371-2, 377, 397 and CTV (1562), p. 488, 524-5 (Researched by Freeman, ‘Papal History’).
   - The continuation of this story with Clement VI was derived from a manuscript version of Hieronymus Massarius, Eusebius captivus (Geneva, 1597), ff. 20r-21r (researched by Freeman, ‘Papal History’).
   - Clement VI ordering the Jubilee to be celebrated every 50 years and offering plenary indulgences to all who attended is taken from Catalogus, p. 375.
   - Exactions in England are probably derived from Walsingham I, pp. 254-60.

   - For the rebellion at Bury St Edmunds, Foxe used a mixture of his usual sources (such as Nicholas Trivet and the Flores Historiarum) alongside archival material taken from the registers of Bury itself.

   - Edward III’s invasion of Scotland is taken from a variety of sources including Walsingham, Trivet and the Flores Historiarum.
   • This account is taken from a combination of Walsingham and the *Chronicon Angliae*.

54. Edward III and Archbishop Stratford (1583, pp. 380-2; 1576, pp. 384-7; 1570, pp. 475-8).
   • The story of Edward III and Archbishop Stratford is taken from Walsingham I, pp. 240-247.
   • Foxe bemoans that old histories generally take the archbishop's side and then attacks Polydore Vergil, lib. 19 cap. 3 for doing just that. The epistle that Foxe uses to support his arguments is taken from Walsingham I, pp. 231-4.

   • The Pope declares a three-year truce between England and France, in order, Foxe claims, to limit the English crown from gaining too much power. Foxe extracts his materials from Walsingham I, p. 228 and *Chronicon Angliae*, p. 12.
   • Foxe notes that the *Polychronicon* ends in 1341. This could be Foxe's own observation of the *Polychronicon* or it could be from *Chronicon Angliae*, p. 12, 10, where it is also mentioned.
   • The Emperor forced by the Pope turns against Edward III. Taken from Walsingham I, pp. 247-250.
   • Edward III complains to the Pope for his bestowing of benefices on curial officials. Derived from *Chronicon Angliae*, p. 13; the letter is from Robert de Avesbury, pp. 353-5 (researched by Freeman, 'Papal History').

56. Outbreak of the Hundred Years War (1583, pp. 384-88; 1576, pp. 389-93; 1570, pp. 480-4).
   • The Hundred Years War is derived from a combination of Walsingham I, pp. 262-290; *Chronicon Angliae*, pp. 15-27; Robert de Avesbury, pp. 377-81.

57. Anti-papal writers (1583, pp. 389-91; 1576, pp. 393-6; 1570, pp. 484-8).
   • Foxe condemns the papacy through the lens of various writers, who attacked the Pope at this time. Derived from *CTV* (1556), pp. 524-5.

58. Quarrel among mendicants and universities (1583, pp. 391-3; 1576, pp. 396-8; 1570, pp. 488-90).
   • For a contention between the prelates and friars of France, Foxe borrowed material from *CTV* (1562), pp. 450-2.
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- The source for the similar contention between the scholars of Oxford and the townsmen is currently unidentified.
- The story of Simon Islip, Archbishop of Canterbury is mistakenly referenced to Robert de Avesbury, but is actually from Walsingham I, pp. 278-9, 285-6, 297, 299.

59. Table of the Archbishops of Canterbury (1583, pp. 394-6; 1576, pp. 398-400; 1570, pp. 490-2).
  - The list of Archbishops of Canterbury probably derives from the work of Matthew Parker (De Antiquitate Britannicae).
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