

**Rectifying the 'ignoraunce of history': John Foxe
and the Collaborative Reformation of England's
Past**

Volume One

Matthew J. Phillpott

**Dissertation submitted in part-fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Department of
History, University of Sheffield**

March 2009

Abstract

The sixteenth-century *Acts and Monuments* by John Foxe was more than a martyrology, which memorialised the persecutions of Mary I's reign. It was also an ecclesiastical history which saw the Christian past as a battle between the church of Christ and the church of Antichrist. This thesis identifies the sources that Foxe and his collaborators used to compile the pre-reformation account in the first two editions of the *Acts and Monuments* (1563 and 1570 respectively). Foxe was producing a revisionist history that saw the past as revelation of prophecy and Scripture. So many of his sources – chronicles and annals written by monks and clergy – were suspected witnesses, no longer considered truthful or accurate. Foxe needed to sift through these texts to find 'God's truth' as he understood it, and to rehabilitate certain authorities over others. Central to this thesis is the contention that Foxe did not do this alone. He worked as part of an extended network of scholars, printers, and reformers. His predecessor and mentor, John Bale was a vital foundation for his research; the German ecclesiastical history usually entitled the *Magdeburg Centuries* was an enormous influence; and the 'circle' of scholars focused around Archbishop Matthew Parker, proved to be an invaluable source for rare or hard to find chronicles and annals. This study of Foxe's pre-reformation sources helps us to understand this collaborative context and to explore how he came to conceptualise the past and to redefine the interpretation of events and historical characters. It will, in particular, focus upon the significance of Foxe's pioneering role in the survival and transmission of manuscript materials relating especially to the English medieval and Anglo-Saxon past.

Contents Page

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Contents Page | i |
| List of illustrations and figures | iii |
| Abbreviations | iv |
| Acknowledgements | vii |
| Preface | 1 |
| Chapter One The Making of Ecclesiastical History: Foxe, Eusebius and the dissolution of England's manuscript heritage | 12 |
| Chapter Two Collaborative History in the Reformation | 59 |
| Chapter Three Collaboration and Matthew Parker's Circle | 99 |
| Chapter Four The compilation of Pre-Gregorian and Anglo-Saxon History in the <i>Acts and Monuments</i> | 155 |
| Chapter Five The compilation of Post-Gregorian and Late Medieval History in the <i>Acts and Monuments</i> | 217 |
| Chapter Six The foundation for history: annotations in the manuscripts belonging to John Bale, Matthew Parker and John Foxe | 276 |
| Conclusion | 318 |
| Appendix 1 Contents and layout of the <i>Acts and Monuments</i> (1563 and 1570 editions) | 334 |
| Appendix 2 A: The division of time as laid out in the 1570 edition of the <i>Acts and Monuments</i> . B: The structure of pre-reformation history in Book One of the 1563 Edition of the <i>Acts and Monuments</i> . | 337 |

C: Identification of possible sources for the use of
Matthew Paris in the 1563 edition of *Acts and Monuments*.
D: Transition of Book One (1563 edition) into Book Four
(1570 edition)

Appendix 3 345
Probable sources for the compilation of Books Two to
Four for the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*

Appendix 4 350
The Pre-Reformation sources in the 1570 edition of the
Acts and Monuments

Bibliography 373

Illustrations and Figures

1. John Foxe, John Day and Sir William Cecil offer the *Acts and Monuments* to Queen Elizabeth. 87
2. Pope Alexander III treading on the neck of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. 224
3. Annotation by John Foxe on the *Annals* of Nicholas Trivet (CCCC MS 152) 283
4. Matthew Parker's manicule in Simeon of Durham, *Historia Regum* (CCCC MS 139). 286
5. Example of Parkerian red crayon in William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* (CCCC MS 43) 287
6. A page copied from John Bale's *Catalogus* by a Parkerian scribe. 290
(Henry of Huntingdon, CCCC MS 280).
7. Handwriting of John Bale and an unidentified hand writing 'Mr Osborne' from *Chronicon* of John Brompton (CCCC MS 96) 299
8. John Foxe annotation in *Chronicon* of John Brompton (CCCC MS 96) 302

Abbreviations Page

There are several conventions, which will be adhered to throughout this thesis. Each edition of the *Acts and Monuments* will be referred to by the year it was published rather than consecutive number (i.e. The second edition will be referred to as the 1570 edition). Each edition is divided into a series of parts. Foxe named each of these a 'book'. These divisions are referred to throughout this thesis and will therefore be signified by the use of capital letters, to denote that we are talking about a division of the *Acts and Monuments*, rather than a separate book (e.g. Book One).

- A&M* John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* [...]. *The Variorum Edition*. [online]. (hriOnline, Sheffield, 2004). Available from: <http://www.hrionline.shef.ac.uk/foxe/>. [Accessed: 2005-2009]
- Bede, *HE* Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969)
- BL British Library, London
- Brompton *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores X*, ed. R. Twysden (London, 1652), cols. 725-1284
- Catalogus* John Bale, *Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brytanniae Catalogus* (Basel, 1557/9). Republished Farnborough, 1971.
- CCCC Corpus Christi College, Cambridge
- Cent.* Magdeburg Centuries [online] *Sources for the History of Ideas of the Late Middle Ages (Queelen zur Geistesgeschichte des Spätmittelalters)*, www.mgh-bibliothek.de/digilib/quellen.htm [Accessed: 2007-2008]
- CM* *Matthaei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard (7 vols, Rolls Series, London, 1872-83)
- CTV (1556)* Matthias Flacius, *Catalogus testium veritatis, Qui ante nostram aetatem reclamationum Papae: Opus varia rerum, hoc praesertim tempore scitu dignissimarum, conitione refortum* (Basel, 1556), http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camenahist/autoren/flacius_hist.html [Accessed: 2008]
- CTV (1562)* Matthias Flacius, *Catalogus Testium Veritatis, qui ante nostram aetatem Pontifici Romano, eiusque erroribus reclamationum: iam denuo longe quam antea & emendatior & auctior editus* (Basel, 1562)

- Eulogium* *Eulogium Historiarum sive Temporibus*, ed. F.S. Haydon (2 vols, Rolls Series, London, 1863)
- Fabyan *The New Chronicles of England and France in two Parts; by Robert Fabyan named by himself the Concordance of Histories*, ed. H. Ellis (London, 1811).
- Flores* *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R. Luard (3 vols, Rolls Series, London, 1890)
- GC *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols, Rolls Series, London, 1879-80)
- G&W T. Graham and A. G. Watson, *The Recovery of the Past in Early Elizabethan England; Documents by John Bale and John Joscelyn from the circle of Matthew Parker* (Cambridge, 1998)
- WG *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough previously edited as the Chronicle of Walter of Hemingford or Hemingburgh*, ed. H. Rothwell (London, 1957).
- Hemingford *Chronicon Domini Walteri de Hemingburgh, vulgo Hemingford nuncupati, ordinis sancti Augustini canonici regularis, in caenobio beatae Mariae de Gisburn, De Gestis Regum Angliae*, ed. H. C. Hamilton (2 vols, London, 1848-9).
- HA *Matthaei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Historia Anglorum*, ed. F. Madden (3 vols, Rolls Series, London, 1866-9)
- Hoveden *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. W. Stubbs (4 vols, Rolls Series, London, 1868-71).
- Huntingdon Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. and trans. D. Greenway (Oxford, 1996)
- James Catalogue M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1912).
- Malmesbury, GR William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. R.A.B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1998)
- Malmesbury, GP William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum – The History of the English Bishops*, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom, R. M. Thomson (Oxford, 2007)
- MGH *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*

- ODNB* Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
- PMLA* Journal of the Modern Language Association of America
- Polychronicon* *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis*, ed. C. Babington and J. R. Lumby (9 vols, Rolls Series, London, 1865-86)
- Polydore Vergil Polydore Vergil, *Anglica Historia (1555 version), A hypertext critical edition*, ed. and trans. D. F. Sutton (California, 2005), <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/polverg/> [Accessed: 2008].
- RS Rolls Series
- SCJ* The Sixteenth Century Journal
- TCBS* Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society
- Trivet *Nicholai Triveti, De Ordine Frat. Praedicatorum, Annales Sex Regum Angliae, qui a comitibus Andegavensibus Originem Traxerunt*, edited by Thomas Hog (London, 1845)
- VE* Articles contained in the *Variorum Edition* [online]. (hriOnline, Sheffield, 2004). Available from: <http://www.hrionline.shef.ac.uk/foxe/>. [Accessed: 2005-2009].
- Votaryes* John Bale, *The first two partes of the Actes or unchaste examples of the Englyshe votaryes, gathered out of theyr owne legendes and chronycles* (London, 1551, 1560)
- Walsingham *Thomae Walsingham, Qundam Monachi S. Albani, Historia Anglicana*, ed. H.T. Riley (2 vols, Rolls Series, London, 1863-64)

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank first and foremost my primary supervisor, Professor Mark Greengrass, whose constant encouragement and enthusiasm for my project is matched only by his devotion and keen eye for research. Many of the best ideas in this thesis have developed whilst in conversation with Mark. I would also like to thank Doctor Tom Freeman, Consultant for the John Foxe Project. My research is heavily indebted to both his written research and to our various discussions over the past three years. His encyclopaedic knowledge has informed both the direction of my own work and steered me clear of many potential mistakes. Any mistakes left, are, of course, my own. I am also indebted to both of my secondary supervisors. First, Professor Sarah Foot, who helped to develop my written style immensely, then second, Doctor Philip Shaw, whose knowledge of Old English and manuscripts was of great help. I would like to thank them both for putting up with my all-too inadequate knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon period. This thesis would also not have been possible without the trust, help and research of the British Academy John Foxe Project, which this thesis is intricately linked. I would particularly like to thank Doctor John Wade, the Latin Consultant for the Project, who never gave up trying to teach me how Latin works. Without his Latin classes and kind guidance most of my research would have been impossible. I must also credit the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), without whom I would never have been able to spend these last three years in the company of John Foxe. Outside of Sheffield, I am particularly grateful to the staff at the Parker Library at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, who were always friendly and helpful as I piled through their collections. I am also appreciative of the help provided to me by other archives and libraries, in particular, Pembroke College Cambridge, Magdalen College Oxford, the Bodleian and the British Library. As a last note I would particularly like to give my immeasurable appreciation and thanks to the lively Postgraduate community based, until recently, at 3 Northumberland Road. When I first came to Sheffield it was the postgraduate community that welcomed me wholeheartedly and gave me a home. I will miss, more than anything our conversations in the kitchen or garden over a cup of coffee. Without that community this thesis would never have been completed, nor would I have had the opportunity to help organise conferences and discussion groups – especially the Early Modern Discussion Group – which have helped no end to develop my knowledge of the past and have made me think about a diversity of historical topics. I would particularly like to thank Geoffrey Little, Martha Riddiford and Gary Rivett for kindly taking the trouble to read and comment on sections of my work. The other members of the community are too numerous to mention here, but my gratitude to all of them is without question. On a personal note, I must also thank my family and friends who have always been there for me and have always been nothing but supportive of my chosen path through life.

Preface

On 20 March 1563, one of the most significant works in English to emerge from the religious turmoil of the sixteenth century was published: the *Actes and Monuments of Matters Most Speciall and Memorable*. Its compiler was the Lincolnshire-born John Foxe (1516/7-1587) and its printer, John Day (1521/2-1584).¹ Working collaboratively they sought to reshape the history of the past, rendering persecution, satanic corruption and martyrdom as the determinant elements of a cosmic battleground in human history, begun after Christ's death and fought between his true believers and the diabolical Antichrist. The *Acts and Monuments* took the historical narrative, especially that of England, and often turned it on its head. Those who had once been heroes turned out to be villains; those who had once been heretics became its martyrs. As is well-known, Foxe and Day went on to produce three more editions of the work in their lifetimes, expanding its scope and content considerably.² By order of the Privy Council, the 1570 (second) edition was to be set up in all cathedrals, next only to the vernacular Bible. Upon publication it would be known simply as Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* and its iconic status was subsequently reinforced when future generations produced their own editions, adding to, subtracting from, or otherwise manipulating the text to suit their different purposes.³ Recent studies have drawn our attention to the importance of

¹ For the latest biographies of John Foxe see Thomas S. Freeman, 'Foxe, John (1516/17-1587)', *ODNB* (2004) and Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Foxe: A Biography', *VE* (2004). For the latest biographies of John Day see Andrew Pettegree, 'Day, John (1521/2-1584)', *ODNB* (2004) and Elizabeth Evenden, 'Biography of John Day', *VE* (2004).

² The four editions of the *Acts and Monuments* published in John Foxe's lifetime were printed by John Day in 1563, 1570, 1576, and 1583. A fifth edition was published thirteen years later in 1596 and further editions in 1610, 1631, 1641, and 1684. All references to the *Acts and Monuments*, unless otherwise stated, will be to the *Variorum Edition (VE)*, version 1.1 (2006).

³ The most detailed surveys on the transmission of the *Acts and Monuments* can be found in four articles from the *Variorum Edition* which are Devorah Greenberg, 'Eighteenth-century "Foxe": History, Historiography, and Historical Consciousness', *VE* (2004); Peter Nockles, 'The Nineteenth Century Reception', *VE* (2004); Vivienne Westbrook, 'Mid-Victorian Foxe', *VE* (2004); and David Loades, 'The Maitland Controversy', *VE* (2004).

understanding the impact of the book in terms of its printing and publishing history. In particular, the John Foxe Project, which was set up in 1992 and will be completed in 2009, has provided, for research purposes, a digital version of the first four editions of the *Acts and Monuments*.⁴ This project is a response to the realisation in the late twentieth-century that the numerous subsequent editions of the *Acts and Monuments*, have distorted what was originally intended by Foxe and Day. Vital to continuing scholarship on the *Acts and Monuments* is the notion that we must study each edition in its spatial and temporal context.

A central concern in this thesis is that scholarship has also focused overtly upon an analysis of the complex depiction of the reformation in the *Acts and Monuments* (with its inevitable concentration upon what Foxe had to say about his own times). This has obscured for us the significance that Foxe and Day accorded to pre-reformation history. My contention is that Foxe sought to undertake a 'reformation of the past', seeking to write history using the tools of humanist textual scholarship in a new collaborative way. A re-interpretation of the past paralleled and illuminated events of the present and provided a guide to the future. It was this form of providential history that informed and characterised Foxe's contemporary reports.

Foxe and Day's preoccupation with pre-reformation history is evident from the most cursory examination of the work in question. By the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* it occupied almost half of the massive work. Foxe devoted extraordinary

⁴ For discussions about the John Foxe Project see Mark Greengrass, Joy Lloyd, and Sue Smith, 'Twenty-first-century Foxe: the online *Variorum Edition* of Foxe's *Actes and Monument*', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe at Home and Abroad* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 57-69; Janice Devereux, 'The internet connection: claiming John Foxe as their own. Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* on the World Wide Web', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe at Home and Abroad* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 271-79; David Loades, 'The John Foxe Project', *History Compass*, 1:1 (2003), pp. 1-3.

energy to compiling the text, with 'compilation' being the operative word. This thesis is a study of that process of compilation, taking up the agenda already foreshadowed by Thomas S. Freeman when he wrote in 2004 that 'a study of the pre-Wiclifite and Continental history in the *Acts and Monuments* has the potential to cast a great deal of light on Foxe's research and accuracy'.⁵ The point of departure for this thesis is, however, that we have to understand Foxe's methods of compilation here as an integral part of a wider process of collaboration that involved the development of a common agenda, the sharing and collation of information, and the pooling of strategies and resources for its publication and dissemination. As we shall see, one of the inevitable consequences of emphasising the collaborative nature of the 'reformation of the past' is to reposition Foxe in relation to his text. Recent scholarship has already begun to show how Foxe was not the 'author' of the book to which his name became inextricably associated in quite the way that we would normally understand the concept of authorship. Foxe's relation to his text was something else: he was perhaps the chief-editor, a compiler or compositor of the text. My research tests this recent trend in the scholarship.

What kinds of collaboration did that imply? Analysing the sources that Foxe used to compile the pre-reformation and pre-Lollard portion of the text will provide the answers to that question, and they are instructive both as to Foxe's methodology and as to the shared sense of purpose which underlay the construction and evolution of the *Acts and Monuments*. We shall explore how Foxe came by these sources and what choices he made in using them. Those choices were dictated by Foxe's historical agenda, and also by the authority he accorded to certain kinds of texts. These were then woven into his

⁵ Thomas S. Freeman, "'St Peter Did not Do Thus": Papal History in the Acts and Monuments', *VE* (3 parts, 2004), pt. 1.

presentational strategies. As we shall discover, Foxe owed a great deal to his collaborators. In practical terms, members of the circle of Matthew Parker furnished him with many of the sources which would be most valuable to him. In intellectual terms, they (and others) framed his historical agenda. In methodological terms, Foxe found the decisions that he was making about the veracity of certain kinds of texts from the pre-reformation period reinforced by other protestant historiographers, both in England and the Continent of Europe. In presentational terms, the title-page of the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* announced Foxe's role as an editor and compiler: '[...] Gathered and collected according to the true copies & wrytinges certificatorie [...] by John Foxe'.⁶ By the 1583 edition, however, Foxe was emphatically the 'author', and the only acknowledged collaborator was Christ himself: 'Newly revised and recognized, partly also augmented, and now the fourth time agayne published and recommended to the studious Reader, by the Authour (through the helpe of Christ our Lord) JOHN FOXE [...]'.⁷ In the body of the text too, Foxe chose not to acknowledge the collaborative agenda and role which had been so significant in the initial elaboration of the text, which is why it is less than evident to us as readers now.

How should we envisage this collaboration? Although the notion of an 'intellectual circle' is now common currency, especially among the historians of ideas, it has yet to be analysed to any degree by social scientists or philosophers. What do we mean by an 'intellectual circle'? The usefulness of the concept is linked, no doubt, to some of its fundamental features. It delineates a flexible, informal, often self-reflexive, non-exclusive grouping of individuals. What brings them together can be a mixture of one or more of the following: a place (of meeting; of common endeavour), a leading

⁶ *A&M*, 1563, Title Page.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 1583.

individual, or individuals (in the sixteenth century, patronage and intellectual circles frequently overlapped), a common language, purpose, methodology, or endeavour. In the case of John Foxe, he belonged to several intellectual circles, which overlapped one upon another. There had been the circle of aspiring protestant humanist writers and tutors in and around the court of Edward VI, where Foxe had played a discreet role. There was the circle of English protestant exiles which Foxe had joined in 1553 and which (for him) focused on Basel and the print-shop of Oporinus. Here Foxe was put in touch with a wider and more diffuse protestant circle of historiographers, intent upon writing the history of the reformation as a decisive break with the past. When Foxe returned to England in 1559, he became part of a circle in London, focused on the print-shop of John Day, but coalescing in the household and around the networks of patronage and influence of the new Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker (1504-1575). Both in the circles of exile, and immediately after, we shall repeatedly find that the influence of one individual was to be of pre-eminent importance: that of John Bale (1495-1563).

This thesis is not an exercise in intellectual biography. Foxe's own life-trajectory is too well-known to need further rehearsal. Those of the major individuals around whom the intellectual circles in which he moved are similarly well-known. A brief review of them here, however, serves to remind us of the disparateness of their backgrounds and roles, and to emphasise that it is important not to use the notion of an 'intellectual circle' as indicating a formal organisation of people who produced a unified collection of publications. This would over-simplify our historical understanding. Their social backgrounds and initial experience of the reformation was very different. The first with which we shall treat here is the aforementioned John Day. Day was born in Dunwich,

Suffolk and quickly made his name as an evangelical printer and bookseller in London; first in partnership with William Seres (d. 1578/80) and then on his own in London's Cheapside. During the difficult years under Mary I, Day eked out a living as a clandestine publisher of protestant literature until he was discovered and forced to publish in support of the regime and under the care of his old partner, Seres. Upon the accession of Elizabeth I (reigned 1558-1603), Day's career was put back on track. By this date, Day had closely aligned himself to the Queen's principal secretary, Sir William Cecil (1520/1-1598) and with Elizabeth's favourite, Robert Dudley (1532/3-1588). Together they provided Day with a monopoly of lucrative patents, which provided a basic stable income to run his new print house in Aldersgate. This financial security and patronage provided Day with the means to work alongside John Foxe in the publication of four editions of the *Acts and Monuments*.

The second figure of importance for this thesis is John Bale.⁸ Bale began his life as a Carmelite friar and was educated at the University of Cambridge. Before long, Bale began to research the history of his order, but by the mid-1530s he was disillusioned with monasticism and the Roman Catholic Church. He renounced his clerical vows and married a woman named Dorothy. During this time, Bale associated himself with the travelling antiquarian, John Leland (c. 1503-1552) and actively pursued the production of polemically charged histories, plays and treatises against papal obedience. With the downfall of Thomas Cromwell (c. 1485-1540) and the enactment of the *Six Articles*, Bale fled into exile and extended his contacts and research through the book fairs and academic institutions in Antwerp. When Edward VI (reigned 1547-1553) came to the

⁸ The most recent biography of John Bale is John N. King, 'Bale, John (1495-1563)', *ODNB* (2004). However the more detailed biographies in Peter Happè, *John Bale* (New York, 1996) and Leslie P. Fairfield, *John Bale: Myth maker for the English Reformation* (Oregon, 1976) are also of considerable use in understanding the many facets of John Bale's character and life.

throne, Bale, back in England, met John Foxe whilst they both resided at Mountjoy House. Their time there was brief but fruitful; in Foxe, Bale had found his apprentice. Bale was however, soon called upon to spread his evangelical message as Bishop of Ossory in Ireland; an appointment that ended in disaster and resulted with Bale again fleeing to the continent upon the ascension of Mary I. Bale and Foxe were reunited again in Basel where they both worked for the printer Johann Oporinus (1507-1568). Bale died in 1563 as a prebendary canon of Canterbury Cathedral. In life he was recognised as one of England's greatest bibliophiles and formidable polemicist against the papacy. In death, his name lived on through his expansive catalogues of English writers and through an epitaph first coined by the historian, Thomas Fuller (1607/8-1661), as 'Bilious Bale'.

The third figure with which this thesis is concerned is Elizabeth's first Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker.⁹ A Cambridge graduate, Parker was appointed as a Royal chaplain and then, after the death of Henry VIII, the Dean of Stoke by Clare. Parker quickly became known for his organisational abilities and was eventually elected vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge. From 1549, he came under the influence of the Strasbourg reformer, Martin Bucer (1491-1551), and at about the same time married Margaret Harleston (1519-1570). As with Day and Bale, Parker's career followed an uncertain trajectory under Mary. Unlike Bale, he stayed at home, attempting to live a quiet life in retirement. Upon the ascension of Elizabeth I, Parker reluctantly accepted the position of Archbishop of Canterbury where he remained until his death in 1575. During this time he attempted a middle way between the agendas and further reforms promoted for the church by various members of the clergy and the Queen's more

⁹ The most recent biography is David J. Crankshaw and Alexandra Gillespie, 'Parker, Matthew (1504-1575)', *ODNB* (2004).

conservative attitude. He also began his programme of gathering old manuscripts in defence of his church, through which means he came into contact with the likes of John Bale and John Foxe.

The fourth figure of note is the German Lutheran radical, Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520-1575).¹⁰ Born in Albona (modern Labin) and named at birth Matija Vlačić, Flacius came to study at the University of Basel. In 1541 he travelled to Wittenberg to join the household of Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560). Here Flacius heard lectures by Martin Luther (1483-1546) and discussed matters of theology. However, upon Luther's death, Melanchthon and Flacius had a serious falling out. Whereas Melanchthon desired conciliation, Flacius advocated further reform. About this time, Flacius, in league with others, began his work on his own catalogue of Christian writers as preparation for a larger history; which eventually became known as the *Magdeburg Centuries*.

The opening chapter of this thesis will begin the discussion with the current state of research into the *Acts and Monuments* as a means of situating the argument into an academic context. It will deal with general issues and problems arising from this topic such as to whether we should view the *Acts and Monuments* as a revisionist history or if this is missing the point entirely. The difficulties of categorising a book that is described as an ecclesiastical history but usually referred to as a martyrology will also be discussed, as will the apocalyptic framework Foxe claimed for his work. This chapter will also deal with the intellectual climate in which the book was compiled. How did humanism and religious ideologies influence the purpose, argument and

¹⁰ See Oliver K. Olson, *Matthias Flacius and the survival of Luther's Reform* (Wiesbaden, 2002).

necessity of the *Acts and Monuments*? What was peculiar to England and what was drawn in from elsewhere?

The second chapter will analyse the nature of the collaboration involved in compiling the 1563 (first) edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. It will particularly focus on the Marian exile as a focal point in which the conception for an ecclesiastical history came into sharper focus and received a weighty inheritance from the much larger ecclesiastical history project based at Magdeburg. The *Magdeburg Centuries*, as the project became known, was, we shall argue, the principal stimulus in persuading Foxe towards a reorientation of his book into an English adaptation of the same project. The impetus came from Matthew Parker and perhaps also Sir William Cecil who has also been enlisted by historians as the primary benefactor of the *Acts and Monuments*. Between them a collaborative network of contacts sharing ideas and manuscripts were formed and it is within this context that an analysis of Foxe's sources must be contained.

Building upon the evidence for the 1563 edition, chapter three concentrates on the scholarly 'circle' focused around Matthew Parker. How and when was this 'circle' formed and for what purpose? How and why did Parker and Foxe collaborate with one another for the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, what methodologies were involved and how do we fit John Bale and the previous community of scholars into this picture?

Chapters four and five act as a pair, dealing with the various sources used to compile the pre-reformation history of Britain. In essence chapter four examines the sources used to

compile the Anglo-Saxon history while chapter five deals with the sources used to compile his post-Conquest narrative. However, this is not quite accurate. Books Two and Three of the *Acts and Monuments* dealt specifically with historical events before the loosening of Satan (after one thousand years), whilst Book Four dealt with Satan unleashed. Once Foxe reached the history of the Lollards, in Book Five, his apocalyptic *schema* pointed towards the beginning of the reformation, which, as far as this discussion is concerned, denotes the terminus for our deliberation. The key turning point is the pontificate of Gregory VII named Hildebrand (1020/5-1085). The implementation of new doctrinal laws at this time clearly fitted into the apocalyptic patterning of history that was implicitly applied to the *Acts and Monuments*. Therefore these chapters deal at first with pre-Gregorian history and then with post-Gregorian history. The purpose of these two chapters is to examine the chief sources actually used to compile the accounts rather than those that were claimed or referenced in the text. As research has shown the two did not necessarily correlate. They will also examine the individual provenance and transmission of these texts as well as their authority in late sixteenth-century English scholarship as a means to analysing the importance of the Parker circle in providing manuscript texts. What authority was given to these texts and did they influence the argument presented?

Chapter six will take the results for the previous two chapters, and analyse the manuscript component of Foxe's pre-reformation sources, especially those connected to the household of Matthew Parker. What evidence, if any, remains on the manuscripts themselves that indicate Foxe's use of them? How did Parker and his household staff treat the texts that they had gathered, especially those that had a bearing on the *Acts and Monuments*? These questions should help to characterise the collaborative co-operation

between Elizabethan scholars and provoke an understanding of the importance of the manuscript base upon which the *Acts and Monuments* were built.

The final chapter will tie together the pre-Gregorian and post-Gregorian history and its sources to come to a conclusion over the relative influence and importance of Parker's circle, the *Magdeburg Centuries*, John Bale and other elements of collaboration that impacted on the compilation of the *Acts and Monuments*. This in turn will allow us to analyse the role of John Foxe himself in the compilation and begin to provide some answers to the question of authorship and the exchange of ideas and materials, which is involved in a project such as the *Acts and Monuments*.

Chapter One

The Making of Ecclesiastical History: Foxe, Eusebius and the dissolution of England's manuscript heritage

For first to see the simple flocke of Christ, especially the vnlearned sort, so miserably abused, and all for ignoraunce of history, not knowing the course of times, and true descent of the Church, it pitied me, that part of diligence so long to haue bene vnsupplied in this my countrey Church of England. Agayne considering the multitude of Chronicles and storywriters, both in England, and out of England, of whom the most part haue bene either Monkes or clientes to the sea of Rome, it greued me to behold how partially they handled their stories.¹

When John Foxe wrote these words for the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* he was reflecting on the problematical nature of historical evidence now that England was orphaned from its pre-reformation heritage. It was a matter of active concern in Elizabethan England. The past had become a polemical landscape, used both to defend the new and attack the old. It was 'abused' (as Foxe saw it) to uphold the corrupt, and misused to cast doubt upon the integrity of the reformation. The records of that past – the chronicles written, in large measure, by Roman Catholic monks and clerics – were themselves the flawed record, testifying to an abandoned and discredited set of traditions. How history was to be written, therefore, had also to be rethought. Tudor intellectuals emphasised the belief that England was now living in an enlightened age, purified from its 'primitive' past and capable of recognising 'partiality' in the handling of sources. The collective and individual memories of the English people, learned and unlearned, had been dislocated. Monuments to the old learning – the monasteries and

¹ *A&M*, 1570, *To the true and faithful congregation* [Prefaces], p. 2.

their libraries – had been dismantled. Older frameworks for the narrative of the past – the kind of history that shapes people’s sense of identity and belonging – had to be re-orchestrated to accord with the protestant reformers’ sense of God’s providential engagement with his world through history. The agents of that engagement, and those who opposed it, had to be identified and documented. ‘The course of times, and true descent of the Church’ was, in Foxe’s eyes an educative instrument (furnished by God) which, rightly understood and properly documented, would be an instrument for the instauration of the new order. A central contention of this thesis is that we misunderstand John Foxe’s purpose if we simply regard his great work of history as a protestant ‘*Book of Martyrs*’. It was much more than this, as we shall see.

Even in the first edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, published in 1563, the work included an extensive, albeit selective history of the pre-reformation and pre-Lollard church – the first of five parts of the volume being solely devoted to that subject.² That part of the work would itself be considerably expanded and reshaped for the edition of 1570. It is not surprising that our focus has been naturally drawn to the dramatic, contemporary events of the English reformation comprising the second half of his great volume. These are the parts of the work for which Foxe had collected first-hand testimony, those where his polemical engagement is most immediately in evidence. This, however, leads us to read the first section of the work as intended simply as a lengthy prologue to his history of his own times, offering (at best) parallels with present-day events. The second contention of this thesis is that we need to redress that balance if we are properly to understand Foxe’s work as a whole. Critics of the protestant reformers had already accused them of radical discontinuity with the past.

² See appendix one of this thesis for the division of the 1563 and 1570 editions of the *Acts and Monuments*.

The charge was that they had departed from Apostolic truth as handed down through the church. So Foxe's preoccupation with the history of the pre-reformation church was not elaborate scene-setting for the theatre of martyrdom. It was to rebut such challenges and to turn them on their head. In one of several prefaces Foxe explained that he wished to open his reader to 'the plaine truth' by proving that the 'state, course, and alteration of Religion, decay of doctrine, and the controuersies of the Church, might discern the better betwene antiquitie and noueltie'.³ The old church, he argued, was (in truth) the novelty having built up traditions and doctrines unknown in the time of Christ. The accused became the accusers.

A third contention of this thesis has to do with the nature of Foxe's relationship with the text that he published under his name. It is, of course, natural to assume authorial sovereignty in a work, unless the evidence is strongly to the contrary. Nineteenth century scholarship took it as axiomatic that Foxe had, for better or worse, authored the work. The purpose of the last Victorian edition by Stephen R. Cattley published in 1841 and then revised by Josiah Pratt between 1853-70, was to reconstitute the work as the author had intended it – a process which necessarily entailed conflating various editions to produce an 'ultimate' copy.⁴ Samuel R. Maitland, meanwhile, cast doubt on the validity and reliability of John Foxe as an historian.⁵ That debate – which serves now but as a historical curiosity – emphasised, however, the direct relationship of author and text. Almost a century later, the biographical study of Foxe published by

³ *A&M*, 1570, *To the true and faithful congregation* [Prefaces], p. 2.

⁴ The nineteenth-century editions mentioned here are John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: A New and Complete Edition*, edited by Stephen R. Cattley (London, 1841); and revised in John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe with a Life and Defence of the Martyrologist by the Late Rev. George Townsend*, edited by Josiah Pratt (3rd ed., London, 1853-70).

⁵ For details on Samuel R. Maitland and the historical context behind the nineteenth-century editions see David Loades, 'The Maitland Controversy', *VE* (2004) and Peter Nockles, 'The Nineteenth Century Reception', *VE* (2004). The most comprehensive reassessment of these debates can be found in Thomas S. Freeman, 'Texts, Lies, and Microfilm: Reading and Misreading Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', *SCJ*, 30:1 (1999), pp. 23-46.

James F. Mozley took as its central assumption that Foxe's 'works' (one of the merits of his study was to recover the significance of Foxe's other publications) should be situated directly in relationship to his 'life' and 'times'.⁶ The direction of Mozley's study was towards understanding how he came to write his martyrology. Foxe's education, his interests, and his experiences whilst in exile at Basel, were, Mozley felt, essential 'building-blocks' towards his compilation of the *Acts and Monuments*. This research helped to identify as important such details as Foxe's regular complaints about his impoverishment and poor health.⁷ From Mozley's research we can now see how driven, single-minded and anxious Foxe was when creating his 'masterpieces'.

The proposition in this thesis, however, is that we have to situate Foxe's authorship rather differently. That will mean, notably, re-evaluating how he collaborated with others in the collection and evaluation of materials to reformulate the history of the pre-reformation church. Others have already taken this approach. Patrick Collinson, Jesse Lander, and Devorah Greenberg have similarly begun to question the extent to which the work that we know as the *Book of Martyrs* can properly be regarded as the sole responsibility of John Foxe.⁸ Susan Wabuda has shown that the reconstructions of many of the Marian martyr stories were produced both independently and in conjunction with Foxe by Henry Bull (d. 1577) and Miles Coverdale (1488-1569),

⁶ James F. Mozley, *John Foxe and His Book* (London, 1940), pp. 63-7.

⁷ The suggestion that Foxe's health issues were probably aggravated by his work-load was first suggested by Mozley, *John Foxe and his Book*, but has most recently been emphasised by Freeman, 'John Foxe: A Biography', *VE* (2004).

⁸ See Patrick Collinson, 'John Foxe and National Consciousness', in Christopher Highley and John N. King (eds), *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 10-34; Jesse Lander, 'Foxe's "Book of Martyrs": Printing and Popularising the Acts and Monuments', in C. McEachem and D. Shuger, *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 69-72; and Devorah Greenberg, "'Foxe" as a Methodological Response to Epistemic Challenges: The Book of Martyrs Transported', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe at Home and Abroad* (London, 2004), pp. 237-255. Although both Mozley, *John Foxe and his Book* and William Haller, *The Elect Nation: The Meaning and Relevance of Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (New York, 1963) recognised that Foxe was not the only 'author' of the text it is only in recent scholarship that a fuller analysis has been undertaken.

while I. Ross Bartlett has shown that the hagiographical methodology behind these accounts imitates John Bale's earlier martyr writings.⁹ John Wade has examined the quality and quantity of Latin transcription and translation in all of Foxe's works and has highlighted the fact that much of the Latin in the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* was produced by a number of others and to a lesser standard than Foxe himself was capable.¹⁰ Thomas Betteridge has placed the development of the *Acts and Monuments* within the framework of engagement with the Tudor public sphere.¹¹ Here, not only is Foxe's changing political opinion stressed within the context of Elizabethan reforms, but also the influence of Marian and earlier Elizabethan histories and their engagement with the idea of monarch and state. Such a discussion has drawn out the importance of Foxe's editorial direction of the text within a public collaborative formation. Another approach has been proposed by Brett Usher, who suggests that behind Foxe's compilation of the contemporary parts of the *Acts and Monuments* lies a hidden network of Protestant congregations which helped to finance and support the exiles during Mary's reign.¹² For a variety of reasons, Foxe sought to keep its existence in the shadows, thereby (unconsciously) reinforcing the impression of his own authorial supremacy. At the same time, interest has emerged over the processes of printing as a way of assessing how the text was compiled, thereby gaining an insight into the complex compilation of the finished product. Heading this research are Elizabeth Evenden and John N. King, who have each produced in-depth studies which concentrate

⁹ See Susan Wabuda, 'Henry Bull, Miles Coverdale, and the Making of Foxe's Book of Martyrs', in Diana Wood (ed.), *Martyrs and Martyrology* (Blackwell, 1993), pp. 245-58 and I. Ross Bartlett, 'John Foxe as Hagiographer: The Question Revisited', *SCJ*, 26:4 (1995), pp. 771-789.

¹⁰ John Wade, 'John Foxe the Latinist', *VE* (2004) and John Wade, *John Foxe's Latin writings: their intellectual and social context, with special reference to the period of his exile, 1554-1559*, unpublished P.h.D (2 vols., Sheffield, 2008).

¹¹ Thomas Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-83* (Aldershot, 1999).

¹² See Brett Usher, "'In a Time of Persecution': New Light on the Secret Protestant Congregation in Marian London", in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 233-51; Brett Usher, 'Backing Protestantism: The London Godly, the Exchequer and the Foxe Circle', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 105-134.

on John Day's print house in Aldersgate, London.¹³ They have demonstrated that a book as complex as the *Acts and Monuments* would have involved a great many men in the print house who worked at various levels as collaborators in the creation of the final text, with Day himself emerging as a far from passive figure in its construction. Another approach has been to examine the political and religious context in which each individual edition was produced. Thus Devorah Greenberg, John King, Francis Bremer, David Loades, Thomas Betteridge and Vivienne Westbrook have all examined either specific editions or a collection of editions published in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth or nineteenth centuries.¹⁴ Yet another approach has been to examine further an altogether different form of collaboration. For contemporary accounts Foxe did not only rely on written texts but also on oral testimony from the people of Elizabethan England. Thomas S. Freeman's examination of the tales of divine judgement on sinners has found that many anecdotes came out of local feuds and private grievances and that such stories formed a central feature of Foxe's work and thought.¹⁵ In all these various ways, Foxe's role as 'author' has become more complex, more collaborative, and more contingent upon the environment of each edition of the work published in his

¹³ See John N. King, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge, 2006); Elizabeth Evenden, 'The fleeing Dutchmen? The influence of Dutch immigrants upon the print shop of John Day', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe at Home and Abroad* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 63-77; Elizabeth Evenden, 'A Biography of John Day', *VE* (2004); Julian Roberts and Elizabeth Evenden, 'Bibliographical Aspects of the Acts and Monuments', *VE* (2004); John N. King, 'John Day: master printer of the English Reformation', in Peter Marshall (ed.), *The beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge, 2002); John N. King, "'The light of printing": William Tyndale, John Foxe, John Day, and early modern print culture', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54:1 (2001), pp. 52-85; and Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Foxe, John Day and the Printing of the Book of Martyrs', in Robin Myers, Michael Harris and Giles Mandelbrote (eds), *Lives in Print* (London, 2002), pp. 40-42.

¹⁴ Devorah Greenberg, 'Community of the Texts: Producing the First and Second Editions of *Acts and Monuments*', *SCJ*, 36:3 (2005), pp. 695-715; John N. King, 'Eighteenth-Century Folio Publication of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*', *Reformation*, 10 (2005), pp. 99-106; Loades, 'The Maitland Controversy', *VE* (2004); Francis J. Bremer, 'Foxe in the wilderness: the *Book of Martyrs* in seventeenth-century New England', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe at Home and Abroad* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 105-15; Vivienne Westbrook, 'Mid-Victorian Foxe', *VE* (2004); Devorah Greenberg, 'Eighteenth-century "Foxe": History, Historiography, and Historical Consciousness', *VE* (2004); Nockles, 'The Nineteenth Century Reception', *VE* (2004); Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations*, ch. 4; Eirwen Nicholson, 'Eighteenth-century Foxe', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 1997).

¹⁵ Thomas S. Freeman, 'Fate, Faction, and Fiction in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*', *The Historical Journal*, 43:3 (2000), pp. 601-623.

lifetime. That is one of the major research conclusions of the *Variorum Edition* which the Foxe Project in Sheffield has worked to produce.¹⁶

Other figures have also emerged as guiding hands for Foxe, leading him to materials upon which to draw for his account, and helping to shape his fundamental methodology. John Bale, the ex-Carmelite friar whose influence as an early Protestant polemicist was so significant, had an important influence upon Foxe. This thesis contends that Bale's role comes through most clearly if we consider the pre-reformation component of Foxe's history. Furthermore, I shall argue that Archbishop Matthew Parker was not only essential for the provision of manuscript sources but also may well have been the primary reason for Foxe's significant engagement with England's manuscript heritage. The implications of these lines of enquiry are to suggest that Foxe's role was as a co-ordinator, compiler, or chief editor of a work, the greater portion of which was put together as a collaborative effort. But this raises important questions about exactly how Foxe guided the research that was undertaken, to what extent he shaped its agenda, and how it influenced what data he chose to amass and how it was arranged. This in turn raises questions as to the extent to which that agenda was a shared one, that did not merely suit Foxe personally, but also fitted his and the Elizabethan regime's purposes. We shall explore these questions in respect to the pre-reformation component of the *Acts and Monuments* and locate that collaborative endeavour within and around the circle of Archbishop Parker. This, however, is something of a *terra incognita* since currently our knowledge of that group is very incomplete, and the extent of its involvement in the compilation of the *Acts and Monuments* remains to be investigated.

¹⁶ As exemplified in the articles and commentaries attached to *The John Foxe Project (VE)*.

A re-evaluation of Foxe's relationship to the *Acts and Monuments* leads to a further set of questions relating to its form and purpose. This is the fifth area of engagement in this thesis. It has generally been taken at face value that it was Foxe who determined the literary form of the *Acts and Monuments*. Foxe, it has been argued, sought to align his memorial of Protestant 'martyrology' into a wider vision of how history should be written. It was a consciously 'revisionist' mode, rejecting the techniques and perspectives of medieval chroniclers.¹⁷ Foxe himself wrote, in 1570, of his need to wade through the treacherous waters of those 'multitude of Chronicles and storywriters' that he regarded as untrustworthy and loyal to Rome. Foxe saw himself, of course, as an Erasmian humanist, for whom the adoption of classical forms of framing historical writing came as naturally as the rhetorical tropes that were an essential part of the 'classical' Latin that he wrote whenever he was able. Granted, then, that Foxe was a 'revisionist' historian, the question remains how he and his collaborators sought the materials with which to construct their revisionist narrative, how they tried to structure and periodise it, what kind of truth claims that they thought it contained, and how their conclusions could be deployed to their own polemical purposes. These are questions that are particularly important in the context of the pre-reformation component of the *Acts and Monuments*. However, they are not easy to answer without, as Thomas S. Freeman has indicated in two pioneering articles, a thorough investigation of the sources that were used to construct the text.¹⁸ As Freeman indicates, even when Foxe refers to a source, that reference has to be treated as part of the truth-claims and form of the work that Foxe and his collaborators sought to create. It is not necessarily or straightforwardly the origin of the text to which it refers. Indeed, as we shall see, it can

¹⁷ This is a proposition put forward principally by Mozley, *John Foxe and his Book*; and Haller, *The Elect Nation*.

¹⁸ These are Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Bale's Book of Martyrs?: The Account of King John in Acts and Monuments', *Reformation*, 3 (1998), pp. 175-223 and Thomas S. Freeman, "'St Peter Did not Do Thus": Papal History in the Acts and Monuments', *VE* (3 parts, 2004).

be shown that, in many instances, the original manuscripts in question were not consulted. Trusted intermediaries served in their place as a 'short-cut' to the revisionist history they were in the process of constructing. Thus, taken out of its original context, the utilisation of medieval sources in the *Acts and Monuments* is all the more difficult to assess. So this thesis seeks to demonstrate through a series of detailed case-studies the degree to which we can arrive at that assessment by comparing the standard and rediscovered Anglo-Saxon, medieval and contemporary corpus of chronicles and texts. We shall concentrate our attention upon the first and second editions of the *Acts and Monuments* (1563 and 1570 respectively), these being the ones where we have the opportunity to see how the pre-reformation narrative was shaped in the light of Foxe's collaboration with Matthew Parker's circle, and the extent to which it was refashioned for a contemporary political and polemical purpose.

Our starting point for this investigation is Freeman's two studies which concentrate on the papal history in the *Acts and Monuments* in one instance, and the reign of King John in the other. In the first, Freeman discovered that although the papal segments were based on 'an impressive array of sources quoted with reasonable accuracy' it was an account that contained only a 'half-truth'.¹⁹ Freeman explains that sources antithetical to Foxe's preferred viewpoint were avoided or suppressed, extracts were quoted out of context and the emphasis altered to fit new preconceptions which served to explain and to justify, in the eyes of Foxe and his collaborators, their approach to their sources. In the second, Freeman proposes a theory that the narrative of King John in the *Acts and Monuments* was written not by Foxe but by an altogether different author.²⁰ A substantial array of largely circumstantial evidence is used to support this suggestion.

¹⁹ Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1.

²⁰ Freeman, 'Bale's Book of Martyrs?', pp. 175-223.

For instance, Freeman has realised that there is no evidence that Foxe ever consulted Roger of Wendover's *Flores Historiarum* or Matthew Paris' *Historia Anglorum*; yet both are cited in the account of King John. The account also differs from other parts of the *Acts and Monuments* in its literary construction and accuracy. Foxe distorted the evidence by suppression, utilisation of rhetorical and literary devices, or by amplification of translation, but he did not generally falsify evidence itself. However, in the account of John's death, the author transforms both Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris' statement. The chronicles claim that many rebellious barons considered surrendering to the king. In the *Acts and Monuments*, the barons actually did surrender, and John immediately pardoned them and then forgave all his enemies and wished good fortune for his son, Henry.²¹ This ending does not occur in any known manuscript and fits too perfectly into the revisionist interpretation of King John. It appears to be a fake. Freeman has pointed out other characteristics not commonly ascribed to Foxe, such as contradictory facts, phrases which Foxe usually avoided, and the skewing of priorities on certain topics. In Freeman's opinion this evidence points to one likely candidate; John Bale. It is known that Bale had access to most, if not all, of the manuscripts used in the account, the form of writing and turn of phrase is largely characteristic of Bale, and Bale was a proponent of the sixteenth-century revisionist account of King John. Although unpublished, Bale had produced a play on *King Johan* c. 1538 in the style of Tyndale.²² Bale was also a mentor and good friend of Foxe. Considering the time

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 194. For the account in the *Chronica Majora* by Matthew Paris see *CM* II, p. 667; For the account in the *Acts and Monuments* see *A&M*, 1563, bk. 4, p. 107. As further evidence for Bale's tendency to twist the words of his sources see the case-study for Bale's treatment of Mantuan's *Eclogues* in Lee Piepho, 'Mantuan's *Eclogues* in the English Reformation', *SCJ*, 25:3 (1994), pp. 623-632.

²² In Peter Happé, *The Complete Plays of John Bale* (2 vols., Suffolk, 1985), vol. 1. The main inspiration for the play appears to have been William Tyndale, *The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man and how Christe[n] rulers ought to governe, where in also (if thou marke diligently) thou shalt fynde eyes to perceave the crafty conveyance of all iugglers* (Antwerp, 1528). Bale further amplified the account with Simon Fish, *A supplicacyon for the beggers* (Antwerp, 1529); and Robert Barnes, *A supplicacion unto the most gracyous prynce H. the VIIJ* (London, 1534); and with medieval chronicles such as the *Brut* and *Eulogium Historiarum*.

restraints for the production of the pre-reformation book of the *Acts and Monuments* and the expertise of Bale in the historiography of King John, Freeman's hypothesis appears highly likely.²³

Freeman's work in this area therefore highlights the difficulties in comprehending the collaborative effort involved in compiling the text. As he said, 'a real understanding of the *Acts and Monuments* is not possible without a thorough investigation of what Foxe's sources actually were, and once this has been done, a systematic comparison of Foxe's text with the texts of his sources.'²⁴ Such an investigation, however, is only the beginning. Once these sources have been identified it is important to note their relative importance to the detail, argument and purpose of the text and then to trace and examine their authority in sixteenth century historiography. We need to know who else used these texts, what they thought of them, and how reliant they were on them so that we can see the extent to which Foxe and his collaborators revalorised some sources at the expense of others. Furthermore, an understanding of the provenance and transmission of the manuscripts and printed books that were used in the *Acts and Monuments* should reveal something of the collaborative element in which this thesis is concerned. Who provided these sources? How did they themselves use them? To what extent did they influence the choice of the passages which were eventually to find their way into Foxe's history?

²³ John Bale produced a revised edition of *King Johan*, which was performed upon his return from exile in the early 1560s. Peter Happé, *Four Morality Plays* (Suffolk, 1979) has proven that a watermark stamp dated 1558 and a reference to the proclamation against Anabaptists (*King Johan*, ll. 2678-81) in the play, proves that the editing was completed by September 1560. Happé, however admits that it is possible he began the revision while in exile. John Foxe would almost certainly have had the opportunity to discuss with Bale at Basel and upon their return to England, the revisionist approach to *King Johan*. He would have been well aware of his mentors' expertise in the topic. See Barry B. Adams, *John Bale's "King John"* (San Marino, 1969).

²⁴ Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1.

There is one further issue to address in outlining the preliminary approaches to this thesis. It relates to the questions of Foxe's authorial role in the *Acts and Monuments* and the form of the eventual work that we have already raised. It concerns authorial intention. Given that, as we have indicated, this thesis seeks to sustain the contention that the *Acts and Monuments* were, in various ways, a collaborative enterprise, can we say anything coherent about why the *Acts and Monuments* were compiled? If so, what does it suggest about the form that the work eventually took? At this preliminary stage, what we can do is to examine some of the misconceptions in the historiography of the subject over what can and cannot legitimately be said about authorial intention. This will be helpful in setting the context in which we can understand some of the complexities behind Foxe and his collaborators' engagement with England's manuscript heritage as they chose to interrogate and exploit it.

1. Martyrs or Monuments?

i. Martyrologies

Misinterpretation of the organisational structure with which the *Acts and Monuments* was conceived and compiled began as soon as it was first published, perhaps even before. Despite its carefully worded title, its readership soon took to calling it the *Book of Martyrs* seeing Foxe's work predominantly as a memorial to the recent Marian persecutions. Foxe, however, did not appreciate the claim that he had written a martyrology, strongly denying the title given to his work by others. Foxe proclaimed that

I professe no such title to wryte of Martyrs: but in generall to wryte of rites and Monuments passed in the church and realme of England. Wherin, why should I be restrained from the free walke of a story wryter, more than other that have gone before me?²⁵

The Basel physician and scholar, Heinrich Pantaleon (1522-1595) similarly complained in his sequel to Foxe's Latin commentaries that their works were often mistaken as identical to the martyrologies produced by Ludwig Rabus (1523-1592) and Jean Crespin (c. 1520-1572).²⁶ This complaint, as we shall see in our next chapter, becomes all the more important when we recognise the extent that Pantaleon's *Rerum pars Secunda* and Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* were developed together.

Although this asymmetry between authorial intention and reader reception is generally beyond the scope of this thesis, it is important in grasping the inadequacies and misunderstandings of research carried out on the *Acts and Monuments* between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries. It is upon this foundation that this thesis engages with the evidence and it is vital to recognise where previous interpretations have gone awry. Most significant is the temptation to compare the *Acts and Monuments* to other martyrologies produced about the same time. During the 1550s and 1560s continental martyrologists Jean Crespin, Adriaan van Haemstede (1525-1562), and Ludwig Rabus all produced martyrologies framed within a concept of a war between the true (Christian) and false (Antichristian) churches.²⁷ For the most part they were extremely similar to the *Acts and Monuments*. Brad S. Gregory has shown that stories of recent

²⁵ *A&M*, 1583, bk. 6, p. 702.

²⁶ Heinrich Pantaleon, *Rerum pars Secunda* (Basel, 1563), preface.

²⁷ Adriaan van Haemstede, *Geschiedenis* (Emden, 1559); Jean Crespin, *Histoire des Martyrs* (Geneva, 1554); Ludwig Rabus, *Historien der heyligen Assorwolten Gottes Zeugen, Bekennem und Martyren* (Strasbourg, 1552-1558). See Alec Ryrie, 'The Unsteady Beginnings of English Protestant Martyrology', in David Loades (ed.) *John Foxe An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 52-66.

martyrs were crossing political and linguistic boundaries via pamphlets, songs, correspondence, and word of mouth.²⁸ With a similar background and education, the martyrologists had all been persecuted at some point in their lives and were influenced by the same growing international Protestant scholarship.

Martyr stories in one form or another had been around since the beginnings of the Christian church, and the idea of memorialising these martyrs was equally old. The distinctiveness of the reformist martyrologists was, however, more in their scope and timing than any conceptual originality. The growing number of martyrs at this time was a significant factor in this interest as was their ability to defend against the Roman Catholic taunt of novelty (the martyr stories being intricately linked to doctrinal messages). It was easy to parallel the martyrs with the Apostles and Christ by showing a 'good' death as a victory in the most dramatic setting. Each martyrology went to subsequent editions and although not proof of their popularity or use, is suggestive that they were having some kind of impact. These books were specific to each country and often written in the vernacular. However, they also all fed on the wider 'Protestant' discourse, placing the martyrs into an apocalyptic framework and tracing church history from the primitive church to the reformation.

Foxe's text, whilst similar in much of this, differed in several important respects from the emerging continental traditions. Foxe began by working on a commentary on the Reformation, rather than a martyrology. The *Commentarii rerum in ecclesia gestarum* (1554) and the *Rerum in ecclesia gestarum* (1559) followed the history and writings of

²⁸ Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake; Christian Martyrdom in early Modern Europe* (London, 1999). In Chapter 5 entitled 'Witnesses for the Gospel: Protestants and Martyrdom', Gregory details the similarities and differences between the martyrologies and the martyrologists themselves. This argument is taken up with specific reference to Foxe's contribution in Mark Greengrass and Thomas S. Freeman, 'The Acts and Monuments and the Protestant Continental Martyrologies', *VE* (2004).

John Wyclif and the beliefs espoused by the Lollards, as a precursor to the reform movement. The *Commentarii* was a small octavo volume of 212 leaves in which Foxe mentioned that he planned to write a second volume concentrating on continental affairs, including Lutheran martyrs.²⁹ The second Latin text, the *Rerum* occupied Foxe during much of his exile period. It integrated the *Commentarii* and added a further five Books in a larger folio volume. The *Rerum* brought the story up to Foxe's own times and in particular seized upon the martyr stories pouring out of Marian England. The *Commentarii* and *Rerum* were entitled as 'commentaries on ecclesiastical matters' while Rebus' *The History of God's Chosen Witnesses, Confessors, and Martyrs*, Jean Crespin's *History of Martyrs*, and Adriaen van Haemstede's *History and Deaths of the Devout Martyrs*, were all clearly labelled as martyrology.³⁰ Similarly, the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* - which to an extent can be seen as a translation and enlargement of the *Rerum* - still follows the conventions of a commentary and never claimed the title martyrology. Although there is a last minute addition of a Book focused on pre-Reformation history, this only suggests that the 1563 edition was already beginning to mutate into an ecclesiastical history. It is the conventions of that latter form of work, which the 1570 edition onwards attempted to imitate, not a martyrology.

²⁹ It is believed that Foxe had more-or-less completed work on the *Commentarii* by the time he went into exile. Claire Cross, 'No Continuing City: Exiles in the English Reformation 1520-1570', *History Review* (1998), p. 18 suggests that Foxe only brought books and notes with him to the continent and that he wrote the work up whilst abroad. However the length of time between Foxe leaving England and publishing the *Commentarii* in Strasbourg suggests, as Andrew Pettegree, 'The Latin Polemic of the Marian Exiles', in James Kirk (ed.), *Humanism and reform: the Church in Europe, England and Scotland, 1400-1643: essays in honour of James K. Cameron*, *Subsidia* 8, (1991), p. 312 reports, that Foxe had largely completed the text before leaving England. Foxe would continue to collect information on continental martyrs for his proposed second book right until the moment before he returned home. At this time he seems to have left the research to Heinrich Pantaleon, a friend he had met at Basel.

³⁰ Thomas S. Freeman, *Great Searching out of Bookes and Autors: John Foxe as an Ecclesiastical Historian*, unpublished Ph.D (New Brunswick, The State University of New Jersey, 1995), p. 40, points out that the genre of 'commentary' was a specific form of historical writing distinct from history itself. This idea derived from Isidore of Seville's confused transmission of the classical idea of two kinds of history; history proper, which was written in an eloquent style modelled after Livy or Sallust; and annals and commentaries, which simply recorded facts about historical events.

By the time the 1563 edition was published, Foxe had clearly made the decision to transfer from a commentary to an ecclesiastical history. Gretchen E. Minton, Viggo Norskov Olsen and Thomas S. Freeman have examined Foxe's increasing debt between the first two editions to the first and most respected model available for writing ecclesiastical histories, Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea (d. 339).³¹ His *Historia Ecclesiastica* was written in the fourth century and delineates the history of the church from Jesus Christ and the Apostles, through the persecution and martyrdoms of Christians by Roman Emperors, finally culminating with the adoption of Christianity by Emperor Constantine the Great. The metamorphosis of Foxe's history was intended to signal to the reader that this was no mere catalogue of historical events but a more complex history of the church.³² The choice of Eusebius as a model was far from arbitrary but rather reflective of a much larger but similar project based in Germany. Foxe had been inspired by the *Ecclesiastica Historia*, commonly named the *Magdeburg Centuries*.³³

³¹ Historians have often discussed Foxe's debt to Eusebius. See Gretchen E. Minton, "The same cause and like quarell": Eusebius, John Foxe, and the evolution of ecclesiastical history', *Church History*, 71: 4 (2002) pp. 715-742; Viggo Norskov Olsen, *John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church* (Berkeley, 1973); Haller, *The Elect Nation*. Thomas S. Freeman has also examined the pros and cons of using Eusebius as the model ecclesiastical history. See Freeman, *Great Searching out of Bookes and Autors*, unpublished PhD.

³² Foxe also changed the title with each edition to create a slightly different emphasis within the genre specified. The 1563 edition began 'Actes and monuments of these latter and perillous dayes' while the 1570 and 1576 edition reflects Foxe's intention that his work should be regarded as an ecclesiastical history: 'The Ecclesiasticall history contaynyng the Actes and Monumentes of thynges passed in every kynges tyme in this Realme.' In the 1583 edition, ecclesiastical history is again dropped to reflect a wider emphasis of a universal church: 'Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorabl, happenyng in the Church with an universall history of the same'. The purposes behind these changes were often political and further analysis has been done by Freeman, 'John Foxe: A Biography', *VE* (2004). Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations*, chapter 4 suggests that the 1563 edition was within the mode of chronicle writing and that it was only with the 1570 edition that Foxe turned to writing History – a distinction clearly defined in the earlier *Carion* chronicle published in England in 1550. The status of the 1563 edition will therefore be discussed in more detail in chapter two.

³³ The full title: *Ecclesiastica Historia, integram Ecclesiae 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 viros in urbe Magdeburgica* (Basel, 1559-74). In English: *Ecclesiastical History, Describing in a Clear Manner According to Individual Centuries, the integral idea of the Church of Christ*.

The *Magdeburg Centuries* were developed under the auspices of Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520-1575) to support and defend the Lutheran church from her adversaries. It chronicled church history century by century and followed a Eusebian model. Foxe was well versed in the Centuriators' work. As we shall discuss in the next chapter, whilst in exile at Basel Foxe helped to bring the early volumes through the printing press.³⁴ The debt Foxe owed to the *Centuries* is difficult to elaborate upon without a more detailed comparison between the two texts. Certain evidence, which again will be discussed in the next chapter, leads us to suspect that the debt was great. For the discussion here, it is helpful to briefly summarise Foxe's reliance on the *Centuries* for Book One of the 1570 edition. Preliminary study suggests that Foxe actively disseminated material from the first four volumes of the *Magdeburg Centuries*, Bale's *Catalogus* and Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, reordering the material into a new chronological arrangement, which depicted the primitive and pure church, the ten persecutions of Christians by the Roman Empire and ending with the conversion of Constantine the Great. Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* was also consulted, but often in addition to what Foxe found in the contemporary research.³⁵ Therefore, studies on Foxe's reliance on Eusebius by Thomas S. Freeman and Gretchen E. Minton are based on a flawed premise that Foxe derived all his information and his inspiration directly from Eusebius.³⁶ There is a need, then, to re-examine this material by taking into

³⁴ See also See Freeman, 'John Foxe, a Biography'; and Norman L. Jones, 'Matthew Parker, John Bale, and the Magdeburg Centuriators', *SCJ*, 12:3 (1981), pp. 35-49.

³⁵ For instance *A&M*, 1570, bk. 1, pp. 47-67, which contains the fourth persecution under Marcus Antonius is derived in part from the *Magdeburg Centuries* (including Cent. I lib. II col. 626-8; Cent. II col. 13-23, 114, 117, 121, 173-176, 209-211, 231-233; and Cent III col. 171-195), but is also supplemented with additional material derived directly from Eusebius, lib. 4 cap. 14-15, lib. 5 cap. 20. For more details of this research see the commentary for Book One on the Foxe Project Online.

³⁶ For Foxe's reliance on Eusebius see Freeman, *Great Searching out of Bookes and Autors*, unpublished PhD and Minton, "'The same cause and like quarell'", pp. 715-742. For the only examination of Foxe's depiction of Roman Emperors, especially of Constantine the Great, see Michael S. Pucci, 'Reforming Roman Emperors: John Foxe's characterisation of Constantine in the Acts and Monuments', in David

account the reliance on Eusebius through the lens of the *Magdeburg Centuries*. None of this is to claim that Foxe followed the judgements of the Centuriators to the letter (his depiction of Constantine the Great, for instance, varies considerably from the version in the *Centuries*), but it does bring into question the origin of Foxe's Eusebian methodology. For our discussion here, it is significant that critics of the *Centuries* labelled it as a commentary rather than an ecclesiastical history. They claimed it followed the conventions of the former, rather than the latter.³⁷ That Foxe too had this difficulty may have been inherent in the use of ecclesiastical history. Its heavy reliance on documentation muddled its appearance and made the *Centuries* appear more like a commentary and the *Acts and Monuments* more like a martyrology. It may also have reflected the difficulties in attempting to adapt Eusebian methodology to contemporary methodology.

ii. Eusebian Histories

To claim precedence from Eusebius located the *Acts and Monuments* within an imitative framework with a long and respected history. Eusebius had proclaimed that mankind was part of a cosmic struggle between good and evil and that the true church, was one that was always persecuted. Foxe found this a useful parallel to his own conceptions of humanity and the role of God in history. Eusebius also provided many parallels to recent events – most specifically martyr stories - that, like a mirror, could authenticate the martyrs of Foxe's own times. Eusebian history also advocated the use

Loades (ed.), *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 29-51. Pucci's article is an illuminating study, but it too ignores the vital connection to the *Magdeburg Centuries* and therefore requires reassessment.

³⁷ This has been examined by Ronald E. Diener, *The Magdeburg Centuries: A Bibliothecal and Historiographical Study* (Th.D dissertation, Harvard, 1979), p. 174. Published at <http://rondiener.com/MCBK01.htm> [Accessed: 2005], p. 174.

of documentation to prove and emphasise arguments, and demanded that secular matters be left to writers of 'profane' histories. Foxe, in imitation of Eusebius' guidelines, explicitly stated that his history was not to dwell on matters of policy or world affairs, which told of warfare, realms and people but to provide 'examples' of witnessing to truth provided by martyrs and men of faith.³⁸ Several times, throughout the *Acts and Monuments*, Foxe paused in his description of an event, concerned that he was moving beyond ecclesiastical matters and into the form of 'profane' or 'secular' history.³⁹ He was not alone in drawing up limits to the legitimate scope for ecclesiastical history. Philip Melanchthon, Matthias Flacius Illyricus, and the Centuriators all stressed similar opinions. Only the famed Lutheran scholar, John Sleiden declared any doubt, announcing that 'in the history of religion...I would not omit what concerned the civil government because...they are interwoven with the other'.⁴⁰

How then did Foxe present his Eusebian credentials to the reader? Foxe's prefaces to his *Acts and Monuments* provide us with an explicit guide as to how he wanted his work to be read. Although the first two editions had five prefaces each, these, as presented in appendix one of this thesis, had markedly changed in both content and form. In 1563, Foxe provided two prefaces for the 'learned reader'. In the second of those, *Ad doctum Lectorem*, Foxe complained of the hostility to his revised history and set out his own methodology. He stated directly that his task was not to produce a new *Golden Legend*, after the form and content of Jacopo de Varagine's thirteenth-century hagiography of

³⁸ *A&M*, 1563, *The Vtility of this History* [Prefaces], p. 15. Also quoted by Collinson, 'John Foxe as Historian', p. 6.

³⁹ For instance, when introducing the Anglo-Saxon law codes, Foxe admits to being selective from 'many...lawes both Ecclesiasticall and temporall'. The Law codes published in the *Acts and Monuments* do indeed amount to a selection of only ecclesiastical or morally related laws. See *A&M*, 1570, bk. 6, p. 923.

⁴⁰ From the preface of John Sleiden, *De statu religionis et reipublicae* (Strasburg, 1555), as discussed in Donald R. Kelley, 'Johann Sleiden and the origins of History as a Profession', *Journal of Modern History*, 52 (1980), pp. 573-598.

saints' lives, for it is 'very unlike that *Golden* (I should rather say *Leaden*) *Legend*'.⁴¹ This preface delivered an important message to Foxe's Roman Catholic 'learned' readers; it provided a direct comparison of Foxe's claim to truth and the claim of the popular *Golden Legend*. For 'if they apply the title of their own *Golden Legend* to this, because they think this history, after the example of that one, similarly belongs to fable; and from this by a hateful word prejudice its truth, what am I to reply to them except that they are naively themselves betraying their own false accusation'.⁴² Foxe was laying out his methodology and making a defence of his personal involvement in its compilation. It was important for Foxe to confirm that his history would be 'drawn and conflated from the very archives and registers of bishops and partly from the martyrs own letters'. It was essential to show that unlike the *Golden Legend*, his work would not be filled with 'fables' and 'unnatural monstrosities of lies and most empty inventions'.⁴³

Foxe's other prefaces in the 1563 edition were intended for other reading audiences.⁴⁴ In *Ad Dominum Jesum Christum* - the first preface addressed to the 'learned reader' - Foxe explained the reasoning behind the use of the vernacular instead of Latin. In the third preface, directed towards Queen Elizabeth, Foxe used rhetoric to both praise and further encourage the Queen's religious policies at the same time. The final two prefaces are addressed to the 'unlearned reader', providing an opportunity for Foxe to

⁴¹ *A&M*, 1563, *Ad Doctum Lectorem* [Prefaces], p. 10. Translated in John Wade, *John Foxe's Latin writings: their intellectual and social context, with special reference to the period of his exile, 1554-1559*, unpublished Ph.D (2 vols., Sheffield, 2008), vol. 2, pp. 69-70. For more on the *Golden Legend* see chapter four of this thesis.

⁴² *Ibid.* A similar discussion of Foxe's claims here is discussed in Patrick Collinson, 'Truth, Lies, and Fiction in sixteenth-century Protestant Historiography', in Donald R. Kelley, and David H. Sacks (eds), *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: history, rhetoric, and fiction, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 37-68.

⁴³ *A&M*, 1563, *Ad Doctum Lectorem* [Prefaces], p. 10. Translated in Wade, *John Foxe's Latin writings*, unpublished Ph.D (2 vols., Sheffield, 2008), vol. 2, pp. 69-70.

⁴⁴ As noted and discussed by John N. King, 'Guides to Reading Foxe's Book of Martyrs', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68:1 (2005), pp. 133-150.

outline his agenda. In *To the Persecutors of Gods truth, comonlye called Papistes*, Foxe identified the 'true' and 'false' reader in terms of the 'persecuting' and 'persecuted' churches, he explained the premise behind his history and introduced the reader to the idea that Roman Catholic devotion to religious images, their belief in pilgrimages and purgatory, and the burning of heretics were all errors that had crept into the church. In *A declaration concerning the utilitie and profite of thys history*, Foxe again defended his dissemination of Latin scholarship by translating and inserting his *De Historiae huius utilitate et fructu*, which he had originally written for his earlier commentary, the *Rerum*. All but one of these prefaces were replaced in the 1570 edition. This was in response, Foxe acknowledged, to criticism from both Roman Catholic and Protestant critics alike.⁴⁵ He updated the preface to Queen Elizabeth to reflect the current state of religion in England. He also attempted to clarify more forcefully to the unlearned reader the purposes of his history in two new prefaces. Foxe's address to the Roman Catholic reader is also replaced. The final preface, *Certeine Cautions of the Author to the Reader, of thynges to be considered in readyng this story*, provided further discourse on those elements Foxe had purposefully left out, which the reader might otherwise have mistaken as an oversight. These prefaces were therefore designed as a guide to reading the ecclesiastical history; they paralleled in form but not in content those of Eusebius, who had provided his own readers with four prefaces that outlined the most important themes he himself had interpreted.⁴⁶ In the prefaces to the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Eusebius had outlined the general plan of his work, then – in the second and third prefaces – argued that Jesus Christ had always existed and should be honoured

⁴⁵ Foxe renamed *A declaration concerning the utilitie and profite of thys history* in the 1570 and latter editions into, *To the True Christian reader, what utilitie is to be taken by readyng of these Historyes*. The *To the Persecutors of Gods truth, comonlye called Papistes* is restored in the 1583 edition. Foxe's address to Roman Catholic readers is replaced by the *To all the professed frendes and folowers of the Popes procdynges*. The Calendar is also removed, but returned in the 1583 edition.

⁴⁶ Eusebius, *The History of the Church*, edited and translated by Geoffrey A. Williamson (London, 1965), pp. 31-49. On Eusebius' prefaces also see Robert M. Grant, *Eusebius as church historian* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 31-44.

in such a way. Eusebius dedicated the fourth preface to showing that there was nothing novel in the religion that he advocated.

The 1563 edition attracted many criticisms, especially from Roman Catholic apologists such as Thomas Stapleton (1538-1598) and Nicholas Harpsfield (1519-1575) who, ‘fumyng and freatyng’, systematically deconstructed Foxe’s work with ‘intemperant tounge’.⁴⁷ Foxe acted upon these criticisms in the 1570 edition, providing, amongst much else, a list of sources from which he claimed the authenticity of his story. Foxe also added a list of the names of martyrs, a chart for conversion of roman numerals to Arabic numerals, and a list of errata. Foxe also provided a more complex index to guide the reader. In 1563, the index to the *Acts and Monuments* had sub-titles distinguished only by the first letter in the usual alphabetical order (a, b, c, etc). In later editions, the sub-titles were re-worked so that the first two letters (ab, ac, ad, etc) provided more detailed division. For the 1576 edition, Foxe and his associates experimented; the index was re-organised under topic-focused sub-titles (such as ‘Christ’, ‘The Primitive Church’ and ‘Pope’) in the hope of guiding the reader toward a proper understanding of the history. As Jesse Lander and Thomas Betteridge have argued, this index was an attempt to provide a simplified guide that provided a means to abridging a reading of the *Acts and Monuments*. It was hoped that such a guide would allow readers to engage with particular themes throughout the text and thereby gain a greater understanding of the key components.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ This is how Foxe described his critics in *A&M*, 1570, *The Epistle dedicatorie to the Queenes Maiestie* [Prefaces], p. 7. Foxe was particularly talking about Thomas Stapleton, *A Counterblast to M. Hornes vayne blaste against M. Fekenham* (Leuven, 1567); and Nicholas Harpsfield, *Dialogi sex contra summi pontificatus, monasticae vitae, sanctorum, sacrarum imaginum oppugnatores, et pseudomartyres* (Antwerp, 1566).

⁴⁸ See Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformation*, pp. 207-8 and Jesse Lander, ‘Foxe’s “Books of Martyrs”’, who have claimed that the index was increasingly intended as a guide for reading. The final preface of the 1576 edition addressed ‘To The Christian Reader’, acts as an explanation of how to read the *Acts and Monuments* as a kind of ‘textual pilgrimage’ with the index in the role of the guide.

These aids to memory and reading reflect the general practices of humanist learning and the various forms of reading Foxe expected his readership to undertake. He perhaps imagined that his book would be digested into commonplaces. He probably envisaged its being searched for specific topics, perhaps used in the composition of sermons, or read aloud in small gatherings by the learned and unlearned. He no doubt expected it to be read by the well-educated English elite, both lay and clerical, Protestant and Roman Catholic. However, it was also a book that might have its uses for the less learned reader. In a sense Foxe used the skills he had fine-tuned whilst working as a tutor to educate further the English population in humanist methodology in how to read his text.⁴⁹ In particular he engaged with a general concern that independent reading, specifically by the 'uneducated', of the vernacular Bible could result in incorrect interpretations. Catechisms had been promoted as a means of safely revealing the Scriptures to the populace within a pre-defined framework. Histories, such as Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, also contributed to providing a sanctioned interpretation of Scripture as a means of controlling the reading of God's words.⁵⁰

The Eusebian model enabled Foxe and his colleagues to authenticate the text by keeping it within an explicit mode of writing, which utilised a specific set of scholarly criteria. It was not an easy task to explain this to the intended readership, as Foxe not only had to write for both the learned and unlearned but he had to write for both the faithful and the disbeliever as well. Foxe was therefore not just writing for the intellectual community but was instead providing a history available to a more general audience. For this, Foxe

⁴⁹ For a discussion on Foxe's engagement with and reaction to his readers see Cynthia Wittman Zallinger, "'The Booke, the leafe, yea and the very sentence": Sixteenth-Century Literacy in Text and Context', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 102-116.

⁵⁰ Richard Gawthrop and Gerald Strauss, 'Protestantism and literacy in Early Modern Germany', *Past and Present*, 104 (1984), pp. 31-55.

found that he had to educate his readership in what an ecclesiastical history should be, and to show that it was not simply a martyrology. The *Acts and Monuments* therefore, need to be understood within its Eusebian framework and within the context of the available corpus of texts. It has to be appreciated that Foxe was revising the nature of ecclesiastical history. The Eusebian model was firmly placed within the Protestant tradition of the primacy of Scripture as the determining framework for human history. This especially took its form through an apocalyptic vision of the *Two Churches* and was heavily influenced by the modifying concept of history drawn out from the Scriptures.

2. Modifying the role of History in defence of the Church

i. A Pattern for History

When John Foxe wrote his summary of pre-reformation history for the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* he explained that 'I haue described briefly to the (good reader) the oryginall state of the church, and the times, almoste from Christe a thousande yeres, although not so copiously, as the matter would require, yet suffyciently, by the way, for thee, to vnderstande, what difference there was, betwixt those times, and the other time, that followed'.⁵¹ The intended scope of this account was to record only those events 'most notable' related to ecclesiastical history and in particular to the rise of the Antichrist and the bondage of Satan. To achieve this aim Foxe set out a prophetic schema based on Bale's *Image of Bothe Churches* but made little attempt to integrate it

⁵¹ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 6.

into the actual narrative.⁵² When he came to develop the framework for the 1570 edition, which 'copiously' covered the entirety of Christian history, Foxe realised that the roles of Antichrist and Satan were to take on different meanings. The interpretation of the prophecies and how they linked to historical events was, Foxe thought, in need of revision.

In his analysis of the apocalyptic traditions, Richard Bauckham has suggested that Foxe failed to reach the apotheosis of this ideological framework until he set about work on the 1576 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.⁵³ This is not entirely accurate since the framework was fully rehearsed in 1570 but, and this is crucial, it was not fully woven into the narrative. Foxe was never to achieve a complete synthesis of history and Scriptural prophecy. The posthumously published *Eicasmī, seu, Meditationes in sacram Apocalypsim*, was an attempt to meld together the prophecies with the historical facts. Foxe, however, only managed to complete the first seventeen chapters of Revelation before he died.⁵⁴ Foxe's pattern of history was therefore always in a state of flux and this is reflected in its use as an ideological framework.

For Bale, the Scriptures had provided a prophetic framework in which to understand and locate the rise and fall of the papacy.⁵⁵ Upon the death of Christ, Satan was bound

⁵² John Bale, *The Image of Bothe Churches after reulacion of saynt Iohan the euangelyst* (Antwerp, 1545-1550). See Katherine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645* (Oxford, 1979); Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic visions from the Reformation to the eve of Civil War* (Toronto, Buffalo and London 1978); Richard Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse: sixteenth-century apocalypticism, millenarianism and the English Reformation: From John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brightman* (Oxford, 1978).

⁵³ Richard Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse: sixteenth-century apocalypticism, millenarianism and the English Reformation: From John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brightman* (Oxford, 1978), p. 84.

⁵⁴ John Foxe, *Eicasmī sev meditationes in sacram Apocalypsim* (London, 1587). See David J. Keep, 'John Foxe's Last Word', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 94-104; and Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war* (Toronto, Buffalo, London, 1978), p. 40.

⁵⁵ See in particular Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition*, pp. 32-68; and Leslie P. Fairfield, *John Bale: Myth maker for the English Reformation* (Purdue, 1976), pp. 60-86.

for 1,000 years. He would then be released at the time of Popes Sylvester II (c.946-1003) and Gregory VII (c.1015/29-1085). Whilst this subject remained an important element for Foxe, he did not share this singular interpretation, but instead saw other historical happenings, most specifically the continual recurrence of persecution, as a more substantial historical reference in which to interpret the Scriptures. For Foxe, the true church was a persecuted church. The idea, then, that Satan was 'bound-up' after the death of Christ for 1000 years, did not sit comfortably with the ten persecutions of Christians by Roman Emperors that had occurred up to the year 324. Foxe believed that he had solved this problem by moving the 'binding of Sathan' to the end of that period. 'After darknes and stormy tempest' Foxe wrote 'should come peaceable calme, and stable quietnes to his [Christ's] church, meaning this tyme of Constantine'.⁵⁶ In Book Five, Foxe reiterated his revised schema, justifying 'the interpretation' by complaining that 'I see the common opinion of many to be deceaued by ignoraunce of histories'.⁵⁷

In doing so, however, Foxe caused for himself another problem. By moving the 1000 years back 300 years, Foxe came up with the date 1324 for when Satan was 'loosened agayne'.⁵⁸ This date correlated with the pontificate of Boniface VIII (Pope between 1294-1303), who declared that secular princes were under his domain. Foxe had, however, already signified that Pope Sylvester II had worked 'through the operation of Sathan' at the turn of the first millennium.⁵⁹ This remained unchanged in all subsequent editions. Although Paul Christianson has suggested that in Foxe's interpretation Satan had begun to break through his bindings even before the 1,000 years were up, Foxe did

⁵⁶ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 1, p. 37.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, bk. 5, p. 493.

⁵⁸ See *Ibid.*, p. 397.

⁵⁹ First written for *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 11-14 and reproduced with no changes in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 167-8.

not make this explicit.⁶⁰ It would seem more likely that these earlier references to Satan were surviving remnants from the 1563 edition, when Bale's schema had still held sway. In the Prologue to the 1570 text, Foxe neglected (or did not have time) to update the summary of the prophetic pattern of his history. This Prologue was most likely one of the last pieces to be written as it contained a description of a visit to London by the Muscovites in October 1569.⁶¹ It is significant, however, that in all subsequent editions, Foxe updated the discussion of prophecy in the Prologue to reflect his revisions.

Whereas Bale's schema closely tied the relationship of Satan and the Antichrist together, Foxe's revisions made them more divergent. The Antichrist symbolised the decline of the papacy and the threat of Islam – a corruptive and chaotic influence. Satan, however, symbolised the persecution of the faithful. Through that association Foxe was able to argue that the martyrs of the primitive church and the martyrs of his own times were proof to the presence of Satan and, by association, fixed points in understanding Scriptural prophecy. The 1,000 years in which Satan was bound (324-1324) was a period of relative stability (as far as persecution was concerned) but it was also one where the Antichrist had increasingly corrupted and maligned the Christian faith and disrupted the proper workings of secular authorities. When Foxe came to write the 1570 edition, he was therefore dealing with two interconnected but overlapping prophetic schemas. The year 1000 was still important, as this was the moment when the Antichrist had gotten the upper hand, but it was no longer the moment when Satan was unleashed.

⁶⁰ Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon*, p. 41.

⁶¹ As indicated in Thomas S. Freeman and Elizabeth Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (forthcoming), ch. 6. Foxe mentions the visit by the Muscovites in *A&M*, 1570, Prologue, p. 26.

In 1563, Foxe had depicted a system of four or three ages to divide human history, starting with the binding up of Satan at the birth of Christ and ending with Judgement Day. The first age grouped together the time of the Apostles, a period of expansion, and a flourishing age of consolidation. The second age (or middle age) was a time of decay. The third age covered the loosening of Satan after 1000 years of bondage.⁶² In 1570, the first and second ages were unpacked and tied more closely to historical events. The 300 years of suffering after Christ's death were directly linked to the ten persecutions of Christians before Constantine, whilst the year of the Beast (AD 666) was linked to the increase of superstition introduced by Pope Boniface III. Foxe divided the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* into twelve Books and claimed that the first five each represented a space of 300 years based upon his interpretation of Scriptural prophecy. Book One was to cover the 'suffering time', Book Two, the 'flourishing time', Book Three the 'declining time', Book Four, the age of Antichrist, and Books Five to Twelve, the time of Reformation (see appendix 2.1). At the beginning of Book Five, Foxe also reiterated that the Lollards and the subsequent Reformation was the result of the faithful fighting the recently unleashed Satan. The Antichrist had prepared the way for his coming.

Although Foxe furnished each Book with the title that it would recount 'the next. 300. yeres' of his prophetic history, the content did not particularly correlate with these divisions. Book Two began with a brief examination into the first founding of the Christian faith in Britain but then quickly moved on to a discussion of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy. The narrative ended in the 780s, at about the time of King Egbert, therefore passing slightly further than 300 years. When Foxe arrived at the pontificate of

⁶² See *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 7-10.

Boniface III he declared him to be the 'runner before Antichrist'.⁶³ Five pages later the foundation of Islam was associated with the number of the Beast.⁶⁴ However, neither event was significantly highlighted as part of Foxe's schema. Book Three ended with the conquest of England by the Normans but there was no mention that this event was significant in relation to a greater prophetic scheme. Only when Foxe came to discuss the story of Hildebrand (Gregory VII) early in Book Four was there any direct acknowledgment of the Antichrist.⁶⁵ Foxe's prophetic schema is evident in the titles of each Book and their rough chronological span but in the actual content of the text there is only an occasional acknowledgment.

There was, then, a third contending framework, which Foxe used to organise and divide his narrative. This framework was more secular, focused on the division of the past by regal succession. Books Two and Three divided the narrative of Anglo-Saxon England between the period of a Heptarchy and the period in which there was an Anglo-Saxon king of England. Book Four was roughly divided up by the reign of each monarch from William I to Edward III. Book Five focused on Edward III to Henry V, Book Six on Henry VI to Henry VII, Books Seven and Eight on Henry VIII, Book Nine on Edward VI, and Books Ten to Twelve on Mary I. Foxe maintained these diverging schemes for all the subsequent editions of the *Acts and Monuments*, even though they clearly conflicted with each other and did not entirely reflect the prophetic history that Foxe worked so hard to produce. The 'secular' framework was followed as a means of dividing up the narrative, whilst the prophetic schemas were largely constrained to an ideological interrogation of the sources and an occasional reference in the text. The

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 161.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, bk. 4, pp. 226-234.

titles for each Book were a rough guide but not the organising construct Foxe would have us believe.

ii. Dissolution of history

The location of the *Acts and Monuments* within the conventions of ecclesiastical history and apocalyptic interpretation of the past informed both the argument put forward, and the evidence used in its support. However, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Eusebius had also advocated and practised the technique of providing substantial verbatim citation of documents to corroborate his historical narrative.⁶⁶ Foxe had begun to follow in this level of citation in his 1563 edition, but had largely concentrated on documents from the recent past, especially those concerned with the Marian persecution. It seems almost certain that Foxe did not have time or access to the necessary materials to produce extensive documentation for his pre-reformation portion – contained in Book One – which appears to have been a last-minute addition.⁶⁷ As such the emphasis was on the more recent persecutions, and the overwhelming mass of documentation that was at his disposal now that Queen Mary was dead.

By 1570, Matthew Parker's patronage of Foxe's project had provided the opportunity to address this imbalance by providing the documentation for extending the pre-reformation portion of the work. However, unlike Eusebius, Foxe could not simply cite these documents. In the opinion of both Parker and Foxe, England's historical foundation was cast into doubt by its tainted Catholic roots and prejudices. Recent

⁶⁶ Thomas S. Freeman, *Great Searching out of Bookes and Autors: John Foxe as an Ecclesiastical Historian*, unpublished P.h.D (New Brunswick, The State University of New Jersey, 1995).

⁶⁷ The probability that the pre-reformation history was a last-minute addition to the 1563 edition has been argued by Thomas S. Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1.

scholarship has begun to show that the key to understanding the complexities in engaging with England's manuscript heritage should not only focus on the severe threat to monastic manuscripts after the dissolution of the monasteries but also on the nature and relationship of manuscripts with printed books as it was understood in English sixteenth-century academia.

When Henry VIII dissolved the smaller monasteries in 1536 and the larger monasteries in 1539 he also set in motion a predicament for those involved in rescuing England's manuscript heritage. Monastic manuscripts and books, containing the traditional repositories of English historical documentation and archiving, were dispersed, destroyed and generally removed from the safety of their monastic context. Not until the Elizabethan period would any effective attempts be made to rectify the problem. The contents of the monastic libraries were enormous. Estimates suggest that Christchurch Cathedral Priory Canterbury held some 2,100 volumes, while St Augustine's held some 1,900 volumes. Bury St Edmund's had about 2,000 volumes.⁶⁸ A few of these manuscripts were taken to the Royal Library but the vast majority were either sold off locally at 'knock-down' prices, or simply left to the mercies of often uninterested landlords or to the decay of time, the punishment of weather, or food for rodents. Several stories of uncertain authenticity exist from this time, which provide us with some glimpses of what may have been occurring. On their second visit to New College, the King's commissioners were recorded as finding the quadrangle full of blown leaves from *Duns Scotus*; Mr Grenfelde of Buckinghamshire was using them to

⁶⁸ Ronald Harold Fritze, 'Truth hath lacked witness, time wanted light: The Dispersal of the English Monastic Libraries and Protestant Efforts at Preservation, ca. 1535-1625', in D.G. Davis (ed.), *The Journal of Library History, Philosophy and comparative librarianship*, 18:3 (Texas, 1983), pp. 274-291. For more details of the collection in Canterbury see Nigel Ramsay, 'The Cathedral Archives and Library', in Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay and Margaret Sparks (eds), *The History of Canterbury Cathedral* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 341-378.

make scarecrows or 'scaring-sheets'. It was told that the service books of Roche Abbey had been taken to mend wagons, while the contents of two libraries were apparently used as wrapping paper for ten years without exhausting the supply.⁶⁹ Many manuscripts also survived as fragments either used as fly-leaves, strengthening strips for book binding or retained as part of a specific interest in collecting manuscript leaves rather than entire books.⁷⁰ Subsequently, only a portion of the great monastic collections survived into modern times.

There were few people from the time of the dissolution or just after who voiced any concerns about these manuscripts. The most important were John Leland and John Bale. Both were particularly horrified at the destruction of England's textual archives. In 1536, Leland begged Cromwell to help him save the manuscripts from destruction and dispersal. Leland specifically voiced his concern that manuscripts were being taken across the sea by Germans who 'spoileth' and 'cutteth' them out of libraries to take as their own 'monuments'.⁷¹ The plea failed to gain the desired response and the dissolution of the larger monasteries prompted Leland to write his *New Years Gift* to King Henry in an attempt to gain official recognition. Leland again bemoaned the theft

⁶⁹ Cited by Margaret Aston, 'English Ruins and English History: The Dissolution and the Sense of the Past', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 36 (1973), pp. 231-255.

⁷⁰ Two articles by Cyril E. Wright, 'The dispersal of the Monastic Libraries and the beginnings of Anglo-Saxon studies; Matthew Parker and his circle: A preliminary study', in Bruce Dickens and A.N.L. Munby (eds), *TCBS*, 1 (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 208-237 and 'The Dispersal of the Libraries in the Sixteenth Century', in Cyril E. Wright and F. Wormald (ed.), *The English Library before 1700* (London, 1958), pp. 148-175 still represent the basis of research on monastic library dispersal. Margaret Aston, 'English Ruins', pp. 231-255 also mentions the manuscripts in relation to the dissolution's influence on the English sense of the past. More recent articles include Ronald Harold Fritze, 'Truth hath lacked witness'; Claire Cross, 'Monastic Learning and Libraries in Sixteenth-Century Yorkshire', in James Kirk (ed.), *Humanism and Reform: The Church in Europe, England, and Scotland 1400-1643; Essays in Honour of James K. Cameron*, 8 (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 255-269; James P. Carley, 'Monastic collections and their dispersal', in J. Bernard and D.F. McKenzie (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, 4, 1557-1695 (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 339-347.

⁷¹ Lucy Toulmin Smith, *Leland's Itinerary in England and Wales*, vol. 1 (5 vols, London, 1964), p. xi. The letter from Bale to Leland is printed in W. Huddesford, *Life of Leland*, (Oxford, 1772), 84-7 and the letter from Leland to Cromwell dated 16 July 1536 is in Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses. An exact History of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their Education in the most Antient and Famous University of Oxford, from the Fifteenth Year of King Henry the Seventh, A.D. 1500, to the Author's Death in November 1695*, vol. 1 (1721), p. 82-3.

of England's heritage by Germans and also by Italians. He also hoped to publish certain works that 'lay secretly in corners'.⁷² His ambition was to create a massive compilation of England's manuscript heritage from his travels. Although Leland did succeed in producing a mass of notes of vital importance to historical knowledge, he died in 1552 with his publication plans largely unfulfilled.⁷³

After his return from his first exile, John Bale, whom had previously aligned himself with Leland, continued his mentors' efforts.⁷⁴ While Leland had only hinted his dissatisfaction in his *Gift*, Bale took no prisoners. 'That in turnynge ouer of the superstycyouse monasteryes,' he wrote 'so lytle respecte was had to theyr lybraryes for the savegarde of those noble & precyouse monumentes.'⁷⁵ Bale's preface to his publication of Leland's *New Year Gift* was written in 1549, sometime after the dissolution had taken place and at a time when the full scope of the loss was becoming evident. As a radical reformer, Bale had no qualms about the monasteries' dissolution, but the loss of England's manuscript heritage was an offence to his antiquarian nature. Bale, again recognised that many of the books had sailed abroad, but it is clear from his words that many at least appeared to have been destroyed. Bale lamented that 'to

⁷² Toulmin Smith, *The Itinerary of John Leland*, vol. 1, p. xxxviii

⁷³ James Carley is the most authoritative researcher into John Leland's manuscripts. See in particular a series of articles on individual monastic libraries, which include James P. Carley, 'John Leland and the contents of English pre-Dissolution Libraries in Lincolnshire', edited by David McKitterick, *TCBS*, 9, (London, 1990), pp. 330-357; James P. Carley, 'John Leland and the contents of English pre-Dissolution Libraries: The Cambridge Friars', edited by David McKitterick, *TCBS*, 9, (London, 1990), pp. 90-100; James P. Carley, 'John Leland and the contents of English pre-Dissolution Libraries: Glastonbury Abbey', *Scriptorium* 40 (1986), pp. 107-120; and James P. Carley, 'John Leland at Somerset Libraries', *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History*, 129 (1985), pp. 141-154. Most recently Carley has combined this evidence in James P. Carley, 'The Dispersal of the Monastic Libraries and the salvaging of the spoils', in Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa E. Somerville (eds), *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland; vol. 1* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 265-291.

⁷⁴ John Bale had befriended Leland in the mid-1530s, perhaps seeing in him a patron for his Carmelite studies. When the smaller monasteries were being dissolved in 1536, Bale had written to Leland to offer his support and to beg him not to give up his important work. See Fairfield, *John Bale: Mythmaker*, pp. 40-49.

⁷⁵ John Bale, *The Laboriouse Journey and Serche of Johan Leylande, for Englandes Antiquitees, Geven of Hym as a New Yeares Gyfte to Kyng Henry the VIII* (London, 1549).

destroie all without consyderacyon, is and wyll be vnto Englande for euer, a moste horryble infamy amonge the graue senyours of other nacyons.⁷⁶ Like Leland, Bale advocated the publication of these manuscripts to bring them into the 'lyghte' and 'brynge them into a nombre of coppyes, both to their and your owne [England's] perpetuall fame'.⁷⁷ Over the same period of time Bale had built up his own library and had prepared a catalogue of English writers.⁷⁸ Although his library was subsequently lost in Ireland as the unfortunate result of Bale's desperate escape from there, upon the death of Edward VI, he was nonetheless instrumental in Elizabethan attempts to rectify the situation.⁷⁹ As we shall see in chapters two and three of this thesis, Bale had given Foxe the inspiration and he was also partly responsible for Parker providing the means properly to re-engage with England's past. These early attempts to preserve England's monastic manuscript heritage have direct implications for how Parker and Foxe eventually treated this material.

During the 1530s, Thomas Cromwell's propaganda campaign vilified the papal church. The title 'Pope' was replaced with 'Bishop of Rome' in all written publications and papal authority and its institutions denied. This break with Rome also signified a fracture with England's Roman Catholic past and in consequence its associated historical documentation. Monastic chronicles, religious and intellectual works were all lumped together by the growing learned Protestant communities as a storehouse of papal corruption. It was their belief that England's manuscript heritage could no longer be trusted for it contained the deceit of a corrupted church and even worse the fables of

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ John Bale, *Illustrium Maioris, Britanniae Scriptorum, hoc est, Angliae, Cambriae, ac Scotiae summarium in quasdam centurias diuisum, cum diversitate doctrinarum atque annorum recta supputatione par omnes aetates a Iapheto sanctissimi* (Wesel, 1548); and John Bale, *Scriptorum illustriu[m] maioris Brytannie quam nunc Angliam & Scotiam uocant catalogus* (Basel, 1557-9).

⁷⁹ As Bale himself discusses in John Bale, *The first two partes of the Actes or unchaste examples of the Englyshe votaryes, gathered out of theyr owne legendes and chronycles* (London, 1551, 1560).

the Antichrist itself.⁸⁰ Historians have generally concluded that this negative association of the monastic manuscripts explains the lack of interest.⁸¹ However, James Carley has recently cast doubt on these claims.⁸² Firstly, there were some – like Bale and Leland - who took a more pragmatic approach to the monastic heritage. They realised that a rejection of monastic documentation threatened the stability of England's entire past. Archbishop Matthew Parker, for instance, recognised that monastic manuscripts could be made to hold their version of 'truth'. Parker advocated the scrutinising of manuscripts to identify papal fabrications which would then enable scholars to lift out the 'truth', from between the 'fables'. Parker's particular engagement with monastic manuscripts will be discussed properly in chapters three and six. Here, we need to recognise that some manuscripts fell outside of this 'process'.

Even John Bale was happy to allow those manuscripts riddled with 'papal lies' and beyond redemption, to be destroyed or lost. He differentiated books as 'the profytable come' and the 'unprofytable chaffe', depending on their ability to say anything useful to his cause.⁸³ Bale was not alone. John Twyne had collected manuscripts providing evidence for English origins, while John Leland generally saved those manuscripts supporting Tudor ascendancy, a mere fraction of what he saw. Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer had specifically saved manuscripts that provided precedents for the Supremacy, but were content to leave the rest to their fate.⁸⁴ Historical texts were saved

⁸⁰ Fritze, 'Truth hath lacked witness'.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² James P. Carley, 'The dispersal of the Monastic libraries', pp. 265-91.

⁸³ Bale, *The Laborious Journey* (London, 1549). That this was not just John Bale's view can be evidenced by Stephen Batman's allusion to it in his annotations to Trinity College MS B.14.19 fol. 67r. See Kate McLoughlin, 'Magdalene College MS Pepys 2498 and Stephen Batman's reading practices', edited by D. J. McKitterick and E. Leedham-Green, *TCBS*, 10, (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 525-534.

⁸⁴ For a reconstruction of Thomas Cranmer's library see David G. Selwyn, *The Library of Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, 1996); and for his collection of manuscripts David G. Selwyn, 'Thomas Cranmer and the Dispersal of medieval libraries; The Provenance of some of his medieval manuscripts and printed books', in J. Carley and C. Tite (eds), *Books and Collectors 1200-1700* (London, 1997), pp. 281-294.

depending on specific interests related to the concerns of scholars in the 1530s and 1540s. Anglo-Saxon manuscripts were not popular until the latter decades of the sixteenth century, which meant that many were disregarded. Those manuscripts related to English supremacy unsurprisingly survived in great proportion. Leland and Bale were horrified not by the destruction of England's manuscript heritage, but only by that portion that supported their beliefs and causes.

iii. England's Manuscript Heritage and the role of Print

As outlined above, the survival rate of monastic manuscripts was influenced by sixteenth-century understandings of a text's authority and of what it could say, which was useful to current debates and controversies. This approach to texts was nothing new. Indeed, medieval monasteries had constantly updated their collections by removing 'obsolete' texts and bringing in the most recent compilations.⁸⁵ However, the rise of universities coupled with the invention of moving type, resulted in an expansion of learning away from monastic scriptoria.⁸⁶ For Ronald Harold Fritze it is the development of the printing press that had revealed an intellectual isolation and growing irrelevance for the monastic institutions which was completely separated from any religious objections.⁸⁷ The situation was not, however, as simple as Fritze suggests. Firstly, some of the more 'lively' monastic institutions had begun to replace some of their 'outdated' manuscripts with printed editions in much the same way as they had

⁸⁵ James Carley has shown that old Bibles, commentaries, and even histories were considered valueless as updated scholarship replaced them. See Carley, 'Monastic Collections and their dispersal', pp. 339-347.

⁸⁶ For the state of printing in the early to mid-sixteenth century see Jean-François Gilmont, 'Printing at the dawn of the Sixteenth Century', in Jean-François Gilmont (ed.) and Karia Maag (trans.), *The Reformation and the Book* (London, 1998), pp. 10-20.

⁸⁷ Fritze, 'Truth hath lacked witnesse'. For the opposing view of this issue see Carley, 'Monastic Collections and their dispersal', pp. 339-347.

been updating their collection for hundreds of years.⁸⁸ It is admittedly true that monasteries were no longer the only intellectual centre for English learning but there are few indications that they were unable to adapt. Monastic institutions had already forged links with both Oxford and Cambridge universities. Monasteries themselves also continued to provide an education for the laity until their dissolution.⁸⁹ Furthermore, England had not enthusiastically taken up the printing trade in either monastic or secular institutions but had instead relied upon continental presses for its printed books.⁹⁰ Throughout the sixteenth century the printing trade was seen as a continental expertise, not English. Where a press was set up it was usually a small-scale, expensive and short-lasting venture. Monastic institutions were therefore no slower than their secular rivals in producing printed books. For instance, neither Cambridge nor Oxford universities set up a printing press until the 1580s. This evidence suggests that monastic institutions were not intellectually irrelevant by the time of their dissolution but rather they were readjusting to current trends fairly well.

⁸⁸ Carley, 'Monastic Collections and their dispersal', pp. 339-347. This point is also contained in James G. Clark, 'Print and pre-Reformation Religion: The Benedictines and the Press, c. 1470-1550', in Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (eds), *The uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 71-94.

⁸⁹ See Claire Cross, 'The origins and university connections of Yorkshire religious, 1480-1540', in Peter Biller and Richard Barrie Dobson (eds), *The Medieval church: universities, heresy, and the religious life. Essays in honour of Gordon Leff, Subsidia*, 11 (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 271-91; and Cross, 'Monastic learning', pp. 255-70.

⁹⁰ Printing presses were first invented in Germany in the 1450s. Some twenty years later William Caxton was the first to set up a printing press in London (1476). By 1479 another had been set up at St Albans and a year later John Letton set up another press in London. England usually imported its books from presses in Antwerp, Frankfurt and similar print centres. For general information on the continental book trade see David R. Carlson, *English Humanist books; writers and Patrons, manuscript and print, 1475-1525* (Toronto, 1993); Elisabeth Leedham-Green, 'Booksellers and libraries in sixteenth-century Cambridge', in R. Myers, M. Harris, and G. Mandelbrote (eds), *Libraries and the Book Trade; The formation of collections from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century* (Newcastle, 2000), pp. 1-14; Christine Ferdinand, 'Magdalen College and the book trade: the provision of books in Oxford, 1450-1550', in A. Hunt, G. Mandelbrote, and A. Shell (eds), *The Book Trade and its customers 1450-1900; Historical Essays for Robin Myers* (Winchester, 1997), pp. 175-187; for details of official government use of continental print houses during the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I see Jennifer Loach, 'The Marian Establishment and the Printing Press', *The English Historical Review*, 101:398 (1986), pp. 135-148. For information on the related paper industry in England see D. C. Coleman, *The British Paper Industry 1495-1860; A study in Industrial Growth* (Oxford, 1958), pp. 4-8.

The changes outlined above, while not making monastic learning irrelevant, as suggested by Fritze, did begin to revise expectations on how a text should or could be written and how it would be circulated. For instance, scholars began to engage with manuscripts for the purpose of making their contents more readily available for contemporary scholarly activities. Those elements of monastic manuscripts that were deemed important to contemporary scholarship were copied out of the manuscript and into printed books. This might mean a printed edition (or copy) of a manuscript or only extracts and paraphrased summaries, interspersed with material from other manuscripts or even contemporary commentary. Once written up, these copies went to the continental printers and were then traded abroad and back at home. This had important results for English scholarship. First, it helped to diffuse English texts more widely. Reformist translations and polemics from Germany, France and the Netherlands were brought into England and infused into English scholarship. This trade, both legal and illegal, introduced men including John Foxe to humanist writings, apocalyptic frameworks and scriptural treatises. John Bale's prolific writing was largely undertaken whilst abroad and his influence on Foxe must therefore be considered as partly a continental infusion on indigenous English scholarship.

Second, the printed book allowed scholars to avoid the difficulties inherent in using monastic collections for their researches. There were now two options. A researcher could actively visit monasteries and search through unique or rare manuscripts containing much irrelevant information to their research topic, or instead they could make use of extracts and paraphrased accounts in contemporary intermediary printed books. It was possible to avoid such journeys as undertaken by John Leland as enough information, it was believed, could be found from the accumulated knowledge emerging

out of the medieval manuscript tradition and now found in easily accessible printed copies. Whilst the reformatting of old texts to reflect contemporary scholarly interests and practices was not new, the nature of printed texts did allow for greater availability of these texts for a fraction of the time and cost. Even Foxe heavily relied on intermediary works for his evidence. The printed book allowed faster dissemination of information through numerous copies. Whereas a scribe could perhaps produce two large books a year, a print house could produce thousands. It is therefore not surprising that good scholarship began to implement more detailed and comprehensive study than had previously been possible. The invention of the printing press had enabled academia to refocus its efforts from a largely preservationist occupation towards a concentration on standardisation of texts and of knowledge. This cannot have failed to produce a perception of an overabundance of books, which must have made the sudden influx of monastic manuscripts onto the market, an unmanageable problem.⁹¹ That this was of concern in the sixteenth-century can be found with Foxe himself. In a 1570 preface to the *Acts and Monuments*, Foxe complains that 'bookes nowe seme rather to lacke Readers, then Readers to lacke bookes'.⁹² Foxe felt that he had to justify the purpose of adding to this overwhelming market.

The difficulties in using the monastic manuscript heritage were therefore more complex than the regularly recited generalisation that few people were interested.⁹³ The printed book had helped to move intellectual concerns into a wider framework and had already provided the opportunity to lift those specific interests which occupied scholars during the 1530s and 1540s out of manuscripts and into more readily available contemporary

⁹¹ Ann Blair, 'Reading Strategies for Coping with Information Overload ca. 1550-1700', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64:1 (2003), pp. 11-28.

⁹² *A&M*, 1570, *To the true and faithful congregation* [Prefaces], p. 9.

⁹³ This view is important to the arguments contained in the edited collection by Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (eds), *The uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700* (Cambridge, 2004).

books. The supposed Roman Catholic corruption of texts was also problematic, making the use of manuscripts difficult to authenticate within Protestant circles. Foxe certainly made a great deal of this point in his *Acts and Monuments*. Of monkish writers he wrote that 'in part they expres some truth in matters concerning the Bishops and Sea of Rome: yet in suppressing an other part, they play with us.' Foxe's solution was not to ignore manuscript chronicles but to provide a reliable guide to their work. He proposed faithfully to collect and reproduce monkish writings and 'open the plaine truth'.⁹⁴ As noted by Jennifer Summit, the re-location of 'monkish' books from the hidden and mysterious confines of monastic scriptoria, freed England's past and presented an opportunity to disassociate the textual archives from their monkish roots and to represent them instead as a liberated heritage.⁹⁵ Knowledge that had for centuries been kept under lock and key was once again available for consumption. Furthermore, the release of these materials from captivity confirmed the reformist beliefs that many writings from the past had been suppressed; history that supported an anti-papal agenda had, they believed, been conveniently forgotten. This then explains why the collaborative effort involving Foxe and Parker amongst many others was so interested in re-engaging with the manuscript heritage in the 1560s. The political and intellectual interests of the previous decades had moved on. Now there was not only a desire but also a need to popularise the historical foundations of English religious supremacy beyond what had already been achieved during the Henrician and Edwardian governments. There was a growing interest in the so-called primitive church, whose writings in Old English were believed to be untouched by later papal corruption. Medieval chronicles, removed from their monkish storehouses were re-examined with the agenda that elements of truth could be drawn out between the popish fabrications.

⁹⁴ *A&M*, 1570, *To the true and faithful congregation* [Prefaces], p. 2.

⁹⁵ Jennifer Summit, 'Monuments and Ruins: Spenser and the problem of the English Library', *English Literary History*, 7:1 (2003), pp. 1-34.

The printed books with their accumulation of extracts and paraphrases were therefore outdated. They no longer held the knowledge which popular scholarship demanded. The 1560s was therefore a decade when reformist scholars realised that to simply disregard the monastic manuscript heritage was no longer an option. Instead it was necessary to re-engage with a carefully constructed and methodical approach and agenda that would strip the 'lies' from the 'truth'.

3. Misunderstandings

In the twentieth century, historians tended to write of Foxe as producing a 'refreshingly modern approach' to documentation and history writing. However, as this chapter has highlighted and recent historiography has exposed, this interpretation is something of a misunderstanding.⁹⁶ That misunderstanding rests on the question of authorial intention and brings us, briefly, to more theoretical approaches to the study of historical texts. In the 1960s Quentin Skinner proposed that historians' approaches to the history of texts needed to move beyond a 'narrow' understanding of their meaning in terms of their internal coherence or their reference to a shared intellectual inheritance. Such an examination, based upon the text itself, could not reliably produce meaning without also considering what was possible to be thought and understood at the time, and which

⁹⁶ This quote is taken from Glanmor Williams, *The Reformation views of Church History* (London, 1970), p. 53. Other historians to present Foxe in broadly progressive terms include Haller, *The Elect Nation*. Haller's, largely denounced thesis argued that Foxe viewed England as an 'elect' nation state. While Fred J Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, 1967) does deal with the *Acts and Monuments* more on its own terms; it does not question the differences between their purposes and ours. May McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford, 1971), describes Foxe as bringing the 'right ideas' to his use of documents; inaccurately suggesting that his methods reflect modern standards. David Womersley, 'Against the Teleology of Technique', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68:1 (2005), pp. 95-108, who has attempted to bring sixteenth-century ecclesiastical scholarship back into the largely accepted political progressive history, is also emblematic of such approaches. Womersley claimed that he was removing the distortion inherent in our understanding. However, he made no attempt to question whether a progressive attitude is in itself a distortion, and therefore fell short of achieving his aims.

linguistic constructs were available for its expression.⁹⁷ Our investment of 'meaning' in a text necessarily, therefore, involves a contextualisation of it beyond the life or experience of the author in question. After Skinner came the even more challenging positions of Michel Foucault and Hayden White over the extent to which any 'meaning' could be objectively derived from historical narratives. These may serve as a reminder of how problematic and historicised issues of 'objectivity' and 'reliability' in historical texts have become.⁹⁸ Foxe, of course, proclaimed his work to be both 'objective' and 'reliable'. It is the single-minded pursuit of both these claims that made Foxe a 'revisionist' historian in the sixteenth century. To us, of course, Foxe appears now as neither 'objective' nor 'reliable'. But his adoption of an apocalyptic periodisation to sustain his truth-claims, his identification of the papacy as the Antichrist, his writing of history in the light of the doctrines, practices and outlook of the Reformed church were all ways by which he sought to proclaim that 'objectivity' and 'reliability' upon which his 'revisionist' history relied. This is not to suggest however, that Foxe's view was universally shared by his contemporaries. Part of the reason why the *Acts and Monuments* was written in the form that we know, was to challenge, by implication, those whom Foxe and his collaborators knew would seek to undermine these claims to the past.

These theoretical approaches to historical texts provide a useful perspective from which to approach Foxe's role in sixteenth-century historiography. The methodologies and agendas which Foxe and his associates relied upon to construct the *Acts and Monuments*

⁹⁷ Quentin Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory*, 8 (1969), pp. 3-53; reprinted, with further discussion in James Tully (ed.), *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and his critics* (Oxford, 1988).

⁹⁸ For an outline and criticism of Foucault's approach including that of Hayden White see Gary Gutting (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Foucault* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 2005); and Hayden White, *The Content of the Form; Narrative discourse and historical representation* (London, 1987).

can usefully be expressed by Skinner's definition of a textual 'mode' or 'form'.⁹⁹ Although this paradigm does not derive directly from sixteenth-century understanding of text, it is within such terms that modern historical realities can observe the intention behind such a book as the *Acts and Monuments*. For instance, both Daniel Woolf and Thomas Betteridge have shown that although there was a shift in the understanding of history in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was not one that should be conjugated with a progression towards modernity.¹⁰⁰ In Woolf's view the earlier sixteenth-century histories involved modes of thought similar to ours, but often not for the same purpose, or with the same intent. Purposes and intentions were far more complex than generally allowed for in our historical interpretations.¹⁰¹ The textual mode of late sixteenth-century writing contained elements which current historiography would consider 'retrograde' as well as those elements considered 'modern'. All too often these 'retrograde' aspects are denounced in an anachronistic fashion, which in turn, distorts our historicising of the purposes of sixteenth-century historical writing. Betteridge has taken this approach even further by ascribing a difference between 'modern' and 'early-modern' understandings of authorial intention. Sixteenth-century 'claim[s] to express the truth of the past' are related to a lack of strong authorial intention. As he puts it, in their view 'time passes, events happen, the chronicle is written, history is produced'.¹⁰² Betteridge also demonstrates, however, that in a time of conflict and change in politics and religion, there were demonstrable differences of opinion, manifest instabilities in what constituted the truth about the past; this instability was reflected in the writing of 'revisionist' history, whose truth-claims were accepted

⁹⁹ Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding', pp. 3-53; reprinted, with further discussion in Tully, *Meaning and Context*.

¹⁰⁰ See Daniel R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England; tradition, Ideology, and "The light of Truth" from the accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto, 1990) and Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformation*.

¹⁰¹ Daniel R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, p. xiii.

¹⁰² Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformation*, pp. 1-39.

because they were in tune with perceptions and cultural assumptions that were being more broadly cultivated or were in the process of being more generally accepted.

These understandings of textual 'meaning' indicate that we must avoid the temptation of measuring Foxe's revisionism in terms of a progression towards a mythical 'modernity'. Patrick Collinson has attempted to apply these new approaches to John Foxe, albeit with somewhat mixed results.¹⁰³ Collinson identifies the inadequate treatment of the texts' construction and 'truth' by historians who impose modern definitions by which to assess the text. He does so, however, by attempting to locate our truths in other elements of sixteenth century academia such as in antiquarianism. Various studies have also begun to identify a complex intersection of influences ranging from the accumulation of English and continental reformation history, martyrology and theology to the necessities of Elizabethan politics and belief. Although these separate studies have identified and highlighted these often-competing themes with an understanding of sixteenth-century methodology, the study of the interconnecting framework of Foxe's ecclesiastical history and its engagement with England's manuscript heritage still remains piecemeal.

For a text such as the *Acts and Monuments* the progressive examination of its content and construction is all the more misleading due to the nature of its transmission. As we have discussed, Foxe's readership quickly misinterpreted the organisational structure and method as martyrology. Further misrepresentation or perhaps more accurately re-appropriation of the text from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries has also heavily distorted not only our general understanding of the text, but also the actual contents of

¹⁰³ See Patrick Collinson, 'John Foxe as Historian', *VE* (2004).

the text itself. There is therefore a need to distinguish between intention and reception. Here the recent historiographical perceptions of Foxe as author are of use. Jesse Lander has used the term "Foxe" in quotation marks to distinguish authorship of the *Acts and Monuments* as a collective endeavour and to distinguish the editorial interventions for subsequent editions.¹⁰⁴ Patrick Collinson has described "Foxe" as a 'community of the text', reflecting the intervention of readership as well as the original authorial intent.¹⁰⁵ Devorah Greenberg has further broadened this meaning to encompass the nine editions of *Acts and Monuments*, the abridgements, the diatribes, the defences, and the commentaries produced in the 400 years since its conception.¹⁰⁶ For Greenberg the term "Foxe" along with *Acts and Monuments~Book of Martyrs* can be used as a methodological approach to provide a way of describing intention, reception and re-appropriation of the text. In terms of studying the pre-reformation portion of the book it is possible to simplify this paradigm to reflect a basic distinction. It is perhaps rather more useful to think of the *Acts and Monuments* as the text that was intended by "Foxe" as described by Lander, while the *Book of Martyrs* as the text that was received, re-appropriated and commented upon as described by Greenberg.¹⁰⁷ Although such terminology does not quite reflect all the communities of text described by Collinson and Greenberg it does allow for a straightforward distinction in which to frame the study of this sixteenth-century historical revision within the context of its textual mode.

Using this paradigm it becomes clear that until recently historians have not studied the *Acts and Monuments* but rather the *Book of Martyrs*. Thus, historical research of the

¹⁰⁴ Jesse Lander, 'Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', pp. 69-72.

¹⁰⁵ Patrick Collinson, 'John Foxe and National Consciousness', pp. 10-34.

¹⁰⁶ Greenberg, "'Foxe" as a Methodological Response', pp. 237-255.

¹⁰⁷ See Thomas S. Freeman, 'Fate, Faction and Fiction', pp. 601-623; Freeman, 'Texts, Lies and Microfilm', pp. 23-46; and John N. King, 'Fiction and Fact in Foxe's Book of Martyrs', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (London, 1997), pp. 12-35. Greenberg, 'Eighteenth-century "Foxe"', *VE* has suggested a similar distinction for John Foxe the man and 'Foxe' the legend.

twentieth century not only ignored the *Acts and Monuments* entirely but also misquoted the nineteenth-century edition of the *Book of Martyrs*. There was little realisation that to understand the *Book of Martyrs* it was necessary to trace its metamorphosis through the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth century editions, rather than rely only on Cattley's edition. Their study was the reception and re-appropriation of the text rather than the intention of Foxe and his companions. This is an important distinction and one that should continue to be emphasised. It must also be stressed that these textual modes were not necessarily fixed, nor in all cases rigidly accepted, just as current modes are often debated and disagreed upon. It is important, in other words, to avoid the trap described by Quentin Skinner of framing our interpretation of the text by a fully-formed expectation of any particular set of criteria.¹⁰⁸ An understanding of editorial process, analysis and purpose of texts, of publication and the nature of Foxe's comprehension of 'truth' and of accuracy is necessary to gain an understanding of what Foxe was doing in his methodology.

It is now possible to avoid the trap of focusing on the reception of the *Acts and Monuments* (as the *Book of Martyrs*), and to concentrate properly on each edition in its individual context. It is towards obtaining a clearer understanding of 'context' for the first two editions of the *Acts and Monuments*, which we shall next turn. The historiography, as discussed, leads us to certain conclusions concerning the reasons and consequences of transforming the *Acts and Monuments* from a commentary on the reformation into an ecclesiastical history focused on the whole of God's plan for humanity. Over the course of the next two chapters we shall explore how and why that development occurred and in particular the reasons for the *Acts and Monuments*

¹⁰⁸ Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding', pp. 3-53; reprinted, with further discussion in Tully, *Meaning and Context*, pp. 47-51.

becoming part of a collaborative process. The scholarship that gave a reason to engage with pre-reformation history in the way that Foxe did, and which made it possible to do so, will form the focus for this discussion.

Chapter Two

Collaborative History in the Reformation

I see a great heap and mass of things. I fear the material is shapeless.¹

Early in 1556 a Lutheran theological humanist, Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520-1575) wrote to a French legal humanist, François Baudouin (1520-1573) in an attempt to call upon his expert opinion and draw him into a collaborative venture to construct an ambitious ecclesiastical history. This history, largely compiled in Magdeburg and inherently entangled in the religious politics of the Empire, claimed to describe in a clear manner the 'idea of the Church of Christ' divided by individual centuries from the time of the Apostles to the present day.² As such the fourteen published volumes became known as the *Magdeburg Centuries*. Although the text was largely a success there was good reason for Baudouin's criticism that the material was 'a great heap and mass of things'. The decision to present materials in one hundred year blocks was a controversial organising structure largely divorced from any real meaning in terms of historical or scriptural exegesis. Some fifty years later the Jesuit theologian and papal

¹ *Magnam video rerum molem atque syluam. Vereor ne informis material sit.* François Baudouin to George Cassander (1 April 1558) as discussed and translated in Gregory B. Lyon, 'Baudouin, Flacius, and the Plan for the Magdeburg Centuries', *Journal of the History of Ideas* (2003), pp. 253-272. This letter has been published in full in Michael Erbe, 'François Baudouin und Georg Cassander. Dokumente einer Humanistenfreundschaft', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 40 (1978), pp. 542-3.

² The first *Century* was broken up into two volumes: one concentrating on Jesus Christ and the other on the Apostles. The title for the fourteen completed volumes is *Ecclesiastica Historia, integram Ecclesiae Christi ideam, quantum ad Locum, Propagationem, Persecutionem, Tranquillitatem, Doctrinam, Hæreses, Ceremonias, Gubernationem, Schismata, Synodos, Personas, Miracula, Martyria, Religiones extra Ecclesiam, & statum Imperii politicum attinet, secundum singulas Centurias, perspicuo ordine complectens: singulari diligentia & fide ex vetustissimis & optimis historicis, patribus, & aliis scriptoribus congesta: Per aliquot studiosos & pios viros in urbe Magdeburgicâ.* Lyon, 'Plan for the Magdeburg Centuries', p. 258 has translated the title, in abbreviated form, as *Ecclesiastical History, Describing in a Clear Manner According to Individual Centuries, the Integral Idea [integram ideam] of the Church of Christ.* All volumes were published in Basel between 1559-1574.

envoy, Antonio Possevino (1534-1611) would also exclaim that it was 'patched together, without base, without order'.³ Proper structure and methodology was essential to the successful presentation of history and there were various opinions in the mid-sixteenth century on how this could best be done.⁴

For the compilation of the *Acts and Monuments* similar concerns needed to be addressed and just as Flacius would come to rely on a collaborative team and an extended series of networks, so too would Foxe. The recognition that history, properly managed, could prove a powerful attack on papal claims to the antiquity of their church had not originated with the *Acts and Monuments* nor with Flacius' *Centuries*, yet both Foxe and Flacius were involved in the complex network of contacts and informants in which this particular formulation of history would emerge. Essential to their ideas was the reclaiming of a textual legacy, largely produced by members of the papal hierarchy. These old and dispersed manuscripts recording the events of Christendom across all realms and throughout all ages, both recent and distant, needed gathering, re-organising and collating. Their truth-claims lay hidden within a cobweb of papal corruptions, which led to the necessity of a more circumspect evaluation of source material and a re-evaluation of their approach to writing history. Such a task was immense and could not have occurred without the co-operation and organisation of a series of networks. It was, however, regarded as a worthwhile enterprise. The recovery and re-evaluation of source

³ Antonio Possevino, *Bibliotheca selecta* (Cologne, 1607); extracted and translated by Oliver K. Olson, *Matthias Flacius and the survival of Luther's Reform* (Wiesbaden, 2002), p. 261.

⁴ For instance, the development of the *Methodus*, concerned with the historiography of history by men such as Baudouin and Jean Bodin (1529/30-1596) exemplifies this heightened interest in providing a new methodological basis to history writing. The *Methodus* 'genre' first appeared in France during the 1560s-70s but was a result of ideas that were forming at least as early as the 1550s. See Donald R. Kelley, *Foundation of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law, and History in the French Renaissance* (New York, 1970).

material exerted a formidable argument boosting the reformist message at a time when the breakaway churches were under intensified attack and persecution.

The collaborative paradigm put forward by Patrick Collinson and others for the compilation of the *Acts and Monuments* cannot be understood without considering these wider concerns.⁵ The similar and not so similar use of methodology by sixteenth-century scholars and their shaping of old texts into a re-ordered argument provided a revitalised and revised authority for ancient authors within both a reformist and conservative context. Such an examination of a variety of scholarly networks and collaborative ventures does not lend itself to neatly categorised and static representations of late sixteenth-century historiography, as has often been attempted. Nevertheless, it provides a clearer understanding of the reasons behind the various and often contradictory elements within such texts as the *Acts and Monuments* and the *Magdeburg Centuries*.

The relationship between these two ecclesiastical histories is a case in point. In 1944 Matthew A. Fitzsimons - in what appears to be a throw-away comment - suggested that Foxe was a 'rather unworthy disciple of the Magdeburg Centuriators'.⁶ Such a statement ignores the interdependence of both texts and the co-dependence of their compilers and researchers. The *Acts and Monuments* was not a 'poor-man's *Centuries*' but a successful English adaptation of the same core philosophy. The nature of this

⁵ As discussed in chapter one of this thesis. See in particular Patrick Collinson, 'John Foxe and National Consciousness', in Christopher Highley and John N. King (eds), *John Foxe and His World* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 10-34.

⁶ Matthew A. Fitzsimons, 'Politics and men of learning in England, 1540-1640', *The Review of Politics*, 6:4 (1944), pp. 452-483. Quote on p. 457. A proper examination of the *Acts and Monuments*, however, suggests that nothing was further from the truth. Foxe, with his more concise and ordered approach, succeeded in his purpose to advertise his 'true' church to the English people just as well, or perhaps even better than the Centuriators were able to achieve in Germany with their large and complex volumes.

relationship has received almost no attention and yet the implications of such a study has the potential to be far-reaching, especially in identifying and confirming the nature and exegesis of a collaborative paradigm involved in the compilation of both projects. The activities of English exiles during the 1550s interlink with the efforts in Magdeburg and the participation of Matthew Parker (1504-1575) in his search for and publication of England's medieval and Saxon manuscripts throughout the 1560s and 1570s. Through an understanding of the interconnection of these networks it becomes clearer that Parker's interest in England's manuscript heritage was inspired by the Centuriators and that in turn, Parker inspired Foxe to transform his commentary of the reformation into England's version of the same project. The role of England's most prominent but aging bibliophile, John Bale (1495-1563), a future Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Grindal (1516/20-1583), a physician and archivist of Basel, Heinrich Pantaleon (1522-1595), the Queen's Chief Secretary, Sir William Cecil (1520/21-1598), and the first Anglo-Saxon scholars, Laurence Nowell (1530-c.1570) and William Lambarde (1536-1601) are prominent influences within these networks who were able to contribute to an academic atmosphere in which an English ecclesiastical history was produced in collaboration. The various contacts involved in the creation of the *Magdeburg Centuries* is therefore an appropriate place to begin this analysis of the collaborative paradigm, as it is here that a broader understanding of the processes behind the compilation of the *Acts and Monuments* can be contextualised and properly comprehended.

1. The *Magdeburg Centuries* (1552-1574)

The intention, as first expressed by Flacius to Casper von Nidbruck (1525-1557), counsellor in the Habsburg court of Vienna and constant supporter of the Magdeburg history project, was to produce a church history 'organised to show through a succession of ages how the true church and her religion declined to the worse from a first purity and simplicity that she had in the age of the Apostles'.⁷ Once Nidbruck had signified his interest, a collaborative '*collegium*' was assigned to help develop the methodology, to gather and organise materials, and relocate them into an organised pattern, which would then be reworked into a polished account of a Lutheran revisionist past. Although much of their material came through Nidbruck's own extensive collection, a wide-ranging programme of 'material-gathering' was organised from the outset. Utilising various contacts the '*collegium*' sent out a series of 'questionnaires' requesting information about the location of documents and pleas to borrow excerpts and copies of manuscripts and old books. A procedure was implemented and advertised to reassure potential donors that their materials would be returned. The Centuriators wished to defuse fears that their contacts might have in lending them their precious collections.⁸

A well-defined division of labour was also organised and funded. Two theologians, Johann Wigand (1523-1587) and Mattæus Judex (1528-1564), at first worked alongside Flacius as the principal organisers and then took charge of the project when Flacius

⁷ From an early 'planning paper' frequently called the *Scheda*, which Matthias Flacius Illyricus attached to his first known letter concerning the project to Casper von Nidbruck, dated 10 November 1552. This section on the utility of a history was translated by Ronald E. Diener, *The Magdeburg Centuries: A Bibliothecal and Historiographical Study* (Th.D dissertation, Harvard, 1979). Available from <http://rondiener.com/MCBK01.htm> [Accessed: November 2005], p. 174.

⁸ Despite their attempts to defuse these fears, the Centuriators nevertheless gained a reputation, probably fabricated by their enemies, of stealing books. See Diener, *The Magdeburg Centuries*, pp. 147-9.

moved to Jena.⁹ The *Magdeburg Centuries* were therefore a collaborative venture, which at the height of production involved seven excerptors to read sources and extract passages, two collectors to assess, arrange and rework the material into a coherent narrative and above them inspectors to judge the work. Five governors were ultimately responsible for the project, funding and organising its publication.¹⁰ This was therefore an ambitious and complex project fully engaged in seeking out ancient textual evidence and re-depositing it into a reformist historiographical narrative.

For Flacius, Wigand, Judex and their collaborative team, the history was intended as an oppositional statement to the Augsburg and Leipzig *Interims* of 1548.¹¹ Although Martin Luther's successor, Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560), had at first rejected Emperor Charles V's attempt at a religious settlement, he had finally conceded to various compromises considered unacceptable to the more 'radical' inheritors of Luther's ideology. The City of Magdeburg had been one of the few city states to reject the agreement and with Flacius acting as their principal proponent against the *Interim*, set itself up as an oppositional alternative to Melanchthon's conciliation. The Centuriators' history project was therefore not only intended as a powerful refutation of the Papal Church but as a vehicle in which an anti-*Interim* and anti-Melanchthon message could be advocated. It is for these reasons that Caspar von Nidbruck agreed to support the project with advice and research materials.¹² For François Baudouin, however, the

⁹ A large portion of Diener, *The Magdeburg Centuries*, concentrates on the role of Matthias Flacius Illyricus once the project had developed beyond its initial conception. Diener suggests that Flacius was not involved in the day-to-day production of the volumes and more than likely increasingly had very little to do with the project. Despite Flacius' name continuing to appear on the title pages of the *Centuries*, Wigand, Judex and the project appear to have parted ways with Flacius in 1561.

¹⁰ Lyon, 'Plan for the Magdeburg Centuries', p. 259.

¹¹ For an outline of the *Interim* and its effect on the reformation and on the relationship between Flacius and Melanchthon, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (London, 2003), pp. 270-3, 349-350.

¹² When Nidbruck replied to Flacius' first letter concerning the ecclesiastical history, he stated that 'I recognise that I owe this to God and to the Church that according to my talent I devote my labours to the

Magdeburg Centuries represented an opportunity for him to push forward his own theoretical approaches to the writing of history and his own methodological approach to source authentication.

The Centuriators took years to work out a methodology and Baudouin's input was welcomed even if it did not form the final basis for the history. In 1552 Flacius had also written to the Lutheran minister of Frankfurt, Hartmann Beyer (1516-1577) claiming that the proposed church history would be produced 'in a certain order and in sequence' suggesting that at least for a time a chronological rendering of history was far from impossible.¹³ Baudouin, like Flacius, viewed history as 'universal', concentrating on a factual and truthful account which could reveal how and when various changes had entered the church. However, Flacius and the Centuriators wished to write a history entirely removed from the more traditional concept of using past events as allegorical *exempla*, which would illuminate and examine present day issues without much concern to the authenticity of the account. Baudouin continued to view history as a comparison to contemporary events. He called his methodology 'integral' history, reflecting its basis in law and universal temporality and geography.¹⁴ His method necessitated a chronological ordering to history within the context of location and time. The idea behind the Centuriators' work seemed an appropriate opportunity to present these theories. However, it was through an alliance with Melanchthon that Baudouin's

propagation of truth things'. Nidbruck had amassed a large 'Lutheran' library and was able to search for documents from places as diverse as Italy, Gaul, Poland, Spain, and Turkey. See Olson, *Matthias Flacius*, p. 259.

¹³ For the translation of this letter dated to 1552, see Olson, *Matthias Flacius*, p. 152 and C. Scott Dixon, 'Faith and History on the Eve of Enlightenment: Ernst Salomon Cyprian, Gottfried Arnold, and the History of Heretics', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 57:1 (2006), pp. 33-54. Neither Olson or Dixon consider the likelihood that Flacius' original intention for the ordering of the history was entirely different than the thematic order eventually decided upon. Diener, *The Magdeburg Centuries*, parts 1-3 has clearly shown that the methodological decisions were decided over a period of years and after much negotiation and consideration.

¹⁴ See Anthony Grafton, *What was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007), ch. 2.

methodology and ideology finally became intertwined. The methodology employed by Melanchthon in his famous restructuring of a chronicle first composed by John Carion acted in direct opposition to the approach and ideology promoted by Flacius, and more closely agreed with Baudouin's ideas.¹⁵

Although Baudouin never accepted Flacius' request to play an active role in the compilation of the *Centuries*, throughout the following year he continued to put forward these concerns on how best to achieve their aim. As can be seen, however, in his letter of 1558 to the Flemish theologian George Cassander (1513-1566), Baudouin's relationship with the Centuriators was fraught with problems.¹⁶ Although the Centuriators had taken note of Baudouin's concerns over source authentication, they largely ignored his call for context in the form of merging ordinary 'secular' history with ecclesiastical history to better frame the historical events of the church. His response to a draft of the first volume was less than complimentary and a year later he can be seen as distancing himself somewhat from the project. In a dedicatory epistle to a small tract on *The Edicts of Ancient Roman Rulers Concerning Christians* (1557), Baudouin publicly revealed his provision of advice and materials to the Centuriators, but only in the past tense. In doing so, he was publicly stressing the closure of his advisory role before the first publication of the *Centuries*. Thus, his material compiled into the first volume could be compared to his own presentation of that same material – a public litmus test for the Centuriators accuracy. The definite end of any co-operation

¹⁵ Published as Philip Melanchthon, *Chronicon Carionis expositum et auctum* (Wittenberg, 1532). Philip Melanchthon was the first to revise Carion's chronicle, but not the last. This text quickly became a key polemical weapon between the various confessional divisions. See Donald R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship*, p. 129; Katherine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 14-23; and Avihu Zakai, 'Reformation, History, and Eschatology in English Protestantism', *History and Theory*, 26:3 (1987), pp. 300-318, for details. Philip Melanchthon was the first to revise Carion's chronicle, but not the last. This text quickly became a key polemical weapon between the various confessional divisions.

¹⁶ Lyon, 'Plan for the Magdeburg Centuries', p. 270.

occurred when Baudouin and Flacius fell out over ideological matters after the failure of the Colloquy of Worms (September 1557) to unite the Lutheran fractions. Where Baudouin had called for unity, Flacius had responded with intolerance.

In this context Baudouin's complaint that the material 'is shapeless' refers to his own disputes with the Magdeburg compilers and his growing agreement with Melancthon's ideology of conciliation. It was a familiar complaint. After the publication of the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* the Roman Catholic theologian Thomas Stapleton (1538-1598) accused Foxe, amongst various points of contention, of producing his material 'so confusely and unordered'.¹⁷ Thus Foxe too shared the accusation of failing to provide a strong and compelling narrative. This is not all that Foxe and the Centuriators shared. The *Centuries* acted as a main source for the account of ten persecutions by the Roman Emperors in Book One of the 1570 edition.¹⁸ It could also be argued that the presence of Eusebian methodology in the *Acts and Monuments* was inspired by the Centuriators' work.¹⁹

Flacius, the Centuriators, Baudouin and Foxe all shared the acceptance of a Eusebian methodology and approach to ecclesiastical history. It was, of course, a humanist and reformist appropriation of the Eusebian model situated within a growing re-evaluation of the purpose and method of historical writing and its factual presentation as relevant to contemporary events. For Foxe and other English scholars writing in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign the presence of Eusebius is most clearly illuminated and explained

¹⁷ Thomas Stapleton, *A Counterblast to M. Hornes vayne blaste against M. Fekenham* (Leuven, 1567), p. 59.

¹⁸ As stated in chapter one of this thesis, Foxe's reliance on the *Centuries* was not recognised by Michael S. Pucci, 'Reforming Roman Emperors: John Foxe's characterisation of Constantine in the Acts and Monuments', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 29-51.

¹⁹ See chapter one of this thesis for a discussion of Eusebius.

through an understanding of the interconnectivity of networks and collaborative enterprises. This brings us to a branch of Matthew Parker's scholarly 'circle': the appropriation of history by lawyers interested in historical precedence and historiographical methodology. Baudouin's interest, application of history and methodology, was primarily concerned with legal authority. At the same time, in England, the increased importance of Old English manuscripts and the appropriation of the Anglo-Saxon past for ecclesiastical purposes evolved in unison with a growing interest in the old law codes.

In placing Foxe and the *Acts and Monuments* into the context of these networks we begin to see how there might be direct and indirect links between the Centuriators' work and the achievements of early Elizabethan scholarship. It also highlights the fact that these links were complex, mutable and expansive, involving a number of contacts and influences outside of ecclesiastical interests, co-dependent intellectual and affective relationships linked to college, church, cultural, geographical and political institutions and a reliance on a shared scholarly apparatus. In summary, studying the *Acts and Monuments* within the context of networks produces a broad spectrum of possibilities, which by necessity needs to be anchored in some way to enable a meaningful analysis. In the case of Foxe, it is his relationship with John Bale that continually locates him and his work within that collaborative framework.

2. The Marian Exile (1554-1559)

i. An exiled community

Sometime after first meeting and befriending John Bale in Mountjoy House, John Foxe began work on his first commentary of the reformation, the *Commentarii* (1554). Previously Foxe's literary interests had been confined to educational tracts, translations of reformist literature and a controversial discourse on the nature of capital punishment and excommunication.²⁰ Bale provided inspiration for Foxe and access to his manuscripts. In particular, he lent Foxe his collection of Lollard papers, the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* so that he could both expand his conception of the reformation and historicize his interest in religious laws concerning the death penalty. Foxe himself announced in the *Acts and Monuments* that he saw Leland's catalogues in Bale's hands (probably when they were living at Mountjoy House), suggesting that they were discussing together Bale's idea for a published catalogue.²¹ This expansion of Foxe's early interests into historical writing would eventually become the basis for his *Acts and Monuments*. Moreover, Bale continued throughout his life to influence Foxe's endeavours and his expanded catalogue of English writers, the *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytannie...Catalogus* (1557-9), would form the basis of much of Foxe's own

²⁰ For Foxe's educational tracts, see John G. Rechlin, 'John Foxe's Comprehensive Collection of Commonplaces', *SCJ*, 9:1 (1978), pp. 83-9. Foxe published translations of Martin Luther, *A frutfull sermon of the moost euangelicall wryter M. Luther* (London, 1548), Johann Oecolampadius, *A sermon of Ihon Oecolampadius to yong men and maydens* (London, 1548) and Urbanus Regius, *An instruccyon of Christen fayth howe to be bolde vp on the promyse of God and not to doubte of our saluacyon* (London, 1548). On the more controversial subject of capital punishment, Foxe suggested that execution should not be used for adultery in his *De non plectendis morte adulteri consultatio* (London, 1548). A year later the prolific author and reformer George Joye (1490/5-1553) published a rebuttal entitled *A contrary to a certain mans consultation* (London, 1549). As an extension of these debates and in an attempt to influence policy concerning the proposed reintegration of excommunication into the English church, Foxe published *De censura seu excommunicatione* (London, 1550).

²¹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 6, p. 830. This evidence was drawn to my attention from John Bale, *Index Britanniae Scriptorum: John Bale's Index of British and other writers*, edited by Reginald Lane Poole and Mary Bateson, with an introduction by Caroline Brett and James P. Carley (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1990), p. xiv fn. 14.

historical account. Bale's concept of an apocalyptic pattern to history would form the basic foundation in which Foxe moulded his version of the past. Bale also informed his re-evaluation of the reign of King John. Bale was present when Foxe produced his second commentary, the *Rerum* (1559). He was also available for consultation and was perhaps actually researching and writing for Foxe during the latter's compilation of the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. During his time in exile for opposing the *Six Articles* of Henry VIII, Bale had become England's most renowned scholar on the continent. He had made contacts with men such as Flacius and Nidbruck and the famed Basel printer, Johann Oporinus (1507-1568) to name but a few. This is an important and often overlooked aspect of the Foxe-Bale relationship – Bale's ability to provide a conduit for Foxe into reformist networks that could and would characterise much of his future work. If, as suggested by various historians, Bale was a disciple of the antiquary John Leland (c.1503-1552), then Foxe was unquestionably the disciple of John Bale.²²

The Foxe-Bale relationship developed during the latter years of the 1550s when both men were forced into exile following the accession of Mary I. It was in Frankfurt and Basel that Foxe's reformation project developed and came into sharper focus as a reformist polemical tool. Not long after publishing the *Commentarii* in Strasbourg, Foxe became involved in the Frankfurt controversies over the status of the Edwardian prayer book. Although Foxe sided with the controversialist and future founder of the Scottish church, John Knox (c. 1514-1572), it is perhaps a sign of his relative equanimity that he was able also to befriend Edmund Grindal who had argued for the

²² See in particular chapter one of May McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford, 1971) and the biographies of Leslie P. Fairfield, *John Bale Mythmaker for the English Reformation* (Oregon, 1976) and Peter Happé, *John Bale* (New York, 1996). The possibility that John Bale actually wrote the account of King John in the *Acts and Monuments* was put forward by Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Bale's Book of Martyrs?: The Account of King John in Acts and Monuments', *Reformation*, 3 (1998), pp. 175-223.

opposing side.²³ Grindal, who was about to ascend to the bishopric of London when Edward VI died, appears to have stayed almost exclusively in Strasbourg during his exile.²⁴ There was a good reason for this. Grindal's earliest biographer, John Strype was the first to stress that Strasbourg was the perfect location for Grindal's activities. Patrick Collinson is in agreement, stressing that Grindal was able to work there in co-operation with other exiled reformers such as the theologian Thomas Becon (1512/3-1567), the future Bishop of Salisbury John Jewel (1522-1571), the future Archbishop of York and childhood friend of Grindal, Edwin Sandys (c. 1519-1588) and the former Bishop of Winchester John Ponet (c. 1514-1556).²⁵ From Strasbourg the English exiles were able to maintain good connections with their contacts still in England as well as expanding their range of continental contacts via reformists such as Peter Martyr (1499-1562) and Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575). They were able to smuggle out of England various materials concerning their 'martyred' friends for the purpose of organising a 'campaign' of polemical literature intended for both a continental market and a subversive attack in England against the policies of Queen Mary.

Strasbourg however, whilst providing an excellent base for amassing materials was not so open to publishing the results.²⁶ During the 1550s, Basel was the most opportune

²³ Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (London, 1979), p. 78 pictures Grindal and Foxe as promoters of concord during the Frankfurt affair. Despite taking opposing sides in the controversy, they appear to have found a respect for one another that led to their close co-operation in the '*Martyrum Historia*' project.

²⁴ Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p. 72 believes that Grindal may have spent a year in Wesselheim to learn the Germanic language and customs. Other than this period between May 1555 and May 1556, documentation shows that Grindal otherwise remained in Strasbourg. Several letters suggests that he had planned to visit Basel at some point, but never achieved this aspiration.

²⁵ John Strype, *The History of the Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund Grindal, the first Bishop of London, and the Second Archbishop of York and Canterbury successively, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1710) and Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, pp. 80-81. It is, however, uncertain who exactly worked directly on the *Martyrum Historia* project although various contacts can be determined through correspondence. The project should be understood as a process of inter-related networks with only a few people directly involved in its production.

²⁶ Miriam Usher Chrisman, 'Reformation printing in Strasbourg, 1519-60', in Jean-François Gilmont (ed.) and Karia Maag (trans.), *The Reformation and the Book* (London, 1998), pp. 214-233 and Jean-

location for having the freedom to print on various controversial doctrines from almost any side in the confessional divide. It was the most appropriate location for the publication of folio books at a time when most publishers of the region were printing in octavo. Basel had also created a niche for itself as a centre for international and vernacular publications.²⁷ Significantly for Foxe, it was also the resting place of the famed humanist scholar, Desiderius Erasmus (c.1467-1536) and the most prolific publishing location for his texts. Throughout his life Foxe continued to hold Erasmus in high regard. Most notably, upon fleeing abroad Foxe had taken a detour to Erasmus' birthplace of Rotterdam.²⁸ It would perhaps not be going too far to suggest that Foxe, in part, travelled to Basel to see for himself the final resting place of Erasmus. However, the larger purpose appears to lie in a happy coincidence in which Grindal's machinations neatly fitted with the purposes of John Bale, whose role and importance in these events will be discussed shortly. Foxe was 'sent' to Basel by Grindal so that he could work for the printer Johann Oporinus as a contact for the English exiles working in Strasbourg.²⁹

François Gilmont, 'Three border cities: Antwerp, Strasbourg and Basle', in Jean-François Gilmont (ed.) and Karia Maag (trans.), *The Reformation and the Book* (London, 1998), pp. 184-187.

²⁷ Peter G. Bietenholz, 'Printing and the Basle Reformation, 1517-65', in Jean-François Gilmont (ed.) and Karia Maag (trans.), *The Reformation and the Book* (London, 1998), pp. 235-263.

²⁸ Thomas S. Freeman, 'Foxe, John (1516/17-1587)', *ODNB* (2004).

²⁹ See forthcoming Thomas S. Freeman and Elizabeth Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, chapter 3. Thomas S. Freeman and Elizabeth Evenden kindly allowed me access to a draft copy. They conjecture that Foxe went to Basel because Bale was already there or was planning to reside there. This is a good interpretation of the evidence but perhaps does not give quite enough credit to Foxe's collaborative connection to Grindal, which was most likely to have been established during or before the Frankfurt controversies. It was important for the English exiles to have contacts working in the Basel printers, especially for Foxe, who could carry out polemical work of his own as well as promote their interests to the local printers and booksellers.

ii. *The Grindal Project*

Grindal's project, the '*Martyrum historia*', was to be organised as a collaborative venture amongst the English exiles in Strasbourg and Basel. From Strasbourg Grindal and his colleagues were to work on smuggled accounts of the Marian martyrs to produce a vernacular memorial to their fallen brethren as a type of 'propaganda' tool intended for smuggling back into England. The material was then to be passed on to Foxe in Basel for incorporation into a Latin edition designed for distribution to a continental market. Grindal had access to an underground network in Strasbourg and was able to smuggle letters, disputations and treatises out of England.³⁰ He could therefore play a key role in gathering together a picture of Marian persecution. Once completed it was intended that the two editions would then be simultaneously published sometime in the summer of 1556 through the printers at Zurich.³¹ As Grindal wrote 'for so it was arranged, that by a division of labour certain persons should manage this business.'³² The 'business' however, was never completed. The documents were harder to gather than originally supposed and other matters often distracted the collaborative effort in Strasbourg.³³

Nevertheless, although Grindal's project never reached completion during the exile period, Foxe's *Rerum* is, broadly, a result of this project combined with his previous *Commentarii*. Furthermore, evidence exists which suggests that Foxe did not work on

³⁰ Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p. 80.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 81; Andrew Pettegree, 'The Latin Polemic of the Marian Exiles', in James Kirk (ed.), *Humanism and reform: the Church in Europe, England and Scotland, 1400-1643: essays in honour of James K. Cameron*, *Subsidia* 8, (1991), pp. 310-11.

³² Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p. 81

³³ Although this particular project was never completed, it does represent the general emphasis of exile print literature concentrating on both English and continental scholarship. Over the six-year period more than 120 vernacular tracts and pamphlets were published and smuggled into England while at least forty different works and fifty editions were published in Latin for a continental readership. See Pettegree, 'The Latin Polemic of the Marian Exiles'.

the project in Basel alone. Foxe appears to have lived in a *collegium* at a former convent attached to the church of St Clara (the Clarakloster). This former dormitory that had once belonged to the disbanded nuns of St Clara would become home to various English exiles, including Foxe's friends Laurence Humphrey (1525/7-1589) and John Bale.³⁴ Seemingly as part of the agreement, the English exiles were also signed up for courses at the University of Basel.³⁵ For Foxe at least contact to the University must have been more than a simple guarantee of accommodation. He became friends with Heinrich Pantaleon, who we shall come to shortly, as well as the University chancellor Boniface Amerbach (1495-1562). Amerbach would act as godfather to Foxe's second daughter. As further evidence of their close relationship, Foxe would present to Amerbach on behalf of the 'young men of your university' his commonplace book inscribed '*Locorum communium Logicalium tituli et ordinationes 150 Basel, 1557*'.³⁶

At the same time as Foxe worked on Grindal's project, Bale worked on the second expanded version of his catalogue of English writers, while Foxe himself also

³⁴ Christina H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles: A study in the origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 55 has suggested that the current Kirche [church] of St Clara built in 1973 appears to be a fair re-construction of the previous nunnery as compared to the map of Basel produced by Matthæus Merian in 1615. This map can be found in Staatsarchiv, Basel. The Basel archives show that in 1557 the kloster was rented for £24 per year to 'die Engelender'. It included a refectory, dormitory and chapel, thereby giving the English exiles a self-contained environment in which to live and worship. However, as recorded by John F. Mozley, *John Foxe and his Book* (London, 1940), p. 50 and Paul Schniewind, *Anglicans in Switzerland* (Berne, 1992), p. 69 the authorities appear to have demanded that the English maintain a relationship to the nearby church of St Theodor. It was here that Foxe's newborn baby, Christiana, was baptised and where another English exile, John Bartholomew, was buried. A memorial tablet still lies within the church. There has been suggestions, most recently by John N. King, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 76-7, that Foxe and his family resided at Oporinus' print house at least before 1557. There is no evidence of this and although there is similarly no evidence that Foxe resided at the Clarakloster before 1557, it would nonetheless seem to be the more likely option especially since the Clarakloster and St Theodor's Church were in the same district (indeed within a few minutes walk of one another). Oporinus' print house was on the other side of the river, and Foxe also worked for the printer Froben when he first arrived at Basel, making it seem less likely that he would reside at Oporinus' house.

³⁵ Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p. 56.

³⁶ A letter from John Foxe to Boniface Amerbach dated to 25 November 1556 as printed in Hastings Robinson (ed. & trans.), *The Zurich Letters comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and others with some of the Helvetian Reformers during the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge, 1845), p. 767.

researched the German (Lutheran) martyrs in hopes of producing a second volume of his *Commentarii*. To put this research into perspective, Andrew Pettegree has described Foxe and Bale as 'the most prolific of the English authors' in exile.³⁷ Whilst working at Oporinus' print house they saw through the press various polemical tracts including Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* (1556) and the first four volumes of the *Magdeburg Centuries*. Bale himself also claimed to have played a significant role in Flacius' project, and it might have been for this reason that Bale arrived at Basel and worked for Oporinus.³⁸ Foxe is known to have had an interest in old manuscripts as early as his first encounter with Bale in the 1540s and there is no reason to believe that he would not have also had a hand in producing Bale's catalogue. A cursory look at the epistles and poems that preface Bale's publications during this time clearly shows that they were not working in an intellectual vacuum but largely through Bale's connections, with an extensive network of colleagues from various parts of Christendom.³⁹ The epistles in Bale's *Catalogus* provide a window into some of these contacts. Both Johann Oporinus and Heinrich Pantaleon wrote epistles for the work but so did local scholars such as Jacob Hartlein (d. 1564), schoolmaster of St Peter's church in Basel, and William Xylander (1532-1576), a Greek professor at Basel University.⁴⁰ Furthermore, evidence provided by Heinrich Pantaleon suggests that at least he and Bale were working together on Foxe's Lutheran project.

³⁷ Andrew Pettegree, 'The Latin Polemic of the Marian exiles', pp. 305-329.

³⁸ In the forthcoming Freeman and Evenden, *Religion and the Book*, chapter. 3 they have unearthed evidence of Bale's relationship to Casper von Nidbruck and Alexander Alesius in the 1550s as well as providing the suggestive conjecture that Flacius had delayed the publication of his *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* to take into account Bale's knowledge of old writers. Olsen, *Matthias Flacius*, pp. 36-7 has shown that Flacius and Bale shared documents of Baptista Mantuanus and the 'goliards' (The apocalypse of Bishop Golias), which were witty songs created by clerics in the thirteenth century. See Leo Piepho, 'Mantuan's Eclogues in the English Reformation', *SCJ*, 25:3 (1994), pp. 623-632. They also shared a thirteenth-century verse entitled *utar contra vitia* by Walter of Chatilla and the biography of Walter Mapes.

³⁹ It should be noted that neither of John Foxe's Latin commentaries (the *Commentarii* and *Rerum*) contained dedicatory material.

⁴⁰ John Bale, *Catalogus*, f. A3-B2.

Pantaleon was a physician, theologian, historian and archivist. In 1556 he was elevated to a chair in natural philosophy and continued to teach and practise in his numerous occupations.⁴¹ He published various German translations including Martin Kromer's *De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum*.⁴² He also produced an ecclesiastical history in 1560 entitled *Chronographia Ecclesiae Christianae* and a history of the famous men of 'Germany' in 1566, which took the form of a series of biographies depicting the heroes and famous men from Germany's ancient and more recent past.⁴³ However, as stated by Martin Möhle, Pantaleon was less an historian and more of a specialist in University administration. In 1559 he catalogued 190 manuscripts and 575 printed books for the newly built library.⁴⁴ It incorporated the collections from the old University library as well as the newly gathered collections from Basel's dissolved monasteries and churches. Pantaleon continued to add to and amend the catalogue at least until 1583. He was also involved in general faculty administration and, significantly, organisation of student lodgings.⁴⁵ It is therefore not difficult to understand the connection of Pantaleon to Bale and Foxe. He may have been involved in providing accommodation for the English exiles at the Clarakloster and more conclusively shared an interest in the archival recording of old manuscripts and in the writing of history.⁴⁶ His position as

⁴¹ Martin Möhle et al (eds), *Treffenliche schöne Biecher – Hans ungnads Büchergeschenk und die universitäts bibliothek Basel im 16 Jahrhundert* (Basel, 2005), pp. 108-115.

⁴² Martin Kromer, *De Origine et rebus gestis Polonorum*, translated by Heinrich Pantaleon (Basel, 1555).

⁴³ Heinrich Pantaleon, *Chronographia Christianae Ecclesiae* (Basel, 1560) and Heinrich Pantaleon, *Prosopographiae heroum atque illustrium virorum totius Germaniae* (3 vols., Basel, 1566). According to Möhle, *Treffenliche schöne Biecher*, p. 109 Pantaleon used his administrative role to retrospectively insert his and his family's biography into the history of the University.

⁴⁴ Möhle, *Treffenliche schöne Biecher*, pp. 105-107.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

⁴⁶ Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p. 56 suggests that the Clarakloster had been taken over by the University as student lodgings following Basel's reformation. Therefore, in his role as administrator Pantaleon would have helped find accommodation for students. Furthermore, Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p. 157, citing Grindal's biographer, John Strype, has suggested that Foxe wrote the original appeal for asylum by the English exiles to the Town Council. Strype suggests that he was chosen for his elegant writing style. However Frederick A. Norwood, 'The Marian Exiles: Denizens or Sojourners?', *Church History*, 13:2 (1944), pp. 100-110 showed that the assertion that the exiles were in a 'wretched condition' was not true.

University librarian made him an invaluable contact for Bale and Foxe, whom Pantaleon would later call his *amicus singularis*.⁴⁷

iii. Heinrich Pantaleon and the *Commentarii pars Secunda*

When Foxe returned to England in 1559 he is usually described as having left his Lutheran project with Pantaleon, who published it as the *Commentarii pars Secunda*. However, it is highly significant that Pantaleon had it published on the same day as the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.⁴⁸ In the preface Pantaleon stated that Foxe, whilst he was an exile in Basel, had worked with him and ‘a number of Dr. Foxe’s friends’ to produce the second volume of the *Commentarii* which ‘describes the affairs of the martyrs across realms and nations’.⁴⁹ He specifically highlighted the help of John Bale and a ‘bookseller’ (probably either Johann Oporinus or his colleague Nicholas Brylingers who published many of Pantaleon’s books). Indeed Bale’s *Catalogus*, published in Basel in 1559, included a dedication from Pantaleon that highlighted the worth of English writers.⁵⁰ This evidence correlates well with a series of letters between Foxe and Heinrich Bullinger concerning the gathering of Lutheran martyr materials at this time. On 13 May 1559 Foxe, while still occupied with his *Rerum*, wrote to Bullinger to ask for his knowledge on ‘events which have happened in your

It is therefore conceivable that Foxe, who was one of the few that were truly impoverished, may well have been chosen partly for that reason. Either way, Foxe’s potential role in the appeal provides a possible direct link to Pantaleon as a contact. The appeal of the English exiles has been printed by Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, pp. 358-9.

⁴⁷ Hans Buscher, *Heinrich Pantaleon und sein Heldenbuch* (Basel, 1946), p. 85.

⁴⁸ The full title is Heinrich Pantaleon, *Martyrum Historia Hoc Est Maximarvm Per Evropam persecvtionvm ac sanctorvm Dei Martyrum, cærarum que rerum insignium, in Ecclesia Christi postremis & periculosus his temporibus gestarum, atque certo consilio per Regna & Nationes distribuarum, Commentarii. pars Secunda* (Basel, 1563).

⁴⁹ Pantaleon, *Commentarii pars Secunda*, p. 4. My translation from the Latin ‘...quo per regna et nationes, res Martyrum describa(n)tur’.

⁵⁰ John Bale, *Catalogus*, f. B2.

own neighbourhood, noting at least the names of the individuals and the places'.⁵¹ On 17 June of the same year he asked for information on Zwingli so that he could print it either in England or 'if it cannot be done' by the printers of Germany'.⁵² Then on 2 August and 26 September he repeated his request for information.⁵³

The last of these letters to survive was sent in September, thus shortly after Foxe had published his *Rerum* and close to the time when Foxe is known to be back in England. The letter dated 17 June suggests that Foxe was already considering producing an account featuring Zwingli, which he hoped might be published in England. It would appear that this proved impossible and, with his imminent return home, Foxe entrusted Pantaleon to publish it through the German printers as he had hinted he might to Bullinger. Again the close co-operation and collaboration with Oporinus is evident. Oporinus was not just a printer but also a well-regarded scholar having worked previously as a professor of Latin and Greek at the University of Basel.⁵⁴ In 1562 he wrote to Foxe in England asking whether Foxe intended to contribute anything more to the *Commentarii pars Secunda*. Freeman and Evenden suggest that Foxe's response was both rapid and negative, as Foxe was not credited with authorship.⁵⁵ However, this does not necessarily mean that Foxe had abandoned the project entirely, or that he did not provide materials. It does not even necessarily mean that he ceased to provide any written accounts of his own. It only suggests that he was no longer the chief compiler

⁵¹ John Foxe to Henry Bullinger, May 13 1559, Basel, in Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, pp. 25-6.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 35-6.

⁵³ Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, pp. 41-3.

⁵⁴ Martin Steinman, *Johannes Oporinus Ein Basler Buchdrucker um die Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Basel, 1967), pp. 9-17.

⁵⁵ In the forthcoming book by Freeman and Evenden, *Religion and the Book*, chapter 3, a letter written by Johann Oporinus to John Foxe in September 1562 is described as resulting in a negative response. Oporinus had asked Foxe if he had any intentions of contributing to the work. Freeman and Evenden do, however, admit that Foxe did contribute some of the material for the *Commentarii pars Secunda*. Foxe also borrowed from Pantaleon various accounts including his material from Ludwig Rabus's martyrology, which was written in French and was therefore beyond his abilities to read directly.

of the book. The distinction is important in understanding both Foxe's conception of the collaborative project that he was involved in, as well as his reasoning behind claiming the role of 'gatherer' rather than 'author' for the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. In the preface to the *Commentarii pars Secunda* Pantaleon had left a hint that this was not the end of Foxe's involvement in the project. He explained that the book had been published 'on this fixed day' and that a request had been made which had persuaded him to publish the work that year.⁵⁶ The publication date of 20 March 1563 for both the *Commentarii pars Secunda* and the *Acts and Monuments* was far from arbitrary. Firstly, it meant that the second volume of the *Commentarii/Rerum* would be ready in time for the next Frankfurt Book Fair. This was the most important factor in preparing publications for print in Basel. They were timed to coincide with the two yearly Frankfurt fairs. Secondly, March represented the end of the year. Therefore Pantaleon's claim that he was persuaded to publish that year and that it coincided with the publication of the *Acts and Monuments* suggest that Pantaleon, Oporinus and Foxe had made an agreement to be ready by the end of that year so that they could produce a joint publication in support of the reformist camp.

This suggests that in the early 1560s Foxe was involved in the production of two inter-related texts, which he conceived as being part of the same project – one for an English market and one for a continental market. There is further evidence at the end of the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, which suggests that Foxe continued to hope and plan an incorporation of the *Commentarii pars Secunda* into an English edition. After briefly writing that in order to touch on 'the great styres and alterations which

⁵⁶ Full quote states that 'we hoped that this second part would be either by himself [John Foxe] or certain other amateur historians brought to light on this fixed day'. My translation from the Latin 'expectauimus subinde hactenus quando tande(m) secu(n)da pars uel ab ipso, uel ab alio quodam Historiarum amatorein lucem prodicet'. Although the request for haste may have been Oporinus' desire to see the book published and to start making a profit, the timing is nonetheless more than coincidental.

have happened in other foreine nations' he required 'an other Volume by it selfe'. Foxe stated his intention to produce another book or a new section in which he could achieve the narration of such matters.⁵⁷

This evidence reveals two important pieces of information. First, that Foxe had been part of an exiled community in *collegium* that had worked on martyrological, polemical and historical texts in collaboration. Second, that Foxe did not simply leave his Lutheran project with Pantaleon but continued to view it as an essential element of a larger collaborative project in which the *Acts and Monuments* was only one other part. Foxe viewed his work as a project to promote conversion and further inform those already converted across the whole of Christendom. William Haller's thesis claimed that Foxe saw the English church as an 'elect nation', but this view has been largely replaced by historians who have claimed that Foxe's conception of the Christian church was that of a universal church across nations and times.⁵⁸ On this occasion, Foxe's subject matter was largely that of the English church. However, in collaboration with his friends in Basel, Foxe was conceiving of his project in much wider terms than have previously been suggested. In 1563 Foxe wrote about the English church in England while Pantaleon worked on the German church in Basel. Less well known is that in 1559, as part of the same project, Foxe had attempted and almost managed to get his *Rerum* translated into French.⁵⁹ Furthermore, in the preface to the *Commentarii pars*

⁵⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 12, p. 2296. Although Thomas Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-83* (Aldershot, 1999), p. 191 fn. 65 mentions this aspiration no connection to Heinrich Pantaleon is recognised. However, when considering Pantaleon's remarks in his preface to the *Commentarii pars Secunda* and that both this book and the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* were published on the same date it would seem reasonable to suggest that Foxe was here referring to a desire to publish an English vernacular edition of the Lutheran *Commentarii*. For details, see Buscher, *Heinrich Pantaleon*, p. 88.

⁵⁸ See William Haller, *Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" and the Elect Nation* (London, 1963) also supported in Zakai, 'Reformation, History, and Eschatology', pp. 300-318. Most historians now agree that Foxe had a wider concept for Christendom and wrote his history in 'universal' terms.

⁵⁹ Buscher, *Heinrich Pantaleon*, p. 86.

Secunda, Pantaleon stated that he planned to write a third volume covering Spain, Sicily, Illyria, Greece, Hungary, Poland and Denmark and Foxe, in his 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* confirmed that he was aspiring to incorporate the Lutheran material in an additional volume.⁶⁰ Therefore, Foxe might have abandoned the writing of continental martyrs to Pantaleon and Oporinus, but he did not abandon the project. It was conceived of as a collaborative venture to bring the story of the persecuted 'true' church and its witnesses to all Christian people, in all countries and in all languages. It is partly for this reason that Foxe only claimed the title of 'gatherer' in the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. The text, in his mind, was not *his* because it was part of a wider collaborative project. In the end Pantaleon became almost a negative collaborative influence in Foxe's English work. As Foxe continued to hope that he would find the opportunity to include Pantaleon's *Commentarii pars Secunda* in the *Acts and Monuments*, it meant that various continental details for which Foxe had the evidence and even the text, failed to materialise in any edition.

iv. John Foxe, a Magdeburg Centuriator?

Foxe's reputation as a scholar grew during his time in Basel as did his contact network both amongst his fellow exiles and amongst German reformers. Therefore, it is perhaps not surprising that the Centuriators of Magdeburg sought both his and Bale's help to compile their ecclesiastical history. As previously stated, both men were working as proof-readers for Oporinus at the same time as Flacius was putting his *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* through the press and the Centuriators were putting through their first volumes of the *Centuries*. Oporinus had been an acquaintance of Flacius for a long

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

time, as had Pantaleon.⁶¹ Bale's contacts included the Centuriators themselves. During the early 1550s, when Bale had been appointed Bishop of Ossory in Ireland, Flacius and Nidbruck had attempted to enlist his help. Now, several years later, with Bale within easier reach in Basel they attempted again, this time with Foxe at his side. Indeed, Freeman and Evenden suggest that Bale came to reside in Basel because of the Magdeburg request for his presence at their chosen printers.⁶² In a letter dated 2 March 1559, Johann Wigand asked Bale to assist them in the compilation of their history.⁶³ He explained that 'since true histories must be compiled, for that reason we have thought they ought to be written by certain learned and good men'. He expressly suggested that Foxe also should 'perform the same task', which was to compare a list of headings which Wigand had provided with their own histories and suggest where more paper needed to be inserted. He also requested that Bale and Foxe 'communicate your opinion and corrections freely to us' as they aided Oporinus with the production of the first set of *Centuries*. Although we cannot be certain if Bale and Foxe actually carried out these tasks, a letter Bale sent to Archbishop Matthew Parker in 1560 mentioned 'The newe Ecclesiastycall hystorye collected by Matthias Illyricus, Joannes Wigandus and others, from whome I haue receyued diuerse and manye epistles, for helpe in the same'.⁶⁴ These letters are important evidence that both Bale and Foxe had a role in the publication of the *Centuries* and perhaps also that they had contributed something to the history itself.

⁶¹ For Oporinus' relationship with Flacius, see Steinman, *Johannes Oporinus*, pp. 69-73. For Pantaleon's relationship to Flacius during the former's stay in Italy, see Buscher, *Heinrich Pantaleon*, pp. 40-2 and Olson, *Matthias Flacius*, p. 25.

⁶² See forthcoming Freeman and Evenden, *Religion and the Book*, chapter. 3.

⁶³ Johann Wigand in Magdeburg to John Bale in Basel, 2 March 1559. Translated in John Wade, *John Foxe's Latin writings: their intellectual and social context, with special reference to the period of his exile, 1554-1559*, unpublished Ph.D (2 vols, Sheffield, 2008), vol. 2, pp. 39-40.

⁶⁴ G&W, p. 18

Collaboration and the formulation of networks in several forms encompass Foxe's time in exile. He was involved in a collaborative venture with the Strasbourg exiles to compose martyrologies against the Marian regime. At the same time he was engaged in a daily collaborative routine with fellow exiles and friends in the Clarakloster at Basel. He had also managed to link himself to the efforts of the Magdeburg *collegium*. In all cases Bale is there beside him; a significant and vital influence who helped to shape and define Foxe's interests and abilities. Furthermore, Bale's presence continued to aid Foxe when he came to write his first vernacular ecclesiastical history in the early 1560s, as did the foundations of collaboration which, upon the ascension of Elizabeth I, transferred from the Rhine valley to England.

3. Birth of the *Acts and Monuments* (1559-1563)

i. Authorship and Patronage

John Day (1521/2-1584) published the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, four years after Foxe had returned to England. For Thomas Betteridge the claim to a specific type of authorship in this edition highlights a particular intention on behalf of those behind the project, which subsequently changed when plans were set for a second edition.⁶⁵ As already touched upon above, the title page did not give Foxe the title of author but that of 'gatherer' of 'true copies and wrytinges certificatorie as wel of the parties them selues that suffered, as also out of the Bishops Registers, which wer the

⁶⁵ Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations*, pp. 186-189.

doers thereof.⁶⁶ Book One was similarly assigned to Foxe as a gatherer of materials. In fact Foxe signed only the prefaces as his own 'authored' work.⁶⁷ In contrast, the 1570 edition clearly identified Foxe as an author. The title page listed the volume as 'Newly recognised and enlarged by the Author Iohn Foxe'.⁶⁸ The increased use of the first person in the prefaces and in the introduction to each Book is a further and striking indication that the 1570 edition was to be understood as the authored and narrated work of one man. Betteridge has suggested that between 1563 and 1570 Foxe had changed role from that of a chief compiler and gatherer of materials to the author of the work. Although Betteridge's interpretations are useful here he perhaps goes too far since such language is only evidence for the presentation of authorship, and not necessarily an indication of any real change. What it does indicate is that there was a shift in perception and that the necessity or desire to present the history as a compilation of true evidence unhindered by authorial intervention had diminished.

This issue of identifying and separating the process of compilation from the presentation of authorship can be understood more clearly within the context of networks and collaborative ventures. If we put aside for a moment Foxe's wider collaborative campaign with Heinrich Pantaelon and Johann Oporinus and concentrate solely on the compilation of the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, we find that Foxe himself had brought with him his *Rerum* and two years' worth of research in Norfolk and Suffolk.⁶⁹ Apart from some indications of a continuing collaboration with

⁶⁶ Between 1560 and 1562 Foxe undertook research in Norfolk and Suffolk. See Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Foxe: A Biography', *VE* (2004) for details.

⁶⁷ Each Preface is signed off by Foxe except for one where Foxe's authorship was claimed in the title: *To the Persecutors of Gods truth, commonly called Papistes, an other preface of the Author*.

⁶⁸ A common usage of the word 'recognised' in the sixteenth-century was 'to look over again', 'to revise', 'correct', or 'amend'. See 'recognised', *OED* [Accessed March 2008]. Available from <http://www.oed.com/>.

⁶⁹ In October 1559 Foxe arrived back to England and stayed at the house of the Duke of Norfolk in Aldgate. On 25 January 1560 Foxe was ordained as a priest by Edmund Grindal, Bishop of London.

Grindal's '*Martyrum Historia*' project, a possible authorial input by an aging John Bale, and a significant editorial role by the printer John Day there is little to indicate that Foxe was not the author of the work as the concept would be understood today. Ironically, the 1570 edition, where Foxe had claimed authorship for himself, does appear to have been a more collaborative venture. It was Matthew Parker who provided not only manuscripts for Foxe but also a conduit through which the project could engage with up-to-date research and new discoveries as they came to light. This process was a two-way agreement; Foxe also provided Parker with several manuscripts already in his hands.

After the success of the 1563 edition, Foxe found that he was also in collaboration with the whole of his readership. A barrage of information came his way to amend, correct or add to his accounts of recent controversies. In an odd turn of events, the *Acts and Monuments*, which was increasingly adapted to educating the English people to the 'true' faith, had entered a two-way communication with that same readership. Foxe had become a conduit for England's emerging religious settlement.⁷⁰ Therefore, there was a real change in how the first two editions of the *Acts and Monuments* were compiled but this change was not necessarily aligned with how the work was presented.

A useful parallel can be found in Annabel Patterson's study of the 'Holinshed' Chronicle.⁷¹ This chronicle was first compiled by Raphael Holinshed (c.1525-1580) for publication in 1577. It was then reproduced in 1587, after Holinshed's death, by a

Later that year, Foxe and his family went to Norwich to stay with John Parkhurst. Here Foxe spent a period preaching in the diocese whilst he conducted archival and oral research in Norfolk and Suffolk. On 31 December 1560 his eldest son Samuel was born and by August 1562 the Foxe family was back in Aldgate. For details of these years, see Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Foxe: A Biography'.

⁷⁰ As an example of this see David Loades, 'The Early Reception', *VE* (2004).

⁷¹ Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (London, 1994).

recognisable - although loosely connected - collaborative team. Patterson conveys it as a type of 'syndicate', which contained freelance antiquarians, lesser clergymen, members of Parliament with legal training, minor poets, publishers, and booksellers. Yet the authorship of the second edition was still presented as that of Holinshed and not those who had actually reordered and extended the text. Years after the event, the antiquarian John Stow (1524/5-1605) complained that his labour on the work had gone unaccredited.⁷² There are similar signs that some people felt that John Joscelyn (1529-1603), Matthew Parker's chief Latin secretary, had suffered a comparable slight for his extensive contributions to Parker's publications.⁷³ These examples suggest that authorial accreditation did not necessarily represent the actual work undertaken but how it was to be presented to the reader.

In the case of the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* Foxe, the 'gatherer' was presented in the opening woodcut alongside two other figures offering the book to the Queen (figure 1). One of the figures is John Day, the printer of the book. The identity of the other figure has been more debated. Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman have most recently - and most convincingly - suggested that the figure is Sir William Cecil, Elizabeth's Chief Secretary.⁷⁴ Together the three figures and the Queen present an image of collaborative authorship to the reader.

⁷² John Stow made this complaint in his *The Annales of England* (London, 1605), p. 1438.

⁷³ G.H. Martin, 'Joscelyn, John (1529-1603)', *ODNB* (2004). The evidence that at least one person felt that Joscelyn had been treated unfairly appears on his epitaph at High Roding, which claims that credit for his work was appropriated by others. However, Martin has pointed out that Joscelyn's own references to Parker were always friendly and that errors in the inscription make it unlikely that the epitaph reflected his own opinions.

⁷⁴ In 1975 Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1975), p. 156 suggested that the woodcut symbolised the three estates of the realm while John N. King, *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (Princeton, 1982), p. 435 has suggested that the image depicted the dedication of the *Acts and Monuments* to the Queen and that the three figures are John Foxe, John Day and Thomas Norton. By comparing the third figure to another drawing of William Cecil, Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Foxe, John Day and the Printing of the "Book of Martyrs"', in Robin Myers, Michael Harris and Giles Mandelbrote (eds), *Lives in*



Figure 1: John Foxe, John Day and Sir William Cecil offer the *Acts and Monuments* to Queen Elizabeth. Taken from *A&M*, 1563, p. 1.

The ‘C’ figure illustrates Foxe’s comparison of the Queen to Constantine the Great (in the 1563 edition) or Christ (in the 1570 edition).⁷⁵ It also encapsulates the book’s theme and the decision, which the Queen still needed to make concerning further reform.

Above the figures, the horn of plenty represents all that could be achieved if reform was completed while the figure of a chained Pope holding the broken keys of heaven and

Print: Biography and the Book Trade from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century (London, 2002), pp. 23-54 have suggested more conclusively that this is in fact William Cecil and that evidence related to both Foxe and Day make this identification more likely.

⁷⁵ Foxe changed the association of Elizabeth to Constantine to Christ because he had become disillusioned with the Queen’s lack of continual reforms. See Evenden and Freeman, ‘Printing of the “Book of Martyrs”’, for more details.

surrounded by snakes represents the Antichrist of Rome and its fall from the true church. The Queen, enthroned between these representations, has received the *Acts and Monuments* from its chief creators and she must now come to a decision based, in part, on the book's content.⁷⁶ This illustration similarly spoke to the general reader who also had the same decision to make. Would they follow the ways of the Antichrist and be deceived by the serpent that had deceived Eve? Or would they receive wealth through the love of Christ? Evenden and Freeman declare that this woodcut is an 'unprecedented acknowledgement of collaborative achievement'.⁷⁷ Cecil as patron, Day as printer, and Foxe as compiler. It is also a microcosm of the message and purpose behind the *Acts and Monuments*. It was to educate, illuminate and convince those whose beliefs were wavering, including foremost the Queen. It was intended both to support and to challenge the current ecclesiastical settlement.

The 'C' illustration was retained in the later editions of the *Acts and Monuments* but its original association of Elizabeth with Emperor Constantine and Foxe with Eusebius was replaced by a reminder to the Queen that Christ had placed her on the throne. It also contained a complaint from Foxe that he had hoped to move onto other writings but had been pressured into amending the text instead in order to confront his 'fumyng and freatyng' critics. The presentation of authorship and intention were therefore carefully crafted to fulfil the necessity of the times. For the 1563 edition it was felt important to distance the presentation of 'authoring' the past, as this would suggest authorial intervention upon the evidence. Conversely, it was necessary to signify the author for the 1570 edition. The *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* had been heavily criticised by Roman Catholic commentators, especially Thomas Stapleton, because no author was

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

declared.⁷⁸ They claimed this omission as a sign that the author was not willing to stand by his arguments. The reality was otherwise. No author was provided for the *Apologia* as it was to be understood as the voice of all England. Thus, beyond the collaborative conception of a multi-faceted publication of reformist texts, in which Foxe situated the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, the reasoning of a non-claim of authorship can be linked to a similar reasoning to that of the *Apologia*. Foxe as ‘gatherer’ of materials was not claiming to have interacted with his text, just to compile together the evidence. It is worth also noting that Bale similarly depicted himself as a collector of texts, not as an author.⁷⁹ Another element of thought can be added to this reasoning. As already argued, Foxe viewed the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* as one part of a larger project that involved the publication of a series of texts in support of the reformed religion. He published his English text at the same time as the Latin *Commentarii pars Secunda* in Basel, designed for an international audience. Therefore, it was not only politically expedient to claim only the role of ‘gatherer’ but also true in respect of the collaborative and dual context in which it was written and compiled. In Basel, Pantaleon did claim authorship although he advertised the collaborative genesis of the project in his preface and front page, whilst in England Foxe admitted this collaboration in a different way by not claiming direct authorship of the project. For the 1570 edition, however, the earlier collaborative context had faded away and it was felt more useful to identify authorship more clearly to avoid the criticism placed upon the *Apologia*. This was perhaps unavoidable for Foxe anyway, as he had already become synonymous with the *Acts and Monuments* after the success of the 1563 edition.

⁷⁸ Although now dated, the Roman Catholic rebuttal of the apocalypse is adequately discussed in Walter W. Greg, ‘Books and Bookmen in the Correspondence of Archbishop Parker’, *The Library*, 16:3 (1935), pp. 243-279.

⁷⁹ Cathy Shrank, ‘John Bale and reconfiguring the “Medieval” in Reformation England’, in Gordon McMullan and David Matthews (eds), *Reading the Medieval in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 179-192.

As also pointed out by Evenden and Freeman, the *Acts and Monuments* could not have been produced without a patron who could provide both Foxe and Day with the means and incentive to undertake such a colossal endeavour. While the *Acts and Monuments* was going through the press, Day could not produce any other works.⁸⁰ Therefore to provide financial security various monopolies were granted largely at the behest of Cecil. The enshrinement of the 1570 edition by the Privy Council's order that it should be placed in every Cathedral Church was part of the same process, providing a ready-made market for Foxe and Day's book.⁸¹ Foxe too received the prebend of Shipton less than a month after publication of the 1563 edition. Before that, Foxe and his family had been provided for by the Duke of Norfolk at his mansion in Aldgate, and while Foxe preached and researched in Norwich, the house of John Parkhurst.⁸² Although Foxe and his family were not well off, they were certainly taken care of by friends, especially Cecil. Patronage from central government was, therefore, essential to the ability to publish a work such as the *Acts and Monuments*, but so was a close working relationship between the printer and compiler.

From the testimonies of Simeon Foxe, in his life of John Foxe (1611) and Day's son Richard in his dedication to his republished edition of Foxe's *Christ Jesus Triumphant* (1607) it is claimed that Foxe had visited Day's print house in Aldersgate at weekly intervals – every Monday according to Richard Day.⁸³ At times he may have even

⁸⁰ Evenden and Freeman, 'Printing of the "Book of Martyrs"', p. 25 have calculated that with three presses available, Day could not have produced the 1570 edition in less than a year, probably longer. During this time Day could earn money by printing his monopoly tracts through other printers and then selling them in designated bookshops.

⁸¹ Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, 'Print, Profit and Propaganda: The Elizabethan Privy Council and the 1570 Edition of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', *English Historical Review*, 19:484 (Oxford, 2004), pp. 1288-1307.

⁸² Freeman, 'John Foxe: A Biography'.

⁸³ See Mozley, *John Foxe and his Book*, pp. 1-12.

lived there on a full-time basis.⁸⁴ Material came to Day in many forms and from various sources. It included transcripts in many hands as well as printed matter. From the irregularity of signatures and the 'mark-up' sequences, it appears that Foxe confused the casting-off process by interpolating new text and removing existing items.⁸⁵ For such a process to work successfully, Day and Foxe needed to co-operate closely and to a greater extent than appears to have usually occurred between printer and author.⁸⁶ Foxe wished to include everything that he possibly could, but internal evidence shows that Day counter-balanced this desire of inclusiveness by applying a pragmatic stay to Foxe's exuberance.⁸⁷ As a further sign of the extent of Day's collaboration with Foxe, Day's portrait appears on the final page of every edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.⁸⁸ Both men also collaborated together again to produce the complete works of William Tyndale.⁸⁹

⁸⁴ As suggested by Evenden and Freeman, 'Printing of the "Book of Martyrs"', p. 32.

⁸⁵ Although no known proofs of the *Acts and Monuments* survive, Emmanuel College Cambridge Library MS 260-262 and BL Additional MS 1940, contain rare survivals of the manuscript version of the *Acts and Monuments* and from John Bull's *Certain Most Godly, Fruitful, and Comfortable Letters* (London, 1564). See Julian Roberts and Elizabeth Evenden, 'Bibliographical Aspects of the Acts and Monuments', *VE* (2004).

⁸⁶ This is an assumption made by Evenden and Freeman, 'Printing of the "Book of Martyrs"'. Certainly the print process is by its nature a collaborative enterprise involving printers, editors, correctors, booksellers and so on. In the case of John Day, Dutch workers were employed to help produce the *Acts and Monuments* and other publications. See Elizabeth Evenden, 'The Fleeing Dutchmen? The influence of Dutch immigrants upon the print shop of John Day', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe at Home and Abroad* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 63-77. More generally, Anthony Grafton, *Bring out your Dead: The Past as Revelation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 2001), pp. 141-155 discusses this idea of collaboration between authors and printers.

⁸⁷ Various examples are given in Robert and Evenden, 'Bibliographical Aspects of the Acts and Monuments' and Evenden and Freeman, 'Printing of the "Book of Martyrs"'.
⁸⁸ Evenden and Freeman, 'Printing of the "Book of Martyrs"', p. 46. Day's portrait is the first occurrence of the printer appearing in a published book in England. This was therefore not a common practice.

⁸⁹ John N. King, "'The Light of Printing': William Tyndale, John Foxe, John Day, and Early Modern Print Culture', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54:1 (2001), pp. 52-85.

ii. *The Grindal Project transported*

Inter-woven in the three-way partnership of Foxe, Day and Cecil we find that the loose scholarly network, which had formed over the previous six years of exile, had also successfully transplanted itself back in England. When news had reached the exiles that Queen Mary had died, Grindal wrote to Foxe suggesting that he suspend his book until more information could be found.⁹⁰ The publication of the *Rerum* in August 1559 and the lack of any further surviving communiqués have often been asserted as an indication of Foxe's independence.⁹¹ Indeed, Patrick Collinson has been unable to find much evidence that Foxe and Grindal remained in contact after their return from exile.⁹² Although this lack of evidence does not prove anything, it does leave our understanding of any potential impact Grindal might have had on Foxe's work from this point, difficult to assess. However, Devorah Greenberg has rightly suggested that Foxe would never have risked alienating Grindal and that in turn, Grindal would not have left Foxe for those months between Mary's death and Foxe's return to England in October.⁹³ Neither had he left his designs for his '*Martyrum Historia*' behind in Strasbourg. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that Grindal was involved, at least, in the early organisation of the *Acts and Monuments* as a project.

⁹⁰ See William Nicholson, *The Remains of Edmund Grindal...successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury* (Cambridge, 1843), pp. 237-8 for this letter.

⁹¹ For instance in Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, pp. 82.

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 108-9, 114, 141. The evidence is scant. The ordination of John Foxe is contained in Edmund Grindal's ordination Register as 'Mr Fox', then as Bishop of London, Grindal is known to have appointed Foxe to preach at St Paul's Cross (much to Foxe's dismay). Patrick Collinson also notes that Foxe was amongst the 'mediators' when Grindal managed to negotiate a reconciliation between the factions in the London French congregations. We lose all threads to a relationship between Grindal and Foxe when the former became Archbishop of Canterbury, although Grindal did order Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* to be bought by Masham church (*Ibid.*, p. 204). The evidence, such as it is, cannot support any probable conclusions. At best we might be able to suggest that Grindal had at least a formative role in Foxe beginning his work on the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* and that this role was most prominent in the first few months following Foxe's return from exile.

⁹³ Devorah Greenberg, 'Community of the Texts: Producing the First and Second Editions of Acts and Monuments', *SCJ*, 36:3 (2005), pp. 695-715.

Until the *Acts and Monuments* 'smothered the competition', as Evenden and Freeman put it, various martyr tracts were published in early Elizabethan England, and Grindal's hand can be shown to have been behind several of them.⁹⁴ In 1559 Thomas Brice had published a poem which listed the Marian martyrs in order of the dates of their executions, while John Day had printed *The complaynt of veritie, made by Iohn Bradford*. A year later William Powell printed *A frutefull treatise and full of heauenly consolation against the feare of death. Whereunto are annexed certaine sweete meditations of the kingdom of Christ ... Gathered by that holy marter of God, Iohn Bradford*. Bradford's writings and examinations were also printed by William Griffith and William Copeland in 1561 as well as by Rowland Hall in 1562. Thomas Marsh published Arthur Golding's *A briefe treatise concerning the burnynge of Bucer and Phagius, at Cambrydge, in the tyme of Quene Mary*. Also in 1559, Henry Sutton had printed *The examination of the constante martir of Christ, Iohn Philpot*.⁹⁵ When prefacing *An apologye made by the reuerende father and constante Martyr of Christe*

⁹⁴ Evenden and Freeman, 'Printing of the "Book of Martyrs"', p. 36.

⁹⁵ Thomas Brice, *A Compendious Register in Metre* (London, 1559) was later used by Foxe in gathering his materials for the *Acts and Monuments*. Other tracts from this period include Matthew Rogers, *The complaynt of veritie, made by Iohn Bradford...The saieng of maister Houper, that he wrote the night before he suffered...and his saying at his deathe* (John Day, London, 1559); John Bradford, *A frutefull treatise and full of heauenly consolation against the feare of death. Whereunto are annexed certaine sweete meditations of the kingdom of Christ ... / Gathered by that holy marter of God, Iohn Bradford. Perused corrected & augmented according to the originall, etc.* (William Powell, London, 1560); John Philpot, *The examination of the constante martir of Christ, Iohn Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, at sundry seasons, in the tyme of hys sore imprisonement, conuented and baited as in these particular tragedies folowynge, it maye (not only to the christen instruction, but also to the mery recreation of the indifferent reader) moste manifestly appeare* (Henry Sutton, London, 1559); John Bradford, *All the examinacions of the constante martir of God M. Iohn Bradforde before the Lorde Chauncellour, B. of Winchester the B. of London, [and] other co[m]missioners: whervnto ar annexed, his priuate talk [and] conflictes in prison after his condemnacion, with the Archbishop of york, the B. of Chichester, Alfonsus, and King Philips confessour, two Spanishe freers, and sundry others. With his modest learned and godly answeres* (William Griffith, London, 1561); John Bradford, *Godlie meditations vpon the Lordes prayer, the beleefe, and ten commaundementes with other comfortable meditations, praiers and exercises. Whereunto is annexed a defence of the doctrine of gods eternall election and predestination, gathered by the constant martyr of God Iohn Bradford in the tyme of his imprisonment* (Rowland Hall, London, 1562); Arthur Golding, *A briefe treatise concerning the burnynge of Bucer and Phagius, at Cambrydge, in the tyme of Quene Mary with theyr restitution in the time of our moste gracious souerayne lady that nowe is. Wherein is expressed the fantasticall and tirannous dealynges ofthe [sic] Romishe Church, together with the godly and modest regime[n]t of the true Christian Church, most slaundersouslye diffamed in those dayes of heresy. Translated into Englyshe by Arthur Goldyng. Anno. 1562. Read and iudge indifferently accordinge to the rule of Gods worde.* (Thomas Marshe, London, 1562).

John Hooper (1562), its editor, Henry Bull (d. 1577) stressed that 'manye frutefull workes did they [the Marian martyrs] write in prison...but fewe are come to lighte'. Bull proposed that they 'wyl not suffer them to be suppressed any longer'.⁹⁶ One year after the publication of the *Acts and Monuments*, Bull kept his word by acting as editor to Miles Coverdale's *Certain Most Godly, Fruitful, and Comfortable Letters of...True Saintes and Holy Martyrs of God*. This tract contained various letters written by the Marian martyrs and acted as both a companion to the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* and as an advertisement for the proposed second edition. Foxe's publication of *Ridley's Friendly Farewell* was also part of this endeavour, which as stated by Foxe himself in the preface was 'Amongest manye other worthy and sundrie histories, and notable acts which we have in hande, and entende...shortly to set abrode'.⁹⁷ *Ridley's Friendly Farewell* was intended as a 'pithie' tract to be studied by the faithful whilst Foxe and his colleagues prepared larger volumes 'which we ar about' that would touch 'the full historie, processe and examinations of all our blessed brethren, lately persecuted for rightuousnes sake.' This advertisement for the book, which would most certainly become the *Acts and Monuments* was promised as a long

⁹⁶ [Henry Bull], *An apologye made by the reuerende father and constante Martyr of Christe John Hooper late Bishop of Gloceter and Worceter againste the untrve and sclaunderous report that he should be a maintainer and encorager of suche as cursed the Quenes highness that then was, Quene Marye. Wherein thou shalte see this Godlye mannes innocency and modest behausoure: and the falsehode and subtyltye of the aduesaryes of Gods truth* (London, 1562), f. Aiii. Hooper's letters were reprinted in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 5, pp. 1020-2.

⁹⁷ It is worth also including the quote in full: 'Amongest manye other worthy and sundrie histories, and notable acts which we have in hande, and entende (by the grace of Christe oure Lorde) shortly to set abrode, of such as of late daies have ben persecuted, murdered, and martyred fro the trewe Gospell of Christ, in Quene Maries raigne. Firste to begin with this litell treatis of Doct. Nicholas Ridley, late Byshoppe of London, this shalbe to desire thee (gentle Reader) to accept it, and studiouslye to peruse it in the meane tyme, whyle the other Volumes be addressing, which we ar about, touching the full historie, processe and examinations, of all our blessed brethren, lately persecuted for rightuosnes sake. Whiche histories whan they shal come to light, (I suppose) thou shalt see as horrible a slaughter of the Sainetes, joined with as much crueltie of some English hertes, as ever in anye one realme before Christe, or after was sene. In the meane time because all thynges can not be done at once, and the Volumes be long, accept well in worth this little (but pithie) worke of this forsaid Bishoppe, in expectation of greater thynges, which shall (perchaunce) more largely satisfie thy desyre'. See John Foxe, *A Frendly farewell, which Master Doctor Ridley, late Bishop of London did write beinge prisoner in Oxeforde, unto all his true Louers and frendes in God, a little before that he suffred for the testimony of the truthe of Christ his Gospell* (London, John Day, 1559), f. 1-2. The main body of the text is reprinted in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 11.

volume concerned with bringing to light the 'slaughter of the Sainetes [meaning the Protestant martyrs] joined with as much crueltie of some English hertes, as ever in anye one realme before Christe, or after was sene'.

This is a clear indication that Foxe's and Grindal's project had been transported back to England.⁹⁸ The primary objective of the small tracts printed by Day and others on behalf of various reformers was in part a preview for an extensive programme of martyrological tracts that would further be incorporated into a 'full historie...of all our blessed brethren'. From the very beginning at least some of these texts and the researches of Grindal's collaborative allies appear to have been intended for a larger project. It would seem sensible to suggest that Cecil's patronage stemmed from consultation with Grindal, now Bishop of London, and his continued desire to pursue a revised version of his vernacular '*Martyrum Historia*' published to support the Elizabethan reforms. Together they allied themselves to Foxe and set him a task that he had already proved himself quite capable of performing. This would explain why Foxe and Day were introduced to one another and why Foxe subsequently spent two years researching in Norfolk and Suffolk. At the same time, and with the help of Matthew Parker, Cecil made certain that Day was in a position to support such a project by providing him with various lucrative monopolies. Yet, none of this quite explains why Foxe complained in the preface to the 1563 edition that he had been given 'scarce eighteen months' to produce the volume.⁹⁹ This, as concluded by Evenden and Freeman, can only have related to the actual printing of the book rather than its earlier

⁹⁸ Susan Wabuda, 'Henry Bull, Miles Coverdale, and the Making of Foxe's Book of Martyrs', in Diana Wood (ed.), *Martyrs and Martyrologies* (Blackwell, 1993), pp. 245-258 has shown that Henry Bull and Miles Coverdale played an essential part in Grindal's project once they had returned to England and that Bull and Foxe shared resources at Day's print house.

⁹⁹ *A&M*, 1563, *Ad Doctum Lectorem* [Prefaces] First translated by Mozley, *John Foxe and His Book*, pp. 132-4.

research; but it also suggests that someone must have been applying the pressure. Greenberg suggests that setbacks in Elizabethan policy had caused Cecil to demand a tighter schedule, and that Parker, in perhaps his first significant contribution to the project, provided Foxe with a commission at the same time as a commission was given to John Jewel to produce his anonymous *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*.¹⁰⁰ However, the continued connection of the project to Basel draws out another possibility. Oporinus was applying pressure for the *Commentarii pars Secunda* to be completed. If, as seems probable, Foxe made an agreement to publish his English text at the same time as the Lutheran text then the eighteen months might refer to his own deadline in conjunction with the other component of the project.

Such a possibility does not deny the importance of Jewel's *Apologia* nor the increased need for the publication of the *Acts and Monuments* due to political pressures. However, the real importance of Jewel and Parker's interest was in the re-appropriation of Foxe's multi-part project into an ecclesiastical history. John Jewel's defence of the Elizabethan settlement used the Church Fathers and papal history as a means to prove the case, and the decision to insert a pre-reformation account at the beginning of the *Acts and Monuments* attempted a similar function. The *Apologia* was written soon after Elizabeth's religious settlement had been confirmed at the Parliament of 1558-9. It was intended as a clear statement for a continental audience of the religion to be practised in England.¹⁰¹ The *Apologia* begins with a statement of the basic principles for the Church of England, especially that they will conform, as much as they can, to the church as it was at the time of the Apostles, and not as the Pope does, to novelties and corruptions. The text largely states the position of the English church in antithesis to the Pope's

¹⁰⁰ Greenberg, 'Community of the Texts', pp. 695-715. John Jewel's *Apologia* is dealt with on p. 708.

¹⁰¹ T.H.L. Parker, *English Reformers* (London, 1966), pp. 3-4.

church through a series of questions, which compare the words of the Church Fathers and commandments in early councils to those of the current Roman Catholic Church. It repeatedly asks, if they are to be called the heretics, why the Pope's church is not the same as the Church Fathers?¹⁰² As one would expect, the general themes and statements agree with those propounded in the *Acts and Monuments*. They were after all part of the same 'campaign' to support the Elizabethan settlement, they both drew on the same contextual discourse of the early 1560s, and, significantly, they were both instigated under the patronage of Sir William Cecil and Matthew Parker. Whether or not there was a commission as such, the insertion of a pre-reformation portion does appear to be a result of the successful comparison to the primitive church in the *Apologia*. The pre-reformation history in the *Acts and Monuments* began with a series of examples in which the Roman Catholic Church of the sixteenth century differed from that of the Apostles, Church Fathers and rulings of the early Councils.¹⁰³ Furthermore, both accounts relied heavily on Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* for their evidence.¹⁰⁴ Through such means a direct scholarly link between both enterprises can be identified.

For various reasons the *Apologia* and the increasing interest in producing an historical defence of the English church brings us finally to Matthew Parker. There is only limited evidence that Parker had any significant involvement in the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. Alongside Cecil, Parker helped Day win his monopolies but he was not to hire him to print his own publications until 1564.¹⁰⁵ Neither is there any

¹⁰² Taken from Parker, *English Reformers*, pp. 14-57.

¹⁰³ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 1-7.

¹⁰⁴ Olson, *Matthias Flacius*, p. 252.

¹⁰⁵ Parker had published through John Day a translation of Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *A godly and necessary admonition of the decrees and canons of the Counsel of Trent, celebrated vnder Pius the*

evidence that Parker provided manuscripts to Foxe, nor any evidence to support Greenberg's suggestion of a commission, although neither can be discounted entirely. The only tangible testimony for Parker's involvement in the 1563 edition is a letter Foxe sent to Parker and Grindal dated to 1561. In this letter Foxe declared that he had discovered a certified copy of the disputation of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer in Oxford.¹⁰⁶ This does suggest that Parker wished at least to be kept informed about such discoveries, and further confirms that Grindal did not abandon the project once he had set it up again in England. However, this is far from concrete proof that Parker was heavily involved. For this we must reach deeper into recent historiography concerning the Archbishop's scholarly 'circle', where circumstantial evidence supports the possibility that Parker was behind the inclusion of a pre-reformation portion in the 1563 edition and the main proponent of transforming an historical commentary into an English ecclesiastical history. It would seem possible that by necessity Foxe supported the English reform settlement to appease his patrons, and found it increasingly difficult to achieve his original ambitions of producing a series of texts in collaboration and in various languages to describe the nature of the reformation. Instead he became an ecclesiastical historian in defence of only England's *Ecclesia*. It is to this subject that we shall next turn.

fourth, Byshop of Rome, in the yeares of our Lord. M.D.LXII. and. M.D.LXIII (London, 1564). This began a long series of publications primarily through Day's print house by Matthew Parker.

¹⁰⁶ J. Bruce and T.T. Perowne (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* (London, 1853), pp. 160-1. According to Bruce and Perowne the disputations that Foxe speaks of is probably Harleian MS 3642.

Chapter Three

Collaboration and Matthew Parker's Circle

He did employ divers men proper for such an end, to search all England over, and Wales (and perhaps Scotland and Ireland too) for books of all sorts, more modern as well as ancient, and to buy them up for his use.¹

The accuracy of this remark, which was written in 1711 by Matthew Parker's first biographer, John Strype, has survived almost 200 years of scholarship. However a more detailed analysis of the chronological detail is now needed to understand further the intricacies entailed in this claim. As regards the paradigm of scholarly collaboration Strype's analysis is too insular. He emphasised that Parker 'gathered' material and 'employed' men to help him in his project. However, the more interesting feature of Parker's work can be found not only from within but also from without. The delicate co-operation with men beyond his household and in many instances those antagonistic to elements of the Elizabethan religious settlement, characterises Parker's endeavours. His relationship with the antiquarian John Stow (1525-1605) is one clear example where Parker put aside theological differences in the name of England's history. His relationship to John Foxe was equally fraught, especially over the subject of vestments. Yet, together they rewrote history and advertised a reformist agenda. Parker's scholarly circle has been recognised by historians, most recently by the Foxe Project team, as a quintessential element for the development of the pre-reformation portion of the *Acts and Monuments*. Yet little has actually been done until now to understand and analyse

¹ John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker: The First Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (4 vols., London, 1711), vol. 4, p. 528.

this vital aspect of Elizabethan-era collaboration. Recent studies of the slightly later collaborative formation behind the 'Holinshed chronicles' has already proven how rich such research can be in enabling us to understand Elizabethan scholarship.² This chapter therefore, provides a preliminary picture of Parker's 'circle', focused around the 'major' characters, which in turn provides an outline sufficient to understand the process of networking in which Foxe played a part.

1. Matthew Parker and the birth of his 'circle' (1560-1575)

i. Parker and the Magdeburg Centuriators

Between June 1559, when Parker accepted the archbishopric of Canterbury and March 1563, when the first edition of the *Acts and Monuments* was published, Parker was not only establishing himself in the role of archbishop, but also as a collector. In 1559 Parker was known for his administrative abilities and his learning, but he had not yet engaged with England's manuscript heritage nor its medieval past.³ By 1563, this was beginning to change. Parker had undertaken an extensive search for various ancient manuscripts including the missing library of John Bale (1495-1563).⁴ He had employed various scholars in his household, most significantly a Latin secretary named John Joscelyn (1529-1603). He was also preparing his own programme of publications and discussing historical projects with Sir William Cecil (1520-1598). Even then, his first

² See Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (London, 1994).

³ See David J. Crankshaw and Alexandra Gillespie, 'Parker, Matthew (1504-1575)', *ODNB* (2006).

⁴ For Bale's library see William O'Sullivan, 'The Irish "remnant" of John Bale's manuscripts', in Richard Bendle and A.J. Piper (eds), *New Science out of Old Books; Studies in Manuscript and Early Printed Books in honour of A.I. Doyle* (Aldershot, 1995), pp. 374-387 and Honor McCusker, 'Books and Manuscripts formerly in the possession of John Bale', *The Library*, 4:16 (1935), pp. 144-65.

historical publication, *The Testimonie of Antiquitie*, was not printed until 1566. Parker's reputation as a 'great collector' only truly holds when discussing the last decade of his life. The decision to undertake such a programme of research cannot have been undertaken lightly; Parker would have been well aware of the difficulties and hard work which he would have to put into it especially when considering his other responsibilities as Archbishop. However, as we shall discuss, Parker viewed such a project as an integral part of his role as Archbishop; it was his responsibility to provide a defence of the Elizabethan church and he chose to do so through the use of history.

The lengthy and challenging process of gathering materials in part answers the question of why Parker was not so heavily involved in the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. He was not yet in a position to offer any tangible aid nor was he the most obvious candidate for patronage of such a project. This changed after 1563 when he helped Foxe to prepare a greatly expanded pre-reformation account for a second edition. By this date, John Jewel's *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* and Foxe's 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* had sufficiently shown how a comparison of the old and new churches could work as powerful evidence to support the religious settlement. However, the pre-reformation account in the 1570 edition was not simply a chronological expansion back to the primitive church but a specific engagement with England's manuscript heritage that was directly linked to Parker's endeavours now that they had reached fruition. Furthermore, both the development of Parker's 'circle' or more accurately his network during the 1560s and the transformation of the *Acts and Monuments* into a fully developed ecclesiastical history, after the Eusebian model, bring us back to the city of Magdeburg, and the project initiated by Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520-1575).

Early in July 1560 a representative of the Magdeburg Centuriators named Bernard Schwartz, arrived at the Court of Queen Elizabeth. In his hand was a copy of the brand new *Fourth Century* of the *Ecclesiastical History*. The Centuriators had dedicated the volume to Queen Elizabeth and in the preface praised her reign as a glorious thing in this war against Antichrist.⁵ Furthermore, they hoped Elizabeth would be enlightened by their discussion of Constantine the Great who had lived for a time in England before becoming Emperor and converting the world to Christianity. In doing so they were feeding into contemporary ideas of power and monarchy, especially the ideas concerning the *Ecclesia Anglicana*.⁶ Constantine had saved Christianity from persecution in the fourth century just as Elizabeth was now doing at the end of the sixteenth century in England. It was a claim that Foxe himself would later borrow in his *Acts and Monuments*. As for the Magdeburg request, it was hoped that, in return, provision be provided of old English manuscripts and books which could aid them in the compilation of further volumes. On 14 July Elizabeth's temporary Principal Secretary Sir William Petre (1505/6-1572) passed the request on to Matthew Parker, who in turn passed it to John Bale, who was now residing at Canterbury as a canon of the eleventh prebend of the Cathedral.⁷ Upon his return to England Bale had busied himself with the production of his revised play *King Johan*, and perhaps also a short

⁵ *Cent. IV*, p. 10. Ronald E. Diener, *The Magdeburg Centuries: A Bibliothecal and Historiographical Study* (Th.D dissertation, Harvard, 1979). Published at <http://rondiener.com/MCBK01.htm> [Accessed: 2005], pp. 194-8, 236-7 discusses the dedications of the first four volumes of the *Centuries*. The first part of the first volume was dedicated to Christian III of Denmark and Maximilian of Bohemia, the second part of the first volume to the Electors of the Palatinate and Saxony, the second volume to the sons of the Elector of Saxony, Johann Friedrich, the third to Wilhelm von Nassau (William of Orange) and Guenther of Schwartzburg.

⁶ For the role of Elizabethan '*Ecclesia Anglicana*' see Patrick Collinson, 'If Constantine, then also Theodosius: St Ambrose and the Integrity of the Elizabethan *Ecclesia Anglicana*', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 30:2 (1979), pp. 205-229.

⁷ Sir William Petre was acting secretary while Sir William Cecil was negotiating in Scotland. See Frederick G. Emmison, *Tudor Secretary; Sir William Petre at Court and Home* (London, 1961), pp. 226-235. The letter from Petre can be found in Hastings Robinson (ed. & trans.), *The Zurich Letters comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and others with some of the Helvetian Reformers during the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge, 1845), no. 83.

history on the same monarch for inclusion into the *Acts and Monuments*.⁸ He was also desperately trying to find his lost library but with little success. Thus Parker's letter was received 'with no small rejoyce', as Bale saw an opportunity to enlist the Archbishop's help in finding his books.⁹

Bale, who appears to have been unaware that the request originated with the Centuriators, replied within twelve days of receiving Parker's letter. He supplied several small books from Canterbury and promised larger books if someone would come and collect them. Using a list of sub-headings, probably first provided by the Centuriators, Bale listed the name and the current location of all manuscripts, not just English, that he could think of at that time. For instance under the heading 'All Ecclesiastical Histories, not yet edited', Bale mentioned that he had seen in Basel the history of Nicephorus Callistus, priest of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. William of Malmesbury, Bale claimed, was in the hands of the executors of John Cheke (1514-1557), while John Pekyns a canon and prebendary of Westminster (1543-54) had copies of Simeon of Durham and Hexham.¹⁰ Under the heading 'all Popes lives, not yet printed' Bale exclaimed 'I haue seane at Basyll an olde coppye therof in the studye of Johan Herolde, a learned man there. But lete wyse men take hede of the deceyt of that boke and suche lyke, concernynge the actes and constytutyons of Romane byshoppes

⁸ For details on Bale's play *King Johan* see R.J. Frontain, "'David in his most Hevynes": Bale's King Johan and the Politicization of the Penitential David Tradition', *Cathiers Elisabethains*, 62 (2002), pp. 1-10; Peter Happé, *John Bale* (New York, 1996), pp. 89-107; and Carole Levin, 'A Good Prince: King John and Early Tudor Propaganda', *SCJ*, 11:4 (1980), pp. 23-32. And for how the play was possibly transformed into an account for the *Acts and Monuments* see Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Bale's Book of Martyrs?: The Account of King John in Acts and Monuments', *Reformation*, 3 (1998), pp. 175-223.

⁹ Bale's reply to Parker dated 30 July 1560 was first published in Henry R. Luard, 'A Letter from Bishop Bale to Archbishop Parker. Communicated by the Rev. H.R. Luard, M.A., University Registrar', *Cambridge Antiquarian Communications; being papers preented at the meetings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, 15:3 (Cambridge, 1865), pp. 157-173. More recently an annotated edition has been produced by G&W. For details on Bale's lost library see the still helpful but out of date annotated bibliography and discussion in McCusker, 'Books and manuscripts formerly in the possession of John Bale', pp. 144-165; and the more recent discussion, which builds upon McCusker's research in O'Sullivan, 'The Irish "remnant"', pp. 374-387.

¹⁰ G&W, p. 18.

afore Syluesters tyme'.¹¹ A specific request for information on Matthew Paris' chronicle was met with an enthusiastic reply that 'no chronicle paynteth out the byshop of Rome in more lyuely colours, nor more lyuely declareth hys execrable procedynges, than it doth'. Parker would later publish various chronicles belonging to Matthew Paris, while Foxe's account of Henry III would become peppered with extracts from his *Chronica Majora*.¹² In other instances Bale tied his own concerns to Parker. Bale began the letter by exclaiming that 'whan I was in Irelande I had great plenty of them [books of antiquity], whome I obtained in tyme of the lamentable spoyle of the lybraryes of Englande...sens that tyme, I was in Irelande, depryued of all that I had, by the papystes under queen Marye, and hauock was made of the bokes, by an othe[r] wurke of the Deuyll, that they shulde not yet come to lyghte'. Yet Bale also mentioned twice that not all was lost as Robert Cage, vicar of Yalding in Kent (1562-1565) would 'not only infourme your grace of the whole hystorye [of the lost library], but also recover a greate nombre of them: for whye, he knoweth the persones, places, bokes and all'.¹³ From research carried out by Norman Jones we can conclusively confirm that Parker and Bale worked together to find these books over the next few years but met with only limited success.¹⁴

On 22 May 1561 Matthias Flacius Illyricus wrote to Parker from Jena promising to send a messenger to England to collect the manuscripts and books which Parker had found.¹⁵

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19 who explains that Johann Herold or Heroldt (1514-67) published various works in Basel during the 1550s.

¹² G&W, pp. 29-30. Parker owned various copies of the *Chronica Majora* as well as a transcript of Matthew Paris' *Historia Anglicana*. He published the *Chronica Majora* in 1571. The manuscripts that Foxe was lent have been identified as CCCC MS 16 and CCCC MS 26.

¹³ G&W, pp. 17, 18, 24.

¹⁴ Norman L. Jones, 'Matthew Parker, John Bale, and the Magdeburg Centuriators', *SCJ*, 12:3 (1981), pp. 35-49. G&W, pp. 4-5 agree with Jones and have further shown how this letter fits into the development of Parker's 'circle'.

¹⁵ Discussed by Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, vol. 4, pp. 110-111 and published in his appendix, pp. 31-2.

He also exhorted the Archbishop to 'make it his business' to bring obscure manuscripts to light. Two months later, on 18 July 1561 Parker wrote to Flacius, Johann Wigand (1523-1587) and Mattæus Judex (1528-1564) with his response to their request. Parker explained that he had sent 'numberless messengers to many persons and places to no effect' but that he then managed to find some of Bale's books. Despite his best efforts, which had resulted in 'a huge heap' being found, he had only managed to gather, as Bale himself had put it in 1560, the 'ryff raff and wurst' of Bale's library.¹⁶ Furthermore by 1563, Parker writing to Sir William Cecil after Bale's death shows that he was still interested in procuring Bale's 'old antiquities'.¹⁷

Until his association with the Centuriators there is no solid evidence to suggest that Parker had any particular interest in the ancient past. Before the reign of Mary I, Parker was closely associated with the famed theologian Martin Bucer (1491-1551). However his election as vice-chancellor of Cambridge University in 1545 had more to do with his abilities as an administrator who could bring about reform than any scholarly distinction.¹⁸ Yet, from July 1560 Parker can be seen to be making a great effort to search out England's dispersed and endangered manuscript heritage. Twenty years on from the dissolution of the monasteries, the fate of monastic manuscripts was still

¹⁶ This letter has led to confusion as it is dated to 1566 in J. Bruce and T.T. Perowne (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* (London, 1853), pp. 286-8 and in Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, pp. 77-80. However Jones, 'Matthew Parker...and the Centuriators', p. 41 believes that the proper context is 1561. In this context the letter not only provides a reasonable explanation why Bale's books were of little use but also proves Bale was involved in the search for his own library. Presumably Parker followed up the lead to Robert Cage and found some of Bale's books, but not the best part. Parker was therefore echoing Bale's words from his letter of 1560 as shown in G&W, p. 20. One of these books might have been the *Scalacronica*, as discussed in Andy King (ed. and trans.), *Sir Thomas Gray, Scalacronica 1277-1363* (The Surtees Society, 209, 2005).

¹⁷ Bruce and Thompson, *Correspondence*, pp. 197-9. Whether or not Parker is referring to books that Bale still had upon his death or his lost library is impossible to tell; however historians have tended to favour the latter, believing Parker's latest attempt to get the books also ended in failure.

¹⁸ There are various biographies of Matthew Parker's life. See Crankshaw and Gillespie, 'Parker, Matthew', *ODNB*, V.J.K. Brook, *A Life of Archbishop Parker* (Oxford, 1962), Edith Weir Perry, *Under Four Tudors: being the story of Matthew Parker sometime Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1940), and John Strype, *The Life and Acts and of Matthew Parker* (London, 1711).

uncertain. In his letter of 1560 to Parker, Bale had not only bemoaned his lost library, much of which he openly admitted to having been gained during the 'lamentable spoyle of the lybraryes of Englande' but that he found many of them 'in stacyoners and boke bynders store howses, some in grosers, sopesellars, taylers, and other occupiers shoppes, some in shyppes ready to be carried ouer the sea into Flaunders to be solde'.¹⁹ Parker would similarly warn Cecil that 'the nation was deprived of such choice monuments...partly by being spent in shops and used as waste-paper, or conveyed over beyond sea, by some who considered more their own private gain than the honour of their country'.²⁰ Bale's concerns, which were also expressed by Flacius, had become Parker's concerns as well.

ii. The Parker Household

The basis for Parker's new scholarly enterprise was in part centred on external contacts that the archbishop had made over a lifetime as well as those that he had inherited as the principal Bishop of England. However, the focus for the study of England's past (that which gave it, its form and character) was the household. In 1566 Queen Elizabeth granted Parker the right to hire a retinue of forty retainers but the actual size of his household was almost certainly higher.²¹ With residences at Lambeth, Croydon, Bekesbourne and Canterbury, alongside the resources of the Cathedral, close contacts to the school in Canterbury and to his old university in Cambridge, Parker was able to

¹⁹ G&W, p. 17.

²⁰ E.C. Pearce, 'Matthew Parker', *The Library*, 4:3 (1925), pp. 209-228. Citation on p. 222. Originally recorded by Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, vol. 4, p. 528.

²¹ Dorothy Gardiner, *The story of Lambeth Palace: A Historic survey* (London, 1930) and Tim Tatton-Brown, *Lambeth Palace: A History of the Archbishops of Canterbury and their Houses* (London, 2000), p. 66.

galvanise a significant network, all reliant on his patronage.²² Beyond these means Parker was closely aligned with the Privy Councillors, especially the Queen's Principal Secretary, Sir William Cecil. From his days at Cambridge, Parker, too, had friends in various dioceses including Wales and the north of England. Historical studies have tended to over-categorise these connections in an attempt to identify a unified system of patronage. More recent attempts have, however suggested a more loosely formed and dynamic system of public citizenship as the formulating context in which specific forms of patronage thrived and, by extension, specific forms of scholarship.²³ The idea of Parker commanding a scholarly 'circle' in the form of an identifiable entity is therefore inaccurate in this context. Instead a pliable system of patronage shaped by and for individuals such as Parker, Cecil and the Queen provoked particular formulations of academic topics gauged to their real or perceived needs and interests. Stephen Alford convincingly suggests that Elizabethans made the connection between intellectual pursuits, historical models for action and behaviour and their active role in the public

²² At least in the case of Canterbury Cathedral itself there was a limit to Parker's patronage in the form of the Queen. Patrick Collinson, 'The Protestant Cathedral, 1541-1660', in Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay and Margaret Sparks (eds), *The History of Canterbury Cathedral* (Oxford, 1995), p. 168 has stated that Parker was to complain about the promotion of Queen Elizabeth's chaplains to Canterbury prebends as having 'detrimental consequences'. The extent of Parker's patronage networks was therefore not complete, but reliant and subordinate to the Queen. Nevertheless the Archbishop of Canterbury was still one of the most important figures in English politics and deserves the accolade of being the focal point for a large proportion of patronage networking during the period.

²³ The role of patronage as harnessing a particular form of scholarship moulded to their interests at a given time is beginning to emerge out of the historiography. Stephen Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558-1569* (Cambridge, 1998) has shown how intellectual pursuits were an essential aspect of public life, while Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal, 1519-1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (London, 1979), pp. 253-265 has discussed the failed attempt by Edmund Grindal to form a structure of patronage around him. The role of patronage to Cardinal Wolsey has been expressed by S.J. Gunn and P.G. Lindley, *Cardinal Wolsey: Church, State and Art* (Cambridge, 1991), ch. 1 and Peter Gwyn, *The King's Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey* (London, 1990), ch. 6, while his successor Thomas Cromwell has been discussed in chapter one of this thesis. During the subsequent reign of James I (1603-1625) Robert Cotton (1571-1631), founder of the Cotton library, supplied material to the French historian Jacques-Auguste de Thou so that he could write a revised and more favourable history of Mary, Queen of Scots (1515-1560) whose reputation had earlier been savaged, prominently by James Buchanan. As a subject close to James I this is a clear example of scholarship being moulded towards patronage. Cotton himself also surrounded himself with a network of famed men who through his patronage were granted access to his library. See Thomas Smith, *Catalogues of the MS in the Cottonian library 1696* (Oxford, 1696). A useful parallel to English patronage can be found in the example of Margaret of Navarre in France whose 'circle' has been described by Jonathan A. Reid, *King's Sister – Queen of Dissent: Marguerite of Navarre (1492-1549) and her Evangelical Network*, unpublished Ph.D (Arizona, 2001).

sphere.²⁴ Projects including the *Acts and Monuments* were therefore moulded by or for a patron as means of engaging in public life. Furthermore the pursuit of intellectual activities by men such as Parker and Cecil should not be seen as side projects but a significant part of their own responsibilities as leaders of England.²⁵ It is therefore not surprising that Parker's interest in the medieval past began only once he had become Archbishop. The defence of the Queen's church by intellectual patronage became an essential part of his new duties.

In his new public role Parker galvanised his household by actively seeking preferment for those that could provide a useful intellectual defence of the church and who could provide a revised historiography of England's religious and secular past. Chief amongst these men was Parker's Latin secretary John Joscelyn, who was proficiently trained in Latin, Greek and Hebrew and an influential figure in the archbishop's household.²⁶ Joscelyn underpinned much of Parker's research during the 1560s and 1570s. He specialised in identifying the usefulness of medieval and Saxon manuscripts, and produced with Parker's son, John, his own unpublished Old English lexicon.²⁷ This lexicon was one of several aids Joscelyn produced to enable the Parker household to study the Anglo-Saxon and medieval manuscripts. Although Joscelyn never published

²⁴ Stephen Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity*, p. 7.

²⁵ There was a variety of means by which the Archbishop of Canterbury could involve himself in the public sphere. Vivienne Sanders, 'The Household of Archbishop Parker and the influencing of public opinion', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 34: 4 (1983), pp. 534-547 discusses not only Parker's publication programme but also his preaching campaigns and the various attempts to present the archbishopric's splendour as a means of honouring the realm.

²⁶ G. H. Martin, 'Joscelyn, John (1529-1603)', *ODNB* (2004).

²⁷ This lexicon was the result of detailed study of the manuscripts going through Parker's household. As confirmed by G&W, various manuscripts known to have belonged to Parker display the marks of Joscelyn's annotations. The manuscript of Joscelyn and John Parker's lexicon survives as BL Titus A 15 and 16. According to C.F. Tucker Brooke, 'The Renaissance of Germanic Studies in England, 1559-1689', *PMLA*, 29:2 (1914), pp. 135-151 this lexicon was an improvement over Laurence Nowell's similar version and was used for several generations to enable students to study Old English.

anything under his own name any reference to Parker's scholarship and publications must reflect his work as much as it does the archbishop's.

Working alongside Joscelyn was George Acworth (1534-1581/6) who joined Parker's household in 1569.²⁸ Acworth and Joscelyn appear to have carried out the bulk of the research for the *De Antiquitate Britannicæ* (1572) but only Parker's name appeared on the front page. Acworth also produced under the Archbishop's patronage a response to the attacks on Jewel's *Apologia* and Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* by Nicholas Sanders (c. 1530-1581).²⁹ Also amongst Parker's household scholars was Stephen Batman (c. 1542-1584), a chaplain in Parker's household who claimed to have collected 6,700 books for the Archbishop.³⁰ Most recently Freeman and Evenden have suggested that Batman's publication of his *A christall glasse of christian reformation*, printed by John Day in 1569, was produced, in part, with the sharing of costs in mind. In the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* the same illustrator had been used as had been hired for Batman's publication.³¹ Batman also collected and annotated some 23 medieval manuscripts.³² There was also 'Lily', probably Peter Lily, Parker's registrar of the consistory court. Lily was skilled in counterfeiting antique hands and his work can be seen in various 'restorations' of manuscripts by Parker's household.³³ Parker also employed another scholar of Greek - Edward Dering (c. 1540-1576) - as a chaplain, and a civil lawyer - Bartholomew Clerke (c. 1537-1590) - to help produce Acworth's

²⁸ Ronald H. Fritze, 'Acworth, George (1534-1581x6)', *ODNB* (2004).

²⁹ Nicholas Sanders, *De Visibili Monarchia* (Louvain, 1571). Acworth's response was entitled *De Visibili Romanarchia* (London, 1573).

³⁰ Rivkah Zim, 'Batman, Stephen (c. 1542-1584)', *ODNB* (2004) and Kate McLoughlin, 'Magdalene College MS Pepys 2498 and Stephen Batman's reading practices', edited by D. J. McKitterick and E. Leedham-Green, *TCBS*, 10, (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 525-534.

³¹ Thomas S. Freeman and Elizabeth Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (forthcoming).

³² For details see McLoughlin, 'Stephen Batman's Reading Practises', pp. 525-34.

³³ Crankshaw and Gillespie, 'Parker, Matthew', *ODNB*.

response to Nicholas Sanders.³⁴ Nicholas Robinson (c. 1530-1585), Bishop of Bangor from 1566 had previously been selected by Parker in 1559 as a preaching chaplain. Not only did he excel in his sermons but he was also a scholar of Welsh history.³⁵ Alexander Neville (1544-1614) acted as secretary for Parker and his successors and took part in examining early ecclesiastical manuscripts. In 1575 he published *De Furoribus Norfolkensium Ketto duce*, an account of the 1549 Norfolk rising with an attached history of Norwich.³⁶ Richard Lyne (fl. 1570-c.1600) worked as Parker's printer and engraver, providing a portrait of Parker for *De Antiquitate Britannicæ*, a map for John Caius' *Historia Cantabrigiensis* (1574) and a large genealogical chart of Britain for Alexander Neville's history of the Norfolk rising.³⁷ For the direct link to Canterbury, plenty of evidence exists to show that Parker corresponded and shared manuscripts with the famed diplomat and Dean of Canterbury and York, Nicholas Wotton (c. 1497-1567) and with William Darell (d. 1580) one of the chapter members of Canterbury Cathedral who elected Parker as Archbishop. Both men had an interest in antiquities and had themselves collected various old manuscripts.³⁸ Along with John Twyne (c. 1507-1581), the headmaster of King's School, Dean Thomas Neville, prebendary Thomas Becon (d. 1567) and again John Bale, these Canterbury residents appear to have harvested the great Canterbury libraries and were willing to exploit their gains in exchange for the archbishop's patronage.³⁹

³⁴ For details see Patrick Collinson, 'Dering, Edward (c.1540-1576)', *ODNB* (2004) and P.O.G. White, 'Clerke, Bartholomew (c.1537-1590)', *ODNB* (2004).

³⁵ J. Gwynfor Jones, 'Robinson, Nicholas (c.1530-1585)', *ODNB* (2004).

³⁶ Elisabeth Leedham-Green, 'Neville, Alexander (1544-1614)', *ODNB* (2004).

³⁷ L. H. Cust, 'Lyne, Richard (fl. c.1570-c.1600)', *ODNB* (2004).

³⁸ Michael Zell, 'Wotton, Nicholas (c.1497-1567)', *ODNB* (2004) and Peter Sherlock, 'Darell, William (d. in or after 1580)', *ODNB* (2004).

³⁹ Discussed in Nigel Ramsay, 'The Cathedral Archives and Library', in Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay and Margaret Sparks (eds), *The History of Canterbury Cathedral* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 374-5. As noted by Ramsay, apart from Bale, John Twyne is the only collector to have received much examination from historians. See especially Andrew G. Watson, 'John Twyne of Canterbury (d. 1581) as a collector of medieval manuscripts: A preliminary investigation', *The Library*, 6:8 (1986), pp. 133-151 and Arthur B.

iii. Matthew Parker's contact network

Parker's surviving correspondence between 1563 and 1568 reveals that he was making use of his position as Archbishop of Canterbury, and leaving it in no doubt that engagement in England's manuscript heritage was an excellent route to gaining his patronage. From Wales, Bishop Richard Davies (1505-1581) of St David's informed Parker that 'Mr Salisbury' [John Jewel] had been baffled by an old Saxon manuscript. Parker replied eagerly that 'I have divers books and works, and have in my house those that do well understand them'.⁴⁰ Parker also sent John Scory (d. 1585) to Wales to search for antique manuscripts and was rewarded with three Saxon homilies.⁴¹ However, the task was not always easy. Co-operation with other scholarly households, such as those belonging to Sir William Cecil and Henry Fitzalan, twelfth Earl of Arundel (1512-1580) did enable an extension of knowledge for all concerned, but many other high and mid-ranking men refused to co-operate. Other men found little of use despite their efforts.⁴² In 1567 Rowland Meyrick, Bishop of Bangor sent Parker a transcript of Eadmer's History but reported that he had found little else of interest. It was a similar case in Lincoln, where John Ælmer claimed to have found nothing.⁴³ When informing Parker of an Armenian Psalter, Richard Davies had also admitted that

Ferguson, 'John Twyne: A Tudor humanist and the problem of legend', *The Journal of British Studies*, 9:1 (1969), pp. 24-44.

⁴⁰ This manuscript was probably CCC MS 478 – an Armenian Psalter. See Bruce and Thompson, *Correspondence*, pp. 265-267 and Walter W. Greg, 'Books and Bookmen in the correspondence of Archbishop Parker', *The Library*, 16:3 (1935), pp. 243-79.

⁴¹ G&W, p. 6.

⁴² Evidence for co-operation with Arundel has been unearthed by David N. Dumville, 'The Sixteenth-Century history of two Cambridge books from Sawley', in B. Jenkins and D. McKitterick (eds), *TCBS*, 7 (1981), pp. 427-444. This research has shown that a transcript of Roger of Howden's prologue was taken from Arundel's manuscript and added to CCC MS 139. Similarly BL MS Royal. 13 B.7 belonging to Arundel contains a transcript of the *Historia Brittonum* and Caradog's *Vita Gilde*, both derived from Parker's transcript in CCC MS 101.

⁴³ Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, vol. 1, pp. 509, 511.

Sir William Cecil had taken the other manuscripts of interest from St David's. He had taken 'Giraldus Cambrensis [Gerald of Wales], a Chronicle of England the author unknown, and *Gilfridus Monumensis* [Geoffrey of Monmouth]'.⁴⁴ Parker fared better in his relationship with the scholar John Stow. Stow provided Parker with a copy of the *Chronica Majora* by Matthew Paris and in return Stow borrowed various manuscripts from the archbishop. This is an interesting relationship as Stow was to be suspected as a recusant (his house was examined in 1569 for signs of popery), yet he and Parker maintained a mutually beneficial association.⁴⁵ In relation to the limited success in searching out Bale's lost library, the difficulty of gathering up the dispersed monastic collections appears to have been great. As recognised by James Carley, many of the manuscripts appear to have entered into private collections after the dissolution and it was not always easy to convince men to part with them again.⁴⁶ After Dr Nevinson had refused Parker access to a collection of Cranmer's books, the Privy Council provided him with a warrant that gave Parker the right to see any writings and records in private hands that 'remain obscure and unknown; in which...be mentioned such historical matters and monuments of antiquity, both for the state of ecclesiastical and civil government'.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Bruce and Thompson, *Correspondence*, pp. 265-267.

⁴⁵ For details on Stow see Barrett L. Beer, 'Stow, John (1524/5-1605)', *ODNB* (2004) and David Scott Kastan, 'Opening gates and stopping hedges: Grafton, Stow, and the politics of Elizabethan history writing', in Elizabeth Fowler and Roland Greene (eds), *The Project of prose in Early Modern Europe and the New World* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 66-79.

⁴⁶ James P. Carley, 'The dispersal of the Monastic libraries and the salvaging of the spoils', in Elizabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (eds), *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, vol. 1: To 1640* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 265-91.

⁴⁷ A copy of this warrant can be found in Bruce and Thompson, *Correspondence*, pp. 327-8. It is often cited as an example of Parker's collecting prowess and of how he had managed to gain official recognition. In many cases this might be taking the importance of the warrant too far, as its powers in fact were probably weaker than in theory. There is certainly no examples of Parker using the warrant after the quarrel with Nevinson in 1563. For more details see Pamela M. Black, 'Matthew Parker's Search for Cranmer's "great notable written books"', *The Library*, 29 (1974), pp 312-322; David G. Selwyn, *The Library of Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, 1996) and Greg, 'Books and Bookmen', p. 271.

The largest collection of manuscripts in Parker's hands had come from Canterbury and it was probably at his houses at Lambeth and Bekesbourne that much of the scholarly work was based.⁴⁸ From Christ Church 36 manuscripts were gathered including a copy of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the chronicle compiled by Gervase of Canterbury.⁴⁹ From St Augustine's 29 manuscripts were brought to the Archbishop including the Canterbury Gospels and a thirteenth century *Brut* in French.⁵⁰ Other manuscripts came via his network of contacts from Norwich, Worcester, Exeter, St Alban's, St Martin's Priory in Dover, Bury St Edmunds, Peterborough, Winchester, St Mary's of York, Sawley, Jervaulx, Rievaulx and Durham.⁵¹ The result of these searches therefore appears to be mixed. Parker had indeed saved many useful manuscripts from destruction and in particular had preserved various Old English manuscripts that would almost certainly have been lost to time if it were not for his efforts. However much appears to have been lost entirely or remained hidden in private collections. Although, as was described in chapter one, this was also a selective recovery of England's past related largely to a defence of the Queen's religious settlement, it was one that made the 1560s and 1570s a time of immense re-evaluation and discovery of England's heritage.

⁴⁸ Although Parker spent most of his time in Lambeth Palace he was unable to move his household there until repairs were completed in 1570. Parker's house at Canterbury also needed extensive repairs after a serious fire had largely destroyed it in 1543. Croydon and Bekesbourne were in a better condition, the latter having been added to the Archbishopric after its surrender to the king in 1540. At Bekesbourne, Parker had also brought a house next to the palace for his wife and children and a survey carried out shortly after Parker's death recorded a collection of his books there. See Tatton-Brown, *Lambeth Palace*, pp. 65-67 and Sheila Strongman, 'John Parker's Manuscripts: An edition of the lists in Lambeth Palace MS 737', in Brian Jenkins and David McKitterick (eds), *TCBS*, 7 (1981), pp. 1-27.

⁴⁹ CCCC MS 173 and CCCC MS 438 respectively. It is important to note that the manuscripts belonging to Canterbury had survived the dissolution relatively well in comparison to many places. See Bruce Dickins, 'The Making of the Parker Library', in John Hanson, Nigel Hancock, Brian Jenkins, and David McKitterick (eds), *TCBS*, 6 (1977), pp. 19-34 and Cyril E. Wright, 'The Dispersal of the Monastic Libraries and the beginnings of Anglo-Saxon Studies: Matthew Parker and his Circle: A Preliminary Study', in Bruce Dickins and A.N.L. Munby (eds), *TCBS*, 1 (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 208-237.

⁵⁰ That is the Canterbury Gospels (*Evangelia Cantuariensia*) CCCC MS 286 and the *Brut of Wace* CCCC MS 50 ii.

⁵¹ 15 MSS from Cathedral Priory of Norwich, 12 MSS from Worcester, 10 MSS from St Alban's, 7 MSS from Exeter, 6 MSS from St Martin's Priory, Bury St Edmunds, Peterborough, and Winchester, 3 MSS from St Mary's in York, 2 from Sawley, 1 from Jervaulx, Rievaulx and Durham. See Dickins, 'The Making of the Parker Library', p. 21.

The compilation of the first two editions of the *Acts and Monuments* cannot be understood without recognising that Parker's household acted as a focal point for much of the scholarship that was taking place in Elizabethan England. Through the means of his household, Parker was able to redefine the loose network of scholars who had come out of Oxford and Cambridge Universities during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI and had, in part, co-operated in an exile scholarly 'campaign' against the policies of Mary I. Parker directed English scholarship back to the question of its past and the complexities of its manuscript heritage.

iv. John Joscelyn's lists of old manuscripts

The transformation of Parker into a 'great collector' was therefore propelled by inspiration from the Magdeburg Centuriators and with the help of Bale's letter of 1560. The search for Bale's library was, however, only one aspect of Parker's early endeavours to derive from that letter. A series of lists which recorded title, author and location of manuscripts was also constructed by John Joscelyn at this time and can be directly linked into Parker's response to the Centuriators' request as well as his own intention to save England's manuscript heritage in order to use it to defend his Queen's religious settlement.⁵² The earliest list (J2 ff. 209-212) contained details of English manuscripts from the Norman Conquest to the end of the middle ages, while the adjoining second list (J2 f. 208) covered the same space in time but included continental manuscripts as well as English. The third list (J1) relays a specific interest in manuscripts dating to the pre-Conquest period. Thus, each list had a slightly different

⁵² G&W, pp. 55-109 have reproduced these lists with annotations. In their introduction Graham and Watson have provided an analysis of the series of changes made to each list providing a strong chronological ordering for them. Although there cannot be any exact dates internal evidence does provide a strong case.

purpose and a chronological analysis of each list's compilation can reveal much about the evolution of Parker's household activities. The partially surviving title of Joscelyn's first list suggests that a history was in preparation: 'desiring perhaps to put together a history...[section missing]...I have thought it very useful to indicate here the names of writers of history and what each of them wrote, and at what time'.⁵³ Graham and Watson have interpreted this partial title as evidence that Joscelyn planned to write a history of his own. However it is unlikely that as Parker's chief secretary he would, himself, have had the time. Instead, the intention that Joscelyn expressed might have meant a collaborative in-house project under the Archbishop's eye, of which Joscelyn was a key component.

Another possibility is that the history referred to was not initially Joscelyn's or Parker's but that of the Centuriators. Graham and Watson have shown that the earliest list dates to sometime before 30 July 1560 as Joscelyn has added material from Bale's letter after the initial list was compiled. Putting to one side these additions for a moment, the remaining items appear to derive largely from Bale's *Catalogus* the most obvious published source available in 1560 if one were to compile a list of known medieval manuscripts. Perhaps Parker's response to the Centuriators' request was two-pronged. He first charged Joscelyn with forming a list but when that only provided limited results went to the source itself – John Bale. This certainly supports Parker's own words to Matthias Flacius Illyricus when he claimed that as he had 'sent numberless messengers to many persons and places to no effect, I was at length stirred up to recover the books of Master Bale'.⁵⁴

⁵³ G&W, p. 9.

⁵⁴ Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, pp. 78.

Whatever the original intention, Joscelyn expanded and annotated this first list and added two more as he and the other collaborators became more knowledgeable and conversant with the medieval and Anglo-Saxon heritage. The result of these lists was, in part, the *De Antiquitate Britannicæ*.⁵⁵ This publication charted the succession and continuity of the Archbishopric of Canterbury with an opening section on the first coming of Christianity to Britain followed by detailed biographies of each Archbishop up to Cardinal Pole. It referenced numerous sources, most of which can be found in Joscelyn's three lists and by extension interacted with the *Magdeburg Centuries* as a source. In terms of source material comparison to the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* also reveals a close relationship between the two texts. For instance the opening section on the first coming of Christianity is an almost identical translation of the opening section to Book Two of the *Act and Monuments* – both extracted from the *Magdeburg Centuries*.⁵⁶ Furthermore, most Books in the *Acts and Monuments* ended with a brief list of the Archbishops of Canterbury, presumably taken from Parker's research during the 1560s.

There is no reason, however to assume that the *De Antiquitate Britannicæ* was the intention from the beginning, nor that it was the only intention. Perhaps inspired by the Magdeburg Centuriators, Parker planned his own adaptation of Flacius' ecclesiastical history for his own church and Foxe was the obvious choice to compile it. Foxe's current project, the English '*Martyrum Historium*' had already familiarised him with accounts of the Marian martyrs. It could be and was adapted and transformed from an historical commentary into an ecclesiastical history. Moreover, apart from Bale who

⁵⁵ Matthew Parker, *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ & Priuilegiis Ecclesiæ Canuariensis, cum Archiepiscopis eiusdem* (London, 1572).

⁵⁶ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 145-6 to *De Antiquitate Britannicæ*, p. 1 and both of these to *Cent. I lib 2 cap 3*, *Cent. I. Lib. 2 cap 3*, *Cent. II cap 2*, col. 4, 6, 8,9, *Cent. III cap 2*, col. 6.

was to die in 1563, Foxe was in a sense England's only representative of the Magdeburg Centuriators, having worked for them in Basel. He and his project were the obvious choice to produce England's ecclesiastical history.

Whether or not Parker was involved in adapting the 1563 edition to this new schema has to remain uncertain, as the evidence is circumstantial. However the decision must have been made within a year of publication, since the pre-reformation portion was added no earlier than this time.⁵⁷ Significantly, this section was conceived whilst Cecil and Parker were 'editing' the *Apologia* and during a period of time when Parker and his household 'circle' were making their initial inquiries into England's dispersed manuscript heritage. Parker's involvement in the decision to produce a second edition of the *Acts and Monuments* is however, undeniable. By 1563 Parker's manuscript collection and knowledge had revealed to him the immense potential of England's largely unused textual history. A second edition of the *Acts and Monuments* closely tied to Parker's discoveries was perhaps a matter of when rather than if. Furthermore, another aspect of England's manuscript heritage was beginning to come to light in the form of Laurence Nowell (1530-c.1570) and William Lambarde's (1536-1601) research into the Anglo-Saxons. This development was also to have vital significance to Parker's 'circle' and to England's ecclesiastical history.

⁵⁷ Thomas S. Freeman, "'St Peter did not do thus": Papal History in the Acts and Monuments', *VE* (2004), pt. 1 suggests that the confused pagination of Book One shows signs of last-minute insertions and the page signatures have been designed to avoid having to renumber all the pages already produced.

2. The rise of Anglo-Saxon studies (c. 1561-c.1570)

i. The Archaionomia

In 1914 C.F. Tucker Brooke wrote that 'Parker found about him a darkness of ignorance regarding the early history of the English church and nation'.⁵⁸ In one sense this opinion on Elizabethan history writing is accurate: English study and knowledge of the Anglo-Saxons was outdated in its scholastic methodology and purpose. The new humanist learning enabled later sixteenth-century scholars to re-evaluate texts and judge history in a new light.⁵⁹ Different questions were being asked and different emphasis placed upon the texts already in circulation, but also new weight for those chronicles that had ceased to be remembered. The past was to be reconstructed upon a new basis of scholarly conviction with a reordered ideal of truth and authority. The reception of the Anglo-Saxon tradition in the early Tudor era was primarily by the means of chronicles such as Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, Robert Fabyan's *The New Chronicles of England and France* and Polydore Vergil's *Historia Anglicana*. Late medieval chroniclers had no need to consult Old English manuscripts to write their histories and give authority to their words. Indeed manuscripts written in Old English had long lost their value.⁶⁰ The reformation conjoined with new humanist learning techniques and a reliance on the classical authors provided a new context for the study

⁵⁸ Brooke, 'The Renaissance of Germanic Studies in England', pp. 135-151. For similar opinions on the role of Anglo-Saxon studies in sixteenth-century England see Richard T. Vann, 'The free Anglo-Saxons: A historical Myth', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 19:2 (1958), pp. 259-272 who suggests inaccurately that Anglo-Saxon studies was a purely Protestant interest in the sixteenth-century and was therefore always religiously motivated.

⁵⁹ Particularly useful for the nature of this transformation by humanist study is the research done by Anthony Grafton, *Bring out your Dead: The Past as Revelation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 2001, 2001) and Donald R. Kelley, 'The writing of History and the study of Law', in A. Rabil (ed.), *Renaissance Humanism: Its sources, forms and legacy* (Philadelphia, 1988), pp. 236-270.

⁶⁰ Nigel R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), p. xlix suggests that Old English manuscripts had lost their value as early as the thirteenth or fourteenth century.

of the past; one where Old English manuscripts were once again valued largely because they had been neglected and because knowledge of the old language was, in the sixteenth-century, scarce. Parker and his colleagues recognised the power of language, especially one that was illegible to their enemies. However, although Parker was the first to publish a translation of a manuscript from Old English, he was not the one to instigate the study.

In 1568 William Lambarde published the *Archaionomia*. It represented the first attempt at a translation into Latin of the Old English Saxon law codes, presenting them in both Old English and Latin on adjoining pages and providing a brief introduction to the Anglo-Saxon period – the invasions, their customs, laws, and kingdoms.⁶¹ It was the result of a small collaborative venture between one of Sir William Cecil's antiquaries Laurence Nowell and at least two members of Lincoln's Inn: William Lambarde and William Cordell (1522-1581). It is worth pausing here for a moment to analyse the careers of these two individuals in more detail and the convergence of an emerging historical approach to law with Parker's ecclesiastical purposes. Laurence Nowell was the cousin of two of Foxe's closest friends – Laurence Nowell, Dean of Lichfield and Alexander Nowell, Dean of St Paul's.⁶² In the early 1550s Laurence Nowell had graduated from Christ Church, Oxford with a degree in philosophy. Between 1553 and 1558 he visited Paris, Rouen, Antwerp, Louvain, Geneva, Venice, Padua and Rome, and

⁶¹ Retha M. Warnicke, *William Lambarde: Elizabethan Antiquary 1536-1601* (London, 1973), pp. 21-35.

⁶² John Foxe and Alexander Nowell had shared accommodation whilst studying at Brasenose College in Oxford during the 1530s. He and possibly his brother Laurence Nowell, future Dean of Lichfield were with Foxe in Frankfurt as described by Christina H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles: A study in the origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 237-9. For the life of Laurence Nowell, antiquary see Retha M. Warnicke, 'Nowell, Laurence (1530-c.1570)', *ODNB* (2004). Historical research into Laurence Nowell has been difficult partly because he never published his own research, preferring to leave it to others. However, Nowell has also been confused with his cousin of the same name, who was Dean of Lichfield. This confusion can be found in the discussion by Robin Flower, 'Laurence Nowell and the Discovery of England in Tudor Times', in E. G. Stanley (ed.), *British Academy Papers on Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 1-27.

shortly after Queen Elizabeth's succession represented Knaresborough in the Queen's first Parliament. Shortly after he travelled around England and Ireland keeping a commonplace book on the classical works that he encountered. It was about this time (c. 1561) that he began to learn Old English, using and translating law codes, the Old English Bede, and Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary*, all texts that Parker would eventually end up with in his collection. By 1563 Laurence Nowell was residing in the house of Sir William Cecil as a tutor, translator of Old English and mapmaker. He translated various Old English texts, from the law codes to a translation of the only surviving copy of the poem *Beowulf*. He also produced an Old English lexicon, the *Vocabularium Saxonicum* that would later be used by Parker's household and by generations of lexicographers. However by March 1567 Laurence Nowell had left his books and manuscripts in William Lambarde's care whilst he again travelled around Europe. During this time he disappeared and was, for several years, presumed dead, although he would eventually return c. 1572 and died in 1576/7.⁶³

The earliest known contact between Laurence Nowell and William Lambarde occurred in 1559 about the time of the Queen's first Parliament.⁶⁴ At this time Lambarde was a member of Lincoln's Inn and a Member of Parliament. He would go on to produce the *Perambulation of Kent*, the earliest county history and the inspiration for William Camden's *Britannia*. Recent studies have emphasised that Lambarde was 'no remote ivory-tower scholar' but an influential and active political commentator.⁶⁵ Such an

⁶³ Once abroad Nowell vanished and the last seven years of his life is a mystery. See Pamela M. Black, 'Laurence Nowell's "disappearance" in Germany and its Bearing on the Whereabouts of His Collectanea 1568-1572', *The English Historical Review*, 92: 363 (1977), pp. 345-353.

⁶⁴ See J.D. Aslop, 'Lambarde, William (1536-1601)', *ODNB* (2004).

⁶⁵ See J. D. Aslop and W. M. Stevens, 'William Lambarde and the Elizabethan Polity', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 8:235 (1987), pp.233-265 and Wilfrid Prest, 'William Lambarde, Elizabethan Law Reform, and Early Stuart Politics', *The Journal of British Studies*, 34:4 (1995), pp. 464-480.

assessment of Lambarde further promotes the importance of the *Archaionomia* and Lambarde's other publications. Historians from Anthony A. Wood to J.D. Alsop have also attested that Lambarde produced the bulk of the work for the *Archaionomia* – building heavily on Nowell's earlier translations of the law codes.⁶⁶ This assertion is, however, uncertain.⁶⁷

The *Archaionomia* itself was dedicated to William Cordell, Master of the Rolls and fellow of Lambarde's at Lincoln's Inn. Cordell's exact role in the production of this edition of the law codes is uncertain. However, in his preface to the *Archaionomia*, Lambarde suggests that Cordell's distinguished abilities in interpreting the law, his interest in preserving old manuscripts and his assistance with the translations were the reason for the dedication.⁶⁸ Although we must keep in mind that the preface reflects the conventions of the day, in which Cordell's role is described as part of a rhetorical troupe, it would seem to suggest that Cordell acted as proof-reader and advisor to Lambarde's project. Whoever did most of the translation and research, Nowell, Lambarde and Cordell's work was subsumed into Cecil and Parker's greater interests. It is important to note that the *Archaionomia* was not a religiously charged publication, and neither were the convictions of its editors overly religious. Although Nowell had travelled abroad during the reign of Mary I he was not in exile for religious convictions but in his own words, for his own research. In all probability he chose to study in Europe during these years to avoid the turmoil that was expected. Neither Lambarde nor Cordell had left England during the 1550s and although Cordell lost his position on

⁶⁶ Anthony A. Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. 1 (London, 1721), p. 246 and Alsop, 'Lambarde', *ODNB*.

⁶⁷ Warnicke, *William Lambarde*, p. 23-5 believes that Lambarde should be given more credit for the work. Patrick Wormald, 'The Lambarde Problem: Eighty Years On', in Jane Roberts and Janet L. Nelson (eds), *Alfred the Wise; Studies in Honour of Janet Bately on the occasion of her sixty-fifth birthday* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 237-275 has analysed the source for *Archaionomia*, and tentatively suggested that Nowell and Lambarde should be given equal prominence.

⁶⁸ William Lambarde, *Archaionomia*, p. A.I.

the Council upon Elizabeth's coronation, he was still allowed to remain Master of the Rolls.

The *Archaionomia* was part of an alternative interest in history designed for the purpose of legal scholarship and practice. In France, François Baudouin (1520-1573), the legal humanist who had for a time helped Flacius and the Centuriators improve their methodological practices, was becoming an important proponent of this type of history writing.⁶⁹ By the end of the 1550s Baudouin had successfully applied his ideas of universal and 'integral' history in the form of his *Institution of universal history* (1561). The interest in the methods of history or *ars historica* as it became known, continued and was further popularised by Jean Bodin (1530-1596) in his *Methodus ad facilem Historiarum Cognitionem* published in 1566.⁷⁰ The *ars historica* was perhaps too late a development to have had any direct influence on Foxe's work or that of Lambarde and Nowell. However, the academic context in which it was forged was certainly alive during their formative years and was no doubt an underlying influence on their own methodologies.⁷¹ Moreover, the rise of an historical interest in law and methodology by lawyers largely in France, but also, to a lesser extent in England paved the way for a parallel development in religious writings.⁷² Baudouin's historical interests were also

⁶⁹ For details of François Baudouin's 'Integral' history see Donald R. Kelley, 'Historia Integra: François Baudouin and his Conception of History', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 25:1 (1964), pp. 35-57. See also the previous chapter of this thesis.

⁷⁰ Antony Grafton, *What was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007) is particularly useful in its discussion of the *Ars Historica*, especially the contribution by François Baudouin and Jean Bodin.

⁷¹ It is worth noting that Conrad Gesner (a friend of Bale and Foxe's in Basel) had published his *Bibliotheca Universalis* in 1545, while Christophe Milieu published an engagement with the ideas of *Ars Historica* through the print house of Oporinus in 1551. There are many other examples, but for this discussion it is worth recognising that whilst in exile, the early ideas of the *Ars Historica* would have been available to Foxe. See Antony Grafton, *What was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 25-6.

⁷² Donald R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law, and History in the French Renaissance* (New York, 1970) and Donald R. Kelley, 'History, English Law and the Renaissance', *Past and Present*, 65 (1974), pp. 24-51, suggests that English lawyers viewed the law as more static than their French counterparts. However, Christopher Brooks and Kevin Sharpe, 'Debate:

intently religious – having converted to Calvinism and then back to a conservative form of Lutheranism – however, Nowell, Lambarde and Cordell, while obviously having religious opinions, were not propelled by religious zeal but by more legal concerns. It was therefore the necessity of patronage from those in power that forged the link between legal historiography in England and the religious pursuit of the past to authenticate the present. This meant that to some extent their work was moulded and designed for their patrons, in this case Sir William Cecil and Matthew Parker. So although the *Archaionomia* was not written with a religious agenda from the outset, the possibilities of adapting the work into something more useful must have influenced Cecil's patronage of Nowell and Parker's lending of manuscripts.⁷³

Parker's involvement is made clear in Lambarde's preface to the *Archaionomia*. He stated that most of the manuscripts had come from the Archbishop's collections.⁷⁴ Manuscripts were also borrowed from Dr Nicholas Wotton, Dean of Canterbury and York who by extension co-operated with Parker's endeavours and left many of his manuscripts with Parker after his death in 1567.⁷⁵ Indeed the Anglo-Saxon law codes and elements of Lambarde's general study into the Anglo-Saxons were included in Parker's *De Antiquitate Britannicæ* and the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.⁷⁶ Nowell's lexicon is apparent in John Joscelyn's own annotations to manuscripts in

History, English Law and the Renaissance', *Past and Present*, 72 (1976), pp. 133-142 have counterclaimed that some English lawyers were interested in the study of customs and laws both modern and ancient. The work of Lambarde and Cordell then, supports such an assertion. They studied the Anglo-Saxon law codes to trace the development of law customs and to stress the continued existence and relevance of these laws after the Norman Conquest.

⁷³ Warnicke, *William Lambarde*, pp. 32-3.

⁷⁴ William Lambarde, *Archaionomia* (London, 1568), p. A.iii.

⁷⁵ See the evidence in Joscelyn's three lists in G&W, pp. 55-109.

⁷⁶ For the insertion of material from Lambarde's work into the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* see chapter 4 of this thesis.

which he placed contemporary English next to difficult Old English words.⁷⁷ There is extensive evidence that Cecil, Parker, Wotton and Joscelyn were actively acquiring Anglo-Saxon manuscripts for the purpose of discovering evidence that England's conversion to Christianity and its existence during the Anglo-Saxon era was not entirely reliant on Rome and that Anglo-Saxon doctrines and ceremonies acted as precedents for the Elizabethan church. To be able to demonstrate that English Christianity, if not the actual church, was founded independently of Rome was a powerful argument in their defence, and it was one that permeated both Parker's and Foxe's publications.⁷⁸ So too was the proposition that the Anglo-Saxons had preached a religion more similar to the Elizabethan church than to the Roman Catholic Church of the sixteenth century. Parker's religiously-motivated 'circle' was therefore intertwined with the general scholarly interests of Nowell and the legal motivations of Lambarde and Cordell to rediscover Anglo-Saxon history. It was also a response to attempts by the supporters of the Pope's church to appropriate the early English church for their own purposes. Felicity Heal has described these contests as a 'battle for the terrain of the early church', citing Bede as the exemplary writer used by both sides to support their own claims of English Christian origins.⁷⁹ In 1565, Thomas Harding (1516-1572) had extensively quoted from Bede to refute Jewel's *Apologia*, whilst Thomas Stapleton had published his own edition of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* in Louvain to educate the Queen and others of Bede's true support of papal authority. Heal also correctly states that the 1570

⁷⁷ For instance John Joscelyn's annotations in various manuscripts appear in his word-list of Old English (Lambeth Palace Library MS 692) and in his and John Parker's two volume Old English Dictionary which can be found in BL Cotton MSS Titus A.xv-xvi. See Mildred Budny, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: An Illustrated Catalogue* (Cambridge, 1997), p. xlv.

⁷⁸ G&W, p. 7 reveals that the main list in J1 was not a list of Old English manuscripts nor a complete inventory of Joscelyn and Parker's knowledge or ownership of Saxon manuscripts. Instead the list appears to have concentrated on manuscripts providing historical knowledge of the period, perhaps intended for their own *De Antiquitate Britannicæ* or, I would speculate, perhaps also for Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.

⁷⁹ Felicity Heal, 'Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Church', *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), pp. 109-132.

edition of the *Acts and Monuments* reinforced the Parkerian rebuttal of Stapleton and the other Papal apologists with its extensive quotations from early documents, including Bede and the first use of Anglo-Saxon fonts.⁸⁰

ii. A shared Anglo-Saxon inheritance

The first publication on an Anglo-Saxon theme was Parker's *A Testimonie of Antiquitie* (1566), which in a similar approach as the *Archaionomia*, presented a sermon by Ælfric in both its original Old English and in translation to contemporary English. Writing the preface, Joscelyn explained that this Old English sermon would prove that the Mass was taken as being symbolic in Ælfric's time and that priests were allowed to marry.⁸¹ He especially noted that the sermon was widely used, having survived in various monastic libraries until the dissolution. Parker and Joscelyn had recognised the importance of confirming the sermon's wide appeal as a means of justifying the present through the use of the past. Joscelyn claimed that the survival of the sermon in the largely forgotten language of Old English gave it authority as a true representation of Anglo-Saxon thought. It continued, Joscelyn contended, to remain uncorrupted by later amendments and, by association, the corruption of it by Papal agents; they could not understand it, so they did not attempt to destroy or amend the text. Nowell's Anglo-Saxon studies had been quickly subsumed into England's religious defence and by extension had influenced the scope of the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* through the lens of Parker's patronage of both projects.

⁸⁰ For a general summary of this subject see Benedict Scott Robinson, "'Darke Speech": Matthew Parker and the Reforming of History', *SCJ*, 29:4 (1998), pp. 1061-1083. A more in-depth discussion of Foxe's use of Anglo-Saxon materials and fonts appears in chapter four of this thesis where further analysis of Foxe's use of Bede suggests some further interesting conclusions on this subject.

⁸¹ From the preface to Matthew Parker, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie, shewing the auncient fayth in the Church of England touching the sacrament of the body and bloude of the Lord here publikely preached, and also received in the Saxons tyme, aboue 600. yeares agoe* (London, 1566).

For this publication and to be re-used for similar future projects, Parker commissioned John Day to produce the first ever Anglo-Saxon fonts for the printing press. This is an important development, which is further tied into Parker's ideological purposes. As recognised by Peter J. Lucas the font was made to be larger than the type used for the main text.⁸² This automatically presented the Old English text as holding more authority than its contemporary cousin. As often cited the font appeared, not only in Parker's *Testimonie of Antiquitie*, but also in William Lambarde's *Archaionomia*, Parker's *Gospels of the fower euangelistes*, and his Asser's *Aelfredi Regis res gestae*. It also appeared in the 1576 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.⁸³ Such a development helped to shape the presentational authority which Parker and to a lesser extent Foxe, were placing in it as a means of highlighting the truth-claims that could be produced from their readings.

It is perhaps not surprising therefore that, in the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, Foxe had only provided a short summary of pre-Gregorian ecclesiastical history as a preface to the larger account of the declining church.⁸⁴ It was largely a comparison between the old 'oryginall state of the church' to 'the...time that followed' to the state of the Pope's church in his own time.⁸⁵ Foxe admitted that such a summary was not treated 'so copiously as the matter would require', yet nonetheless Foxe believed that it was sufficient 'for thee to understande what difference there was'. It was not Foxe however, who came up with this particular scheme. John Jewel's *Apologia*, instigated by Sir William Cecil and Matthew Parker and inspired or at least

⁸² Peter J. Lucas, 'From politics to practicalities: Printing Anglo-Saxon in the Context of Seventeenth-Century Scholarship', *The Library*, 4 (2003), pp. 28-48.

⁸³ See particularly Robinson, "Darke speech", pp. 1061-1083.

⁸⁴ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 1-7.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

extrapolated from Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* had been the first such tract in England to explain the stance of the Elizabethan church through a comparison of its religion to both that of the primitive church and the Roman Catholic church of his own age.⁸⁶ Through Cecil and Parker's recognition of the Anglo-Saxon research undertaken by Nowell and Lambarde, this changed. In the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* the decision was made that a summary of the pre-Gregorian church was not enough and that a fuller account was required after all. Foxe explained that;

For the better accomplishing wherof [...] I haue thought good first, beginning from the time of the primitiue Church, and so continuing [...] to these latter yeares and daies, to comprehende or runne ouer the whole state and course of the Church in general⁸⁷

Indeed, from this short comparative summary emerged three new Books covering the history of Christianity from the time of the Apostles to the decrees of Pope Gregory VII in the eleventh century. Although the original comparative account was not entirely superseded, the majority of the new history interacted on a large scale with England's manuscript heritage and in particular was concerned with the history of the Anglo-Saxons, who were previously absent. Two years after the 1570 edition was published Parker's *De Antiquitate Britannicæ* would use much of the same materials to discuss the first conversion of the Britons to Christianity.⁸⁸ All these texts interconnect in terms of ideas, evidence, interpretative context, and above all in the minds of the persons who compiled them. From a shared experience of exile during the previous reign of Mary I, to the day-to-day collaboration in John Day's print house, the recognition of a useful

⁸⁶ For details of Jewel's *Apologia* see T.H.L. Parker, *English Reformers* (London, 1966), pp. 3-57. For the use of Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* as a source and possible inspiration for the *Apologia* see Oliver K. Olson, *Matthias Flacius and the survival of Luther's Reform* (Wiesbaden, 2002), p. 253.

⁸⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 1, p. 1.

⁸⁸ See Matthew Parker, *De Antiquitate Britannicæ*, p. 1.

purpose to England's dispersed manuscript heritage, and to a particular engagement with the Elizabethan polity via the patronage of Sir William Cecil and Matthew Parker, the *Acts and Monuments* became a repository and receptacle for English religious and historical thought. Research carried out for works such as Lambarde's *Archaionomia*, Parker's *A Testimonie of Antiquitie* and *De Antiquitate Britannicæ* all filtered into the *Acts and Monuments* and vice versa. Within this context of collaboration and interaction of texts the expansion of the pre-reformation history in the *Acts and Monuments* can be seen to have had a profound importance for the development of the book's methodology and purpose.

3. Suppression and the Revision of History

i. The Ideology of Parkerian History

The Parkerian impact on Anglo-Saxon studies and upon its insertion into the *Acts and Monuments* produced a bold move into an area and interpretation of early Christian history, which had indeed been left in 'darkness', as Tucker-Brooke put it. However, Parker's interest in the medieval past extended well beyond pre-Gregorian history and its texts. On 9 August 1569 Parker wrote to Sir William Cecil to 'borrow, but for a week or two, your book of Matthew Paris's story'.⁸⁹ This was perhaps not the first time that he had borrowed Cecil's copy of Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora* as Frederic

⁸⁹ Archbishop Matthew Parker to Sir William Cecil, 9th August 1569 in *Correspondence*, Letter CCLXXI, pp. 352-4. Cecil's copy is Paris Bibliothèque Nationale (B.N.) MS Latin 6048.

Madden has suggested, but it was certainly more urgently required.⁹⁰ Parker mentioned that he had already made this request in a previous letter, but received no response. He also exclaimed that 'I would be loth to be importune, but I would turn it to the commodity of our own country'; the archbishop feared that these 'testimonies' would be lost forever if something was not done.⁹¹ Thus, over a period of a decade Parker made it his business to gather all the known surviving copies of the *Chronica Majora* written by the thirteenth-century Benedictine Monk of St Albans, so that he could publish it for the use of Protestant scholars. Cecil's copy, a mixed text containing elements of both the 'Greater' and 'Smaller' chronicle was needed by Parker to compare with the other copies that he had collected from Edward Aglionby of Balsall Temple in Warwick, Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Deputy of Ireland, Henry FitzAlan, Earl of Arundel, and the antiquarian John Stow.⁹² As Madden has described, Parker conflated these variant copies using Stow's copy to remove the deficiencies in Sidney's, and Cecil's copy to insert matter not to be found otherwise in the *Chronica Majora*.⁹³ In Madden's words no 'single manuscript was followed at all, but interpolated throughout from others, or altered by conjectural and arbitrary readings'.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ *HA*, vol. 1, p. xxx. To support this assertion Frederic Madden noted that William Lambarde alluded to it as being in his hands in 1565 when he was writing his *Archaionomia*, whilst Parker himself references it in a margin of his transcript of the *Historia Anglorum*, produced in 1567 (CCCC MS 56).

⁹¹ Parker to Cecil, 9th August 1569, *Correspondence*, pp. 352-4.

⁹² From Edward Aglionby, Parker gained the first volume of the *Chronica Majora* containing the creation to 1188 (CCCC MS 26), from Sir Henry Sidney the second half from 1189 to 1253 (CCCC MS 16). These were the copies that John Foxe would come to use in the 1570 edition of his *Acts and Monuments* as confirmed by his folio references to the manuscript. From Henry FitzAlan, Parker acquired the concluding portion of the *Chronica Majora* containing the years 1254 to 1259 along with a copy of the *Historia Anglorum* (BL MS Reg. 14 C. vii.). Parker had the *Historia Anglorum* transcribed (now CCCC MS 56). From John Stow, Parker borrowed a copy containing the creation to the year 1250 (MS Cotton. Nero. D. V). Sir William Cecil's copy (Paris Bibliothèque Nationale (B.N.) Latin MS 6048) was a mixed text containing portions of both the *Chronica Majora* and the *Historia Anglorum*.

⁹³ Parker inserted the 'De Chronographia' from Cecil's manuscript. The 'De Chronographia' originally belonged to the *Historia Anglorum* only, but Cecil's manuscript had been produced as a conflation of both the Greater and Smaller chronicles in the fifteenth century and through this means, Parker felt it justified to include it in his edition.

⁹⁴ *HA* I, p. xxxiii.

When Parker published the results of this conflated text in 1571 he declared that Matthew Paris was a distinguished and honest author at a time of great darkness and corruption in the church and that it is thus all the more admirable that he managed to record so precisely 'the arrogant pride, insatiable desire for wealth, the tyranny and unjust authority of the Roman Pontiff'.⁹⁵ Whereas Madden and Richard Luard have both criticised Parker's method in compiling his edition of the *Chronica Majora* as intrusive and untruthful, Parker himself would not have thought so.⁹⁶ Indeed, as Madden states with some incredulity Parker wrote in his preface to Asser's *Alfredi Regis Res Gestae* (1574) that in all of his books that he published he never added anything of his own or erased anything from the original.⁹⁷ By this statement Parker did not mean, as Madden presumed, that he was providing an accurate facsimile of a manuscript or a balanced comparison of variant readings, but rather an unspoiled or faultless edition, unblemished by perceived disfigurements and corruptions whilst also complete in all its parts. Parker's purpose was more as a restorer of antiquity than a preserver of manuscript integrity.⁹⁸

The gathering of manuscript copies and the methodology employed to bring the *Chronica Majora* to publication was not a neutral endeavour, but rather a politically and religiously charged activity designed to reform England's history so that it better represented the Protestant image of a persecuted pure church and that of its persecutor - the Papal Antichrist. Foxe himself admitted as much when he wrote in his fourth

⁹⁵ Matthaeci Paris, *Monachi Albanensis, Angli, historia maior à Guilielmo Conquaestore, ad vltimum annum Henrici tertij. Cum indice locupletissimo*, ed. Matthew Parker (London, 1571), f. 1.

⁹⁶ *HA I*, p. xxxvii and *CM I*, p. ix. These opinions are of course reflective of nineteenth-century scholarship and are no longer accepted today. For more details of these types of remarks concerning Parker see Robinson, "Darke Speech", pp. 1077-8.

⁹⁷ *HA I*, p. xxxvi. The difficulty in accepting such a statement by modern standards is made all the more problematic as Parker is known to have interpolated material from Matthew Paris, the Annals of St. Neot's, Henry of Huntingdon and even John Bale.

⁹⁸ A point noted by Robinson, "Darke Speech", p. 1079.

edition (1583) of the *Acts and Monuments* that 'in such a great conflict of religion, in such a great variety of judgements, heads and thoughts, where each man favours and promotes his own side, what can be so skilfully or circumspectly explained that it can please everyone?'⁹⁹ Both Parker and Foxe by different means were rediscovering and re-examining their past through a re-discovery of England's old documents in an attempt to persuade this multiplicity of voices to support their side in the debate and to discredit the opposition. In his *Society Must be Defended*, Michel Foucault characterised such activities as the result of 'multiple relations of power' at a time when a new regime is attempting to assert itself. Ideology, Foucault stressed, directs observational methods and investigative procedures whilst a decentred (and non-neutral) discourse can result in a truth which denounces the illusions and errors of the adversary, whilst promoting a true interpretation of the evidence.¹⁰⁰ This exactly describes Parker's programme of publication. The archbishop was attempting to produce what he foresaw as 'true' accounts of God's providence in history and put them into circulation to support his own regime. God's truth revealed through history would only be revealed to those who were prepared to listen and the fact that monks could not see this truth only further implied that they had fallen from grace. The ideological assumptions with which Parker's household observed and investigated their sources, allowed them to come to logical conclusions about the past and the nature of manuscripts.

It is through these procedures that Parker and his colleagues could come to believe that a text, such as the *Chronica Majora*, had been purposefully suppressed and could legitimately claim to be reproducing the text, as they believed it was meant to be

⁹⁹ *A&M*, 1583, *John Foxe to the Learned Reader*. This translation was kindly lent to me by John Wade before its publication as part of the John Foxe Project (VE).

¹⁰⁰ Michel Foucault, *Society must be Defended*, translated by David Macey (London, 1997), pp. 53-4.

understood. Similarly 'popular' texts, often filled with Roman Catholic devotional beliefs such as the pre-eminence of saints and the observance of God's actions on Earth (such as miracles), were thrown off their pedestals and re-located as examples of papal corruption. Hagiographies and most specifically the *Golden Legend*, were reconstructed as the pinnacle of fabrication and, as Foxe exclaimed in his preface to the learned reader 'a book abounding with unnatural monstrosities of lies and most empty inventions'.¹⁰¹ It is clear from Foxe's comments in this preface and from the dedicatory epistle by his friend, Laurence Humphrey that the *Acts and Monuments* was by many conceived of as a replacement for the *Golden Legend*. For, as Humphrey exclaimed 'now at last a new and real Golden Legend is coming to the fore. An outstanding chronicle, a mournful history'.¹⁰² Foxe disliked this association but the comparison stuck nevertheless. On one level, however, the *Acts and Monuments* was indeed conceived of by its chief compiler, as a replacement for the so-called fictional *Golden Legend* of saints, with a 'truthful' one: the lives of Protestant martyrs.¹⁰³

Other particularly staunch Roman Catholic books were used with similar intent. The humanist history of Bohemia by Pope Pius II was presented to support an argument concerning the Hussites that was in direct opposition to Pius' original purposes. Similarly, the English humanist history produced by Polydore Vergil would be appropriated as a principal example of a biased 'propagandist' history. The relocating of popular Roman Catholic and well-known texts in antithesis to a largely 'forgotten' textual heritage, claimed as a suppression of God's truth, fits neatly into Foucault's

¹⁰¹ *A&M*, 1563, *Ad Doctorum Legenda* [Prefaces]. This translation was kindly lent to me by John Wade before its publication as part of the John Foxe Project (VE).

¹⁰² Laurence Humphrey dedicatory poem for the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. This translation was kindly lent to me by John Wade before its publication as part of the John Foxe Project (VE).

¹⁰³ See Helen L. Parish, *Monks, Miracles and Magic. Reformation Representations of the Medieval Church* (London, 2005).

theory of power relations at times of regime change. Such a reappraisal of the past involved a particular methodological engagement with the sources and the laying out of a specific set of assumptions about its claims to truth and fact.

ii. A Papal Conspiracy

Parker's scholarly circle recognised, as Foxe again explained, that the accuracy of histories were influenced by pressures from above; that 'fear and flattery' were 'plagues of history' of which 'the one always says less and the other always adds more to the narrative than is proper'. In other words, and to give an example, a chronicler such as Matthew Paris would write only what it was safe for him to write. When producing his abridgement, the *Historia Anglorum*, Matthew Paris appears to have instructed the scribe to remove various passages that would have been offensive to the king.¹⁰⁴ Similarly, the partiality of Gervase of Canterbury in retelling the story of Thomas Becket and for the reign of King John provided a less than useful viewpoint for the reformers, whilst providing a bountiful collection of contentions between the clergy of Canterbury during these times. On national affairs it was important to toe the line, but on local affairs in which Gervase was directly involved, a more personal opinion could be maintained and promoted. It is largely for this reason that Protestant scholars soon replaced the *Historia Anglorum* with the more controversial and angry words, of the *Chronica Majora* and why John Foxe almost entirely passed over the account in Gervase of Canterbury of Thomas Becket and instead used it only as a source of examples for internal disputes at Canterbury during the reign of Richard I.

¹⁰⁴ As recognised by Richard Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge, 1958), p. 117 various offensive passages in the CCC MS 16 copy of the *Chronica Majora* have the word 'vacat' or something similar written in the margins to instruct the scribe to remove them from the *Historia Anglorum*.

Parker's circle also believed that Papal agents had, throughout history, attempted to suppress and rewrite history to their own liking. For instance, in Book Six of the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, John Foxe paused briefly in his description of the battle of Barnet (14 April 1471) to tackle an inconsistency amongst his sources over the number slain. Foxe had noted a variance between Edward Hall's account (which had followed Polydore Vergil almost word for word) and that contained in Robert Fabyan's *The New Chronicles of England and France*. It provided one of many opportunities to attack Polydore's accuracy and reputation. Foxe exclaimed that 'Polydore [Vergil] wrytyng of so many thinges which he neuer saw, doth not vouch safe to cite vnto vs those writers of whom he borrowed. And more do I maruell, or rather lament, if it bee true that I haue heard, that he not onelye nameth no author vnto vs, but also burned an heape of our Englishe stories vnknowen, after the finishyng of hys, in the dayes of K. Henry the 8'.¹⁰⁵

The accusation of suppression, fabrication and destruction of history and its texts was just one facet of many that Protestant reformers were using to attack the Papacy and to support their own interpretation of the Christian faith. Throughout the *Acts and Monuments*, John Foxe painted the Henrician historian Polydore Vergil (1470[?]-1555) as an unreliable and dangerous authority. Polydore and his English history became the archetype villain of Foxe's named sources. He was depicted as the last of many Italian visitors to have ransacked England's manuscript heritage, thereby depriving the reformers of significant evidence in support of their claims that the English church had been founded independently of Rome, that it had once held onto a truer Christian religion that was slowly corrupted over time by the Papal Antichrist, and that

¹⁰⁵ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 6, p. 847. Foxe also recounts the same story in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, p. 1304 when dealing with the attempted erasure of Ælfric's Easter homily as first described in Matthew Parker's *Testimonie of Antiquitie* (London, 1566).

throughout time there had still remained some small element of true Christianity amongst its people. 'Other Italians' Foxe stressed 'lykewise bee suspected, in makyng away such Latin bookes within this land, as made not for their purpose'.¹⁰⁶

The depiction of Polydore Vergil in the *Acts and Monuments* had a two-fold function. First, it provided a contemporary history of Britain that Foxe could attack in order to authenticate his own evidence and argument. Such a use is evident when Foxe described the miracle of a rood screen talking to Archbishop Dunstan. Foxe used Polydore Vergil to suggest that even Roman Catholics doubted its authenticity. On another occasion, a story taken from Polydore Vergil on Harold Godwineson (1022-1066) going to Normandy to seek pledges from Tostig (c.1029-1066) and Beorn Estrithson (*d.* 1049), was described as inaccurate as 'that can not be, for Tostius was then in England'.¹⁰⁷ Foxe also attacked Polydore's honesty in his characterisation of Archbishop Lanfranc. Polydore, Foxe claimed, 'so greatly magnified...his countreyman', thus distorting the honesty of his history.¹⁰⁸

Second, an attack on Polydore Vergil provided a useful pretext that helped to explain away the problem that most of England's history books did not directly tell the version of the past that they wished (and believed) to have occurred but that only fragments and distorted clues had survived. Foxe argued that 'where as of al other writers of histories that haue bene in England, as of Fabian, Lanquet, Rastall, More, Leland, Bale, Halle, and such other, some of their bookes whiche they then occupied, yet remayne in handes to be sene. Only of such bokes, as Polydore vsed and which past his handes, what

¹⁰⁶ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, p. 1304.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, bk. 3, p. 209.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, bk. 4, p. 237.

Englishe man is he that hath sene or can shew me one?'¹⁰⁹ The loss of monastic manuscripts, caused by the reformers' own negligence after the dissolution of the monasteries, was marginalized in preference to a conspiracy story that could be traced and interpreted through a specific interrogation of the standard and re-discovered historical sources. The release of forgotten 'suppressed' texts from their monastic 'prisons' was an opportunity to re-organise and in some cases replace those texts promoted by the old order with those more favourable to the new. As discussed in chapter one of this thesis the manuscript heritage, freed from the monastic storehouses, needed to be reformed in a new location (such as university libraries and private collections) and in a new order of priority.¹¹⁰ The accusation that Papal agents had destroyed evidence and rewritten history did come partly out of necessity but there was more to it than that. The reformers were attempting to discredit the honesty and believability of Papal supporters by charging them with suppression, falsification and fabrication of the truth. They were also providing evidence that they were not the ones revising history; they claimed that had already been done and that they were instead returning the story of the past back to its true pattern.

Of course the accusation of suppression went both ways. In Thomas Stapleton's edition of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* he significantly accused Foxe of mishandling the 'truth' in his text, and with good reason. Foxe had employed a specific methodological and theoretical framework as to how he would approach his sources, which to us would seem like fabrication and suppression of an inconvenient reality, but to Foxe and his colleagues was a legitimate approach to assessing their sources and revising history. Patrick Collinson has provided us with an assessment of Foxe's claim to truth, expressly

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, bk. 8, p. 1304.

¹¹⁰ For the inspiration behind this interpretation see Jennifer Summit, 'Monuments and Ruins: Spenser and the problem of the English Library', *English Literary History*, 7:1 (2003), pp. 1-34.

emphasising that 'their' truth is not a truth now accepted.¹¹¹ The writing of history was often perceived as an artistic endeavour as much concerned with elegance and poetic representation as it was with the accuracy and assessment of evidence. Foxe did not write fiction, as in created stories, but he did weave his material into forms that were as fictive as they were factual. The purpose was not only to support their own regime, but also to come to the 'truth' of the past. This they honestly thought had been 'suppressed' and manipulated for hundreds of years. Foxe and his fellow reformers were diligently approaching their texts under a set of guidelines that they believed would produce a more realistic account of the past.

For instance, in his preface written for the 1571 edition of Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora*, Matthew Parker not only claimed that the chronicle had been 'suppressed' because it detested the 'arrogant pride, insatiable desire for wealth and unjust authority of the Roman Pontiff' but that it had also been purposefully hidden from public use ever since.¹¹² In the case of Matthew Paris this was a relatively easy claim to make. Not only were the contents of the chronicle highly anti-papal in character but also Matthew's chronicles had largely failed to integrate into the standard corpus of texts prominent in Tudor history writing at the beginning of the sixteenth century. For instance, when John Leland, the famed antiquarian, had visited various monastic institutions across the width and breadth of England he had found or recorded few traces of Matthew's writings. In 1535, when Leland visited Matthew's own Abbey, St Alban's, he recorded that he had found no sign of Matthew's chronicles in the library,

¹¹¹ Patrick Collinson, 'Truth, Lies and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century historiography', in Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (eds), *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, rhetoric and fiction, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 37-68.

¹¹² Matthew Paris, *Historia Maior*, edited by Matthew Parker (1571), p. 1 of preface: detestari arrogantem superbiam, insatiabilem diuitiarum cupiditatem, tyrannidem, et iniustum imperium Romani Pontificis.

and that only later did he come across a copy, which also contained Matthew's *Lives of the Abbots*.¹¹³

About the same time Polydore Vergil had used Matthew Paris' smaller chronicle, the *Historia Anglorum* in the composition of his *Anglica Historia*. In his notes, but not in the final publication, Polydore clearly expressed his opinion that 'of the various annals those written about English affairs by the monks William of Malmesbury and Matthew Paris should be accounted true histories' as opposed to the vast majority which he considered to be little more than annals or worse, mythology.¹¹⁴ However it was not Polydore who revitalised interest in Matthew Paris in the sixteenth century but John Bale.

Bale, who was for all intents and purposes, Leland's successor, claimed Matthew Paris in his *Catalogus* as a skilled and wise historian who 'painted' the 'avarice, fraud, lies, deceit, pomp, shamelessness, tyranny, and blasphemy' of the Bishop of Rome for all to see.¹¹⁵ For Bale, Matthew Paris was an exemplar of why England's past authors were worth saving from destruction. He included extracts from the *Historia Anglorum* in both editions of his *Catalogus* (1548-9 and 1557-9), in the composition of his polemical play on King John, and various other polemic texts such as his *The Apology of Johan*

¹¹³ *HA*, pp. xv-xvi. John Leland made little use of Cotton MSS Claudus E. IV, the probable copy that he eventually consulted noting only a little bit of information about the Abbots. This information was contained in Leland's notes, which were eventually published by Thomas Hearne as *Joannis Lelandi Antiquarii de rebus Britannicis collectanea* (Oxford, 1715), pp. 163-4.

¹¹⁴ See Francis Aidan Gasquet, 'Some Materials for a New Edition of Polydore Vergil's "History"', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 16 (1902), pp. 1-17 for a discussion of this statement which was found in a manuscript held in the Vatican library and for the full quote see Fred J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (Toronto, 1967), p. 56.

¹¹⁵ John Bale, *Catalogus*, p. 315: In quibus quorundam Romanorum pontificum auaritas, fraudes, mendacia, dolos, pompas, impudentias, tyrannides, blasphemias, & artes pessimas ita depinxit, ut nullus unqua[m] Apelles melius.

Bale againste a ranke papist (1550) and his *Actes of Englysh Votaryes* (1551).¹¹⁶ Bale would later recommend Matthew Paris to both Archbishop Parker and Matthias Flacius Illyricus explaining that it was a wonderful source for painting out the Pope 'in...lyuely colours'.¹¹⁷ From there the chronicles compiled by Matthew Paris were disseminated into Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, various volumes of the *Magdeburg Centuries*, and John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. The *Chronica Majora* also became the centrepiece of Matthew Parker's publication of England's historical authorities.

Until that moment Matthew Paris had remained, by and large, a forgotten and neglected writer. Although Parker himself admitted that Matthew's writings had been digested into the chronicles of Thomas Walsingham, William Rishanger and Matthew of Westminster, these were, he claimed, corrupted versions, which held much less of Matthew's truth-claims than contained in his own chronicles.¹¹⁸ At any rate monastic consultation and copying of this series of St Albans chronicles had become less necessary once Ranulf Higden had produced his universal history, the *Polychronicon*.¹¹⁹ This fourteenth century chronicle, as will be described in chapter four of this thesis, was based on a vast range of knowledge derived from both classical and medieval authorities including the St Albans tradition. Furthermore, the chronicle was translated into vernacular English in the 1380s by John Trevisa, which propagated its popularity

¹¹⁶ John Bale, *The apology of Iohan Bale agaynste a ranke papyst anuswering both hym and hys doctours, that neyther their vowes nor yet their priesthode are of the Gospell, but of Antichrist. Anno Do. M.CCCC.L. A brefe exposycyon also upo[n] the .xxx chaptre of Numerii, which was the first occasion of thys present varyaunce. Cum priuilegio ad imprimendum* (London, 1550), and John Bale, *The First two partes of the actes or vnchast examples of the Englysh votaryes* (London, 1551).

¹¹⁷ G&W, p. 29-30.

¹¹⁸ Matthew Paris, *Historia Maior*, edited by Matthew Parker (1571), preface.

¹¹⁹ Randolph Higden was not the first chronicler in fourteenth century England to produce 'universal' world history but he was the most well known and therefore the basis for writings over the next two hundred years. As noted by John Taylor, *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 93-4, it was Nicholas Trivet's *Historia ab orbe Condicto* and his *Cronicles* (An Anglo-Norman world history) which first engaged in world history in the fourteenth century. However, Trivet's works appear to have been more popular in France than they were in England. Most surviving copies can still be found in France rather than England.

across the country. For most writers and readers of history, the older chronicles had become largely redundant as the *Polychronicon*, its continuators and those histories that it inspired provided it all and in a more convenient and updated scholarly form.¹²⁰

As is often the case with written histories, methods and interests again moved on, and in the sixteenth century the scholastic reading of the past, encapsulated in the *Polychronicon* and its descendents, was replaced by a humanist and often reformist methodology. As the *Polychronicon* tradition had once impacted on the St Albans tradition, reformist humanism impacted on the *Polychronicon* tradition. The standard corpus still held its place, but new details were being drawn out of it and new interpretations made. Both Parker and Foxe were therefore, in part, replacing an outdated tradition with the latest scholarship by supplementing the standard corpus of texts with older and largely forgotten texts, which often they could also claim as suppressed. Therefore, Matthew Paris, as an anti-papist writer, was rediscovered almost entirely through Protestant efforts and it is by those means that Matthew Parker's claim that it was a suppressed text should be understood.

If we return for a moment to Parker's adoption of Anglo-Saxon history and its texts, further methodological elements can be identified. Ælfric's Easter homily (published by Parker in 1566) was subjected to a similar but also more complex treatment. The painstaking analysis by Parker's household of the homily in both Old English and Latin script was based upon the premise that Papal agents had previously engaged in a

¹²⁰ As expressed by John Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, p. 101. These chronicles inspired and continued from the *Polychronicon* include John Brompton, Adam Murimuth, Robert Avesbury, John of Reading, the *Eulogium*, Thomas Walsingham, John of Tynemouth, and Richard Cirencester.

deliberate programme of historical erasure.¹²¹ John Joscelyn probably wrote the preface. He set up Ælfric as a servant of the papacy whose 'epistles, were then thought to contayne sounde doctrine' but maintained that Ælfric had lived in a time 'full of blindnes and ignoraunce: full of childish seruitude to ceremonies'.¹²² As Bale had proclaimed in his writings and Foxe had pronounced in the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* just three years earlier, Ælfric was living in a time when 'some supersticion and imperfection began to touche the prelasy then being: Yet in comparison to tymes that followed, all this might seme some thing sufferable and honest'.¹²³ Parker and Joscelyn had now added their voices. It was important to show that Ælfric generally accepted Papal doctrines such as the abstinence of Priests from marriage, in order to prove that his translation into Old English of a sermon denying the Real Presence was not abnormal but rather generally accepted and unchallenged in the late tenth century. Furthermore, the preface recorded that Archbishop Lanfranc in the eleventh century also found Ælfric's doctrines sound and that it was only afterwards, through the corrupting doctrines of Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand) that transubstantiation was distorted from its original form.

¹²¹ There has been some disagreement whether the *Testimonie of Antiquitie* was published in 1566 or 1567. By placing it into the context of the 1566 Parliament in which Article 29 dealt with the question of the 'Real Presence' Erick Kelemen, 'More Evidence for the Date of A Testimonie of Antiquitie', *The Library*, 7:4 (December 2006), pp. 361-376 has further strengthened the case for a publication sometime in the last few months of 1566 and that the reason for its publication was an attempt by Parker to influence Elizabeth's policy at a time when her religious settlement was at a delicate moment. The most detailed examination of the process involved in producing the *Testimonie of Antiquitie* is John Bromwich, 'The First Book Printed in Anglo-Saxon Types', edited by Bruce Dickins and A.N.L. Munby, *TCBS*, 3, (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 265-291 and for a summary which places the book into the context of the Parker publication programme see Robinson, "Darke Speech", pp. 1061-1083.

¹²² Matthew Parker, *Testimonie of Antiquitie*, f. 11, 17.

¹²³ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 2. John Bale makes a similar statement in John Bale, *The first two partes of the Actes or unchaste examples of the Englyshe votaryes, gathered out of theyr owne legendes and chronycles* (London, 1551, 1560), p. 15 when he states that 'many such turmoylynges had England in those dayes by Sathans procurement, to make that Romysh spirytualte a very Sodome and stynkyng iakes of helle' and that at the time of Hildegard, Lanfranc and Ansleme there was much 'hurly hurly, turmoyle, and change in relygyon' (*Votaryes*, p. 43).

Parker and Joscelyn would come to see four of the surviving five copies of Ælfric's Easter Homily, but at the time of producing the *Testimonie of Antiquitie* they only had two (although they was aware that others existed); one of the copies came from Worcester and the other from Exeter.¹²⁴ They proved that the Old English copies were indeed translations from an earlier Latin but, as Joscelyn wrote; 'I thinke...that there will hardlye be found of them any Lattyne bookes being...vtterlye perished and made out of the waye since the conquest by some which coulde not well broke thys doctrine'.¹²⁵ They then provided their evidence for the accusation of historical erasure from examination of another Worcester copy which was partly in Latin and Old English: 'a fewe lynes, wherin dyd consiste the chiefe poynte of the controuersie, be rased out by some reader'. In another copy of that sermon written all in Old English the full text survived as Papal agents had not been able to read it. From the Exeter copy Parker and Joscelyn could restore the Worcester copy and thus by doing so circumvent the attempted erasure of history that they believed they had found in Worcester.

Parker and Joscelyn were using language as a polemical and rhetorical weapon. They charged their enemies with forgery and historical revisionism by using the evidence that they had discovered through the relearning of Old English. The interpretative assumption imposed on these manuscripts was that the papacy had attempted to suppress the evidence that they had changed their doctrine on the Real Presence in the eleventh century by erasing and destroying the Latin homilies that proved otherwise. The lack of Latin editions and the erasure on the Worcester copy was proof of this attempt. However, through the relearning of Old English, a language that had become inaccessible to their enemy, Parker and Joscelyn could bring the truth back to life. The

¹²⁴ See Bromwich, 'The First Book Printed in Anglo-Saxon Types', p. 269. The copies used for the *Testimonie of Antiquitie* are CCCC MS 198 and BL MS Cotton Faustina A.ix.

¹²⁵ Matthew Parker, *Testimonie of Antiquitie*, f. 5v.

inclusion also of an Old English translation of the Lords Prayer, the Creed and the Ten Commandments further established Parker's main point – that the policies of the Elizabethan church in providing Scripture in the vernacular agreed with the policy of the Anglo-Saxons and that the hiding of Scripture in Latin was an aberration of the Roman Catholic Church.

Foxe too approached his sources in a similar fashion. When using Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora* in his account of Legate Otto [Otho] arriving in England during the early years of Henry III, Foxe purposefully left out the part claiming that Otto had not taken all the presents offered him out of modesty but instead emphasised Matthew's detailed record of the gifts offered to the legate: 'many rich and precious giftes in scarlet, in plate, in jewels, in money and palfreys were geuen him...to whom also the Bishop of Winchester for his part gaue toward keeping of his house, fifty fatee oxen, a hundreth seme of whete, and viij. great vessels of pure wyne'.¹²⁶ This omission cannot simply be dismissed as Foxe suppressing evidence that was not useful to his argument, although this is very much the result. It is more complex than that – he had approached the text with the belief that such remarks were suspect and might reflect corruption and revision of the actual truth. Logically, as Matthew Paris was generally anti-papal and the vast majority of his characterisation of Otto was extremely negative, Foxe could pass over the erroneous material in good conscience believing that it did not reflect God's truth. In this way, his methodological approach to the manuscripts could legitimately ignore evidence contrary to his argument not just because it was

¹²⁶ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 115 taken from *CM III*, p. 412 translated from J.A. Giles, *Matthew Paris' English History from the year 1235 to 1273* (London, 1889), vol. 1 pp. 68-9. Although Giles has translated from the *Historia Anglorum*, in many cases the text is the same. In each instance I have confirmed the translation with the Latin story as found in the *Chronica Majora*.

inconvenient, but because Foxe believed that such remarks reflected a corruption and revision of the true events of the past.

The methodological assumption that historical documents were purposefully corrupted, coupled with a belief that England had become distanced from its past after the break from Rome, also conjoined with an emerging humanist and reformist scholarship that examined documents in a new light. To accommodate these changes it became necessary not only to denounce the previous regime through a reinterpretation of the past and to promote instead the current regime, but also to promote certain historical material over others. Thus it was important not only to examine the usual material in a new light but to realign the authority particular histories had over others. For Parker a change of allegiance from one universal history to another was necessary if they were to distance themselves from an outdated and disinherited textual inheritance.

iii. A new Universal History

In his 1571 preface to the *Chronica Majora*, Matthew Parker mentioned his earlier publication of the *Flores Historiarum*, Matthew Paris' smaller chronicle the *Historia Anglorum* and Thomas Walsingham's *Historia Brevis* as providing a shared vision of the past, which Parker believed to be closer to the truth than many latter chronicles. In doing so he was again acting upon a shared ideological assumption about the nature of medieval chronicles and setting up a rival claim to the past. Parker had first published the *Flores Historiarum* in 1567, only to discover afterwards a more complete version, which he published in 1570. On both occasions he ascribed the chronicle to a Matthew of Westminster, a name now known to be a fictional character ascribed to the chronicle

mistakenly by John Bale.¹²⁷ Although Parker believed this to be the work of an entirely separate compiler, he did recognise that a great portion of the chronicle derived from Matthew Paris.¹²⁸ He also recognised that it had been continued to the year 1307 by another scribe, William Rashanger.¹²⁹

As for the *Historia Anglorum*, Parker had already been made aware of the potential for its truth-claims by John Bale's aforementioned comment that it 'paynteth out the byshopp of Rome in more lyuely colours'.¹³⁰ Nevertheless only one complete copy was known to exist and besides having a transcript of it made, Parker never engaged with it in the same way as he did with the other texts from St Albans. The simple reason for this is expressed in his preface to the *Chronica Majora*.¹³¹ Although Parker admitted that there is much in the smaller chronicle not to be found in its larger cousin he found that most of the pertinent material was in the *Chronica Majora*, and to better effect.¹³² The impact of the *Historia Anglorum* was therefore reduced and its authority in Protestant writings replaced by its larger cousin.

The last of the texts Parker mentions is Thomas Walsingham's *Historia Brevis*. This chronicle, unlike the others, was a continuation of Matthew Paris rather than an abridgement like the *Historia Anglorum*, or a compilation like the *Flores Historiarum*.

¹²⁷ The *Flores Historiarum* was first listed under the name of Matthew of Westminster in John Bale, *Catalogus*, p. 473. In the earlier edition of the *Catalogus* entitled John Bale, *Illustrium Majoris Britanniae Scriptorum* (Wesel, 1548/9), f. 143r Bale refers to the author as Florilegus.

¹²⁸ Parker mentions this in his preface to the 1570 edition of Matthew of Westminster, *Flores historiarum per Matthaem Westmonasteriensem collecti: praecipue de rebus Britannicis ab exordio mundi vsque ad annum Domini 1307* (London, 1570).

¹²⁹ This is in fact a continuation of Matthew Paris compiled by William Rishanger. It has been published in Henry Thomas Riley (ed.), *Willelmi Rishanger, Quondam Monachi S. Albani, et Quorundem Anonymorum, Chronica et Annales, Regnantibus Henrico Tertio et Edwardo Primo* (Rolls Series, London, 1865).

¹³⁰ G&W, pp. 29-30

¹³¹ Matthew Parker, *Historia Major*, p. 6.

¹³² This is supported by the evidence given by the nineteenth-century editors of the Smaller Chronicle, in which it is stated that exactions by the papal court and rapacity of its legates were 'frequently modified' or 'marked for omission' by Matthew Paris himself. See *HA I*, p. xxxiii.

In his preface Parker admitted that its most important use was not as a source for anti-papal rhetoric but because it filled a gap between thirteenth century chroniclers and fifteenth century chroniclers.¹³³ Parker emphasised that their value as documents in support of the Elizabethan church could be gained through a considered exclusion of elements that were to be considered Roman Catholic corruptions. The *Historia Brevis* was an important addition to Parker's publication programme as it provided the last portion of a unified and universal history of Britain beginning in the *Flores Historiarum* with creation to the year 1307, then with the *Chronica Majora* settling in the middle beginning with William the Conqueror in 1066 and ending about 1273, and then the *Historia Brevis* continuing from the same year up to 1422. This was important if Parker was to be successful in providing an alternative vision of history to Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*. To reform the past, they needed also to set up alternative avenues of evidence in which to challenge or confirm the story told by Higden and his successors. In the preface to the *Chronica Majora*, Parker attempted to place Matthew Paris and the St Albans chroniclers into a unified chronology alongside Henry of Huntingdon, William of Malmesbury, and Ranulf Higden. It is no accident that many of these chronicles were also neglected in favour of the *Polychronicon* and its continuations. The trio of St Albans chronicles that Parker's household published represented the basis for a universal history to rival and challenge the standard corpus of English histories. It was meant as a revived basis for Protestant research and, most particularly, as a parallel project to support, prove and strengthen the case put forward by John Foxe in the revised 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.

¹³³ For more detail see Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, vol. 2: c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (London, 1982), chapter 5.

4. A Reformist Collaborative Network

On 21 October 1568, while attending a meeting in Altenburg between theologians from Ducal Saxony (Jena) and Electoral Saxony (Wittenberg), Matthias Flacius Illyricus was declared a heretic for his doctrinal stance on original sin.¹³⁴ The other Centuriators fared little better. Four years earlier, on 15 May 1564, Matthæus Judex had died in Wismar and seven years before that Casper Von Nidbruck had died under mysterious circumstances whilst on a diplomatic mission in the Netherlands.¹³⁵ In 1577 Johann Wigand's reputation was tarnished because of his involvement in a controversy based in Ducal Prussia.¹³⁶ Thereafter all production of the ecclesiastical history project, now based in Wismar, ceased. Diener suggests that it mattered little that the work was not completed. The point had already been made.¹³⁷ Fourteen volumes had been produced tracing history from the time of Jesus Christ up to the thirteenth century.¹³⁸ However, these events must have had some influence on how the works of Flacius and the Centuriators themselves were viewed and subsequently used in England. It was no secret that Parker disagreed with much of Flacius' doctrines. Parker had informed Flacius directly and in no uncertain terms in his letter to him dated 18 July 1561 that 'upon due consideration of these your opinions, I cannot but lament that there should be some disagreement among us upon the chief controversies of religion'.¹³⁹ Nonetheless Parker had become excited by the Centuriators' work. The Archbishop had published

¹³⁴ Diener, *The Magdeburg Centuries*, pp. 225-230.

¹³⁵ Olson, *Matthias Flacius*, pp. 268-9. Nidbruck died on 26 September 1557.

¹³⁶ Diener, *The Magdeburg Centuries*, pp. 270, 307-311.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹³⁸ The first *Century* had been separated into two volumes. One on the times of Jesus Christ and the other on the Apostles.

¹³⁹ Matthew Parker to Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Johann Wigand and Matthæus Judex (18 July 1561) in Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, p. 78. Parker was responding to a set of 'commentaries' that Flacius had sent him, which described his doctrinal position. After admitting to not agreeing with his doctrine and beseeching him to seek accordance, Parker then offered up what books he had managed to find even though he himself felt they were not much use.

Flacius' tract which denounced the Council of Trent (1564) largely through the use of historical examples and convinced Foxe to transform his own historical commentary into an ecclesiastical history, thereby launching a campaign to gather England's manuscript heritage. In the *De Antiquitate Britannicæ* of 1572, Parker was still willing to reference the Centuriators for evidence.¹⁴⁰ Similarly Foxe's use of the *Centuries* and direct reference to Flacius, Wigand and Judex is also evident in the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. In the third (1576) and fourth (1583) editions Foxe made no attempt to modify his support despite the damage that had been caused to the Centuriators' reputations. Indeed, in the 1576 edition a short additional preface by Sam Fleming interestingly stated that 'The centuryes written by Illyricus and other do more largely set out the troubles wherby godly men haue ben tryed and exercised for the defence of true fayth: But for playne vnderstandyng, mainfest prooffe, and sufficient discourses, this worke of maister Iohn Foxe is to be preferred before other that haue bene written in time past'.¹⁴¹ Although this preface was removed for the 1583 edition, it nonetheless confirms that in 1576 the *Magdeburg Centuries* were still considered worthy of recognition.

This preface by Sam Fleming is also interesting as an example to how the *Acts and Monuments* had developed from the first edition. The 1576 edition in which the preface

¹⁴⁰ For instance Matthew Parker, *De Antiquitate Britannicæ*, p. 8 where the allegation by Pope Innocent that all the churches in Africa and the East were established either by Peter or by the disciples and their papal successors was cited as being 'foolish and wrong' by the 'Magdeburg history'.

¹⁴¹ *A&M*, 1576, *To the Reader* [Prefaces], p. 11. This preface has not received much attention. It was probably written by the Samuel Fleming who was ordained as a deacon and Priest on 25 October 1576 and became rector of Cottenham, Ely by 1581. See *Fleming, Samuel, Clergy of the Church of England Database* (CCED), www.theclergydatabase.org.uk [Accessed May 2008]. According to John Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A Biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge from the earliest times to 1900* (10 vols., Cambridge, 1922), vol. 2, pp. 23, 148 Fleming had been accepted into King's College at the age of seventeen in 1565 and had previously been at Eton. Richard Day, himself, had at first attended Eton, before being admitted into King's College in 1571. It is almost certain that these two men were friends and that Day encouraged Fleming to write a preface to give his career an early boost.

had appeared was largely a reprinting of the second with only a moderate attempt to update or correct the details that were contained within it. Rather, the project was a test for John Day's son, Richard, and Fleming's preface was no doubt a favour from Richard Day to his friend whose career was just beginning in 1576. That Fleming made the comparison between the *Acts and Monuments* and the *Magdeburg Centuries* is itself interesting and a signifier that Foxe's work was being judged in England as an ecclesiastical history as well as a martyrology – a fact that has often been overlooked when scholars have continually referred to the *Acts and Monuments* by its popular title the *Book of Martyrs*. Fleming's preface also reminds us that the intention towards a greater multi-part project had by this date been largely abandoned. Foxe never removed the paragraph near the end of each edition in which he promised to produce a new section or book describing foreign martyrs.¹⁴² Yet if, as has been suggested in the previous chapter, this promise referred to an English translation of Heinrich Pantaleon's *Commentarii pars Secunda* it was never realised. Foxe's initial enthusiasm for a series of historical and martyrological texts in Latin and various vernacular languages, which would reflect his understanding of the 'universal' nature of history within the concept of Scriptural apocalypse and prophecy, ceased after March 1563. Instead, Foxe continued to update and add to his English text and to elaborate further upon his theoretical judgements on the *Book of Revelations* and in particular concentrated on how it mapped out over 1,500 years of Christian history. There were various reasons for this. First, the *Acts and Monuments* had received heavy criticism from Roman Catholic apologists such as Thomas Stapleton and Nicholas Harpsfield, to which Foxe and his colleagues felt it necessary to produce a response. Second, as Elizabeth's reign had progressed and the hoped for further reforms failed to materialise, Foxe had found it necessary to

¹⁴² The paragraph appears identically in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 12, p. 2296, 1576, bk. 12, p. 1988, and 1583, bk. 12, p. 2097.

advance the reformist message to the English government and people. The involvement of Archbishop Matthew Parker, as outlined above, in transforming Foxe's reformation commentary into an English version of the *Magdeburg Centuries* was impossible to achieve in the first edition, which was, at some point, set up for publication at the end of 1562/3 alongside the *Commentarii pars Secunda* in Basel. Thus a historically and methodologically expanded second edition was probably in production even before the first edition had become a success. Therefore the second, third and fourth editions which, for the most part are the *Acts and Monuments* that are well known today, were set up as a largely different production in terms of its conception, methodology and purpose than the original project.

Through the lens of collaborative co-operation and their reliance upon various inter-related networks it is possible to contextualise the four editions of the *Acts and Monuments* produced in Foxe's own life time, as a product compiled, published and sold at specific moments in time. The 1563 edition was a re-development of Foxe's *Commentarii* project, which was in itself intended to merge with Grindal's originally separate '*Martyrum Historia*' project. The *Commentarii* was proposed as a series of books that described the course of the reformation and its martyrs in universal terms. It was to be translated from the Latin into various languages including French and English in an attempt to advertise the reformist message to various readerships across Christendom. In the end the Latin edition only reached two volumes, which covered English and German Lutheran martyrs and reforms. The French translation never quite made it off the press, whilst the English edition was reappointed as an English response to the Centuriators' larger project of ecclesiastical history.

Although by 1570 the original idea behind the *Acts and Monuments* had not entirely disappeared, its transformation into a history of Christendom within a scripture-based framework was largely complete. This appropriation of ecclesiastical history was not an aberration, located at one moment of time and inconsistent with English scholarship that followed it. Beyond Foxe's lifetime the *Acts and Monuments* would be extended and re-published in a myriad of forms, most of which would keep the historical framework that Foxe had set in place. The *Acts and Monuments* also formed a model and inspiration on which other ecclesiastical histories could be developed. For instance in 1604, Robert Cotton (1571-1631) published his own ecclesiastical history within a similar collaborative atmosphere involving scholars such as John Dee (1527-1609), John Stow (1524/5-1605), and William Camden (1551-1623).¹⁴³ Men such as Foxe and Flacius had set a precedent in bringing the Eusebian mode of writing into the realm of contemporary scholarship.

The nature of these internal relationships within a process of scholarly networking helped to mould the final form of the *Acts and Monuments*, and in turn would provide the same for future projects. The adoption of a legal concentration in ancient law and methodology deriving from men such as François Baudouin and William Lambarde became part of the inherited language of historical writing. In his *Institution of Universal History*, Baudouin outlined his 'integral' history, noting that all periods of history across all nations needed investigating if history was not to be inaccurately fragmented. Both secular and ecclesiastical history was to be studied as one since both subjects informed each other. It was also essential to purge 'fable' and 'myth' from the manuscripts in order to confirm tradition. Finally, it was necessary to write in

¹⁴³ Robert Cotton, *The State of the Church of Great Britain* (London, 1604). See Stephen Bowd, 'John Dee and Christopher Saxton's Survey of Manchester (1596)', *Northern History*, 42:2 (2005), pp. 275-292.

chronological order to permit the demonstration of cause and effect. Although Baudouin's *ars historica* was his own means of providing methodology for the past, it had emerged from the same language and thought processes available within the networks that have been described here. Foxe and the Centuriators believed in 'universal' or 'integral' history that crossed traditional realms and boundaries, whilst Bale and Parker preferred the concept of *Ecclesia Anglicana* to *Ecclesia Christiana* to support their positions. Chronology was essential to Foxe's method as was his reliance upon canon law as a means of refutation of papal claims. The Centuriators, however, chose to construct their history with a series of thematic *topoi* rather than a chronological progression for their own great work. In his *Catalogus* Bale had ordered his English writers in an approximate chronological order, whilst Parker's publication of ancient English chronicles was an attempt to build an alternative and 'unified' historical tradition more suited to reformist needs. Through these network connections each 'historian' found the tools with which he would produce his own contribution to late sixteenth-century historiography, and although there were differences there were also many similarities.

All of this tells us something about the nature of these networks and their willingness to ignore contrary aspects of each other's doctrine and thought for the greater purpose. There was no one single anti-papal voice claiming the truth but instead there were various 'truths' competing, but often also collaborating with one another. For instance, a variety of differences of opinion are evident between Foxe and Parker. During the 1560s Foxe's refusal to accept the Archbishop's decree over vestments could easily have ruptured their collaborative relationship and ended Parker's patronage of the *Acts*

and Monuments.¹⁴⁴ That this did not happen is perhaps indicative of Foxe's attitude of equanimity first displayed during the Frankfurt controversies some ten years earlier. But this also hints that both men were willing to work with those who disagreed with them over various points of contention for the greater good. Even with John Bale, Foxe was not always in agreement and they too had taken opposing sides on the issue of the Edwardian Prayer book in the Frankfurt controversies.¹⁴⁵ To further corroborate this apparent willingness to overlook objectionable opinions in each other, one only needs to look at the Archbishop's relationship to the antiquarian John Stow.

More minor scholarly disagreements also confirm that English scholars were not presenting an entirely uniform version of the past. For instance there was a variance of opinion over a letter attributed to St Ulric Bishop of Augsburg.¹⁴⁶ Foxe believed that it was produced at the time of Pope Nicholas II while Parker's publications, following Bale, maintained that it was produced at the time of Pope Nicholas I. Yet these differences were not all consuming. Foxe and Parker agreed more than they disagreed and they shared a similar purpose in researching their histories. What these examples do is remind us that there were differences of argument, purpose and methodology influencing the final form of scholarly works throughout the 'network' of English reformist scholars. The examination of collaboration between people of similar faith working in co-operation to defend their churches in an uncertain world needs to be justified with an equally important examination of the inter-relationship of the results.

¹⁴⁴ For the vestment controversy see W.J. Torrance, "Relics of the Amorites" or "Things Indifferent"? Peter Martyr Vermigli's authority and the Threat of Schism in the Elizabethan Vestiarian Controversy'. *Reformation and Renaissance Review*, 6:3 (2004), pp. 313-26. For Foxe's dealing with vestments in the *Acts and Monuments* see Judith H. Anderson, 'Metaphor, Metonymy, Vestments and Foxe', *Reformation*, 8 (2003), pp. 63-77. It is plausible that Foxe wrote cautiously about vestments when dealing with the opinions of Bishops Hooper and Ridley to appease, as much as his conscience would allow, his patron, Matthew Parker.

¹⁴⁵ Happè, *John Bale*, p. 21

¹⁴⁶ This letter will be discussed in chapter 4 of this thesis.

Here we come to the sharing of resources and ideas which were so essential to the success of the *Acts and Monuments*. What sources were used and where were they derived from? What influence did each source have as an argument and what authority did each text have in sixteenth-century scholarly circles? The collaborative paradigm can be clearly tested and expressed through the answers to these questions. This is where we now turn, first to the compilation of an Anglo-Saxon history for the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* and then, in the fifth chapter, to the extension of the post-Conquest and pre-Lollard history.

Chapter Four

The compilation of Pre-Gregorian and Anglo-Saxon History in the *Acts and Monuments*

ther were many noughty & wicked kings...so some there were agayne (although but few) very sincere and good. But none almost from the first to the last, which was not either slayne in warre, or murdered in peace, or els constraigned to make himselfe a Moonke. Suche was the rage the(n) and tyranny of that tyme.¹

When John Foxe compiled Book One of the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, the Anglo-Saxons could not have been further from his mind. There is no trace of their history in that Book, nor any reason why there ought to be. In 1563, Anglo-Saxon studies were in their infancy. It was that year, or just before, that Sir William Cecil had drawn Laurence Nowell to his household to translate for him various texts written in Old English.² However, sixteenth-century Anglo-Saxon research was only just beginning. By the mid-1560s progress had been made, and largely through the efforts of Archbishop Matthew Parker, Foxe was ready to research and write on a period of British history that had, until then, remained the preserve of pre-reformation chroniclers.

When Foxe began his research there was no clear genealogy of Anglo-Saxon kings, no concrete conception of the political divisions of Anglo-Saxon England, or any real understanding of its religious institutions. It would have been far easier to pass over these c. 600 years in favour of stories concerning a pre-Saxon conversion of the Britons by Christ's own Apostles. However, the Italian humanist historian Polydore Vergil had

¹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 154.

² Retha M. Warnicke, 'Nowell, Laurence (1530-c.1570)', *ODNB* (2004).

already exposed the weak artery of early British history by rejecting Geoffrey of Monmouth as a reliable source.³ The credibility of this, a key text for the Romano-British conversion to Christianity, could no longer be relied upon. Other sources for the period beginning in the fifth century and ending with the Norman Conquest had not been subjected to humanist critique and evaluation. The new interpretational frameworks and methodological tools could reveal a hidden potential for a revised history of the Anglo-Saxons.

It is an unfortunate fact that our knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon history contained in the *Acts and Monuments* is at a similarly embryonic state to that which Foxe found when he began his own early researches into the period. Only Benedict Scott Robinson has made any attempt to examine Foxe's Anglo-Saxon history in any detail and even then he only manages to scratch the surface.⁴ Robinson observes that Foxe's engagement with this period of history 'occupies a peculiar and difficult position in Foxe's narrative'.⁵ Such 'peculiarity' and 'difficulty' arises from the tension implied in Foxe's narrative between his antiquarian inclinations to recover the distant past and his ambition to integrate his findings into his overarching narrative of nascent papal degeneracy. Avihu Zakai suggests that the result was a more sophisticated interpretation of English history, which implied that the Church of England was founded upon apostolic origins, and that Rome was the harmful usurper.⁶ Therefore, the study of English history revealed a continual struggle against Roman attempts at appropriating English rightful regal and ecclesiastical powers. The Roman rulers had

³ See May McKisack, *Mediaeval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford, 1971), ch. 1.

⁴ Benedict Scott Robinson, 'John Foxe and the Anglo-Saxons', in Christopher Highley and John N. King (eds), *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 54-72.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁶ Avihu Zakai, 'Reformation, History, and Eschatology in English Protestantism', *History and Theory*, 26:3 (1987), pp. 300-318.

created 'great misery & ruine in the realme'. The 'noughty' and 'wicked' Anglo-Saxon kings had 'dispossessed the Britons of their right', at first imposing paganism upon them and then, even when accepting Christianity, taking the Roman rather than Celtic Church as their own.⁷ The Anglo-Saxons, Foxe wrote, were

Not onely vexed of the Danes, and co(n)quered at last by the Norman: but also more cruelly devoured them selues, one warring stil against an other, til they were neither able to helpe them selues, nor to resist others.⁸

Yet, Foxe also admitted that some were 'sincere and good'. The Anglo-Saxons were, therefore an ambiguous commodity. Nonetheless the imperative to ground the protestant churches in an apostolic tradition independent of the papacy was vital for the reclamation of the English past and as a means to deconstruct Roman Catholic interpretations. Felicity Heal has noted that Protestant scholars became 'obliged' to engage with pre-Conquest England as otherwise they were leaving themselves open to attack.⁹

Robinson concludes that Foxe failed in that task, constantly finding fault with his own arguments and forced to silently exclude evidence that supported the Roman Catholic origins for British Christianity.¹⁰ However, Robinson's interpretation of the Anglo-Saxons in the *Acts and Monuments* is not based on a full recognition or engagement with Foxe's arguments. In fact, it is almost solely based around his engagement with Ælfric's homily: a text almost wholly extracted or reprinted from Matthew Parker's *Testimonie of Antiquitie*. In Book Eight, Foxe's discussion of the Anglo-Saxons was

⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 154.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Felicity Heal, 'Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68:1 (2995), pp. 109-132.

¹⁰ Robinson, 'John Foxe and the Anglo-Saxons', pp. 54-72.

one of several points directed against the Henrician *Act of Six Articles*. Much of Foxe's material at this juncture was not his own. Robinson does not take into account the lengthy and more important accounts in Books Two and Three. To appreciate how Foxe approached the Anglo-Saxon period and moulded it into a useable shape, this is vital. It is in those Books that Foxe presented his own image of England's past based upon contemporary arguments, known and partially forgotten manuscripts and a selection of previously printed materials.

In Books Two and Three, Foxe refers to approximately forty sources including the works of the Church Fathers, Anglo-Saxon and later medieval chronicles, annals, and hagiographies, as well as various archival records, papal decretals, epistles and decrees. However, as Thomas S. Freeman has identified, these references do not necessarily represent the actual sources Foxe and his colleagues consulted.¹¹ It is necessary, therefore, to check all the available sources and compare them to Foxe's text. Once identified it is then possible to examine the relative authority that Foxe awarded to each source and what purpose they were put to in the text. Many of these sources were of course, and to varying degrees, unsupportive of his argument. Foxe was required to rely largely upon chronicles composed by medieval monks, as these were almost the only written records of the past. To a limited extent, Foxe also borrowed from chronicles and texts contemporary to the Anglo-Saxons, but, as will be discussed, these extracts were generally acquired at second hand. By far the most extensively utilised sources for the Anglo-Saxon account in the *Acts and Monuments*, were a series of more trusted printed texts. Most prominent amongst these were the historical catalogues produced by

¹¹ Thomas S. Freeman, 'Texts, lies, and microfilm: reading and misreading Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', *SCJ*, 30 (1999), pp. 23-46.

John Bale and Matthias Flacius Illyricus.¹² These provided a bridge between recent scholarship and England's manuscript heritage. So too did *The New Chronicles of England and France* compiled in the fifteenth century and attributed to Robert Fabyan.¹³ Putting aside the 'antagonistic' history by Polydore Vergil, Fabyan's chronicle contained the most recent and detailed account of the Anglo-Saxon period. Fabyan was also not a monk, but an alderman of London. This was important in accepting the honesty of its author, and the relative reliability of his text. The combination of these sources, researched within a collaborative context and a constantly revising atmosphere of study, provided the basis for Foxe's engagement with the Anglo-Saxons.

The reworked framework of apocalypse and prophecy which Foxe was developing for his entire history was also essential to his interpretation. In Book One, Foxe had focused on the apostolic church, with Emperor Constantine in the role of Christian saviour.¹⁴ In Book Two, Foxe focused on 'the next 300 yeres', but narrowed his scope to 'such domestical histories, as more neare concerne this our country of England and Scotland'.¹⁵ He located this period of time at the end of the 'flourishing time' of the

¹² John Bale's first catalogue, the *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum* was published in Ipswich in 1548 and again in Wesel in 1549. Bale subsequently extended this text during his Marian exile and published it Basel in 1557 and 1559 as a greatly enlarged edition entitled *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae...Catalogus*. Richard H. Rouse, 'Bostonus Buriensis and the Author of the Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiae', *Speculum*, 14:3 (1966), pp. 471-499 has identified and discussed some of Bale's primary sources for his *Catalogus*. The catalogue by Matthias Flacius Illyricus is discussed in Oliver K. Olson, *Matthias Flacius and the survival of Luther's Reform* (Wiesbaden, 2002). The full title is Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Catalogus testium veritatis, Qui ante nostram aetatem reclamarunt Papae: Opus varia rerum, hoc praesertim tempore scitu dignissimarum, cognitione refertum* (Basel, 1556).

¹³ Henry Ellis (ed.), *The New Chronicles of England and France in two Parts; by Robert Fabyan named by himself the Concordance of Histories* (London, 1811). Originally published in 1516, 1533, 1542, and 1559.

¹⁴ Michael S. Pucci, 'Reforming Roman Emperors: John Foxe's characterisation of Constantine in the Acts and Monuments', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 29-51.

¹⁵ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 145.

church and at the beginning of what he called the 'declining time'.¹⁶ Foxe described the invasion of the pagan Anglo-Saxons, the separation of Britain into seven kingdoms, and the adoption of a not entirely pure Roman Catholic Christianity. In Book Three, 'conteynyng the next 300 yeares, fro(m) the raigne of K. Egbertus to the time of W. Conquerour', Foxe recounted how the rise of monasticism, the constant threat of Viking invasion, and the 'savage' nature of the Anglo-Saxon kings of England confirmed the deepening of the decline of the 'true' church. The apocalyptic pattern of history was not, however, a highly visible element of Books Two and Three. It was instead a background feature, which constantly informed Foxe's reading of the sources but relatively rarely found its voice in the actual text. The main focus of these Books was rather to establish, as best as Foxe could, an acceptable rendering of the Anglo-Saxon period based on a revised reading of established and not-so established sources. The starting points for Foxe's study were undoubtedly the catalogues previously mentioned, compiled by his mentor, John Bale, and his German counterpart, Matthias Flacius Illyricus.

1. Contemporary and near-contemporary sources

i. Sixteenth Century Catalogues

In the second edition of his catalogue of English writers, John Bale announced that his research should be used as 'weapons' so that 'those who are assailed may defend

¹⁶ See chapter one and appendix two (A) of this thesis for more details on the apocalyptic framework in the *Acts and Monuments*.

themselves and slay their adversaries'.¹⁷ Foxe undoubtedly agreed, using the *Catalogus* for that very purpose. Through Bale's research, Foxe was able to access detailed biographies and bibliographies for a revisionist interpretation.¹⁸ Bale had separated his text into groups of 100 authors, each approximately paralleling an age in his greater apocalyptic scheme. These biographies were supported with historical 'appendices' detailing political and religious history, the activities of papal agents and the Pope. As Alan MacColl has stated, Bale used traditional cataloguing methods and placed them into an ideological format.¹⁹ That material was particularly helpful for its delineation of the early papacy. In fact, once the *Catalogus* was complete Bale extracted that material and republished it separately as the *Acta Romanorum Pontificum*.²⁰ As Thomas S. Freeman has stated, it is a testimony to Foxe's admiration for Bale, that he consulted both texts even though one was virtually a reprint of the other.²¹ However, as a direct source for Anglo-Saxon history Bale's catalogue was often vague, providing generalisations, brief edited synopses and only a small scattering of evidence.

¹⁷ *Catalogus*, f. A3r, as translated and discussed in J. Christopher Warner, 'Elizabeth I, saviour of Books: John Bale's Preface to the Scriptorum Illustrum Maioris Brytaniae...Catalogus (1559)', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 91-101.

¹⁸ John Bale relied upon numerous sources but key amongst these was the fourteenth-century catalogue by Henry Kirkstead, which Bale called *Bostonus Buriensis*. The discussion of Rouse, 'Bostonus Buriensis', pp. 471-99 and R. H. Rouse, 'Kirkestede, Henry (b. c. 1314, d. in or after 1378)', *ODNB*, (2004) is interesting. Bale had acquired a manuscript copy of Kirkstead from a pensioned monk of Bury after the dissolution. That manuscript later passed to James Usher, then to Thomas Gale and finally to Thomas Tanner who made a transcript. The manuscript vanished at this point. Bale also combed through Robert Barnes, *Vitæ Romanorum Pontificum* (Wittenberg, 1535) and Conrad Gesner, *Bibliotheca Universalis* (Zurich, 1535). A discussion of Bale's use of these two texts can be found in Peter Happé, *John Bale* (New York, 1996), pp. 63-4. The most important source for the *Catalogus*, however, was the unpublished material, which Bale inherited from John Leland. For details see McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age*, ch. 1 and John Bale, *Index Britanniae Scriptorum: John Bale's Index of British and other writers*, edited by Reginald Lane Poole and Mary Bateson with an introduction by Caroline Brett and James P. Carley (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1990), pp. xi-xviii.

¹⁹ Alan MacColl, 'The Construction of England as a Protestant 'British' nation in the Sixteenth Century', *Renaissance Studies*, 18:4 (2004), pp. 582-608.

²⁰ John Bale, *Acta Romanorum Pontificum* (Basel, 1558).

²¹ Thomas S. Freeman, "'St Peter Did not Do Thus": Papal History in the Acts and Monuments', *VE* (3 parts, 2004), fn. 69.

The *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* compiled by Matthias Flacius Illyricus was even emptier of Anglo-Saxon history but its importance to Foxe's concept of the period was nevertheless essential. Flacius' catalogue had been published in 1556 and again (with a few additions) in 1562. It was originally compiled as a preparatory device for the much larger *Magdeburg Centuries*.²² Flacius gathered between 400 to 650 'witnesses' many of whom were obscure or entirely unknown until then.²³ Oliver K. Olson, in his study of Flacius, has described this catalogue as containing a vast quantity of sources but lacking organisation.²⁴ There was only an approximate chronological ordering and no sign of a discernible topic or framework. The only unifying principle behind the *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* is a statement made by Flacius that all sources that might shed light on the spirit of the 'true church' needed investigation. Flacius' interest in medieval documents was in their ability to act as witnesses to the continuity of the church rather than in their individual merit. Such an organisation (or lack of) was not a problem for Foxe; he knew the work all too well, having seen it through the presses of Basel.

Flacius, like Bale, was inclined to provide his own summaries of his sources rather than reproduce much of the original text. The two catalogues together, however provided a foundation for Foxe's broader interpretations and polemical approach, provided to the reader through the lens of their polemical and ideological interpretations. They complemented one another; Bale provided some information on the Anglo-Saxons, whilst Flacius furnished continental evidence. Both catalogues were particularly helpful

²² See Gregory B. Lyon, 'Baudouin, Flacius, and the Plan for the Magdeburg Centuries', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64 (2003), pp. 253-272 and in Olson, *Matthias Flacius*.

²³ The figure of 650 sources was derived by Olson, *Matthias Flacius*, p. 238, albeit with the disclaimer that the number of sources counted depends upon how one counted them. This fact is clearly demonstrated in Robin Bruce Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis: Apocalypticism in the wake of the Lutheran Reformation* (Stanford, 1988), pp. 76-7, where 400 sources are counted.

²⁴ Olson, *Matthias Flacius*, pp. 233-4.

for leads on the early medieval papacy. However, neither could give Foxe the detailed evidence and extensive quotation from historical sources that were needed for a proper history to be compiled. That was intentional. Bale and Flacius designed their catalogues to be guides to materials available, not sources containing editions of the material itself. Even for papal history, Foxe would need to look beyond the catalogues. He added various details from William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* and Platina's *Vitæ Pontificum*.²⁵ The importance of these texts, then, was as a route into a specific and instantly useable form of Anglo-Saxon scholarship.

In Books Two and Three, there is only limited direct evidence of the catalogues being used beyond papal history. Certainly, Flacius had barely touched upon Anglo-Saxon England and what he did produce was largely borrowed from Bale. Foxe may have taken material directly from Bale's *Catalogus* for his accounts of the controversy over the dating of Easter, the synod at Bangor and the dating of Augustine's death, but in all cases it is just possible that Foxe had borrowed directly from manuscript copies of the chronicles in question.²⁶ Foxe definitely used the *Catalogus* when compiling his account of the fictional female pope named Joan.²⁷ This legend was of a woman, pretending to be a man, who was supposedly elected as pope during the 850s. According to the legend, two years after her election she gave birth to a child whilst in procession from St Peter's to the Lateran church. The controversy over the authenticity

²⁵ Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1.

²⁶ For the controversy over the dating of Easter compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 154 to *Catalogus*, p. 66. It is possible that Foxe consulted Bede, *HE*, lib. 2 cap. 2 directly as well. For the synod at Bangor compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 159-160 with *Catalogus*, pp. 63-66. Again Foxe may have also consulted Bede, *HE*, lib 2 cap 2. Also *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 164-165 with *Catalogus* pp. 81-87 in which Brompton col. 790 or *Polychronicon* lib 5 cap 17 are also possible sources. For the dating of Augustine's death compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 160 with *Catalogus*, pp. 65-6 which also takes from several other texts.

²⁷ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 182 to *Catalogus*, p. 116. For a discussion of the importance of the Pope Joan myth to Protestant and Roman Catholic arguments and the subsequent controversy over its authenticity see Thomas S. Freeman, 'Joan of Contention: The Myth of the Female Pope in Early Modern England', in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 60-79.

of this story had reached Britain in the early 1560s through the debates between John Jewel and Thomas Harding. The Augustinian scholar, Onofrio Panvinio had also effectively deconstructed the myth in 1562, although the Magdeburg Centuriators defended it all the more virulently by citing every medieval author that they could find who supported the Joan story.²⁸ Foxe appears to have been either ignorant of this controversy, or more likely, decided to ignore it entirely, by simply reprinting what Bale had already written.

Foxe was, however, generally more careful before borrowing wholesale from the catalogues of Bale and Flacius. Whilst compiling evidence for the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, harsh criticism from Roman Catholic apologists tore apart any inconsistencies or errors contained in the 1563 edition. Foxe could not afford to follow any source blindly, especially since Flacius and Bale were both prone to overstate, and even falsify, evidence to prove their points.²⁹ For instance, we can see that Foxe made his own mind up about the first conversion of Britain to Christianity. English scholarship generally claimed that there had been three conversions of Britain. The first had come about from early missionary efforts by Joseph of Arimathea, St Peter, St Paul and Simon Zelotes. The second was believed to have occurred in the second century, when King Lucius (a fictitious king) had asked the Bishop of Rome, Eleutherius (c. 174-189) to confirm his conversion to Christianity. The third conversion was

²⁸ *Cent. IX* (1565).

²⁹ John Bale's overzealous support of a reformist agenda, often at the expense of historical accuracy, was particularly noted and detested by John Pitts some fifty years after the publication of the *Catalogus*. In his *Relationum historicarum de rebus Anglicis* (Paris, 1619), Pitts felt it necessary to lift the encyclopaedic details, layout and method from Bale's polemics. That he felt it useful to do so, however, shows that Bale's catalogue was of use fifty years later. The antiquary, Anthony Wood, believed Pitts had plagiarised from Bale despite Pitt's distaste for the author. However, antiquary and diarist Thomas Hearne's examination has shown that Pitts, while highly dependent on Bale, did form his text independently. See F. Blom and J. Blom, 'Pitts, John (1560-1616)', *ODNB* (2004) and Richard Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Belgium, 1997), p. xii. For the similarly radical opinions of Matthias Flacius and how these were impressed in his own catalogue see Olson, *Matthias Flacius*.

Augustine's mission in the sixth century. Bale was one of those scholars who had accepted the Lucius myth in its entirety. He inserted it into his *Catalogus* and another work, which became useful to Foxe's purposes, his *Actes of Englysh Votaryes*.

The *Actes of Englysh Votaryes* was first published in 1546 then greatly expanded with a second Book in 1551.³⁰ It attacked clerical chastity through the use of historical evidence. Book One brought the history from creation to the year 1000, whilst Book Two continued to the end of the twelfth century. Bale planned, but never completed, a third part which would bring his history up to the Reformation. In Book One, Bale constructed a story of Britain as a 'beleaguered isle' in which the gospel of Joseph of Arimathea had been renewed by King Lucius' request for help and advice (implicitly stating that Lucius was already a Christian when he sent his letter).³¹ Pagan Saxons then overthrew that faith. The sixth-century mission of St Augustine is described as a partial conversion, one corrupted by 'monkery' and 'superstitions'. As Felicity Heal has stated these themes were not only taken up by Foxe in the *Acts and Monuments*, but were also rearranged slightly to represent Foxe's own opinion.³² Foxe began his account with a list of seven authorities, which he claimed clearly supported the probability of a pre-Augustinian and pre-papal Christianity in Britain. This research was partially based on Bale, but it also took the opinions of others, such as Matthias Flacius (the *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*) and the Magdeburg Centuriators (*Cent. I-*

³⁰ John Bale, *The actes of Englysh votaryes comprehendynge their vnchast practyses and examples by all ages, from the worldes begynnyng to thys present yeare* (Wesel, 1546) and John Bale, *The first two partes of the actes or vnchast examples of the Englysh votaryes* (London, 1551). For a discussion of these volumes see Leslie P. Fairfield, *John Bale: Mythmaker for the English Reformation* (Oregon, 1976), ch. 4.

³¹ See Felicity Heal, 'What can King Lucius do for you? The Reformation and the Early British Church', *English Historical Review*, 120:487 (2005), pp. 593-614.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 607-8.

III).³³ Although Foxe listed Joseph of Arimathea amongst these original preachers, he appears to have favoured the Greeks as the cause for Britain's earliest conversion.³⁴ For the story of King Lucius, Foxe added a copy of the letter sent to Eleutherius, but appeared reluctant to accept the story entirely; Foxe related how he did not feel the need for it to be strictly adhered to and, in keeping with this opinion, placed it within the conjectural framework alongside the list of seven authorities for an apostolic conversion. Thus, in this instance, Foxe had held back from the opinion of Bale, Flacius and the Magdeburg Centuriators, because he was uncertain about the credibility of such stories.

In his use of Bale's *Catalogus*, Foxe also displays an independence of thought concerning which authorities to cite. One of the sources Bale most frequently referred to in his *Catalogus* and in such works as his *Actes of Englysh Votaryes* and *The Image of Bothe Churches* (1548-50), is John Capgrave's *Nova Legenda Angliæ*.³⁵ This collection of saint's lives was theologically opposed to both Bale and Foxe's beliefs, but nonetheless the text did provide useful evidence, which, Bale appears to have believed, could be made to serve his revisionist agenda. Foxe, however appears to have been less certain of its worth as a source. In the *Acts and Monuments* the *Nova Legenda Angliæ*

³³ Foxe appears to have extracted material mainly from Bale's *Catalogus* and Flacius' *CTV*, with a brief synopsis of events in Britain, which appeared in every edition of the *Magdeburg Centuries*. Foxe also appears to have taken a few elements from medieval chronicles such as those compiled by Henry of Huntingdon and Robert Fabyan.

³⁴ Heal, 'What can King Lucius do you you?', p. 608. Foxe states his preference in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 145.

³⁵ Noted in Happé, *John Bale*, p. 52 but also obvious from a cursory glance at these texts. For more details on the *Nova Legenda Angliæ* see Carl Horstman, *Nova Legenda Anglie: As collected by John of Tynemouth, John Capgrave, and others, and first printed with new lives by Wynkyn de Worde* (Oxford, 1901).

is only referred to three times and always in conjunction with the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* compiled by William of Malmesbury.³⁶

Although these catalogues were of limited direct use for the provision of actual evidence on the Anglo-Saxons, there is some evidence, admittedly circumstantial, that Foxe might have used them as an initial reference to help him navigate the complexities of the period. In general such a use is difficult to detect. However, in one instance, where Foxe was building his case against Augustine, he accused Augustine of being the root cause of the slaughter of monks at Bangor by King Æthelfrith of Northumbria (593-616). For this account Foxe cited three authorities; Ranulf Higden, Henry of Huntingdon and Geoffrey of Monmouth. Whilst it would seem that he did indeed consult an actual copy of the first two texts, the material from the *Historia Regum Britanniae* by Monmouth was lifted directly from Bale's *Catalogus*.³⁷ In this case Foxe had added to Bale's account, independently finding a diversity of opinions concerning the date when Augustine had died. In another instance, when dealing with the dating of the coronation of Æthelwulf as king (AD 839), Foxe extended a discussion begun in Bale's *Catalogus*. Robert Fabyan had claimed that Pope Pascal (817-824) had granted dispensation for Æthelwulf's coronation because he was previously a subdeacon or, according to Fabyan's opinion, Bishop of Winchester. In contrast, Bale had cited

³⁶ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 207-8, which discusses Archbishop Dunstan's plot involving Edith, with *Votaryes*, pp. 64-5 and Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 cap. 159, 161. Capgrave is referenced twice in that account. Capgrave was also cited in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, p. 1301 this time taken in large part from Matthew Parker, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie* (London, 1566). It is worth noting that neither Bale's *Catalogus* nor Matthew Parker's *Testimonie* includes the detail that Dunstan's vision was thirteen years after Edith's death. This perhaps suggests that Foxe did consult the *Nova Legenda Angliæ* independently. Compare to 'De Sancta Editha' in Horstman, *Nova Legenda Angliæ*, vol. 1, p. 313. The *Nova Legenda Angliæ* that Foxe might have used, may have been the version published by Wynkyn de Worde in 1516 or perhaps the manuscript first owned by John Bale and perhaps then by Matthew Parker. As shown by G&W, p. 108 either CCC MS 408 or MS Cotton Tiberius A VIII, ff. 1-167, which belonged to Parker could have been Bale's copy but there is no way to be certain.

³⁷ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 160 to *Catalogus*, pp. 65-6, *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 caps 9-10, Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 25 and Huntingdon, lib. 3 cap. 17.

Gregory IV (827-844), as the pope who had granted the dispensation. Foxe chose to corroborate Bale's opinion over Fabyan's, by adding the authority of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum* (which also stated Gregory).³⁸

In summary, Foxe's engagement with Anglo-Saxon history began with the catalogues compiled by Bale and Flacius. These influenced his opinion and the arguments with which he engaged. For papal history in particular, they acted as the essential building blocks for an argument, which purported to demonstrate the slow decline of truth, faith and the rise of ambition. Foxe was not, however, beyond questioning the evidence or the polemical framework which they contained. Sometimes he disagreed with an interpretation, occasionally he would use alternative sources than those suggested, often he would come to his own opinion based upon available source material. These catalogues were a starting point for the Anglo-Saxon history. To go further, Foxe required a small selection of near-contemporary core texts with which he could actively contest sixteenth-century interpretations in comparison to the older chronicles. Foxe found these in a chronicle acquired by the abbey of Jervaulx in the fifteenth century and a printed edition of a fifteenth-century London chronicle. It is to these texts that we now turn.

ii. Robert Fabyan and John Brompton

From the viewpoint of Elizabethan protestant scholars *The New Chronicles of England and France* attributed to Robert Fabyan had potential. Robert Fabyan was an alderman

³⁸ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 180-1 with Fabyan, lib 6 cap 162 and *Catalogus*, p. 113. Foxe has used Malmesbury, *GP*, lib 2 cap 75 (pp. 252-255) to support Bale's position.

in London.³⁹ He was thus no monk or 'papal puppet' and although many of his sources were from the monkish tradition many of his other sources were secular. Fabyan was one of the last writers of the London Chronicle tradition and as such became the principal vehicle by which it was transmitted to Tudor England.⁴⁰ Both Polydore Vergil and Thomas More had relied on Fabyan, as did John Stow, Richard Hakluyt, Edward Hall, Raphael Holinshed, and John Bale. Bale's biography of the chronicle described it as a useful and an intelligent presentation of numerous documents.⁴¹

The chronicle, as published in 1516, covered history from creation to the year 1485. A continuation was then added in the subsequent 1533, 1542, and 1559 publications, bringing the chronicle up to the third year of Henry VIII.⁴² Around the year 1566 (which incidentally is about the time Foxe began work on the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*), Matthew Parker and the printer and scholar Richard Grafton were discussing, via correspondence, whether or not the identification by the antiquarian John

³⁹ Historians have come to doubt the attribution of the *Newe Chronycles* to Robert Fabyan. The surviving manuscripts, MS Holkham 671 containing books 1-6 and MS Nero C XI containing book 7, are anonymous as is the first printed edition by Richard Pynson in 1516. John Rastell, when publishing the chronicle and its continuation in 1533 was the first to attribute the chronicle as 'Fabyan's chronicle newly prynted' however, as pointed out by M.R. McLaren, *The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century: A revolution in English writing* (Cambridge, 2002) there is no evidence as to what Rastell meant by this title. He could have just as easily been referring to the owner or scribe of his particular manuscript as that of the original compiler. To further compound the error, John Stow in his draft copy for his *Survey of London* (MS Harley 538) confused the *Newe Cronycles* with a manuscript containing a chronicle named by C. L. Kingsford as *The Great Chronicle* (MS Guildhall 3313). See A.H. Thomas & I.D. Thornley, *The Great Chronicle of London* (London, 1938); and C.L. Kingsford, *English historical literature in the fifteenth century* (Oxford, 1913) for the modern naming of this manuscript. This text will continue to attribute the chronicle to Fabyan to correspond with the sixteenth-century belief in his authorship.

⁴⁰ The chronicle survives in two manuscript editions – Holkham Hall MS 671, which covers the period from Brutus to the death of Philip Augustus of France, and BL Cotton MS Nero C XI, which continues from 1223 to 1485. The chronicle was first published in 1516 by Richard Pynson as *Prima pars cronecarum* then with amendments and a continuation by John Rastell in 1533 entitled *Fabyans cronycle newly prynted, wyth the cronycle, actes, and dedes done in the tyme of the reygne of the moste excellent prynce kynge Henry the vii. father vnto our most drad souerayne lord kynge Henry the .viii. To whom be all honour, reuere[n]ce, and ioyfull contynaunce of his prosperous reygne, to the pleasure of god and weale of this his realme amen.* This version was reprinted in 1542, and 1559.

⁴¹ *Catalogus*, p. 642.

⁴² For details on the continuation see Fabyan, pp. xviii-xxi.

Caius of the two papal nuncios, allegedly sent to King Lucius by Bishop Eleutherius, were correct. Grafton wrote that

for the matter of Lucy [Lucius], that Eleutherius sent Eluanus and Meduinus unto him that his Britons might receive the faith of Christ; concerning their two names they are added by Mr Keyes [probably John Caius], but where he found it I know not, but I will learn of him and certify your grace. The rest of the story of Lucy is in Fabian, in his iii. Book and lix chapter.⁴³

The story is indeed in Fabyan, but there the names are referred to as 'Fugatius or Faganus' and 'Damianus or Dimianus'.⁴⁴ Where Foxe continued to follow Fabyan, Parker, upon his discussion with Grafton, favoured Caius' suggestion.⁴⁵ Here then, is evidence that there was a limit to the co-operation and collaboration between Foxe and Parker's household. Foxe made no mention of the alternative names suggesting that he was unaware of the new evidence. However this also shows that interest in Fabyan, his work and the contents of the printed edition were of interest and concern to Parker at the same time that Foxe took the chronicle as one of his key texts for the Anglo-Saxons. In content and historiographical tradition, Fabyan for the most part provided little that was new, but there were certain innovations, which made the chronicle more useful to the *Acts and Monuments*. Firstly, Fabyan himself described his history as a 'concordance of Storyes' as an indication and recognition of its unusual joint focus on both England and France. This meant that Fabyan provided a detailed account of England, while maintaining a wider continental perspective. Secondly, whereas a compiler had usually followed the source that seemed to them most plausible or which suited their prejudices,

⁴³ J. Bruce and T. T. Perowne (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* (London, 1853), Letter CCXXVI, pp. 295-6.

⁴⁴ Fabyan, lib. 3 cap. 59.

⁴⁵ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 146 with Matthew Parker, *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ & Priuilegiis Ecclesiæ Cantuariensis, cum Archiepiscopis eiusdem* (London, 1572), p. 6.

Fabyan compared his sources at specific points. Thus Fabyan noted that the 'Englysshe Cronycle of Englande' contended that Æthelbert (560-616), king of Kent, was slain in a battle with Æthelfrith, king of Northumbria, while the *Polychronicon* only mentioned that he died and went to heaven.⁴⁶ For the reign of Malgo (a fictional king of Kent created by Geoffrey of Monmouth), Fabyan cited the *Historia Regum Britannicæ*, the *Flores Historiarum* and the *Polychronicon* but also mentioned that the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* made no mention of him.⁴⁷ In another instance Fabyan compared the contradictory accounts of Marianus Scotus and William of Malmesbury (*Gesta Regum Anglorum*), as to the cause of the death of King Edmund (922-946).⁴⁸ These critical moments in Fabyan are important. Not only did Fabyan provide a detailed account of English history that was often lacking in other contemporary chronicles, but it also allowed later scholars such as Foxe to identify alternative arguments and sources of information from an authority that was not directly linked to the monasteries.

The second key text that Foxe used to frame his argument was a manuscript that he referred to as *Iornalensis*. This is actually the *Chronicon* incorrectly assigned to the fifteenth-century monk John Brompton, Abbot of Jervaulx.⁴⁹ According to V.J.

⁴⁶ Fabyan, lib 5. cap. 120 (p. 87). The English Chronicle of England is most likely an English *Brut* chronicle. See Fabyan, p. xiv.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, lib 5 cap 109 (p. 84).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, lib 6 cap 188 (p. 191).

⁴⁹ This chronicle has been largely ignored since the seventeenth century when it was published in a compilation of ten chronicles. See Roger Twysden (ed.), *Historiæ Anglicanæ scriptores X* (London, 1652), cols 725-1284. The attribution of authorship to John Brompton is an error probably on the part of John Bale, although V.J. Goodman, 'John Brompton', *ODNB* (2004), believed the error had originated with Twysden. The chronicle was actually acquired by Brompton for Jervaulx Abbey. The manuscript itself probably dates to between 1340 and 1377 and the author is anonymous. Neither Fred J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, 1967) nor McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* contains any reference to Brompton. Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (2 vols., London, 1982), vol. 2, pp. 56-7; 359 and John Taylor, *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 19-20, 108-9 furnish a few details while John Taylor, *The Universal Chronicle of Ranulf Higden* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 23, 143-4 discusses Brompton as a continuation of the type of history presented by Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*. Although Bale made no mention of the *Chronicon* in his *Catalogus*, Foxe's reference to '*Iornalensis*' must come directly from

Goodman it appears to have been written sometime between 1340 and 1377 by an anonymous author with the purpose of continuing and expanding upon Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*.⁵⁰ The *Chronicon* also took material and methodological impetus from Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* and Tynemouth's *Historia Aurea*. John Taylor describes it as one of the 'most ambitious attempt[s] in fourteenth-century England to write a sustained account of the British past'.⁵¹ It is therefore unfortunate that Taylor does not elaborate much beyond this comment. Research on the *Chronicon* is limited largely because there is little original in its contents; its author preferred instead to rely upon a diverse range of earlier chronicles.⁵² Also, instead of concentrating on recent history, it detailed English events (both secular and ecclesiastical) from the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons down to the time of King John (1199-1216). The *Chronicon* often referenced its sources and, like the *New Chronicles*, would note alternative accounts.

The contribution of Fabyan and Brompton as authorities for the Anglo-Saxon portion of the *Acts and Monuments* has received little (if any) attention or recognition. In the introduction to Book Three Foxe advertised the *New Chronicles* as a helpful supplement to his own account. 'As touching the actes and doings of these kyngs' Foxe wrote 'they are sufficiently and at large described and taken out of Latine writers into the Englishe toung by sundry autors, and namely in the story or Chronicle of Fabian'.⁵³ Foxe was therefore willing to refer his readers to this contemporary chronicle for a more detailed

Bale, as he owned a copy of the manuscript and referred to Brompton as 'Abbas Iorenallensis' in his notebook. See Bale, *Index*, p. 185. This appears to be a misreading of 'Iorualensis' from the manuscript.

⁵⁰ Goodman, 'Brompton, John', *ODNB*.

⁵¹ Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, p. 109.

⁵² The *Chronicon* was primarily compiled from sources such as Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough, the *Historia Anglorum* by Henry of Huntingdon, a Latin *Brut*, the *Quadripartitus*, and the chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough. It also used to a lesser extent authors such as William of Malmesbury, John of Worcester, William of Newburgh, Geoffrey of Monmouth and Bede.

⁵³ *A&M*, 1570, bk 3, p. 180.

account of the Anglo-Saxon kings of England. Fabyan's text was useful as an authorisation of the protestant position as it had already been 'reformed'. Various alterations and omissions had been made to the 1559 and subsequent editions to suit the new position of the English government now that it had broken away from Rome.⁵⁴ Thus 'Pope' became 'Bishop of Rome' and saints lost the words 'holy' and 'blessed'. Omissions included various elements of the saints, the verses that began each book (The Seven Joys of the Blessed Virgin) and all passages that tended to encourage monastic virtues such as penance, pilgrimage and the preservation of relics. Occasional notes were also added against papal authority and to guide the reader away from perceived incorrect readings. Thus, Foxe could safely send his readers to this book as, in his opinion, the dangerous elements had already been removed.

In direct references to Fabyan, Foxe entered into a dialogue with his source, directly comparing and contrasting the details given by Fabyan with those of other histories. When describing a story concerning the defeat and humiliation of King Egbert II of Kent (c. 765-c. 779) in Book Two, Foxe disagreed with Fabyan who attributed the victory to King Offa (757-796). Instead he agreed with both William of Malmesbury and Ranulf Higden who attributed the victory instead to Cynewulf of Wessex (757-786).⁵⁵ The papal dispensation, previously mentioned, which was granted to Æthelwulf (the only son of King Egbert) to become king was attributed to Pascal by Fabyan, while Foxe asserted that by a 'computation of time' it had to have been Gregory IV.⁵⁶ Foxe, however, accepted Fabyan's account more than he discounted it. The story of a shower of blood falling in York, testified by William of Malmesbury, is provided with a date,

⁵⁴ See Fabyan, pp. xix-xx and MacColl, 'The construction of England', pp. 582-608, for a parallel example.

⁵⁵ *A&M*, 1570, bk 2, p. 173.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, bk 3, p. 181. Foxe follows Malmesbury, *GP*, lib 2 cap 75 in his amendment of Fabyan.

which Foxe gathered from Fabyan.⁵⁷ Foxe exclaimed that William of Malmesbury and Ranulf Higden wrote of how King Alfred (871-899) had dressed as a minstrel so that he could spy on the Danes. Fabyan, Foxe stressed, had followed them both.⁵⁸ In the case of the length of the reign of King Æthelred I (840-871), Foxe noted without further comment that William of Malmesbury claimed five years while Fabyan claimed eight.⁵⁹ These examples help to show that while Foxe trusted much of what Fabyan wrote he also critically assessed and compared his source with others.

Foxe consulted the *Chronicon* with similar enthusiasm. It provided the basis for detailed stories in the reigns of Anglo-Saxon kings, especially Offa's role in the murder of Æthelbert of East Anglia (c. 749-c. 760), Osberht (d. 867) king of Northumbria battling the Danes, and for the battles and building work carried out in the reign of Edward the Elder (899-924).⁶⁰ It added vital evidence for the moment when Gregory the Great first met the English and for the subsequent mission of Augustine to Kent. The *Chronicon* also provided a lens for other texts. When describing the learning of King Sigeberht of East Anglia (ruled c. 629-634) as a context for the famed learning of King Alfred, Foxe cited both Bede and Geoffrey of Monmouth, but actually extracted the account and references verbatim from Brompton.⁶¹

⁵⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk 2, p. 176.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, bk 3, p. 188. This also occurs in bk 3, p. 215.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

⁶⁰ For the act of Offa compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 173 with Brompton, col. 776. Foxe also independently inserted material from Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 cap. 210. In the example of King Osberht, King of Northumbria, battling the Danes both Fabyan lib. 6 cap. 169 and *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 cap. 32 had claimed Ella was now in control of the West Saxons. Thus Foxe relied on Brompton cols 802-4 as his clearest account. Compare to *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 185-6. For events in Edward the Elder's reign compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 194 with Brompton, cols 833-5.

⁶¹ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 190 with Brompton, col. 814. The reference to Bede, *HE*, lib. 3 cap. 18 shows that Foxe followed Brompton's citation which stated '...creditur studium apud Grantecestre sedem juxta Cantebriam a venerabili Bede esse fundatum'.

Foxe was however, aware of the dangers in following Brompton and Fabyan as main authorities. Although John Bale had praised Fabyan he had also declared that the *New Chronicles* was based on faulty knowledge of the older texts.⁶² Thus Foxe needed to check for error and disagreement in his sources. On most occasions Foxe appeared to have checked and confirmed Brompton's and Fabyan's accounts either through references that they provided or through his own independent comparison to older texts. For this, he no doubt used the guiding hand of Bale's *Catalogus* and similar polemical works, but he must also have systematically checked a core selection of manuscripts independent of contemporary and intermediary help.

Whilst Fabyan's *New Chronicles* was well known in its published form, Brompton's *Chronicon* survived in just one manuscript copy.⁶³ John Bale had probably re-discovered it sometime earlier in the century, having found it in the hands of a 'Mr Osburne'.⁶⁴ This manuscript therefore provides a secondary engagement by Foxe with Bale's research. Only one other Elizabethan scholar, Richard Grafton, appears to have made use of the *Chronicon*, which by this time had been appropriated by Matthew Parker.⁶⁵ Bale, as stated above, also recommended Fabyan as a good authority, even if it was partially based upon faulty knowledge of the medieval chronicles (meaning that Fabyan did not examine Monkish texts from a Protestant point of view). That Foxe used both the chronicles of Fabyan and Brompton as key texts in which to form his

⁶² *Catalogus*, p. 642.

⁶³ The manuscript is CCCC MS 96.

⁶⁴ This is Peter Osburne (d. 1592). See chapter six of this thesis for more details.

⁶⁵ The *Chronicon* attributed to John Brompton is not listed as a work used in John Stow, *A summarye of the Chronicles of Englande* (London, 1570), nor in Edward Hall, *The vnion of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre [and] Yorke* (London, 1548) or John Rastell, *The pastyme of people* (London, 1530), John Jewel, *Apologia ecclesiae anglicanae* (London, 1562), nor Matthew Parker, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, (London, 1566). Neither can Brompton be found in Holinshed's *Chronicle* of 1587 or in John Stow's *A Survey of London* (London, 1598). The only chronicle, other than the *Acts and Monuments*, to use Brompton appears to be Richard Grafton, *A chronicle at large and meere history of the affayres of Englande and kinges* (London, 1569).

history is suggestive of his close association with Bale, and also of his significant and continuing reliance upon his research. However, again these chronicles were not enough to compile a fresh and revised history of the Anglo-Saxons. As highlighted in the previous discussions, to satisfy fully the complexity of detail which a new account required, Foxe needed to re-examine the medieval textual inheritance. His history was meaningless without a confrontation with the corpus of historical evidence compiled by generations of monks.

2. The 'monkish' Inheritance

i. Ranulf Higden

One significant benefit of using the chronicles ascribed to Fabyan and Brompton as key authorities to consult, extract, compare and even structure arguments was their association with a particular chronicle tradition reinvigorated in the fourteenth century by Ranulf Higden.⁶⁶ Higden had compiled the first universal chronicle in England that approached world history in a sustained manner and which was also appealing to the general reader. The *Polychronicon*, as it was entitled, approached history from a colossal mass of sources ranging from classical to medieval texts but was mainly focused on pre-Conquest history. Six of the seven Books were focused on the ancient and Anglo-Saxon periods and whereas other histories generally began with an outline of how various nations had arisen over the course of time, the *Polychronicon* was framed within a linear view beginning with Creation and ending in the future, with the Last

⁶⁶ See Taylor, *Ranulf Higden*.

Judgement. In general, it had provided something that was previously unavailable; a clear and convincing picture of world history. In an unusual move, the *Polychronicon* was also translated into the vernacular, making it available to a much wider audience than most medieval chronicles.⁶⁷ The popularity of the *Polychronicon* ensured that it became the basis for most subsequent attempts to write history. It inspired various chronicles and numerous continuations. Many of the sources that Foxe used in his *Acts and Monuments* were based upon Higden's work: the anonymous *Eulogium*, John Tynemouth's *Historia Aurea*, and of course the chronicles of Brompton and Fabyan.

There was, however, a problem for Foxe in using a chronicle that had previously held such a central role in English historiography. What Foxe was attempting to do was to revise English history into a Protestant order. To achieve this aim Foxe needed to use sources that had been forgotten, but also to re-interpret histories that were well known. The *Polychronicon* had to be displaced from its centrality in the historiography to enable other texts to be heard again. Foxe appears to have solved this difficulty by relying on the later chronicles that had based their methodology and evidence upon the *Polychronicon*. The *Chronicon* attributed to John Brompton, for instance, was a perfect appropriation of Higden's methods for Foxe to use, as it was also a chronicle that had been largely forgotten.

Foxe occasionally provides a reference to the *Polychronicon* but these instances are not as regular as in many previous histories. However, there is enough evidence to show that Foxe did indeed use a copy if only to fill in details where he was otherwise lacking or uncertain. For instance, when Foxe came to describe how King Alfred encouraged

⁶⁷ The *Polychronicon* was translated by John Trevisa (1342 - 1402) and first published by William Caxton (c. 1415/22-1492) in 1482.

his nobles to become more learned, Foxe produced a quotation directly taken from Higden.⁶⁸ On another occasion when describing the death of King Æthelred and his wife, Foxe used, albeit without reference, the *Polychronicon* as his only source.⁶⁹ Most of the time, Foxe used the *Polychronicon* to check the evidence contained in other texts or to emphasise a particular date or event where chroniclers deviated.⁷⁰ Foxe was willing to use the *Polychronicon* when needed but this was limited; retained only for when there was no other option or when a point needed substantiating with various authorities. This was intentional, as it allowed Foxe to foreground other medieval monastic chronicles that had been eclipsed by the success of the *Polychronicon* in the fourteenth century. These included most specifically the twelfth century chronicles by Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury. It is to these two chronicles that Foxe turned, to extend his researches beyond fifteenth and sixteenth-century compilations and catalogues.

ii. Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury

In Books Two and Three of the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, Foxe used to a significant extent the *Historia Anglorum* compiled by Henry of Huntingdon and the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* and *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* compiled by William of Malmesbury. Together these three twelfth-century chronicles appear to have been approached, by Foxe, as his most important comparative texts, which he used in conjunction with the chronicles and catalogues that we have already addressed above. These chronicles along with the *Historia Regum Britanniae* compiled by Geoffrey of

⁶⁸ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp.189-191 to *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 cap. 1.

⁶⁹ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 212-3 to *Polychronicon*, lib. 6 cap. 16-17.

⁷⁰ An example of the *Polychronicon* being used in this way can be seen in the argument over the discrepancy of the date of Augustine's death in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 160.

Monmouth, were all written within a twenty year period and, for the most part, were independent witnesses to their own times and to the interpretation of English history to that point. They shared a similar intellectual inheritance and all signified their adoption of ideas and methods contained in Bede's eighth-century *Ecclesiastical History*.⁷¹ Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* was especially useful as it was written in a simple language with an emphasis on story telling.⁷² It also relied upon the eighth-century *Historia Brittonum* attributed to Nennius and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. For Foxe, this meant that he had a text that was both lively and entertaining whilst also based upon a solid foundation of Anglo-Saxon texts. Taking note from Bede's Eusebian methodology, Henry of Huntingdon also reproduced extensive extracts from his document base. Thus Foxe was able to take, from the *Historia Anglorum*, verbatim materials such as Pope Gregory I's letter to Arelalensis and Augustine and the Anglo-Saxon epitaphs for King Alfred and Edgar (959-975).⁷³ Henry of Huntingdon was also an important source for Foxe's descriptions of the character and death of Oswine (d. 651), the controversy over the dating of Augustine's death (d. 604), and the crowning of Ecgrith as King of Northumbria (670-685).⁷⁴

⁷¹ Nancy F. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, 1977) and Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (2 vols., London, 1974), vol. 1, pp. 127-130.

⁷² See the introduction in Diana Greenway (ed. & trans.), *Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon; Historia Anglorum: The History of the English People* (Oxford, 1996).

⁷³ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 155-6 with Huntingdon lib 3 cap. 2 for the letter to Arelalensis and Augustine. Foxe might have used Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* for letters between Gregory I and Augustine, however in all the other cases Bede is also an obvious possibility. Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 159 with Bede, *HE*, lib. 1 caps 30-32 or Huntingdon, lib. 3 caps. 7-9. For the epitaphs to Alfred and Edgar compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 192, 207 with Huntingdon, lib. 5 caps 13, 26. It should be noted that Foxe may have taken the epitaph to Alfred from the Parker copy of Asser. It appears at the end of the life of Alfred alongside another citation that Foxe has inserted into his account. See Matthew Parker, *Ælfredi Regis res gestæ* (London, 1574), p. 35.

⁷⁴ For Oswine's character and death compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 164 with Huntingdon, lib. 9 caps 14-17. As one of the sources used to date Augustine's death compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 160 with Huntingdon lib. 3 cap. 17. As a key source for Ecgrith becoming King of Northumbria compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 166 with Huntingdon lib. 2 cap 35.

For other reasons William of Malmesbury was an important source for Foxe. His two chronicles – one focused on the succession of Anglo-Saxon and Norman monarchs and the other on the papal succession – offered a disconnected secular and ecclesiastical content and contained an internal thematic organisation. Both were useful to Foxe. For instance, the Anglo-Saxons were presented in the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* in a hostile light. They were described as a lustful and gluttonous race, generally lacking in religious observance.⁷⁵ In the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, William of Malmesbury strongly favoured the archbishopric of Canterbury in Archbishop Lanfranc's battle over supremacy with York.⁷⁶ It was important for Foxe to support his chief patron, his own archbishop, by declaring his loyalty to the supremacy of Canterbury.

Foxe seems to have particularly favoured William of Malmesbury, inserting evidence from his chronicles at the earliest possible opportunity and weaving them into his account until they reached their end. From the *Pontificum*, Foxe extracted short and lengthy portions of text to add to and expand upon the material already found in the catalogues for individual bishops and archbishops. To name but a few occasions, Foxe implanted material from the *Pontificum* for his description of the building of St Paul's and St Peter's in London, the ascension of 'Pleimundus', schoolmaster to King Alfred to the archbishopric of Canterbury, for the epistles of Archbishop Odo to the clergy, and for the dreams of King Edgar, which led him to build monasteries.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Gransden, *Historical Writing*, vol. 1, p. 173.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 176-7.

⁷⁷ For the building of St Paul's and St Peter's compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 161 with Malmesbury, *GP*, lib. 2 cap. 2 with Fabyan, lib. 5 cap. 120 and Huntingdon, lib. 3 cap. 20. For the account of Pleimundus compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 192 with Malmesbury, *GP*, lib. 1 cap. 13-14. For the epistles of Archbishop Odo compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 200 with Malmesbury, *GP*, lib. 1 cap. 16-17. For the dreams of King Edgar compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 201 with Malmesbury, *GP*, lib. 2 cap. 75.

From the *Regum*, Foxe added largely political accounts on the English kings from the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons to the Norman Conquest. William of Malmesbury was particularly useful for the character of various Anglo-Saxon kings.⁷⁸ The *Regum* was also one source amongst many for the reign of King Æthelfride. It was also his chief source for the death of David, Archbishop of Keirleion and for the reign of Ine of Wessex.⁷⁹ Foxe's account of Bede's life is largely an abstract from the *Regum*, as are the letters of Alcuin.⁸⁰ Elements of the reign of King Alfred, especially his learning and the division of his goods were taken wholesale from the *Regum*, as were the description of King Athelstan, the verse about the battle of Brunanburh, and the reign of King Edgar, especially the description of his four vices.⁸¹

At the beginning of the sixteenth century both Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury were neglected authors, however as early as the 1520s Polydore Vergil had declared the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* as a 'true history'.⁸² In his *Catalogus*, John Bale described the *Historia Anglorum* as contaminated with fictional (*fabulae*) and unworthy evidence concerning the first coming of the Anglo-Saxons, but he admitted that this was a general problem of the times and that Henry of Huntingdon was generally an elegant and learned historian.⁸³ Bale also declared that both Polydore Vergil and John Leland

⁷⁸ For instance the character of King Egelred in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 210-211 taken from Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 cap. 164.

⁷⁹ For the reign of King Æthelfride compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 159-160 with Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 47; Fabyan, lib. 5 cap. 109; *Polychronicon*, lib. 5 cap. 10. For the death of Archbishop David compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 160 with Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 25. For the reign of Ine of Wessex compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 169 with Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 36.

⁸⁰ For Foxe's account of the life of Bede compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 170 with Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 caps. 53-60. For Alcuin compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 175 with Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 70-2.

⁸¹ For the reign of King Edgar compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 189-191 with Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 caps 122-4. For Athelstan compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 195-8 with Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 cap. 131-7. For the verse on the battle of Brunanburh compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 196 with Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 cap. 135. For the reign of King Edgar compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 204 with Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 cap. 148-159.

⁸² Polydore Vergil as cited in Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, p. 56. This reference was never published.

⁸³ *Catalogus*, p. 192-3. Bale is probably referring to those elements of Henry of Huntingdon taken from Geoffrey of Monmouth when he complained about fabricated material.

confirmed Henry of Huntingdon as a distinguished historian. Of William of Malmesbury, Bale noted that he was of singular diligence, industry and elegance. Bale particularly noted William of Malmesbury's interest in the Anglo-Saxons and his ability to write well the stories of kings and popes.⁸⁴ In 1570, John Stow also wrote that William of Malmesbury was specifically glorified as he 'hath laboured to restore the 'memorable actes of the auncient Britons and valiaunt Englishmen'.⁸⁵ This appeared in Stow's revised second edition of *A summarye of the cronicles of Englande*. In the same section, Stow noted that Henry of Huntingdon should receive praise for his truth, virtue and honesty.⁸⁶ Together these references prove that these chronicles were recognised by sixteenth-century scholars as worthwhile histories and that their compilers were still able to provide a certain element of truth despite the corruption of their age. For the Anglo-Saxon account in the *Acts and Monuments*, Foxe found Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury useful historians to compare and contrast to his other sources. However, there were plenty of other chronicles and annals written by monks that Foxe also engaged with for this account. Although in all cases these were used to a lesser degree, they did provide an important contribution to the account whether it be as scattered references or as a source for specific stories.

iii. Medieval Chronicles

Foxe rarely tells us why he has chosen one text over another, or why he gave more authority to one author than to others. The biographies in John Bale's *Catalogus* and John Stow's *A summarye of the chronicles of Englande*, help to a point in determining some of the reasons why. They had both praised the chronicles belonging to Robert

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 186-7.

⁸⁵ John Stow, *A Summarye of the cronicles of Englande* (London, 1570), ff. 6v-10r.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

Fabyan, John Brompton, Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury. They also favoured Ranulf Higden, with Bale describing the *Polychronicon* as having been written with much diligence, care and concern and displaying a particular interest in chronology and world affairs both of divine and human histories.⁸⁷ Another two sources that Foxe used in his account of the Anglo-Saxons were also praised by Bale (although unmentioned by Stow). The first of these is the *Annals* compiled by Roger of Hoveden in the twelfth century.⁸⁸ Bale described Roger of Hoveden as a 'distinguished annalist' who began his book with Bede and integrated various authors' works.⁸⁹ For Foxe, the *Annals* was most useful as a reference for dates and chronology. Time and again Foxe exploited its annalistic content and form to add chronological details to events occurring in the reigns of kings. For instance, Foxe added such details to his accounts of various kings of Northumbria, including Ceolwulf (729-737), Eadberht (737-758), and Ceolwulf II (731-738). These accounts tended to include dates and length of each king's reign. In Book Three, Roger of Hoveden provided the date of the accession of Byrnstan to the bishopric of Winchester in AD 933, Oswald, Archbishop of York's replacement of priests with monks in AD 969, and Bishop Aldhun of Durham's translation of the body of St Cuthbert from Chester to Durham in AD 995.⁹⁰

The second text compiled by medieval monks and referenced by Bale is the *Flores Historiarum*. This chronicle was compiled by Matthew Paris in the thirteenth century but, in Foxe's time, was believed to have been the work of a fictitious author named Matthew of Westminster. In the *Catalogus*, Bale explained that he 'brought forth

⁸⁷ *Catalogus*, p. 462.

⁸⁸ Gransden, *Historical Writing in England*, vol. 1, pp. 225-230.

⁸⁹ *Catalogus*, p. 248.

⁹⁰ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 196 with Hoveden I, p. 54; *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 201-2 with Hoveden I, pp. 62-3; *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 211 with Hoveden I, p. 68 respectively.

[*genere*] a good book with clear skill'.⁹¹ As was touched upon in the previous chapter of this thesis, Matthew Parker also published two new editions of the *Flores Historiarum*, each time noting its worth to the Protestant view of the English past. Foxe would use this chronicle to a much greater extent when he came to post-Conquest history, particularly of Matthew Paris' own times, however he did also insert a few references into his Anglo-Saxon account. It was one of many sources Foxe consulted when trying to work out the authenticity of the story of King Lucius.⁹² It was also used in describing events during the reigns of King Ceolwulf of Mercia (821-823) and King Edmund of East Anglia (855-869).⁹³ In these few instances the *Flores Historiarum* was always used in conjunction with other sources, adding a few extra details to a wider discussion. Other times when Foxe cited the *Flores Historiarum* the actual source of the information and the reference appears to have derived from the *New Chronicles* by Fabyan.⁹⁴

There are numerous instances where medieval chronicles Foxe claims to be consulting actually turn out to be taken directly out of the *New Chronicles* or a similar text. Although John Stow commented that Gerald of Wales is 'worthy to be made common to manye' for his 'great knowledge and estimation', Foxe does not use him for his account of Anglo-Saxon England.⁹⁵ The only reference to 'Giraldus Cambrensis' is in connection with Geoffrey of Monmouth and was inserted for Foxe's rendition of the

⁹¹ *Catalogus*, p. 472.

⁹² Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 147 with *Flores I*, p. 149.

⁹³ For Ceolwulf compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 153 with *Flores I*, pp. 252-7. For Edmund compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 154 with *Flores I*, pp. 433-5. The *Flores Historiarum* was also briefly used in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 163 for the account of Archbishop Paulinus (d. 644). Compare this account to *Flores I*, p. 308.

⁹⁴ Compare the account on the privileges and donations given by Ethelwulf to the clergy in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 181 with Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 162 and *Flores I*, p. 423. Foxe also lifted a reference to the *Flores Historiarum* from Fabyan, lib 6 caps 157-8 in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 180. As these accounts are close together it would appear likely that Foxe did indeed consult the *Flores Historiarum*.

⁹⁵ John Stow, *A Summary of the Chronicles of England*, ff. 6v-10r.

battle between Edwin and Æthelbert of Kent. In reality this was lifted from the *New Chronicles*.⁹⁶ Similarly Foxe's references to the aforementioned John Capgrave were probably almost all taken directly from Bale's *Catalogus* rather than an actual manuscript copy. Less certain are Foxe's references to Simeon of Durham's *Historia Ecclesie Dunelmensis* (a twelfth-century chronicle). Foxe claimed to use Simeon and Roger of Hoveden for his account of the expulsion of priests by King Edgar from the churches and their replacement by monks, and for the controversy concerning Edgar's successor.⁹⁷ These accounts did not come from any of Foxe's known sources so, it would seem logical to suggest that Parker or Joscelyn had provided this information for Foxe to use independently of his own researches.⁹⁸ Another case where this might have occurred is with the seventh to fifteenth-century Crowland (Croyland) chronicle assigned to Pseudo-Ingulf. This text was written in stages over a 900 year period and is perhaps more useful for its latter parts and its various continuations.⁹⁹ Partly due to its more limited use for the earlier period there is only one reference to Crowland's chronicle. This concerns the expulsion of monks from monasteries in the reign of Edward the Martyr. It is a quotation, copied in Latin and translated into English. As this is the only reference it would again seem likely that this was provided from elsewhere. However, there appears to be no evidence that Parker had a copy of

⁹⁶ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 161-2 with Fabyan, lib. 5 cap. 128.

⁹⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 207.

⁹⁸ Compare *Ibid.* with J. Stevenson (ed. & trans.), *Simeon of Durham; A History of the Kings of England* (1858, facsimile reprint 1987), pp. 94-5 and Hoveden I, p. 65. The editors of Roger of Hoveden, believe that Roger of Hoveden drew this material from Simeon of Durham. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that Joscelyn could have helped Foxe with this section. Parker had copies of Roger of Hoveden and a copy of Simeon of Durham in the form of CCC MS 139. This manuscript was referenced in both Bale's 1560 letter to Parker (G&W, Bn12) and Joscelyn's list (G&W, J2. 43/46). Joscelyn had also made excerpts from MS Cotton Vitellius D VII. Another possibility is a manuscript listed by Joscelyn (G&W, J2.42) that is untraced. This manuscript, coming from Twyne's collection, is described as containing Simeon of Durham and mentions its reliance on Hoveden.

⁹⁹ See Michael Hicks, 'Crowland's World: A Westminster View of the Yorkist Age', *History*, 90:298 (2005), pp. 172-90.

Crowland's chronicle.¹⁰⁰ It does not appear in Foxe's other sources and might therefore have come from the Lord of Arundel himself, either directly or via Parker's household, for it is known that they did share some manuscripts.¹⁰¹ Another source is the *Chronicon sive Chronographia* of Sigebert of Gembloux. This eleventh-century text was only used as an extension to evidence already provided by Bale in his *Catalogus*. It dealt with the turbulence over papal elections during the time of Pope Formosus.¹⁰² It would seem likely that this information also came from the Parker household, either at Foxe's request or by Parker or Joscelyn's initiative.

iv. Hagiographies

John Foxe, following in the footsteps of reformist writers such as Robert Barnes and John Bale, appropriated hagiographies rather than casting them completely aside. The old *Lives (vitae)* of Roman Catholic saints were prominent and powerful examples of discarded traditions and, properly managed, a weapon to be moulded against the cult of saints and as a vehicle to promote in their stead the protestant martyrs, not as men and women to be venerated but to be idealised as an example of true believers who had committed the ultimate test of faith in God's name. As we have previously discussed the *Acts and Monuments* was itself partially perceived as a replacement for Jacopo de

¹⁰⁰ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 208 with Henry Thomas Riley, *Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland: With the Continuations* (Michigan, 1854), p. 109. Arundel MS 178 is the only copy of Crowland and even this is a transcript rather than an original manuscript. It is possible that the Lord of Arundel lent Parker the manuscript.

¹⁰¹ James P. Carley, *The Books of Henry VIII and his Wives* (London, 2004), p. 145.

¹⁰² Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 192-4 with *Catalogus*, pp. 119-120 and Sigebert of Gembloux, *Sigeberti Gemblacensis monachi opera omnia, Accedunt Chronicon Polonorum auctore anonymo.*, edited by J. P. Migne (Paris, 1854), p. 345. This research was carried out in Freeman, 'Papal History'. Parker did own a manuscript copy of Sigebert of Gembloux in CCC MS 51, which contained annotations by Joscelyn and perhaps by Parker himself.

Varagine's *Golden Legend*, compiled in the thirteenth century.¹⁰³ Foxe might not have appreciated the comparison, feeling that it would 'prejudice its truth', but nevertheless found it a useful text to deploy in a similar fashion as Polydore Vergil's English history.¹⁰⁴ For the pre-Conquest portion of his own history Foxe used the *Golden Legend* as part of his attack on Pope Gregory I, to show the reader 'the time when this usual Masse of the Papistes began first to be universal and uniforme, and generally in churches to be received'.¹⁰⁵ He did this by first citing from a tale of how two versions of the Mass book were left in a church. One had been written by Ambrose and used for centuries, the other was a new version by Gregory. When the bishops returned the next morning, Gregory's version was scattered around the church, while Ambrose's remained as it had been. Thus, the bishops decided, this was God telling them that Gregory's version should be spread around the world, while Ambrose's should only be used in his own church. Foxe deconstructed this tale calling it a 'mystical miracle' and, quoting from Daniel 14, claimed that the more likely interpretation of the event – if it had occurred at all – was that crows had ripped Gregory's book apart as a sign that God was angry with it, while Ambrose's book was left in one piece as God was pleased with that version.

Two earlier hagiographies that Foxe used were inserted into one particular section that dealt with King Edgar and Archbishop Dunstan. The two versions of *Vita St Dunstani* by Eadmer and Osbern were produced in the context of the recent Norman Conquest. Eadmer's life was largely a reproduction of Osbern's earlier text but with several

¹⁰³ Jacobus De Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, edited and translated by William G. Ryan (2 vols., Princeton, 1993).

¹⁰⁴ *A&M*, 1570, *To the Learned Reader* [Prefaces].

¹⁰⁵ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 174 with Jacobus De Voragine, *The Golden Legend*, vol. 1: Saint Gregory, pp. 182-183. The research into Voragine as Foxe's actual source was carried out by Freeman, 'Papal History'.

mistakes removed and a particularly Worcester bias added.¹⁰⁶ Foxe had, in part, used Bale's *Catalogus* for extraction of these hagiographies. However the vast majority of the extracts appear to come directly from the manuscripts.¹⁰⁷ Both works can be found in Parker's collection.¹⁰⁸ Foxe used Eadmer as his reference for the building of monasteries in Edgar's reign although he also appears to have relied upon Fabyan, William of Malmesbury or Higden, or perhaps all three, for full details.¹⁰⁹ For Osbern's life of Dunstan, Foxe described the penance of King Edgar enforced by Archbishop Dunstan. For this account Foxe also cited William of Malmesbury, Roger of Hoveden and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This is the only reference to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and it would appear unlikely that Foxe had consulted the source directly at this point. Citation of it appears in Brompton's *Chronicon* and this might well be Foxe's source. Alternatively Joscelyn has a similar reference in his list of medieval manuscripts.¹¹⁰ Thus, in conjunction with Osbern's life of Dunstan, it would seem likely that Foxe was relying on Joscelyn for much of this information.

These were Foxe's texts, which he used to varying degrees to compile his Anglo-Saxon history in the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. Monks had written most of the sources between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, however these generally were not the texts on which Foxe placed most of his emphasis. Instead Foxe used the 'monkish'

¹⁰⁶ Gransden, *Historical Writing*, vol. 1, pp. 127-130.

¹⁰⁷ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 207 with *Catalogus*, pp. 139-141, which describes near-contemporary opinions of Dunstan. *Catalogus*, pp. 131-141 contains numerous references to Dunstan and Edgar and was probably the initial source for Foxe's account, although it lacked the detail necessary for inclusion in his actual text.

¹⁰⁸ Eadmer's life is in CCC MS 371 while Osbern's is in BL Arundel MS 16, which is heavily annotated by John Joscelyn.

¹⁰⁹ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 205 with Fabyan, lib. 6 cap. 193, Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 cap. 149 and *Polychronicon*, lib. 6 cap. 9. The number of monasteries calculated to 48 is not in any of these sources and must come directly from Andred J. Turner and Bernard J. Muir, *Eadmer of Canterbury, Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald* (Oxford, 2006), *vita S. Dunstani*, lib. 57 (p. 143).

¹¹⁰ Brompton col. 868 and G&W, p. 58 (J1.14) references the *chronico Saxonico Ecclesiae Wigornensis*. According to Graham and Watson this manuscript is MS Cotton Tiberius B. IV, ff. 3-86, 88-90. It is written in Old English and was probably Joscelyn's own property. Foxe's reference to both this copy of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and to Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* can be found in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 205-6.

inheritance to compare and contrast with more trusted sources in the belief that such a technique would bring him closer to the truth. As indicated by the inclusion of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, probably through the researches of Parker's household, Foxe did draw in a few other sources beyond those that we have discussed. Foxe, himself did not generally use pre-Conquest sources but neither could he ignore them. For that, Foxe appears to have been more reliant on his collaboration with Matthew Parker. It is probably through Parker that he was able to engage with Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. The use of Gildas and Asser can similarly be linked to the Archbishop's household rather than to Foxe himself. A clothworker named William Carye was another source from whom Foxe (probably via Parker) borrowed manuscripts. On many occasions we can link Carye's manuscripts with Foxe's references to Gildas and Polydore Vergil's problematic sixteenth-century chronicle – the *Historia Anglica*. This brings our discussion to another critical point, the impact of contemporary Roman Catholic histories upon the writing of Protestant histories, and to the response implemented largely from the Archbishop's household. It is therefore to these texts and to these subjects that we now turn our attention.

3. The battleground over Anglo-Saxon texts

i. Bede

One would expect Bede's eighth-century *Historia Ecclesiastica* to be an essential source for Foxe's Anglo-Saxon history. Unlike many later histories, Bede's had retained its importance as a source and had been transmitted to the sixteenth century as

a particularly stable manuscript tradition.¹¹¹ It was a well-known and admired text that had been dispersed into almost every history written since the Norman Conquest. Like Foxe, Bede had based his history upon the methodology encapsulated by Eusebius, producing a variety of documentation and focusing upon the church rather than the state. In his *Catalogus*, John Bale had proclaimed Bede a learned, dependable and virtuous chronicler, knowledgeable in both Greek and Latin and in physics and mathematics.¹¹² Foxe also wrote that Bede was a 'man of worthy and venerable memorie' who 'in reading and digesting so many volumes, consumed all hys whole cogitations in writing vpon the Scriptures'.¹¹³ Foxe dedicates almost an entire page to Bede's epitaph and attempted to gather evidence that he had been summoned to Rome in praise of his high 'estimation' as a scholar.¹¹⁴ It is therefore surprising that there is little evidence that Foxe actually consulted the *Historia Ecclesiastica* for the *Acts and Monuments*. There are plenty of references to Bede in Books Two and Three, but few of them can definitely be linked to a direct consultation of the actual text. Most, in fact, can be demonstrated to have derived from later chronicles.

For the first arrival of the Anglo-Saxons in Britain, Foxe entirely ignores Bede. There are only two references that Foxe makes to the *Historia Ecclesiastica* in this early portion of his text. The first was derived from Bale's *Catalogus*, as one of the seven authorities which Foxe cited for a pre-Roman conversion of Britain to Christianity.¹¹⁵

The second states that Polydore Vergil 'cityng the authoritie of Bede' claimed that

¹¹¹ See George Hardin-Brown, *Bede the Venerable* (Stamford, 1987).

¹¹² *Catalogus*, p. 94.

¹¹³ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 170.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* Foxe cites an epistle from Pope Sergius I to Ceolfrith (c. 640-717), Abbot of Wearmouth and Jarrow Abbey (who was also mentor to Bede), which required Bede to be sent to Rome because of the fame of his learning. Foxe took this evidence from Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 1 cap. 58.

¹¹⁵ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 145-6 with *Catalogus*, p. 66.

Aurelius Ambrosius was a Roman by his father.¹¹⁶ Foxe argued that although this was probably true, he was also born of an Englishwoman and brought up in England. When Foxe came to the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church in Britain, we do find a few references to Bede, but these are few and far between. This, itself, is surprising as Bede was the first witness to everything that Foxe inserts on the subject. Bede is admittedly referenced for the first encounter between the English and Pope Gregory I, however this citation could easily have derived from the *Historia Anglorum* compiled by Henry of Huntingdon.¹¹⁷

The series of letters and 'interrogations' between Gregory I and Augustine also lack any reference to Bede. The first set of letters derived from a reading of Henry of Huntingdon.¹¹⁸ The 'interrogations' (or *Responsa*) are a particularly interesting example, as these do not generally appear beyond Bede's text.¹¹⁹ The 'interrogations' are a response sent by Pope Gregory to Augustine, which answer a series of questions he had made about the establishment of the English churches. These were subsequently recorded by Bede, but never replicated by Henry of Huntingdon or other later chronicles. They were also missing from the *Registrum* of Gregory the Great.¹²⁰ In the *Acts and Monuments*, Foxe has left us a clue as to the origin of his copy of the 'interrogations' and it does not lead us to Bede. Instead, Foxe seems to suggest that he gained his copy from Gregory's register: 'Ex decretis Gregorii primus lib. Concil. Tom.

¹¹⁶ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 153.

¹¹⁷ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 155 with Huntingdon, lib. 3 cap. 12.

¹¹⁸ See *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 155-161. These were almost certainly extracted from Huntingdon, lib. 3 cap. 2.

¹¹⁹ F. Homes Dudden, *Gregory the Great: His Place in History and Thought*, vol. 2 (London, 1905), p. 130. The 'interrogations' appear in Bede, *HE*, lib. 1 cap. 27.

¹²⁰ See Dudden, *Gregory the Great*, p. 130 who believes that the letter was 'misaid' by the Roman Curate but rediscovered sometime after 736 AD. John R. C. Martyn (ed. & trans.), *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, vol. 1 (Toronto, 2004), pp. 61-66 is more uncertain over its authenticity but takes the middle ground in the argument.

2'.¹²¹ As we know, the 'interrogations' do not appear in the official copy of Gregory's register, but they do interestingly occur in one of Matthew Parker's miscellaneous manuscripts. Parker owned a manuscript containing various sermons and canons, which include an item entitled 'Interrogationes beati Augustini episcopi Cantuariorum ecclesiae cum responsionibus sancti Gregorii papae urbis Romae'.¹²² Upon investigation these appear to be of a copy, largely the same as that which appears in Bede, and are interestingly contained in the second part of the manuscript (corresponding perhaps to Foxe's statement of 'Tom. 2'). The evidence remains circumstantial, but does suggest that Bede is an unlikely source (the 'interrogations' appear in Tom. 1 of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*).

Foxe's accounts of the early Anglo-Saxon kings are also lacking in reference to or use of Bede. There is one exception. In the account of Ine, Foxe prints a letter about the shaving of priests' heads which he states as having been obtained 'in Bede' and that 'I haue here annexed'.¹²³ What does Foxe mean by 'annexed'? Foxe does not generally use that word when he inserts material. It might suggest that the letter was borrowed, perhaps from Matthew Parker's household.¹²⁴ There are several other occasions where material from Bede might have been obtained by such means. For the controversy over the dating of Easter, played out largely at the synods of Bangor and Thetford, Foxe does produce material which appears to be genuinely taken from Bede. For the inclusion of a copy of the disputation concerning Easter, Foxe noted that this was 'as in the story of

¹²¹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 155.

¹²² This is CCCC MS 320, pt. 3.

¹²³ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 168. This appears in Bede, *HE*, lib. 5 cap. 21.

¹²⁴ Matthew Parker had several complete, incomplete and short excerpts of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*. These included CCCC MS 41, an Old English translation given by Bishop Leofric to the Cathedral of Exeter in the eleventh century and CCCC MS 359, a complete Latin edition.

Beda at large described'.¹²⁵ Indeed, it is virtually word-for-word the same as the version in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which points to the actual use of a manuscript copy.¹²⁶ The genealogies of Anglo-Saxon kings presented near the beginning of Book Two also contain evidence from Bede, as does the list of building foundations near the end of the Book.¹²⁷ It is possible that these were abstracted from elsewhere, but reference to Bede's history should not be discounted in these instances.

This evidence therefore suggests that some material from Bede was obtained for Foxe's Anglo-Saxon account. However, the instances are few and can be explained by specific requests for that material to Parker. Most references to the *Historia Ecclesiastica* were actually derived from Henry of Huntingdon or other chronicles and manuscripts. How then, do we account for the discrepancy between Foxe's validation of Bede as a trusted authority, while at the same time noticing that Foxe generally avoided direct use of and reference to his history? First of all it is telling that in his article on 'John Foxe and the Anglo-Saxons', Benedict Scott Robinson describes how other sixteenth-century scholars treated Bede, including John Bale, but does not tell us how Foxe himself incorporated it into his text.¹²⁸ He hints at the reason when he states that 'the crucial text for anyone wanting to argue the Anglo-Saxon origins of the English was Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*'.¹²⁹ Foxe was not interested in arguing an Anglo-Saxon origin for the English or for the English church. Indeed, this is the opposite of what he wanted to argue. For Foxe the Anglo-Saxons were invaders who trampled over the British natives, but at the same time were never entirely able to subdue them. Thus the failure of the apostolic church and the reception of the Church of Rome, were due to foreign

¹²⁵ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 164.

¹²⁶ Bede, *HE*, lib. 3 cap. 25.

¹²⁷ See *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 149-152 and 177.

¹²⁸ Robinson, 'John Foxe and the Anglo-Saxons', pp. 54-72.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

impositions and not to the British themselves. Bede, whose central contention is that Celtic practices should be suppressed to enable the acceptance of a fully Roman English church, was at odds with the protestant message. Both Allen J. Frantzen and Benedict Scott Robinson admit that even when Bale engaged with Bede it was a limited engagement, intended only to stress (through an extraordinarily skewed reading) that the first encounter between the Pope and the English was a sexualised encounter.¹³⁰ Bale wished to accuse Pope Gregory I of sodomy.

The main obstacle to interpreting Bede into a Protestant reading was the publication of his *Historia Ecclesiastica* by the Roman Catholic apologist Thomas Stapleton in 1565.¹³¹ As Allen Frantzen has stated this was a political act by Stapleton and a powerful attack on Bale's 'poisoned sense and meaning', which he had drawn out of Bede's history.¹³² As Robinson has pointed out, Stapleton framed the *Historia Ecclesiastica* 'at odds with Foxe's treatment of the "Saxons"'.¹³³ The date of this publication is significant. 1565 was about the time when Foxe probably began work on the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. Stapleton was also one of the key critics of the 1563 edition, of whom Foxe was especially wary. So Foxe seemingly decided to avoid using Bede because his critics had already claimed it as their own, and could easily attack any revisionism Foxe attempted on that basis. We must also remember that Foxe was pressed for time. Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* was no small text. To use it properly Foxe or one of his collaborators would have had to immerse themselves in the text, which would have required much time and effort. It was far better to put that

¹³⁰ Allen Frantzen, "Bede and Bawdy Bale": Gregory the Great, Angels, and the "Angli", in A. Frantzen and J.D. Niles (eds), *Anglo-Saxonism in the Construction of Social Identity* (Florida, 1997), pp. 25-32 and Robinson, 'John Foxe and the Anglo-Saxons', pp. 60-1.

¹³¹ Thomas Stapleton, *The History of the Church of England: Compiled by Venerable Bede, Englishman* (Antwerp, 1565).

¹³² Frantzen, "Bede and Bawdy Bale", pp. 25-32.

¹³³ Robinson, 'John Foxe and the Anglo-Saxons', p. 58.

effort into alternative texts, which were harder for Roman Catholic critics to attack. One such text Foxe named the *Historia Cariana*. This was a manuscript that would have been unavailable to his critics, making it far easier for him to defend. It is significant that Foxe used this manuscript to go onto the offensive, by using it to criticise one of the more recent attempts at writing an English history: the *Historia Anglica* by Polydore Vergil.

ii. *Polydore Vergil, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Gildas and the Historia Cariana*

The *Historia Anglica*, written by the Italian Priest and scholar Polydore Vergil was a well-researched humanist history, with an innovative methodology and a clear bias towards the Tudor dynasty. But, as we have already said it was unappealing to protestant interests and undesirable to English scholars for its approach toward British myths. It had therefore received a mixed reception amongst English scholars.¹³⁴ Instead of the early British story contained in the *Historia Regum Britanniae*, Polydore Vergil promoted Gildas, publishing his own edition in 1525 and used it to help him discredit the English origin myths about Brutus, King Arthur and Merlin.

John Stow, when describing his sources, wrote that Geoffrey of Monmouth's 'Cronicle of the Britons is of some [i.e. Polydore Vergil] scornfully rejected' while Thomas Loeline, he claimed, had to reproduce Gildas, a 'tolerable' text, because Polydore had done it 'soe corruptlye'.¹³⁵ In 1568 John Joscelyn also produced a 'more accurate' edition of Gildas under the auspices of Matthew Parker. As we discussed in chapter

¹³⁴ See McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age*, ch. 1.

¹³⁵ John Stow, *A Summary of the Chronicles* (London, 1570), p. 14. Denys Hay, *Polydore Vergil: Renaissance Historian and Man of Letters* (Oxford, 1952), p. 31 has stated that Polydore Vergil's edition of Gildas is actually a carefully constructed amalgamation of the available manuscripts and a good piece of academic work.

three of this thesis, by the 1560s, rumours were rife that Polydore Vergil had burnt documents which either did not fit his history or even worse those that had given validity to England's claim of an ancient independence from Rome.¹³⁶ These were rumours that Foxe himself repeated and appears to have believed.

Foxe, building on the written attacks by John Leland and John Bale, appropriated the history by Polydore Vergil as the main example of a corrupted and forged Roman Catholic history.¹³⁷ It was for Foxe to provide a 'true' history so that the lies and fables of chroniclers such as Polydore could be dismissed. The *Historia Anglica* was not of much use to Foxe as an actual source anyway. Polydore had written his history for a continental market and had therefore only summarised the English past.¹³⁸ Foxe was, however often careful to avoid those contentious areas that Polydore had called into question, such as the stories of King Arthur and Merlin. On those topics Foxe acquiesced, stating that 'the olde Brytaine historyes' had ascribed to Arthur twelve victories against the Saxons but that 'I judge them more fabulous, then that any credit shoulde be geuen unto them, more worthye to be joined with the Iliades of Homere, then to have place in any ecclesiastical history'.¹³⁹ Similarly, when Foxe came to dealing with the history by Geoffrey of Monmouth, he was much less certain of its truthfulness, than John Bale had been. Yet, at the same time, Foxe did not promote Gildas despite its new presentation by John Joscelyn.

¹³⁶ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, p. 1304, as discussed in chapter three of this thesis. See Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, pp. 63-64. Foxe was not the only one to mention these rumours as can be seen in John Caius, *De antiquitate Cantabrigiensis academiae* (London, 1568), pp. 71-2.

¹³⁷ See Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, pp. 130-1 and McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age*, ch. 1.

¹³⁸ See Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, p. 173.

¹³⁹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 153.

Although Geoffrey of Monmouth's history ended circa 1136 Foxe only referenced the text in Book Two and then only up until circa 636 when Oswald was crowned king of Northumbria. Likewise, Gildas is used sparingly and is only really given any strength as an authority when Foxe listed a series of texts as evidence on the first coming of Christianity to Britain.¹⁴⁰ Neither source was left to authenticate evidence by itself, always being supported by other authorities. Furthermore, it appears unlikely that Foxe ever consulted them directly.¹⁴¹ When he referenced Geoffrey of Monmouth he usually relied upon Bale, Fabyan or Brompton. Thus, when accounting for the various opinions concerning the death of Hengist, Foxe cited 'Galfridus in suo Britannico' as a source that claimed he was beheaded at Conisborough by Aurelius Ambrosius. This was actually taken from Bale's *Catalogus*.¹⁴² When describing a rumour that the Christian king of Kent, Æthelbert, had stirred Æthelfrith of Northumbria to war against the Britons, Foxe referred to both the *Historia Regum Britanniae* and the *Polychronicon*.¹⁴³ His actual source was Fabyan's *New Chronicles*. Foxe again used Fabyan's reference to Geoffrey of Monmouth when describing Æthelbert's battle against King Edwin and again for the crowning of Oswald as king of Northumbria. This last example may also have come out of Brompton's *Chronicon*, where we are told the same story and also referred to Geoffrey of Monmouth as his source.¹⁴⁴ There is however, one exception. When describing the period leading up to the Anglo-Saxon invasions, which Polydore

¹⁴⁰ See *Ibid.*, p. 145 where Foxe lists seven sources proving that Christianity came to Britain before Augustine and the Roman Catholic Church. Gildas, *lib De Victoria Aurelli Ambrosii* is Foxe's first source but it is actually taken from either *Catalogus*, p. 23 or *Cent. II*, cap. 2 col. 8.

¹⁴¹ The only printed editions in existence of Geoffrey of Monmouth had been printed at the beginning of the century in France, so it is more likely that Foxe was relying on one of the numerous manuscripts. John Stow is known to have used Geoffrey of Monmouth as did John Bale and Matthew Parker. Foxe would have had easier access to Gildas as Polydore Vergil had published an edition as had John Jocelyn. A copy of the manuscript appears amongst the list of Foxe's books in Lansdowne 819, f. 95r.

¹⁴² Compare the account in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 148 to *Catalogus*, p. 42.

¹⁴³ Compare the account in *A&M*, 1570, bk 2, p. 160 to Fabyan, lib. 5 caps 109 and 120. Bale's *Catalogus* also references Geoffrey of Monmouth for this story but this is unlikely to be Foxe's main source, as Bale also references Bede and Capgrave, neither of which Foxe mentions.

¹⁴⁴ These stories appear in *A&M*, 1570, bk 2, p. 161-3 and can be compared to Fabyan, lib. 5 caps 128 and 130 and for the latter account Brompton, col. 784-8.

Vergil had criticised, declaring such figures as Uther Pendragon and Arthur mythical, neither Bale, Fabyan nor Brompton appear to provide references to the *Historia Regum Britannicæ*. Instead Foxe cited an unnamed source alongside Geoffrey of Monmouth, Polydore Vergil and Gildas. This source, Foxe explained was written in Latin in the fourteenth year of Richard II. He named it *Historia Cariana*, after the man from whom he claimed to have borrowed the manuscript.¹⁴⁵

Identification of this manuscript remains elusive.¹⁴⁶ The owner appears to be William Carye, a clothworker from London who died in 1572/3. In his notebook John Bale listed 'Guilhelmo Carye' as holder of various manuscripts, some of which are identifiable.¹⁴⁷ The list contained in Bale's 1560 reply to Matthew Parker described Carye as 'a younge man in Colman street at London' having access to Roger of Hoveden and the *Topographia Britannicæ* by Gerald of Wales.¹⁴⁸ It is from this list that John Joscelyn added Carye as an owner of Roger of Hoveden.¹⁴⁹ John Stow is also

¹⁴⁵ This appears to be William Carye, clothmaker who is mentioned as the owner of manuscripts by both Bale and Joscelyn. See Andrew G. Watson, 'Christopher and William Carye, Collectors of Monastic Manuscripts, and "John Carye"', *The Library*, 5:20 (1965), pp. 135-142.

¹⁴⁶ Watson, 'Christopher and William Carye, pp. 135-42 provides a list of manuscripts known to have belonged to Carye. The majority of these manuscripts cannot be the one used by Foxe. Item 1: CCCC MS 276, a copy of Dudo of St. Quentin, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniæ ducum* describes the Normans c. AD 852-996 and cannot be the manuscript as it describes the wrong location and period. Item 2: Bodleian MS. Douce 128 is Robert Avesbury, *De gestis mirabilibus Regis Edwardi tertii*. This is largely a Brut chronicle, which does contain elements of what Foxe discusses but in this case it starts too late. Item 3: part of CCCC MS 400 containing Gerald of Wales, *Descriptio Cambriæ*. Foxe was aware of this text and there is no reason why he would state it as anonymous. Item 5: a copy of the *Polychronicon*, was a well known text. Item 7: BL MS Harley 3634, a copy of the St. Alban's chronicle only begins in 1328 and therefore cannot be Foxe's manuscript. Items 11 and 12: Part of CCCC MS 400 containing the texts of Gerald of Wales, a group of works which is identifiable and thus not the Foxe manuscript. Item 13: CCCC MS 242, a copy of Nicholas Cantilupe, *Historiola*. This manuscript was not owned by Matthew Parker. Item 14: Lambeth Palace MS 504. This is a French Brut and is therefore unlikely to be the manuscript. Item 15: Nennius. No copy of Nennius in Parker's collection can be related to Carye. This text ends in the ninth century and cannot be the manuscript. Item 16: Geoffrey of Monmouth. Foxe was aware of this text and thus it cannot be the manuscript. Item 17: College of Arms MS Arundel IX, a copy of a Greek-Latin Lexicon and Nicholas Trivet's *Annales*. Trivet begins in the twelfth century and therefore cannot be the manuscript. Item 18: College of Arms MS Arundel XIII containing the *chronicon* of Walter Hemingford, which begins with the Conquest.

¹⁴⁷ Bale, *Index*, pp. 477-8. Bale did not include this reference in his *Catalogus*.

¹⁴⁸ G&W, pp. 18, 24.

¹⁴⁹ See *Ibid.*, p. 82. Joscelyn has put 'Joan Carye' but this appears to be a mistake for William Carye.

known to have consulted a manuscript belonging to Carye, as is John Dee, who is recorded as having purchased one of Carye's manuscripts on 3 August 1573.¹⁵⁰ However, none of these sources provide any definitive clues to the manuscript that Foxe is using here. There are in fact several references in the *Acts and Monuments* to either one or several anonymous manuscripts belonging to William Carye. In Book Three, Æthelwulf's war with the Danes is taken from the first chapter of 'Historiæ Carianæ' while the replacement of monks with canons in the monastery of Evesham in the time of King Edmund was taken from 'an old written story, borrowed of W. Cary: a citizen of London, a worthy treasurer of most worthy monuments of antiquitie'. Of this manuscript Foxe further explained that 'the name of the author I can not alleage: because the booke beareth no title, lacking both the beginning, and the latter end'.¹⁵¹ Again in Book Four Foxe used a manuscript belonging to William Carye for evidence on Henry II and to clarify the diversity of opinions expressed by Polydore Vergil on Edward II's queen travelling to France.¹⁵² Lastly, in Book Five William Carye's manuscript is cited as a 'boke' written by 'a monk of Dover'.¹⁵³ There is no obvious identification of any manuscripts that fit these definitions. From the list of manuscripts that Graham Watson believes were at one time in Carye's library, only a copy of Thomas of Elmham's *Historia Monasterii sancti Augustini*, a modified copy of the *Nova Chronica*, and a composite manuscript containing the writings of Roger of

¹⁵⁰ References to a manuscript belonging to William Carye written in Stow's hand appear in various places in MS BL Cotton Vietellius A XVI. See Alexander Gillespie, 'Stow's "owlde" manuscripts of London Chronicles', in Ian Gadd & Alexander Gillespie (eds), *John Stow (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past; Studies in Early Modern Culture and the History of the Book* (London, 2004), pp. 57-67. Unfortunately Gillespie has been unable to identify the Carye manuscript, which Stow was referencing. John Dee purchased BL MS. Harley 3 from Carye's widow. See Bale, *Index*, pp. xi-xviii and Andrew G. Watson, 'Christopher and William Carye', pp. 135-142.

¹⁵¹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 185, 198.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, bk. 4, pp. 299, 469.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, bk. 5, p. 494.

Hoveden, William of Jumiéges, and Philip of Clairvaux have any possibility of being the one used by Foxe. None however seems likely.¹⁵⁴

Without identification of the *Historia Cariana* or perhaps *Historiae Carianae* it must remain uncertain whether Foxe ever consulted Geoffrey of Monmouth or Gildas independently. It is certainly not impossible. Even if Foxe did not wish or was unable to consult Polydore Vergil's edition of Gildas, he was certainly able to use Joscelyn's or to have gained the extract directly from Joscelyn/Parker who had access to the manuscript itself. Manuscript versions of Geoffrey of Monmouth were common and Foxe would not have found it difficult to acquire a copy. However, as this is the only occasion when the citation cannot be found in other texts and there remains this elusive and anonymous manuscript used for the same account, it would seem plausible that Foxe gained the information on Geoffrey of Monmouth from the *Historia Cariana* rather than the originals. This is therefore an important connection with Matthew Parker's household and again with John Bale.

¹⁵⁴ From the manuscripts known to have belonged to William Carye, only three have any potential. Trinity Hall, Cambridge MS 1, containing Thomas of Elmham's *Historia Monasterii sancti Augustini* does contain the reference to Hengist dying in Kent, which Foxe associated with the Carye manuscript and it was written at Canterbury, which is not too far from Dover. However there does not seem to be any other correlation. This manuscript had belonged to Robert Hare (d. 1611) rather than Parker, however they were known to have joint-owned CCC MS 467 so this does not preclude the possibility. Elmham's chronicle concerns the history, both factual and fictional of the Abbey founded by St Augustine in AD 597. Its end date is circa 1410-13 rather than circa 1390 and the years 804 to 1087 are missing, which is an important portion of the *Historia Cariana*'s use. Trinity Hall Cambridge MS 1 also contains *Vita Regis Ricardi II scripta a quodam monacho de Evesham*, a chronicle depicting the reign of Richard II. A second possibility is CCC MS 311. This is a Parkerian manuscript that appears to be a modified version of the *Nova Chronica*. CCC MS 311 is listed in the James, *Catalogue I*, pp. 111-2 as *Chronicon Angliæ* and begins 'britannia que nunc dicitur Anglia primitus'. Watson suggests that Carye had owned this manuscript at some point, although Robert Recorde is signified by the James catalogue. The beginning of the manuscript is missing and it covers a date range of circa AD 75 to the fourteenth century.

iii. Asser's *Life of Alfred and Edgar's oration*

Another two sources briefly used in Book Three of the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* similarly provide a connection to Matthew Parker. The first is a short extract from Asser's *Life of Alfred*. It is notable that Foxe built his account of Alfred the Great without reference to what is now generally considered the key witness.¹⁵⁵ Instead Foxe relied (unusually) upon the *Polychronicon* with some additions from Fabyan's *New Chronicles*.¹⁵⁶ Asser's only appearance is by way of a short extracted Latin epitaph on Alfred's life.¹⁵⁷ The epitaph is a last-minute addition, presumably provided to Foxe by Parker's household. It is significant that as a source Asser had only just been rediscovered (it would be published by Parker in 1574).¹⁵⁸ Its inclusion in the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* is therefore a sign of recognition that it was a potentially important discovery.

¹⁵⁵ Alfred P. Smyth, *King Alfred the Great* (Oxford, 1995) and Alfred P. Smyth, *The Medieval Life of King Alfred the Great: A translation and Commentary on the Text attributed to Asser* (London, 2002), has suggested that Asser's *Life of Alfred* was a forgery and that Alfred's reign should therefore be written without this source – which is generally considered essential to an understanding of the period. This thesis has been largely discredited but it is interesting to note that Foxe, for very different reasons, was attempting the same in the sixteenth century. The reason behind the neglect of Asser in the *Acts and Monuments*, however is a more simple one. The manuscript of Asser had only recently been re-discovered by the Parker household and they were still in the process of identifying its worth and importance. The publication of Asser in 1574 by Parker shows that he had recognised its significance at least by this date. For a more widely accepted account of Asser's *Life of Alfred* see Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge (ed. and trans.), *Alfred the Great: Asser's Life of King Alfred and other contemporary sources* (Harmondsworth, 1983).

¹⁵⁶ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 187 with Fabyan, lib. 6 caps 171-3, *Polychronicon*, lib. 6 cap. 1, Huntingdon, lib. 5 caps 7-13, Hoveden I, p. 41, and Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 2 cap. 121.

¹⁵⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 193.

¹⁵⁸ Matthew Parker, *Ælfredi Regis Res Gestæ* (London, 1574), p. 35. This edition provides a slightly alternative version of the reference used by Foxe but must come from the same manuscript. On this page is also the epitaph included in Henry of Huntingdon and also cited by Foxe. Parker's manuscript copy of Asser was Cotton MS Otho A XII, which is the only copy to have survived to modern times. However the manuscript was destroyed in the Cotton fire of 1731 and is now survived only by Parker's publication and several transcripts including CCC MS 100 produced by the Parker household.

The second Anglo-Saxon text, which again connects Foxe to Parker, is a reproduction of an oration to the clergy attributed to King Edgar. This extract was a last-minute addition, which Foxe described as

a certain oration of king Edgarus, which should haue bene placed before, chaunced in the meane time to come to my handes, not vnworthy to be red: I thought by the waye in the ende of thys booke, to inserte the same (although out of order) yet better I iudge it out of order, then out of the booke.¹⁵⁹

There is nothing particularly striking about this oration, which historians have since recognised as a forgery, but Foxe does highlight what he saw as the significance of the text.¹⁶⁰ He indicated that it described the 'dissolute behaiour and wantonness of the clergie' and that it demonstrated the 'blynd ignoraunce and superstition of that tyme'.¹⁶¹ Parker or a member of his household presumably discovered this oration from their copy of Ælfred of Rievaulx's *De genealogia Regum Anglorum*, from which this oration derived, and passed it on to Foxe.¹⁶²

The use of these two texts represents only a small element of Foxe's Anglo-Saxon researches, but in many ways they are the most illuminating. Neither text was actually part of Foxe's own research; rather both were derived directly from Parker's household. This then, is evidence that Foxe was informed of Parker's discoveries soon after they were made and that Foxe made an effort to include them in his text, even if that portion had already been completed. There is plenty of other evidence that also supports the

¹⁵⁹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 222-3.

¹⁶⁰ Brett Whitelock and C.N.L. Brooke, *Councils and Synods with other documents relating to the English Church*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1981), p. 116.

¹⁶¹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 222-3.

¹⁶² Compare *Ibid.*, with Marsha L. Dutton (ed.), *Ælfred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works*, (Kalamazoo, 2005), ch. 17, pp. 98-102.

theory that Foxe was working in close collaboration with others, including most specifically members of Parker's household. A notable instance is furnished by Foxe's genealogy tables. These, as we next discuss, were an engagement with a wider discourse on the order of Anglo-Saxon kings and were, almost certainly, researched in collaboration or at least discussion with William Lambarde.

4. The Genealogical Tables

In Books Two and Three a series of genealogical tables listed the early kings of Britain, followed by separate lists for each of the seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, and ending with the later Anglo-Saxon kings of England.¹⁶³ These tables almost certainly took their inspiration from a series of brief chronicles entitled the *Breviat* and from John Stow's *A Summary of English Chronicles*. The *Breviat* chronicles had met with a brief but significant popularity during the 1550s. A total of nine editions were published between 1551-61 and then continued in Stow's *A summary of English Chronicles* (London, 1565, 1570), and in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.¹⁶⁴ However, the *Breviat* and Stow's summary were not Foxe's direct source.¹⁶⁵ His genealogical tables differ in several points from those that had gone before. For the kings of Britain before the Anglo-Saxons, Foxe, Stow and the *Breviat* all agree on the order but they differ in the types of detail given. For instance, the *Breviat* does not contain all the details on parentage, while Stow does not state that Octavius was a 'Gewissian'. The differences

¹⁶³ Contained in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 147, 149-152 and bk. 3, p. 180.

¹⁶⁴ John Mychell produced three editions of the *Breviat* chronicle from 1551. Subsequent editions were printed in London by John Byddell. For more details see Daniel R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 39-47, 53.

¹⁶⁵ For this comparison I have used *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 147-152 and bk. 3, p. 180; *A Breuyat chronicle containing al the kynges from Brute to this daye* (London, 1556); John Stow, *A Summary of Chronicles* (London, 1565).

are even more apparent when dealing with the seven kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxons. Neither the *Breviat*, which does not even mention the diversity of kingdoms, nor Stow's account, which mixes them together, are the same as the details in Foxe's tables. For Wessex, Stow missed out several of the early kings. He cited Cerdic as the first king of Wessex but then cited Ceolwulf as his son. Foxe has it that the first Cerdic was the first king of Wessex and was followed by Kenricus (Cynric), Chelingus (Ceawlin) and then a second Celricus (Ceola) who was the father of this Ceolulfus (Ceolwulf). Cuthbert, who reigned between Æthelred and Sigebert in Wessex, is also not mentioned by Stow. For Kent, Stow started with Hengist, but then did not mention Eosa, Ocha or Eormenric. He does mention Æthelbert but does not mention the length of his reign nor that he was the first of the Anglo-Saxons to receive the Christian faith and that he subdued all the six other kings except the king of Northumbria. Stow simply states that he battled with Ceolwulf, king of Wessex. Stow largely agreed with Foxe on the order of the Anglo-Saxon kings and the continuing line of Briton kings, although Foxe separated Aurelius and Conanus whilst Stow listed just one king: Aurelius Conanus. Stow's account of the seven kingdoms is confused and disordered, compared to the account produced by Foxe. Therefore the *Breviat* and Stow's *Summary of Chronicles* cannot have been his direct source. William Lambarde's *Archaionomia* published in 1568 also contained a summary of the Anglo-Saxon heptarchy. Again this differs from Foxe's genealogies, yet the work was going on at the same time – might Foxe and Lambarde (or perhaps Laurence Nowell) have been working these chronologies out together? It is not impossible. Foxe was a friend of Nowell's cousin. In the 1576 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, Lambarde's map of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy was inserted into Foxe's text, further illustrating the collaborative nature of this undertaking.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁶ Walter Goffart, 'The first venture into "Medieval Geography": Lambarde's map of the Saxon

We must assume that Foxe used his usual corpus of manuscripts as the basis for his own, independent compilation of royal genealogies. Part of this research can be uncovered, as Foxe himself cited several references for independent parts of the tables. For the early British kings, Foxe mentioned Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, Higden's *Polychronicon* and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum*. Foxe also mentioned the *Flores Historiarum* for details of Æthelfrith of Northumbria's children; Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* for Alfred of Northumbria's conquest of lands and Æthelbald's order that all churches should be free from exactions and public charges. The *Historia Cariana* is listed for Bernard's character, and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum* for Swæfred of the East Saxons. As previously discussed, Foxe's genealogies included evidence taken from Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, a source that we have argued was not extensively consulted by Foxe himself. Foxe perhaps got that information through other 'intermediary' texts or perhaps again through Lambarde or Nowell's research. The same could also be claimed for the other sources he cites. For the present, there is no good reason to doubt Foxe's word in these instances. In general, the genealogical tables further substantiate Foxe's independent use of various manuscripts.

5. Anglo-Saxon history in the latter books of the *Acts and Monuments*.

We began this chapter by recognising that the only substantial recent research carried out on Foxe's Anglo-Saxon history was focused not on Books Two and Three, where Foxe is most original, but upon Books Six and Eight, where Foxe is largely borrowing

Heptarchy (1568)', in Jane Roberts, Janet L. Nelson and Malcolm Godden (eds), *Alfred the Wise; Studies in honour of Janet Bately on the occasion of her sixty-fifth birthday* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 53-60.

from elsewhere. Foxe inserted a series of Anglo-Saxon law codes in Book Six, and near the end of Book Eight, a section entitled *Allegations against the Six Articles*. These portions of text appear to have been last-minute additions, perhaps added to fill up gaps at the end of Books, and perhaps written specifically to insert old documents and new texts which were unavailable at the time of writing Books Two and Three. As such they provide an interesting insight into the evolution of both Foxe's knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon period as well as that of English scholarship largely coming out of the work of Parker's intellectual network. It also serves as a useful comparison with the use of sources in the early Books and a further indication of the collaborative nature of its compilation.

i. The Anglo-Saxon Law-Codes

For the law-codes in Book Six, Foxe consulted William Lambarde's *Archaionomia*, which had been published in 1568 through the patronage of Matthew Parker.¹⁶⁷ Foxe abridged and translated the law-codes into the vernacular, listing only those relevant to ecclesiastical matters and then formed an argument that the Popes had lied about being universal head of the church since primitive times and in claiming that no prince, king or emperor had ever had influence in matters and laws ecclesiastical. To create this

¹⁶⁷ *Archaionomia* is the Greek word for 'Original Laws'. The full title of the work is William Lambarde, *Archaionomia, siue de priscis anglorum legibus libri sermone Anglico, vetustate antiquissimo, aliquot abhinc seculis conscripti, atq[ue] nunc demum, magno iurisperitorum, & amantium antiquitatis omnium commodo, è tenebris in lucem vocati* (London, 1568). Various texts by Felix Liebermann continue to act as the basis for research into the Anglo-Saxon law codes. For example see Felix Liebermann (ed.), *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (3 vols, Halle, 1903-1916). More recently Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1999) has become an essential guide, which also focuses on the early involvement of Laurence Nowell, William Lambarde, Matthew Parker and John Joscelyn. See also R.J. Schoeck, 'Early Anglo-Saxon Studies and Legal Scholarship in the Renaissance', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 5 (1958), pp. 102-110; H.W.C. Davis, 'The Anglo-Saxon Laws', *The English Historical Review*, 28:111 (1913), pp. 417-430. Modern English translations of the law-codes can be found in F.L. Attenborough (ed. & trans.), *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings* (Cambridge, 1923) and A.J. Robertson (ed. & trans.), *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I* (Cambridge, 1925).

argument Foxe first outlined the Pope's claim to have always had the right to meddle with ecclesiastical affairs and laws and then provided the evidence, through the law-codes, that this was not the case. Following the laws, Foxe then produced a short section entitled the 'Proud primacie of Popes'. This section discussed the papacy's corruption by describing its classical form and then providing a brief survey of papal relations with the Emperors as well as with English kings such as King John and Henry III.¹⁶⁸ The law-codes were therefore used to access this wider point concerning papal corruption and in particular the rise of the Antichrist within the papacy.

The law-codes of Ine (688-726), Alfred (871-899), Edward the Elder (899-924), Athelstan (924-939), Edmund I (939-946), Cnut (995-1035) and Edward the Confessor (1042-1066) are also briefly mentioned in various parts of Book Two and Three. On the surface at least this appears to be a clear indication that Foxe was borrowing from the *Archaionomia*. Foxe certainly lifted an epistle from Pope Eleutherius to King Lucius from Lambarde's work.¹⁶⁹ However, Foxe's extensive use of John Brompton raises another possibility. The *Chronicon* also listed various law-codes but the text of these was often quite different from that used by Lambarde. Which did Foxe use in these earlier books? The evidence is revealing and shows clearly that Foxe was actually using Brompton for these references. Only when dealing with the laws of Edmund and Cnut might either source have been possible. In the case of Ine's law-code Foxe stated that there were eighty laws, which agrees with Brompton. However, Lambarde has only listed seventy-five.¹⁷⁰ Similarly Edgar's law that Sunday should be celebrated from nine o'clock on Saturday mornings must be taken from Brompton as the

¹⁶⁸ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 6, pp. 923-940.

¹⁶⁹ Compare *Ibid.*, bk. 2, p. 145 with *Archaionomia*, f. 131.

¹⁷⁰ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, p. 170 with Brompton, cols 759-761 and *Archaionomia*, ff. 1r-18v.

Archaionomia states three o'clock in the afternoon.¹⁷¹ Furthermore, the laws of Athelstan are almost taken word-for-word from Brompton and the laws of Alfred and Edward, while scattered, largely agree.¹⁷² Thus, this confirms that Foxe was inserting these law codes from Lambarde at a later date than writing his earlier Books. It also shows that Foxe had an interest in the law-codes at the same time that research into the codes was being patronised by Matthew Parker.

The importance of Lambarde and Laurence Nowell has already been treated in the third chapter of this thesis. However, what this investigation into the sources has further proven is that Foxe had a direct link with that work. Pope Eleutherius' epistle to King Lucius could have easily been passed to Foxe from the preparatory work that Nowell and Lambarde were undertaking rather than the final printed *Archaionomia*. As John Day was to be the printer of this book, that material would have become available to him as proofs and perhaps as independent leaves of paper. Foxe and Day could easily have inserted the material without consultation of the book itself.¹⁷³ Nowell's greatest activity in Old English studies had occurred between the years 1561 to 1566, the exact period when Foxe was probably extending his *Acts and Monuments* back to the Anglo-Saxon period. Thus the addition of the law-codes in Books Two and Three as well as the abridgement of the *Archaionomia* in Book Six provide clear indications of intellectual networking between Nowell/Lambarde, Parker and Foxe during the 1560s.

¹⁷¹ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, p. 207 with Brompton, col. 871 no. 6, which states 9 o'clock in the morning. Alternatively the *Archaionomia*, f. 78 states three o'clock in the afternoon.

¹⁷² For Alfred and Edward compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 194-5 with Brompton col. 823 (no. XII), 826 (no. XLVI), 829 (no's. I, II), 830 (no's. III, V, VI). For the laws of Athelstan, compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 3, pp. 197-8 with Brompton, cols 845, 840 no. I, 841 no. II. *Archaionomia*, ff. 19-46 and ff. 57-72.

¹⁷³ This is a point that confirms and strengthens Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1 where the possibility that the letter derived from proofs sent to John Day is briefly mentioned, but not elaborated upon.

ii. Allegations Against the Six Articles

This section of the *Acts and Monuments* argued article by article why this piece of Henrician legislation was 'heretical' and based on 'erroneous doctrine'. The purpose was to show 'by true antiquitie, and course of histories...whether it be a doctrine old, or new'.¹⁷⁴ To construct this piece Foxe again returned to Anglo-Saxon history, but this time cited documents in Old English, reproduced medieval charters and referenced arguments from Scripture, historical manuscripts and recent reformist polemical writings.

The compilation against the *Six Articles* relied on two methods to put across the argument. A scriptural and theological discourse was constructed to argue against the Eucharist in both kinds, against Masses for the dead and against auricular confession. The sources in these instances were almost entirely Biblical although the occasional insertion from sixteenth-century texts added a flavour of historical context.¹⁷⁵ A mixture of theological and historical sources was used against priests' marriages whilst the argument against transubstantiation was almost entirely historical. Most of this historical compilation was composed from evidence about the Ancient and Anglo-Saxon times for it was here that Foxe could show the true uncorrupted doctrine in comparison to that alleged in the *Six Articles*. However, Foxe did not stay within these confines, as he wished to show the reader not only the true religion but also how it became corrupted.

¹⁷⁴ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, pp. 1298-1345.

¹⁷⁵ Compare *Ibid.*, p. 1314 with *Catalogus*, p. 50 for the discussion of the Fourth Council of Toledo. For elements of the argument against auricular confession compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, p. 1340 with Beatus Rhenanus, *Septimii Florentes Tertulliani* (Basel, 1521), p. 434 and Antoninus, *Tertia pars historialis*, vol. 3 (Basel, 1502), ff. 33r-v. The John Foxe Project Team have supplied all identifications of the sources Foxe used to compile his argument against the *Six Articles*.

Against transubstantiation several recent publications were deployed. To support the Protestant viewpoint Foxe cited Heinrich Bullinger's *De Origine Erroris libri duo*, which had been re-published in Zurich only just in time to reach the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.¹⁷⁶ While, from a Roman Catholic viewpoint, *De Veritate corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Iesu Christi*, edited by Johann Vlimmer in 1561 was inserted.¹⁷⁷ These texts represented some of the most up-to-date analysis of controversial theological topics and were therefore an important inclusion to the *Acts and Monuments*. Foxe also added details and polemical elements from Bale's *Catalogus*, and from William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum* and *Gesta Regum*. This section provides yet another example of continental scholarship being integrated into a largely English-based work. The context of the 'universal' church was a strengthening element to the argument against an English Act, purposefully targeting the allegations against it within this larger framework. Thus, the *Six Articles* were depicted as not just heretical to English doctrine, but to the true universal Church in general.

Some of these texts tell us little about collaboration. Bale's *Catalogus* and William of Malmesbury's manuscripts were certainly in Foxe's possession, while Bullinger and Vlimmer's publications might have come via Parker's household, or they might not.¹⁷⁸

Other sources used to attack transubstantiation do, however, clearly link this argument

¹⁷⁶ Heinrich Bullinger, *De Origine Erroris libri duo* (Zurich, 1568).

¹⁷⁷ For details of Johannes Vlimmer see Neil Ker, 'English MSS owned by Johannes Vlimmerius and Cornelius Duyn'm', *The Library*, 22:4 (1942), pp. 205-7.

¹⁷⁸ Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583: The struggle for a Reformed church* (London, 1979), p. 44 has noted that Heinrich Bullinger sent Edmund Grindal a copy of his new edition of *De Origine Erroris*, in response to Grindal's admission that the first edition had moved him away from Luther's position on the Lord's Supper. It is not impossible that Foxe, who had also had various communications with Bullinger, also received a copy or at the very least was both able to and interested enough find a copy independently of Matthew Parker.

to the efforts of Parker's household. Foxe's citations of works of Eadmer as well as Osbern's life of Oda, and the *Vita Sancti Oswaldi* and *Vita Sancti Dunstani* all link to Joscelyn.¹⁷⁹ Although it is possible that Foxe consulted Parker's manuscripts himself, it appears more likely that Joscelyn simply passed Foxe some notes on the relevant segments. Probably in preparation for Parker's *Testimonie of Antiquitie*, Joscelyn had made copious annotations in these manuscripts so the work was already done.

Further evidence of this direct link to Parker's household in construction of this section against the *Six Articles* can be found in Foxe's use of *A Testimonie of Antiquitie* itself. Although the inclusion of this lengthy 'abridgement' of Parker's text could have been intended as a homage to his patron, its use here, in conjunction with other texts from Parker's household, appears to suggest quite the opposite. It would seem more likely that Foxe, Parker and Joscelyn were working together to produce this argument. It might well have been Parker or Joscelyn who suggested its inclusion in the first place.

When moving on to the arguments against the ban on priests' marriages, Foxe could not avoid using Bale, who had a strong interest in the topic. Foxe cited liberally from the *Catalogus* and also from Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, which also concerned itself quite heavily with this subject. However, a large portion of the argument is concerned with defending the use of epistles claimed to have been written by St Ulric to Pope Nicholas II (d. 1061).¹⁸⁰ These epistles, one of which Foxe had already used in

¹⁷⁹ These are the conclusions of the Foxe Project Team. Eadmer's works are contained in CCC MS 371, Osbern's life of Oda and the *Vita Sancti Dunstani* in BL Arundel MS 16, and the anonymous *Vita Sancti Oswaldi* in BL Cotton MS Nero E.i/1, ff. 3r-23v. All these manuscripts bear annotations in John Joscelyn's hand.

¹⁸⁰ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 8, pp. 1329-1330. Foxe uses the dating of these two pontificates to show that Nicholas II was Pope at the greatest height of the Gregorian reforms. See the conclusions of the Foxe Project Team and appendix 4 of this thesis.

the 1563 edition and again inserted into Book Two of the 1570 edition, had already produced some controversy over authenticity.¹⁸¹

Thus, the *Allegations Against the Six Articles* shows how both Foxe and Parker's household had progressed in their understanding and knowledge of the period and its texts. Although this demonstrates collaboration, it also documents Foxe's independence. When discussing the letters by St Ulric he cited Nicholas II as the recipient while Bale, Flacius and Parker had cited Nicholas I (d. 867). That Foxe was able to make this argument in contradiction of the opinion of Parker's household, where most of this material appears to have come from, is revealing of the nature of their collaboration.

6. Paper Trails

The parallel between the sources used to compile Books Two and Three of the *Acts and Monuments* and those used to compile elements of Anglo-Saxon history in Books Six and Eight are revealing of both the chronological ordering in which the research took place, as well as suggesting something about the collaborative element. Several of the sources were already in Foxe's ownership. Foxe would no doubt have owned a copy of both Bale's and Flacius' *Catalogi*. He is also known to have owned copies of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum* and *Gesta Pontificum*, Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia*

¹⁸¹ Epistle of St Ulric to Pope Nicholas II can be found in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 3, p. 385 and 1570, bk. 3, pp. 182-3. For analysis into the confusion over these epistles see Catherine Hall, 'The One Way Trial: Some Observations on CCC MS 101 and G&CC MS 427', *TCBS*, 11 (1998), pp. 272-284 in which it is shown through evidence extracted from annotations of the manuscript now categorised as Gonville and Caius MS 427 that both Bale and Parker were independently building upon each others work to confirm and identify which Pope this letter was concerned with. That Foxe reached an altogether different conclusion is evidence for his independence of thought.

Anglorum, Roger of Hoveden's *Annals*, and two copies of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*.¹⁸² It should also have been possible for Foxe to get hold of a printed copy of Fabyan's *New Chronicles*.¹⁸³ These texts represent almost the entire core corpus of texts that Foxe has already been shown to have relied upon. Missing from this list of course is the *Chronicon* attributed to John Brompton. The Brompton manuscript is definitely CCCC MS 96 and therefore suggests a link to Parker.¹⁸⁴

This is important as it shows that Foxe had easy access to at least most of his core corpus of texts. This might have influenced what he used, how he used it, and to what extent. His inclusion of lengthy extracts from the *Chronicon* is a clear link to the Parker circle. Another direct link to Parker via Bale can be found in Foxe's use of a manuscript formerly in the possession of William Carye. The anonymous chronicle named by Foxe as *Historia Cariana* almost certainly came from Parker's collection, either through Bale (who may have borrowed the manuscript from Carye) or from Bale's identification of Carye as a contact for manuscripts which the Archbishop

¹⁸² From Joscelyn's lists in G&W, pp. 72, 74, 82. Foxe's manuscripts are also listed in BL MS Lansdowne 819, ff. 95r-96v. Foxe owned two manuscript copies of *Polychronicon* – Arundel MS 5 in the College of Arms – which Foxe named '*Scala Mundi*' – has annotations in Foxe's hand (f.118r) and Magdalen College, Oxford, Latin MS 181 also has annotations by Foxe on the reverse of the rear flyleaf and on the endpaper (see Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Bale's Book of Martyrs?: The Account of King John in Acts and Monuments', *Reformation*, 3 (1998), p. 185). The *Polychronicon* was also available in print both in Latin and vernacular. Foxe's copy of the other manuscripts mentioned here are thus far unidentified.

¹⁸³ John Bale in his *Catalogus*, p. 642 claimed that Cardinal Wolsey had the 1516 edition burnt as it revealed the rich revenues of the clergy but there is no evidence to support this assertion. The first edition, printed by Richard Pynson was entitled *The Newe Cronycles of England and of Fraunce* (London, 1516). Foxe is therefore more likely to have used one of the later editions. The second edition was printed by John Rastell as *Fabyan's cronycle newly printed with the cronycle, actes, and dedes in the tyme of the regne of the moste excellent prynce kynge Henry the VII, father unto our most drad soverayne lord kynge Henry the VIII* (London, 1533). With the same title the chronicle was published in 1542 by W. Bonham and also by J. Reynes; and then in 1559 by J. Kingston.

¹⁸⁴ CCCC MS 96 was also in Bale's hands at some point. On f. 1 he has written '*Chronicon Joannis Bromton Abbatis Joreuallensis Cisterciensis instituti*'. It seems possible that Peter Osborne also owned the manuscript, either before or after Bale as he too has his name written on both the flyleaf and f. 1. Osborne died in 1592. At some point Foxe or Parker must have had access to it. CCCC MS 96 is the only copy of Brompton in existence. It was printed by Roger Twysden, *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores X* (London, 1652), cols 721-1284.

subsequently raided.¹⁸⁵ Alternatively, Foxe might have obtained the manuscripts directly from Carye himself and then, perhaps, passed them on to Parker. The unidentified nature of Carye's manuscripts, might support the opinion that Foxe subsequently provided Parker with some of Carye's manuscripts. It is also interesting to note that John Stow had access to at least one of Carye's manuscripts, which is also unidentifiable. This suggests that Foxe and Stow may have shared this resource. Capgrave's *Nova Legenda Angliæ* had been printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1516, although this does not preclude the possibility that a manuscript version was either borrowed from Parker's household or that the details were transcribed for Foxe's use.¹⁸⁶ The twelfth-century manuscripts of Eadmer and Osbern were almost certainly borrowed from Parker or Joscelyn, while Asser's ninth-century, *Life of Alfred* must have come from the Parker household's production of a transcript.¹⁸⁷

From this examination, then, we can say something about the collaborative effort that appears to have been involved. In compiling Books Two and Three, Foxe appears to have relied largely on a core corpus of texts that he either owned or had easy and continuous access to. Additional details on important events or persons, or when there was controversy, appear to have been provided by the Parker network including particularly the sharing of manuscripts with John Stow and William Lambarde. Moreover, when new documents became available, these sometimes seem to have been shared with Foxe. Working at the forefront of knowledge on this period in history,

¹⁸⁵ Thomas S. Freeman and Elizabeth Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (forthcoming), ch. 5 have used evidence from Bale, *Index*, pp. xxi, 62, 366, 427, 438-9, 477-8, 486, 490, and 492, which supports the assertion that Bale had borrowed Carye's manuscripts.

¹⁸⁶ If Foxe had used a manuscript from the Parker household this would most likely have been CCCC MSS 5 or 6, which contained Capgrave's *Nova Legenda Angliæ*.

¹⁸⁷ The transcript is CCCC MS 100.

Foxe and his collaborative team were constantly reappraising their ideas. Books Two and Three were out of date before the ink had dried.

Analysis of Foxe's text against the *Six Articles* reveals that it was based upon sources compiled by Parker's household rather than by Foxe himself. The inclusion of Parker's *Testimonie of Antiquitie* has often been cited as Foxe's gift to Parker for his help, but it would seem also possible that this was in actuality the inspiration for Foxe's tackling of the subject (quite possibly at Parker's suggestion). Thus, what do the Anglo-Saxon portions of the *Acts and Monuments* tell us about collaboration? Foxe was initially largely left to his own devices, with a core selection of manuscripts and printed books on which to rely. Extra information was passed to him or borrowed/researched in the Parker household for specific elements of the account. Sharing of documents took place, such as Lambarde's letter of Eleutherius to King Lucius, and a manuscript of William Carye's with John Stow. The additions in the later books were more closely associated with contemporary up-to-date literature, much of which was deeply involved with the Parker circle or was at the very least of interest to it. This makes it all the more difficult to tell who had the guiding hand. Did Foxe ask Parker to help him write against the *Six Articles* or was this Parker's idea? Did Foxe himself decide to insert details from Bullinger's *De Origine Erroris* and Johann Vlimmer's *De Veritate corporis* or was this again the suggestion of Parker or Joscelyn? Certainly Foxe can be shown to have control over the overarching argument. His identification of Pope Nicholas II rather than Nicholas I as the recipient of St Ulric's epistles is evidence of that. The inclusion of the genealogical tables drew upon the popularity of the *Breviat* chronicles, while the inclusion of the law-codes reflected a growing interest in the ancient constitution. The use of Fabyan must, in part, be seen as a link to popular history in

Elizabethan England. On the other hand, Foxe appealed to the more learned reader by analysing evidence and endorsing particular polemical arguments current at the time. This shows an interest in interacting with scholarly academia both in England and abroad. Thus, the Anglo-Saxon account reflected what had been promised in the prefaces. It would light up what had previously been dark for the benefit of all the people of England.

Before we finish this part of our discussion, there is something more to be said about the involvement of John Bale and Matthias Flacius Illyricus. As providers of protestant 'study guides', Bale and Flacius helped Foxe to engage with contemporary and protestant revisionism of the pre-Conquest period. Their catalogues provided Foxe with a ready-made polemical scaffolding with which to begin his researches. They also directed Foxe to the available sources, making him more aware of the diversity of evidence available both in England and on the continent. There are signs Foxe was expanding upon Bale's own research. This is an interesting and important illumination of our understanding of Foxe's working methodology. It is something that we shall build on in the next chapter, where we examine Foxe's post-Gregorian medieval sources. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon portion, Foxe began this account for the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, and then greatly expanded upon it using, in part, the available resources of Parker's household.

Chapter Five

The compilation of Post-Gregorian and Late medieval history in the *Acts and Monuments*

And I saw an aungell decednyng from heauen, hauyng a key of the bottomles pitte, and a great cheyne in his hand. And he toke (th)e dragon the old serpent which is the deuil and Satanas, and bound him for a thousa(n)d yeares, and put hym in the bottomeles doungeon and shyt him vp, and signed hym with his seale, (tha)t he should no more seduce the gentles, till a thousand yeares were expired. And after that, he must be loused agayne for a little space of tyme.¹

The narrative of pre-Reformation history in the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* was divided between four Books. The first covered Roman times, the second and third the Anglo-Saxons and the fourth, the Norman Conquest to the reign of the English monarch, Edward III (1312-1377). John Foxe told us that these divisions represented the ages of mankind as prophesied in Scripture. Each Book represented a period of 300 years, which showed through a complex series of calculations, that God foresaw the decline of the Church of Rome and its subjugating into the hands of the Antichrist. Foxe also saw in Scripture and History a parallel story, that of the scattered and persecuted faithful who, in his own times, had begun a reformation to enlarge the body of Christ's followers in preparation for the end of days. It was this pattern for history which determined how Foxe interpreted and conceptualised the middle ages and its sources. Although in 1563, Foxe only provided one Book focused on events before the Lollard uprisings, he did not conceive of it simply as a prologue to those events, but as a crucial investigation of God's plan for humanity. In the greatly expanded edition of

¹ From *A&M*, 1570, bk. 5, p. 493; quoted by John Foxe from *Revelation* 20.1-3.

1570, that history was not only drawn back further in time to the beginnings of Christianity, but also more fully worked out. The sources that Foxe raised up as 'monuments' to this history were important in establishing the authority of his narrative and in extracting an alternative story of the past that supported and endorsed the Elizabethan Church in his own times.

Book Four of the 1570 edition was where Foxe was able fully to rehearse his theme of the 'two churches'. On the one hand, Foxe told the story of the Papal Antichrist, of the corruption of monks, the controversies between bishops (and also between bishops and monarchs), and the insatiable greed and worldly concerns of the Pope. On the other, Foxe told how some princes resisted Papal authority – such as Frederick Barbarossa, Emperor Frederick II, and King John of England – of how so-called heretical groups were actually standing up for the true faith, and of how various scholars had written against the papacy's policies. One story in Book Four was that of the persecutors; the other, in parallel, was the story of the persecuted faithful. The conception behind that history was not, however, as consistent as it might first appear. This is a central contention for this chapter, which also builds upon our understanding of collaboration discussed in the first half of this thesis and upon the analysis of pre-Gregorian history in the 1570 edition, as considered in chapter four. Not only do we need to know what sources Foxe used, where he obtained them, and what use and authority he attributed to them, but also how he defined them within the context of a constantly changing intellectual discourse. As was argued in chapter two, the metamorphosis of the *Acts and Monuments* between the 1563 and 1570 editions represents a juncture in which the pre-reformation text became more central to understanding the Reformation in context.

With the help of Archbishop Matthew Parker, Foxe transformed the *Acts and Monuments* into England's version of the *Magdeburg Centuries*.

As part of Parker's 'circle' Foxe was able also to utilise a much wider corpus of materials and further establish himself as part of a complex network of contacts. Some of this we have already seen whilst investigating Foxe's sources for the Anglo-Saxon portion of his text. As that chapter demonstrated, Foxe tended to follow one or two particular sources, inserting variant and additional material from elsewhere where convenient. A similar process appears to have occurred in Foxe's treatment of post-Gregorian history. However, there are some important differences. First, Foxe began this story in Book One of the 1563 edition, which, in turn, formed the basis for Book Four in 1570. Whereas most of the sources used for the pre-Gregorian past covered the entire period, the same cannot be said for the sources covering 1066-1360. Although Fabyan's *New Chronicles* lasted until 1485 in its original form - eventually continuing to the reign of Elizabeth I in the 1559 edition - the content and form radically changed upon the commencement of Richard I as king of England. At this point the chronicle became more annalistic and narrowly focused on London.² The *Chronicon* attributed to John Brompton ended in 1199, while William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon ended their accounts in the mid-twelfth century. Therefore, Book Four of Foxe's history was compiled from one major source overlapping with another, combined with increased insertion of lengthy and largely independent tracts. Foxe also continued to rely on Bale's *Catalogus* for various stories and interpretations, but more so on Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*.

² The chronicle originally ended in 1485 but was then continued, possibly by Robert Fabyan himself, up to 1509, when Henry VIII became king. The printed 1533 edition brought the account up to Henry VIII and the 1559 edition to Elizabeth I.

The most important source, however, was Foxe's own original post-Gregorian history contained in Book One of his 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. It is surprising just how much survived to the 1570 edition and to what extent Foxe maintained its original integrity despite breaking it up with masses of new material. This focused study of Foxe's sources will therefore begin with the 1563 edition before exploring the network of sources and topics that were added to it. As before, we will end with an assessment of where the corpus of sources derived from and what authority was given particularly to those texts lent to Foxe by Matthew Parker.

1. The 1563 Edition: A basis for Protestant History

i. Contents of the Pre-Reformation History

In the 1563 edition, Foxe narrated his pre-reformation history as a series of interlinked case studies (see appendix 1), beginning with a brief iteration of his apocalyptic schema and a comparison of papal doctrines with those of the Church Fathers.³ From there, Foxe focused on the contentions between bishops or archbishops, rivalries between the church and secular princes, and various controversies involving the Pope. These, for Foxe, were all signs of the Papal Antichrist at work. Foxe also described the parallel history of 'faithful witnesses' such as the Waldensians. He described various prophecies against the Pope and attacked the rise and proliferation of monastic orders. Foxe extracted these 'case-studies' from a short list of chronicles and catalogues, which he had probably gathered over a period of time.

³ The composition is similar to Jewel's *Apologia* but the content is markedly different. Foxe had obviously understood the polemical worth of Jewel's composition in defence of the English church and adapted it for his own needs. Both accounts derived their information from the *Magdeburg Centuries*.

Is there anything we can say about these sources for the 1563 edition? Foxe appears to have found a copy of Thomas Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana* in the 1550s, while he was researching his *Commentarii*.⁴ A variety of books such as the *History of Bohemia* by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II, 1405-1464), the *Fasciculus Rerum* by Ortwin Gratius and the *Lives of the Popes* by Giovanni Stella, may have been purchased during his sojourn abroad (they had all been published in Germany) or Foxe may have consulted them from elsewhere. One possibility finds us in the library of his old Oxford College, Magdalen. According to Paul Morgan, Magdalen College was the first Oxford College to purchase books with its own income after the break from Rome and was particularly strong on folio volumes of the Church Fathers, theology and classics which had been printed in Basel.⁵ Furthermore, we find that Foxe had a direct link to Magdalen College during the 1560s. His friend Laurence Humphrey who had also resided in Basel during the 1550s, was elected as President of Magdalen College in 1561.⁶ As noted by Freeman and Evenden, this relationship paid dividends as Humphrey and the College students were conscripted into acting as proof-readers and copy-editors for Foxe's text.⁷ There is no reason to discount the possibility that Foxe could also have borrowed or used books from its library.

From Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, Foxe borrowed the accounts on Gregory VII, the deposition of Henry IV, the death of Rudolph of Swabia, a tale of Arnulphus,

⁴ See Thomas S. Freeman and Elizabeth Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (forthcoming).

⁵ Paul Morgan, *Oxford Libraries outside the Bodleian: A Guide* (Oxford, 1973), p. 66. See also Christine Ferdinand, 'Magdalen College and the Book Trade: The provision of Books in Oxford, 1450-1550', in Arnold Hunt, Giles Mandelbrote and Alison Shell (eds), *The Book Trade and its Customers 1450-1900* (Winchester, 1997), pp. 175-187.

⁶ Thomas S. Freeman, 'Humphrey, Laurence (1525x7-1589)', *ODNB* (2004). Humphrey also provided a Latin poem to Bale's *Catalogus; Foxe's Rerum* and to the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.

⁷ Freeman and Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England* (forthcoming), ch. 6. It is also worth noting here, that Foxe presented a copy of his 1563 edition to Magdalen in return for their efforts.

the concubine of Philip, King of France, and the Waldensian persecution.⁸ Various accounts and references can also be traced back to Bale's *Catalogus*, his *Actes of Englysh Votaryes* and possibly Bale's unpublished notes. There is certainly a high probability that Foxe obtained his list of 101 monastic orders from Bale.⁹ It was intended to help attack the profusion of 'monkish sects' which 'they al differ in many thinges, but accord in superstition and hypocrisy'.¹⁰ In his *Actes of Englysh Votaryes*, Bale had clearly stated his intention to focus on the monastic orders for his proposed but never produced third part.¹¹ It is therefore plausible that Bale had already compiled details on various monastic orders in preparation, and that Foxe inherited that material. To further substantiate this point, it is worth noting that in the last years of his life, Bale reworked his Henrician play on *King Johan* for an Elizabethan audience. The revisions are substantial and suggest Bale's in-depth knowledge of the thirteenth century, the result of some twenty years of research.¹² In his article on the account of King John in the *Acts and Monuments*, Thomas Freeman has taken this evidence a step further by

⁸ For Gregory VII compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 20-4 with *CTV* (1556), pp. 205-6, 223, 239, for the deposition of Henry IV compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 26 with *CTV* (1556), p. 212, for Rudolph of Swabia compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 29 with *CTV* (1556), pp. 211-2, for the tale of Arnulphus compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 33 with *CTV* (1556), pp. 386-7; for the concubine of King Philip compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 34 with *CTV* (1556), p. 402. This account is also surrounded by other material taken from the *CTV* (1556), pp. 400-3 concerning a book complaining of church abuses by Johannes Trithemius, the purging of Israel of women being with Priests and the founding of the Knights Templars. The entire account of the Waldensian persecution (*A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 42-6) was taken from *CTV* (1562), pp. 704-57 as was the prophecy of Hildegard in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 111-3 taken from *CTV* (1556), pp. 391-3.

⁹ See *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 109-110. This is an assumption, based on the use of Bale's materials which support the account, a lack of alternative and likely origins for the list, and the requirement for the account to be written quickly. Some of the supporting material does derive from *Catalogus*, pp. 234-5, but not the lists. Foxe references a tract by Martin Luther and an untitled English book, though Luther did not produce any such list and the untitled book is unidentified. It is possible that this is Foxe's own compilation from his sources. However this seems unlikely considering the speed with which the pre-reformation account was written for the 1563 edition.

¹⁰ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 110.

¹¹ John Bale, *Actes of Englysh Votaryes*, p. 1.

¹² See Raymond-Jean Frontain, "David in his most hevynes": Bale's King Johan and the politicisation of the penitential David tradition', *Cathiers Elisabethains*, 62 (2002), pp. 1-10 and John Bale, *Kynge Johan: a play in two parts*, edited by J. Payne Collier (London, Camden Society, Old Series 2, 1838).

suggesting that the entire account of King John was Bale's composition.¹³ Although Freeman admits that his findings are largely circumstantial there is no reason whatsoever to presume that this was all that Bale provided. At the very least we have to assume that Foxe discussed his pre-reformation history with his old mentor and that important elements of the final text was inspired by his opinions.

The story of Frederick Barbarossa provides a particularly illuminating instance where Foxe has taken his entire account from the catalogues. In the *Acts and Monuments* Barbarossa is described as a stout pillar against the papacy. While Pope Hadrian IV sought warfare 'The Emperour all this whyle, sitting quietly at home: began to consider with himself, how the pope had extorted from the Emperours (his predecessors) the inuesting and induing of prelates: how he had pyllled and poled all nations by his Legates: and also hath bene the sower of seditio(n)s through al his Impery'.¹⁴ Neither did the contest for Hadrian's successor improve matters. Alexander III refused to co-operate with the Emperor, leading Barbarossa to elect Victor IV as the new pope. The resulting battles were ended only when Alexander captured the Emperor's son, forcing him to capitulate. At this point Foxe retold a fictitious but popular story and also turned it into one of the few woodcuts that would appear for the pre-reformation account – a scene of Alexander III treading on the neck of Barbarossa to signify his superiority.

¹³ Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Bale's "Book of Martyrs?": The Account of King John in Acts and Monuments', *Reformation* 3 (1998), pp. 175-223.

¹⁴ Compare the account in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 35 and 1570, bk. 4, p. 260 with *Catalogus*, pp. 178-80.

☛ Pope Alexander treading on the necke of Fredericke the Emperour.



Figure 2: Pope Alexander III treading on the neck of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. Taken from *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 41.

According to Thomas S. Freeman, the story had been created by the Venetians and had been depicted in the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena. From here various German humanists, including Johannes Nauclerus, Martin Luther, Caspar Hedio and Robert Barnes expanded upon it as an example of papal usurpation of a legitimate secular authority.¹⁵ The woodcut, and the supporting narrative resulted from a close reading of Bale. Foxe explained the speeches in the picture: 'The proud pope setting his foote vpon the Emperours necke, said the verse of the Psalme...Thou shalt walke vpon the adder and the Basiliske: and shalt tread downe the Lion and the Dragon, &c.'. Barbarossa replied

¹⁵ Thomas S. Freeman, "'St Peter Did not Do Thus': Papal History in the Acts and Monuments', *VE* (2004), pt. 1. Bale extracted his account from Robert Barnes, *Vitae Romanorum Pontificum* (Basel, 1535) and Foxe repeated and translated Bale's account verbatim. For more details on this story see Kurt Stadtwald, 'Pope Alexander III's Humiliation of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa as an Episode in Sixteenth-Century German History', *SCJ*, 23:4 (1992), pp. 755-768.

'not to thee but to Peter' and the Pope responded 'Both to me & to Peter'.¹⁶ Alongside Bale's story, Foxe also borrowed much of his material on Barbarossa from Flacius. Most of this consisted of letters sent by the Emperor and Pope. These make interesting reading when placed in a 'Foxeian' context. In one letter Barbarossa stated that Cardinals were sent into the Empire not to preach or create peace but to take money. In another letter concerning Barbarossa's attempted break with Rome, the Emperor stated that 'we feare the whole body of the church is lyke polluted'.¹⁷

Foxe also followed Flacius when he came to the significant narrative on Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand). For Foxe, the pontificate of Gregory VII was where 'springeth all the occasion of mischief, of pride, pompe, stoutness, presumption and tyranny' in the Roman Catholic Church.¹⁸ In his narrative, Foxe called Hildebrand the 'souldiour of Sathan'. He also recorded that the French Bishops had accused Hildebrand of ruling 'not by the spirite of God, but by Sathan'. Cardinal Benno recorded a tale of how Gregory VII had carried with him a book of Necromancy which, when the 'secrees [secrets] of the sathanical booke' were read 'sodenly there came about them the messengers of Sathan'.¹⁹ The account gained much of its fiery disposition from its main source, Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, but it also relied on Bale, Platina and Lambert of Hersfeld.²⁰ From these sources Foxe suggested that his research was more wide reaching than it actually was; he referenced Aventiono, Lambert of Hersfeld,

¹⁶ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 41 and 1570, bk. 4, p. 263 taken from *Catalogus*, p. 202.

¹⁷ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 39 and 1570, bk. 4, p. 262. Extracted from *CTV* (1556), pp. 371-4 or (1562), pp. 247-9.

¹⁸ Quoted from *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 29 or 1570, bk. 4, p. 235.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 24 or 1570, bk. 4, p. 228.

²⁰ The 1563 account was derived from *CTV* (1556), pp. 205-6, 239, 223, 236, 212; Lambert of Hersfeld, 'Lamberti Hersfeldenses annals a 1040-1077', edited by V.C.L.F. Hesse in *MGH, Scriptorum V* (Hanover, 1845), pp. 217-8, 230; Bartolomeo Sacchi de Platina, *De vitis pontificum Romanorum*, edited by Onofrio Panvinio (Venice, 1562), ff. 131r-132v, 133r-134v, 135r-v, and *Catalogus*, p. 160. The 1563 account was reinserted in the 1570 edition with additional material from the letters of Cardinal Benno in the middle derived from *CTV* (1556), pp. 220-5. This section has been researched by Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1.

Cardinal Benno, Platina, Ursperg, Nauclerus, Sabellicus, and Crantzius as his sources, but, as often was the case, not the actual source; Flacius.

The Waldensian heresy or more accurately in this context, the persecution, was lifted from Flacius' catalogue or possibly the *Magdeburg Centuries*.²¹ However, Foxe's account had originally derived from the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum ac Fugiendarum*, written by Ortwin Gratius (1475-1542), a humanist from the University of Cologne. This is interesting as Foxe had independent access to Gratius' text. Freeman has noted its direct use for the condemnation of Wyclif at the Council of Constance and in conjunction with the *History of Bohemia* written by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini.²² For the Waldensians, Gratius had provided the essential Protestant collection of documents. However, Foxe chose to extract his account from Flacius' abridged version. There are several possible reasons for this. First, that time was limited in producing the account. Second, Flacius was the first reformer to exploit the Waldensian movement as a progenitor of the reformed church.²³ However, there is no reason at all why he would not have confirmed that Flacius had accurately recounted the documents from his own copy of the *Fasciculus*. The use of sources here does help to show the speed with which Foxe was forced to write his account, as well as the trust he placed in Flacius' replicas.

²¹ Compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 42-6 with *CTV* (1556), pp. 704-57 and *Ecclesiastica Historia* (*Magdeburg Centuries*), edited by Johannes Wigand and Mattheus Judex (14 vols, Basel, 1559-70), *Cent.* 12, cols 1204-8.

²² Ortwin Gratius, *Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum et Fugiendarum* (Cologne, 1535). For details see Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1 and appendix B. Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, *History of Bohemia* (Basel, 1489); is another interesting text for Foxe to have used. Foxe was obviously cautious of advertising one of the few examples of a history written by a Pope. However, as far as depicting the 'Turkish' threat and the Hussites, Aeneas was a valuable, even incontestable source. The history had been published in Basel and it is probably whilst Foxe was in exile here, that he became familiar with the text. In the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, Aeneas was largely used for Book Six to help Foxe describe the Council of Basel. See *A&M*, 1570, bk. 6, pp. 820-842. For further details of the History of Bohemia by Aeneas see Z.R. von Martels and Arie Johan Vanderjagt (eds), *Pius II – 'El Piu Expeditivo Pontifice': Selected Studies on Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (1405-1464)* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 55-86.

²³ Olson, *Matthias Flacius*, p. 242.

Foxe joined these sixteenth-century texts with medieval chronicles compiled by William of Malmesbury, Roger of Hoveden, John Brompton (attributed), and Walter of Guisborough. For Papal history, Foxe also borrowed from William Caxton's *Chronicles of England*, Platina's *Lives of the Popes* and for Gregory VII a short section from the chronicle of Lambert of Hersfeld.²⁴ For the lengthy account of Thomas Becket, Foxe extracted heavily from the *Quadrilogus*. This was a hagiographical work consisting of four lives of Thomas Becket, to which he would again add more when he came to reproduce the account in 1570. Foxe also used, for individual sections, Giovanni Stella's *Lives of Popes*, and Nicholas Cisner's account of Emperor Frederick II.²⁵ There is one other source that we have not yet mentioned; yet it is of vital significance. This is the *Chronica Majora*, compiled by Matthew Paris in the thirteenth century. It is to this chronicle, and to its complicated identification in the 1563 edition, that we now turn.

ii. Foxe and Matthew Paris

It is generally accepted that the *Chronica Majora* was an essential source for Foxe's depiction of the Papal Antichrist during the late middle ages.²⁶ This chronicle - which was lent to Foxe by Matthew Parker - is perhaps the best-known connection between

²⁴ See *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 23. The description of the synods of Mainz and Erfurt appears to have been extracted directly from Lambert of Hersfeld, 'annals a 1040-1077', *MGH*, pp. 217-8, 230. This was researched by Freeman, 'Papal History', in which he notes that although Cattley and Townsend, in their edition of the *Acts and Monuments* published between 1843-9, believed Foxe to have borrowed the account from Matthias Flacius Illyricus' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, this cannot be the case. The account only appears from the 1608 edition and not in the 1556 or 1562 editions, which were available to Foxe.

²⁵ Ortwin Gratius and Aeneas Sylvius was the source Foxe used in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 15-18 on the history of the controversy between the Archbishoprics of York and Canterbury. Giovanni Stella was used in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 30 for the laws of Pope Urban II. Nichols Cisner's account of Frederick II was inserted in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 730-74.

²⁶ As recently stated in Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1.

the *Acts and Monuments* and the Archbishop's 'circle'.²⁷ However, there is doubt as to whether Foxe had access to this or any other version of the *Chronica Majora* in time for the 1563 edition.²⁸ In that edition, Foxe did refer some of his material to 'Matthew Paris' but it is unlikely that Parker had as yet, gathered any copy of the text. Further, John Bale is generally believed not to have ever seen a copy, although Thomas Freeman has suggested that this assumption might be incorrect.²⁹ Other than a manuscript copy of Matthew Paris' greater chronicle there are only a limited number of alternative avenues from which Foxe could have obtained his material. The evidence upon which the following is based can be found in Appendix Two (C) of this thesis.

The 1556 and 1562 editions of the *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* provide little more than brief summaries from Matthew Paris, covering the period 1094 to 1273.³⁰ There is not enough here for Foxe's references. John Bale's *Catalogus* is another possibility, but other than a few accounts, which agree with Bale's turn of phrase, there is again little evidence that Foxe used this as his source.³¹ Like Flacius' catalogue there was not enough detail. Bale's *Actes of Englysh Votaryes*, again does not contain enough material.³² The most obvious possibility is the *Historia Anglorum* (Matthew Paris' smaller chronicle). It is of no surprise that much of the material Foxe references to

²⁷ The copy of *Chronica Majora*, which Foxe borrowed from Parker is CCCC MS 26 (containing the first half of the chronicle up to 1188) and CCCC MS 16 (containing the second half of the chronicle up to its end in 1253).

²⁸ As stated in Freeman, 'John Bale's "Book of Martyrs"', p. 191-2.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 175-223.

³⁰ Extracts from Matthew Paris mainly occur in *CTV* (1556), pp. 594-605 and *CTV* (1562), pp. 366-371.

³¹ *Catalogus*, p. 175 is almost certainly the source for *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 33, which describes the tale of Cardinal John of Crema (d. 1137). This Cardinal, Foxe tells us, came to England to denounce priest's concubines (wives) only to be discovered that same night sharing his bed with a whore. The language that Foxe uses in his narrative is more reminiscent of Bale than Matthew Paris. The *Catalogus* might also have been Foxe's source for an account of a contention over investiture between Henry I and Pope Paschal. Compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 31 with *Catalogus*, pp. 162-3. *HA* I, p. 192 is another possible source. Otherwise the *Catalogus* is a highly unlikely or at least uncertain source for Matthew Paris.

³² There are a few exceptions. The account of William Rufus not favouring the papacy agrees in both language and composition to *Votaryes* II, p. 49. Compare to *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 30. All of the books mentioned could also be the source for King Stephen reserving the right to bestow spiritual livings. Compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 34 with *CTV* (1556), p. 596; *Catalogus*, p. 177; *Votaryes* II, p. 105.

Matthew Paris can be found here. However, the scribe had severally edited and reduced the narrative in this chronicle, removing vital documentary evidence such as epistles and official statements; some of which we still find in the *Acts and Monuments*.³³ As can be seen from Appendix Two (C), not all of the material extracted by Foxe can be found in the *Historia Anglorum* or in the other possible sources. The origin of at least some of the material, must, therefore, derive from the greater chronicle itself.

Thomas Freeman has argued that Foxe would have taken more from the *Chronica Majora* for his 1563 edition, if he did indeed have access to it.³⁴ However, we must allow for the time constraints imposed upon Foxe in preparing his account. The evidence from Foxe's narrative in 1563 suggests that, at most, Foxe had notes for a few examples of papal tyranny from the early years of Henry III's reign, and perhaps also for John. There is certainly no indication that the *Chronica Majora* was a central source for information and argument in the 1563 edition beyond those reigns. What explanations might account for this? When Bale published his second part of the *Actes of Englysh Votaryes* in 1551 he promised that 'The thirde part wil declare the crafty vpholdinge of their [monks] prowde degrees & possessyons, by the wilye and subtile slayghtes of the. iiij. orders of frires. And (th)e fort part shal manifest their horrible fall in this lattre age by tha(t) grou(n)ded doctrines of the true preachers & writers'.³⁵ No doubt the proposed third part would have covered both the reigns of King John and Henry III and Bale would have hoped to consult the *Chronica Majora* to help him in this matter. He was certainly aware of its existence by the time he came to compile his second catalogue in the 1550s, although at that stage Bale was continuing to rely on the

³³ Such as the account of Legate Otto pillaging money from England in the early years of Henry III's reign. See *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 113-8.

³⁴ Freeman, 'John Bale's "Book of Martyrs"', pp. 191-2.

³⁵ *Votaryes*, p. 1.

Historia Anglorum for his information.³⁶ If Bale did, at some point, get hold of a copy of Matthew Paris' greater chronicle, then it is likely that he would have taken notes on both the reign of King John and of Henry III. Does this suggest that Bale could have written both accounts for the 1563 edition? That is certainly a plausible conjecture. One option put forward by Freeman is that Bale turned his draft for the *Votaryes* into a finished form for inclusion in the *Acts and Monuments*.³⁷ Another option is that Bale forwarded his notes to Foxe so that he could compile the account himself. It is also plausible to suggest that Bale only obtained access to the *Chronica Majora* in the last years of his life. If so, then perhaps Foxe did indeed consult an actual copy of the chronicle.

These possibilities are perhaps strengthened by research carried out by Julian Roberts and Elizabeth Evenden on the irregularity of signatures used to prepare the 1563 edition for print. Roberts and Evenden believe that these irregularities denote the interpolation of extra material, and that during the accounts of King John and Henry III these are particularly evident where material has been inserted on the abuse of papal power.³⁸ This might suggest that much of the material for these sections was gathered at the last minute, perhaps by a plea from Foxe to Bale to borrow his materials. In whatever way Foxe obtained his material, there is now little doubt that he did so from at least a series of notes or extracts taken from the greater chronicle in combination with Bale's printed works. Consultation of the *Historia Anglorum* by Foxe remains uncertain. It is,

³⁶ However, Bale does not appear to be aware of it in 1548/9 when he published the first edition (*Scriptorum*, f. 143v) of the catalogue. Here he simply states that Matthew Paris had produced various works of antiquity including the *Historia Anglorum* (*Gesta Anglorum*).

³⁷ Freeman, 'John Bale's "Book of Martyrs?"', pp. 202-3.

³⁸ Julian Roberts and Elizabeth Evenden, 'Bibliographical Aspects of the Acts and Monuments', *VE* (2004).

however, suggestive that there is no definite textual evidence to prove beyond doubt that he extracted material from the smaller chronicle.

iii. Conversion into the 1570 edition

Book One of the 1563 edition was deposited into the 1570 edition and, for the greater part, formed the basis for Book Four. However, it was not inserted wholesale. Rather it was broken apart, reorganised and reworked to fit into the revised and greatly expanded narrative. The original text, then, did not retain its cohesive integrity. Some parts were omitted, while other parts were re-arranged or deposited out of their original sequence. The old material was inserted around the new material. Yet, the original structure and content of the text was not entirely dissolved. The narrative was already fragmented, having been compiled as a series of interlinked stories in a generally thematic and chronological order. It might have lost its overarching cohesion when Foxe reused it for his 1570 edition but individual elements retained their own internal integrity to a surprising degree. For instance, the narratives of Gregory VII and King John were lifted out of the 1563 edition as self-contained narratives and repositioned into the 1570 edition in the same form.³⁹ For the account of Gregory VII, Foxe only added additional documentary material. Foxe had at first only summarised an epistle written by Cardinal Benno (1010-1106) and declared that 'if it be a fable ye have the author therof'.⁴⁰ In 1570, Foxe added examples from the collection of Benno's letters contained in Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, removing the need for his readers to look up the material for themselves.⁴¹ With the narrative of King John, Foxe changed even less. The only

³⁹ Compare the account of Gregory VII in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 20-29 with the almost identical account in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 225-235.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 24.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 228. This material was extracted from *CTV* (1556), pp. 220-5.

substantial revision comes near its end. In 1563, the narrative placed the coronation of Henry III before the exposition on the possible causes of John's death. Before the narrative returned again to Henry III, Foxe briefly recounted the life and acts of Pope Innocent III.⁴² In 1570, this awkward layout of the narrative was placed into a more satisfactory chronological order.⁴³ The possible causes of King John's death were placed first – with additional evidence from the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough – then Foxe added an extended account of Henry III's coronation and finally ended the section with the short narrative of Innocent III.⁴⁴

Foxe also retained his original narrative of Legate Otto without change, despite having obtained a greatly extended collection of anecdotes from Parker's copy of the *Chronica Majora*. Instead of integrating this new material into his original account Foxe did something quite different and at odds with his general attempt in 1570 to structure the text in chronological order. After inserting the account of Otto from 1563, Foxe discussed the Albigensian Crusade, Pope Gregory IX and the division between the East and West churches. These were all situated within a chronological structure.⁴⁵ Then Foxe inserted a narrative entitled 'The intolerable oppression of the Realme of England, by the Popes exactions and contributions and other sleights here used in the tyme of king Henry 3'.⁴⁶ Often covering the same ground as the material incorporated from the 1563 edition, this narrative provided an opportunity for Foxe to emphasise the extortionate taxation of England carried out by Papal legates up to 1250. Foxe derived the evidence entirely from the *Chronica Majora*, making the resultant narrative into

⁴² *Ibid.*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 107-9.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 329-332.

⁴⁴ The additional evidence is from WG, pp. 154-6. Earlier in the account Foxe also added some material from *Eulogium III*, pp. 100-1. Compare the account of Legate Pandulph from there to *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 322.

⁴⁵ See appendix 2.D.

⁴⁶ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 366-373.

something resembling an abridgement of what Matthew Paris had to say on papal interference in England.⁴⁷ References to the folio number in the *Chronica Majora* are inserted regularly in this section of the narrative as proof that he was indeed consulting a manuscript copy rather than the soon to be published edition of the *Chronica Majora* by Matthew Parker (1571). Foxe did not change the text itself but simply reordered it so that the polemical effect would be stronger. Removing this account from chronological limitations, Foxe could create the impression that the burden of taxation and the trampling over English customs and laws were constant and more extensive than the text actually allowed for in its original form.

A few sections of Book One from the 1563 edition did not, however, survive the transfer in 1570. A short description of how Archbishop Anselm (1033-1109) was removed from his bishopric by Pope Pascal for making his own elections without royal authority was entirely replaced by a more detailed and lengthy account.⁴⁸ Similarly, an entire page, explaining how Canterbury became the preferred bishopric in England was removed and new text inserted into the description of the contention between Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury and Thomas, Archbishop of York.⁴⁹ Almost the entire account of Richard I was replaced by verbatim citations from the chronicle compiled by Gervase of Canterbury.⁵⁰ A brief introduction to the Waldensians, a selection of laws produced by Henry III and condemned by the pope, and the contention between

⁴⁷ The entire narrative is taken from *CM* III, pp. 75-6, 224, 259, 395-6, 401-516, 568, 610-2; *CM* IV, pp. 6-7, 9-15, 32-5, 55, 87, 101-2, 263-4, 384-379, 395-418, 440-1, 478-9, 504 -10, 564-6, 580, 595; and *CM* V, pp. 97-8, 109-10, 259, 595.

⁴⁸ Compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 31-32 with *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 239-243. Although Foxe claimed to have taken the 1563 account from Matthew Paris, it is actually a word-for-word translation from *Catalogus*, pp. 162-163. Freeman, 'Papal History', appendix 2 has shown that the extended account in the 1570 edition is largely taken out of Malmesbury *GP*, lib. 1 caps 45-66 and Walter Fröhlich (ed. & trans.), *The Letters of St Anselm of Canterbury*, vol. 2 (Kalamazoo, 1990-4), pp. 156-8, 163, 170-1, 177-8, 289.

⁴⁹ Compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 18 with 1570, bk. 4, pp. 224-225.

⁵⁰ Compare *Ibid.*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 90-92 with 1570, bk. 4, pp. 300-317.

Emperor Frederick II and Popes Innocent III, Honorius III, Gregory IX, Celestine IV and Innocent IV, were also all removed and replaced by more in-depth accounts.⁵¹ There were also other notable erasures. In 1563, Foxe had inserted verbatim letters and documents in their original Latin, sometimes, but not always, with an English translation. For the 1570 edition, these were all fully translated and the Latin originals erased.⁵² Marginal glosses, which noted dates, characters, events and polemical or rhetorical messages, were also increased between the first two editions. In the main body of the text words and sentences were modified to express a slightly altered emphasis. The glorification of Henry II as a 'mirror to all princes' in the 1563 edition was subtly demoted to 'the actes of this prince not to be so vicious as some monkish writers do describe'.⁵³ Facts were corrected when found to be in error either by mistake or by the application of new evidence. Thus the date of King Richard I's coronation is corrected from 1179 to 1189 and the prophecy of Hildegard is corrected from 1170 to

⁵¹ See *Ibid.*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 41, 48, 119-120.

⁵² For the pre-reformation portion these documents were usually epistles, but were also occasionally taken out of contemporary commentaries or orations. In the 1570 edition, these Latin tracts were often reduced to one or two opening lines or removed altogether. Thus, almost all epistles involving Archbishop Thomas Becket and Pope Alexander III as well as Becket's oration concerning the resignation of his bishopric have lost their Latin equivalents in the 1570 edition. Compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 46-90 with *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 263-294. Only the short sections of Latin cited for an epistle between Pope Alexander and King Henry in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 67 and 1570, bk. 4, pp. 276-7, the opening sentence of 'an effectuall and pithy letter' between the clergy of the church to Thomas Becket in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 72 and 1570, bk. 4, p. 279, and Becket's reply to that letter in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 74 and 1570, bk. 4, pp. 280-1 are maintained. The rest of the Latin for the epistles involving Thomas Becket are entirely removed. As has Frederick Barbarossa's answer to Pope Adrian IV and his subsequent letter to his subjects, as well as the complaint by the English nobles concerning over-taxation by Rome, which they sent to the ecclesiastical houses in the time of Henry III. For Barbarossa's epistle to Adrian IV and his subsequent epistle to the empire compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 36-41 with *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 261-2. For the nobles complaint about Rome compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 113-119 with *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 339-343. An epistle from Pope Gregory I to Augustine in England had been reproduced in full Latin and English in the 1563 edition but its transposition into Book Two of the 1570 edition had removed it from its original context and reduced the Latin to the first two sentences. Compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 16-17 with *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2, pp. 158-9. The epistle from Pope Hadrian to Emperor Frederick concerning their respective allegiance and authority, and Thomas Becket complaining about Henry II to the Pope were also reduced to one sentence of Latin in Book Four of the 1570 edition. For the epistle of Pope Hadrian to Emperor Frederick compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 36 with *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 260-1. For the epistle between Thomas Becket and Pope Alexander in *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 71-72, the opening sentence in Latin is retained, but the rest of the epistle is translated for the first time to English. See *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 278-9.

⁵³ Compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 88 with 1570, bk. 4, p. 293.

1146.⁵⁴ Evidence that Foxe was not yet fully acquainted with the Anglo-Saxons for his 1563 edition is revealed in his less than certain description of ‘five or six kingdoms’ which he listed as Kent, East Saxon, South Saxon, West Saxon, Mercia, and Northumbria. In 1570, this was updated to seven kingdoms.⁵⁵ Minor errors such as printing ‘ij’ instead of ‘iij’ for the number of archbishops writing against the Waldensians were also corrected.⁵⁶

In summary, almost everything that was in Book One of the 1563 edition was reintegrated – albeit in a revised sequence and form - into the 1570 edition. The lack of alteration confirms that Foxe was expanding his original argument rather than creating a new one, and that the general pattern of history was already set. Of course there were various sections in the 1570 edition, which Foxe inserted for the first time, such as the account of Anselm, religious controversies in the reign of Richard I, the third crusade, and most significantly the expansion from a very brief summary to a full and detailed account of events from Henry III to Edward III. The importance of the 1563 text in creating the basic argument for Book Four, therefore means that the collaborative foundation of the post-Gregorian account lent itself more to the returning ‘exiled’ community of which Foxe had been part, rather than to the adoption of Foxe’s project by Archbishop Parker. Analysis of the new material for Book Four therefore assumes a slightly different role for Parker’s manuscripts than it had for Books Two and Three.

⁵⁴ Compare *Ibid.*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 90 with 1570, bk. 4, p. 300 for the correction of the dating of Richard I’s coronation to 1189. For Hildegard’s prophecy compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 111 with 1570, bk. 4, p. 334. Hildegard lived between 1098-1179 and claimed to have prophecies for most of her life. She first wrote these visions in a text named *Scivias* in 1151. For more details see Sabina Flannagan, *Hildegard of Bingen 1098-1179: A visionary Life* (London, 1989), especially chapter four, which discusses her visionary words including the *Scivias*.

⁵⁵ Compare *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 16 with 1570, bk. 4, p. 224.

⁵⁶ Compare *Ibid.*, p. 46 with 1570, bk. 4, p. 297.

2. The 1570 Edition: The Rising Antichrist

When we look at Book Four of the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*, we see that Foxe used a large corpus of materials ranging from contemporary protestant literature to medieval chronicles and annals, with the occasional excursus into archival documentation. Foxe was selective when he gathered evidence from other writings, picking only what he found useful or necessary to writing his history. He generally relied on texts, which were particularly congenial to his revisionist intent – such as the *Chronica Majora* – and then, from other texts, built up an intricate web of source verification to support and defend their authenticity. Foxe shows a keen awareness that it was not enough to set up an alternative narrative based upon substitute ‘monuments’. It was not sufficient simply to revive the earlier chroniclers – such as William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon – in place of the late medieval chroniclers – such as Ranulf Higden. Instead, Foxe recognised that he would need to conflate variant narratives and verify seemingly contradictory evidence. For instance, when Foxe came to describe the contest between several popes and Emperor Frederick II in the mid-thirteenth century, he followed almost entirely Nicholas Cisner’s short tract on the Emperor but also inserted variant and additional material from Matthew Paris’ *Chronica Majora* and Pier della Vigne’s *Epistolarum Petride Vineis*.⁵⁷ Cisner’s text was therefore verified against other sources, one contemporary to Foxe and one from Frederick II’s own time. This is exactly what Foxe did in the rest of Book Four, taking several sources as the foundation for his arguments and narrative.

⁵⁷ Compare *Ibid.*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 373-97 with Nicholas Cisner, *De Frederico II. Imp. Oratio* (Strasburg, 1608), pp. 97-102. Additions were added from *CM III*, pp. 151-3; and Pier della Vigne, *Epistolarum Petride Vineis*, edited by Simon Schard (Basel, 1566), pp. 204-15, 128-30.

In this section, we shall briefly review the first half of this Book, where Foxe deals with history from William the Conqueror up until King John. It is here where Foxe traced the increasing activities of Antichrist and the slow corruption of the papacy. In the subsequent section, we shall move on to how Foxe dealt with a period of history, in which he claimed the Antichrist as fully at work in the world. We shall examine Foxe's use of the *Chronica Majora* and other chronicles derived from the scriptorium of St Albans.

i. The Norman Yoke

In 1570, John Foxe had begun his account of the 'misordered raigne of Antichrist', which was 'begynnyng to styrre in the church of Christ', with the coronation of William the Conqueror. Foxe lamented that the English 'not so much by assent, as for feare, & necessite of time' gave their allegiance to William. The citizens of London had promised their assistance to Edgar Atheling but 'beyng weakened and wasted so greatly in battailes before, and the duke commyng so fast vpon them, fearing not to make their partie good submitted them selves'.⁵⁸ In 1954, Christopher Hill talked about a 'Norman Yoke' as a series of variant theories on political power and antiquity of law, which were prevalent in seventeenth-century politics and law making.⁵⁹ The general theory ran that, before 1066, the Anglo-Saxons had lived as free and equal citizens and that the Norman Conquest had deprived the English of those liberties. Later concessions, such as Magna Carta, represented signs of continued resistance to Norman hegemony. Although the term 'Norman Yoke' first appeared in print in 1642, Hill believed it to be a much older

⁵⁸ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 222 taken from a mixture of Fabyan, lib. 7 cap. 219 and Brompton, cols 961-2, 965-6, Huntingdon, pp. 14-15, 339, Malmesbury, *GR*, pp. 414-7, 456-8.

⁵⁹ First printed as Christopher Hill, 'The Norman Yoke', *Democracy and the Labour Movement: essays in honour of Dona Torr*, edited by J. Saville (London, 1954) and reprinted in Christopher Hill, *Puritanism & Revolution; Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution in the 17th Century* (London, 1958).

'legend', which had already infiltrated the collective memory of the various strata of society.

The *Acts and Monuments* provides an earlier form for the theory in print.⁶⁰ Foxe wrote that William ruled 'with great seueritie & cruelty, toward the Englishme(n)' and by force 'chaunged the whole state of the gouernaunce of this co(m)mon weale: & ordeyned new lawes at his owne pleasure, profitable to him selfe, but greuous and hurtfull to the people'.⁶¹ Foxe complained that the Conqueror had abolished the laws of King Edward, which he had earlier sworn to observe. That decision, Foxe explained, had resulted in 'great commotions & rebellions' which 'remayned long after among the people, as histories recorde: to haue the sayd lawes of kyng Edward reuiued againe'.⁶² When Foxe came to the final years of William the Conqueror he also told of how it had become shameful to be called an Englishman, and how the king had 'planted & aduaunced' his Norman Barons in the 'landes & possessions of English Lordes, who(m) he either expulsed or els beheaded'.⁶³

This depiction of the Norman Conquest was closely tied into Foxe's larger schema. The 'Norman Yoke' acted as a conduit for further corruption and controversies to infiltrate the English church. The Anglo-Saxons, of whom Foxe had depicted as far from perfect but 'in comparison of that as followed after...might seeme...something sufferable' had

⁶⁰ As Hill, 'The Norman Yoke' (1958), p. 54 recorded the term 'Norman Yoke' first appeared in the publication of a thirteenth century tract entitled *The Mirror of Justices*, which was published in its original French in 1642 and then translated to English in 1646. Christopher Hill, however believed that the general theory, in one form or another, had existed for centuries before as an 'urban class' legend against the oppression of feudal lords.

⁶¹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p.222.

⁶² *Ibid.* Foxe also harked back to his Anglo-Saxon account by drawing the Norman Conquest into the concept of 'five plagues' which 'the hande of God' had sent to the English people. This idea came out of Huntingdon, pp. 14-15 and had previously been used in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 2.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 236.

been replaced by a regime closely linked to a corrupted papacy.⁶⁴ The 'Norman Yoke' brought with it a 'Papal Yoke'. From the 1563 edition, Foxe had a fully formed narrative of the time of Hildebrand. He also had a short narrative of the rivalry of the Pope with Emperor Barbarossa and various contentions over primacy between English archbishops. These were, to varying degrees, expanded. The account of Hildebrand was strengthened by the insertion of Cardinal Benno's letters (taken from the *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*).⁶⁵ The contention between Archbishops Lanfranc and Thomas was further analysed through evidence extracted from William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, Fabyan's *New Chronicles*, the *Annals* of Roger of Hoveden and perhaps the *Historia Anglorum* of Henry of Huntingdon.⁶⁶

For the period between the Norman Conquest in 1066 and the accession of Henry II as king in 1154, Foxe traced his history through three interdependent lenses, the corruption of the papacy; contention in the realm of England, and rivalry between the papacy and the Empire. Foxe provided space for a summary of each Monarch's reign; each varying in length and detail. The reign of William I was focused largely upon the banishment of the English from influential positions. Foxe also discussed William's character, finances, and religious endowments.⁶⁷ Nestled within those narratives we find also a table listing the Norman barons who had come over to England with William, probably taken from an archival source.⁶⁸ The reign of William Rufus, a monarch disliked by

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, bk. 1, p. 1.

⁶⁵ Compare *Ibid.*, bk. 4, p. 228-231 with *CTV* (1556), pp. 220-225.

⁶⁶ See appendix 4, block 4.1.

⁶⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 222-6, 235-7.

⁶⁸ The origin of this list remains uncertain. Foxe stated that the material came from 'ordinale ecclesiastici officii', which might suggest that he found the list in an archive. He is known to have consulted documents at Hereford, Lincoln, Rochester and the Royal archives in the Tower. Other material was also sent to him from Bath and Wells, Chichester, Durham and York. See Thomas S. Freeman, 'John Foxe: A Biography', *VE* (2004). Examination of the portion of Parker's manuscript collection that now resides in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge has only highlighted two possible manuscripts, neither of which appear to be Foxe's source. See Montague R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the*

both Normans and Englishmen, was furnished with a more even-handed treatment than provided by most of the medieval chroniclers.⁶⁹ For this reign and the subsequent reign of Henry I, Foxe expanded upon the idea that foreign archbishops were the cause of controversies in the English church. Foxe introduced the stories of Archbishop Anselm (Canterbury) and Thurstan (York) to support this contention. King Stephen's reign was more disjointed. Foxe had little to say other than criticise him as untrustworthy, violent and bloodthirsty.⁷⁰ Most of his comments focused upon the bad treatment of Empress Matilda. A brief reference to the possible poisoning of William, Archbishop of York and a brief survey of scholars living at that time finished the account.

Predominantly Foxe recounted these events with reference to the same medieval chronicles that he had consulted in Books Two and Three. This corpus of texts contained the writings of John Brompton, Robert Fabyan, William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, Ranulf Higden, Roger of Hoveden and the anonymous author of *Eulogium*. While some of these texts were used to the same extent as they had previously been used in the earlier Books – such as the work of Ranulf Higden, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon – others, such as the *Chronicon* attributed to John Brompton and the anonymous *Eulogium*, were used less.⁷¹ In contrast Foxe appears to have increased his reliance upon the *Annals* compiled by Roger of Hoveden. Foxe generally reserved the *Annals* for the reign of Henry I, providing short details on

Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge (2 vols, Cambridge, 1909), vol. 1, pp. 183-4 and 406-177. The first is the chronicle attributed to John Brompton, cols 963-5 (CCCC MS 96), which contains a list of the Norman barons. However, this list does not contain their full names. The second possible source is CCCC MS 177 no. 41. This is a composite manuscript containing miscellaneous documents. Again, this manuscript does not contain the full names of all the barons, although it does differ in content slightly from Brompton's. In neither case do the list of barons appear in the same order as in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 236.

⁶⁹ Such as Malmesbury, *GR*, lib. 4 cap. 338 and *Polychronicon*, lib. 7 cap. 5. The account can be found in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 237-246.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 258-9.

⁷¹ See appendix four, Block 4.1-6.

Anselm, the council of Rheims, William of Turbine, Matilda and numerous other events and people of the time.⁷² The *Annals* were also the primary source for Foxe's account on the Council of Westminster in 1070, where he named two cardinals as Peter and Paul; a detail only found in the *Annals*.⁷³

ii. Foxe's deployment of sources for St Anselm and Thomas Becket

For his narrative on St Anselm, Foxe compared evidence in the two most relevant texts – the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* compiled by William of Malmesbury, and the *vita St Anselm* by Eadmer – then verified their evidence to a manuscript containing Anselm's epistles.⁷⁴ It was important for Foxe to show that he had thoroughly investigated Anselm, as this was an Archbishop of Canterbury, revered as a saint by Roman Catholics, and one who 'gaue no little courage to Thurstanus & Becket his successors: & to other that followed after to do the lyke against their kynges and princes'.⁷⁵ Describing Anselm as 'the stout champion of poperye and superstition', Foxe used his story as a prologue to the more important account of Thomas Becket.⁷⁶ They had both sided with the Pope against their king and had similar opinions against the marriage of priests. On the issue of constitutional law that was brought up between 1094 and 1097, Foxe recounted accurately from the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, the story of how

⁷² See appendix four, Block 4.5.

⁷³ The account in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 223 closely follows Brompton, cols 967-8 or Fabyan, lib. 7 cap. 220. However neither of these texts contains the names of the Cardinals. Foxe therefore must have derived this information from Hoveden I, pp. 122-3.

⁷⁴ R. W. Southern, 'Anselm [St Anselm] (c.1033-1109)', *ODNB* (2004). The collection of Anselm's letters is described in more detail in the introduction to Fröhlich, *The Letters of Saint Anselm*, pp. 5-65. It is worth noting that both Eadmer and William of Malmesbury may have been involved in preserving Anselm's letters, in the hope of Anselm's eventual canonisation. The manuscript which Foxe probably used for the letters is CCC MS 135 from Parker's collection. Foxe similarly borrowed CCC MS 371 of Eadmer's *Life of St Dunstan* as discussed in the previous chapter of this thesis (ch. 4). William of Malmesbury, another of his contemporaries, appears to have taken pains to preserve Anselm's letters in the 1120s. This is suggested in Southern, 'Anselm', *ODNB*.

⁷⁵ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 252.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

Anselm worked against the king's purposes. Foxe demonstrated his argument by offering transcripts of Anselm's letters as evidence to his treason. 'Who soeuer he were,' Anselm is quoted as writing 't[hat] would presume [to] proue it any breach of allegiance of feaulty to his soueraigne, if he appealed to the vicar of s. Peter, he was ready to answer at all times to the contrary'.⁷⁷ That argument would have been familiar to Foxe's readership, having been overturned by Henry VIII when he separated England from Rome some forty years earlier.

Anselm's own words were again used against him when Foxe moved on to a discussion of the Eastern Orthodox Church. After providing a list of twenty-nine points in which the 'Greke church' differed from the 'Latin church', Foxe noted that on the subject of unleavened bread for the Eucharist, Anselm had announced that 'the diuersitie of customes hurt nothing'.⁷⁸ To Foxe's readers such an opinion would appear quite naive. On the subject of investiture during the subsequent reign of Henry I, Foxe recounted how Anselm refused to support the previous policy by Lanfranc of investing priests under the kings' authority. The Pope's recent decrees stated that 'open sentence of excommunication' would be pronounced 'vpon all such laye persons...that shoulde from henceforth conferre or geue any spirituall promotions'.⁷⁹ In other words, only the Pope could invest a priest. Furthermore, Anselm demanded that married priests be removed and acted 'lyke a Lyon vpon (th)e married priestes, contrary to the word of God, diorsing & punishing that by mans authoritie, which the eternall and almighty

⁷⁷ Quote from *Ibid.*, p. 240. Compare the account on *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 239-241 with Malmesbury, *GP*, pp. 85-91, 100-115 and Fröhlich, *The Letters of Saint Anselm II*, pp. 156-8, 163, 170-1.

⁷⁸ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 243. Foxe notes that his list of twenty-nine differences between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox churches, was derived by himself from the archives at Hereford. Although this claim has not been verified it seems almost certainly to be true as Foxe is known to have used the Hereford archives in preparation for the 1563 edition.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 247.

God had coupled'.⁸⁰ In all instances Foxe belittled Anselm's opinion as mere 'popery'. Each source had its role in how Foxe shaped the account. The character of the piece was largely taken from the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, the biography of Anselm from Eadmer, and the damnable documentation from Parker's manuscript of Anselm's letters.

When Foxe came to the subsequent story of Thomas Becket he inserted his detailed and lengthy account from the 1563 edition and drew in further examples from his original source: the *Quadrilogus*.⁸¹ Thomas Becket was given prominence in the *Acts and Monuments* for several reasons. First, Foxe wished to deconstruct the cult of the saints by attacking its most popular icon. Second, Foxe found in Becket's story the same theme of antagonism and controversy between kings, bishops and Popes that he had traced through history. Third, the popularity of 'miracle' stories attached to Becket could be demonstrated as falsities. Fourth, Becket provided the perfect opportunity to contest the different characteristics of a Protestant and Roman Catholic martyr, which was of course vital to Foxe's treatment of the reformation. Foxe attributed to a true martyr 'faith, religio(n), true doctrin, sincere discipline, obedie(n)ce to gods co(m)mau(n)dme(n)ts' but not, as in the case of Thomas Becket, 'vpo(n) things perteini(n)g to this world as possessions, liberties, exemptio(n)s pruileges, dignities, patrimonies & superiorities'.⁸² Becket had died for 'te(m)poral desertes' not for the 'spiritual church'.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

⁸¹ *Vita et processus S. Thomae a Becket super libertate ecclesiastica* (Paris, 1495) now published as *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury*, edited by James C. Robertson, vol. 4 (London, 1879).

⁸² *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, pp. 46-7 and 1570, bk. 4, p. 263.

In her analysis of the Protestant appropriation of the Becket story, Helen L. Parish has suitably illustrated the integral relevance this account had for Foxe's post-Gregorian history.⁸³ The relocation of the Becket text shortly after the woodcut denoting the supplication of Frederick Barbarossa closely tied both events together. The *Dialogues* of Caesarius inserted much later into Book Four, drew the reader back to the Becket controversy by illustrating that his sanctity had been called into question as early as the thirteenth century.⁸⁴ Foxe also directly linked Becket's story to the aforementioned contentions of Lanfranc and Anselm and to the material lifted from Gervase of Canterbury, concerning more strife at Canterbury during the reign of Richard I. Together these thematic strands with which Foxe subtly, and often not so subtly, drew together the pattern of his history, provoked a substantial attack on the sanctity of Roman Catholic faith and practice.

iii. Contentions at Canterbury: Gervase of Canterbury

The verbatim insertion of Thomas Becket's life from the *Quadrilogus* was followed by the careful extraction of material from the *Regum Angliæ* compiled by Gervase of Canterbury in the twelfth century. This chronicle was not an easy text for Foxe to use. For specific examples of internal disputes at Canterbury during the twelfth century, it was a gold mine providing adequate proof for the internal chaos that Foxe had traced at England's principal bishopric from the times of Lanfranc. However, for events of national importance Gervase was, in Foxe's view, tainted by the bleak darkness and corruption of the Papal Antichrist. Gervase had written his chronicle at a time when the

⁸³ Helen L. Parish, *Monks, Miracles and Magic: Reformation representations of the medieval church* (London, 2005), p. 102.

⁸⁴ Contained in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 447-8. Caesarius' letters were lifted entirely from John Bale, *Acta Romanum Pontificum* (Basel, 1558), pp. 338-344.

annalistic simplicity of history writing was being marginalized by an awareness of rhetorical worth.⁸⁵ Thus, Gervase was zealous in his championing of his own Convent over that of the archbishop or monarch. This made much of his account hostile to the historical cohesion that Foxe was attempting to achieve.

The chronicle covered a period encompassing kings Stephen I, Henry II and Richard I and was written about twenty years after Thomas Becket's murder. Gervase claimed to have attended the funeral making him an eye-witness to this significant event and yet, Foxe only briefly used the *Regum Angliæ* for his narrative and even then, only when he came to re-editing the book for a fourth edition in 1583.⁸⁶ The first three editions took nothing from Gervase for Becket's murder, which is especially important as Foxe certainly borrowed from Gervase for the subsequent rivalries at Canterbury during the reign of Richard I. In that reign, Foxe proved that he was aware of the Becket material as he provided a brief summary of the events which can only have been taken from Gervase.⁸⁷

The Gervase material is almost entirely used to describe the mid-to-late twelfth century contentions between the monks of St Augustine's and the Archbishops of Canterbury from Theobald (c.1090–1161) to Baldwin (c.1125–1190). As disputes go these were nothing out of the ordinary, but Gervase's ability to tell a story, clearly coloured by his own opinions, allowed Foxe ample scope to reiterate his point. Gervase's *Regum*

⁸⁵ John Taylor, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004), p. 126.

⁸⁶ *A&M*, 1583, bk. 4, p. 226. This is a brief tale concerning a false miracle after Becket's death in which he appeared 'to a certayne priest, named Thomas, declared to him that he had so brought to passé, that all the names of the Monks of the Church of Caunterbury, with the names of the priestes and Clerkes, & with the families belonging to that city and church of Cant. Were written in the booke of lyfe'. Foxe references this account to 'Geruase fol. 6'.

⁸⁷ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 303 with GC I, pp. 274-6, 296-7, and 309-325. This has also been recognised by Freeman, 'Papal History', appendix B.

Angliæ was used to show how papal interference in the English church and the subsequent contentions which that caused, was a sign of the growing seeds of corruption within the papacy. As with his other sources, Foxe interpreted, expanded upon and generally imagined more in Gervase's words than their meaning warranted. Thus, Gervase, with Foxe copying, described the quarrel between Sylvester, Abbot of St Augustine's and Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, who claimed that 'Silvester making a great bagge of money, went to Rome, where he obtained of the Pope, for money (for what ca[n] not money do at Rome?) letters that the Archb[ishop] should consecrate the abbat, in his own Church of S. Austen, and also not exact of him any profession of canonicall subiection'. Then, a few lines later, Foxe added: 'Silvester with a new purse of money was fayne to trauaile and trot agayne to Rome'.⁸⁸ In neither instance did Gervase mention money and nor did Matthew Paris, when describing Legate Otto just before his council at St Paul's Cathedral. This is a story that we will come to shortly. What this example tells us, is that Foxe read between the lines when he used Gervase and Matthew Paris. Foxe searched for the opportunity that money could have been involved then decided that the lack of evidence in the text to support the claim was proof that monks had glossed over the truth.

The location of the Gervase material in the *Acts and Monuments* is also important. Foxe had placed his extract from Gervase as an epilogue to Thomas Becket and as a prologue to the disastrous reign of King John in which the Pope managed to wrestle control of England out of the king's hands and into his own. The material also referred back to the controversies between York and Canterbury at the time of Lanfranc, which Foxe had discussed at the beginning of the Book. At the end of the section, Foxe also

⁸⁸ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 302-3 with *GC I*, pp. 147-8. This is described in Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1.

judged the material as evidence that 'where such dissension dwelleth, there dwelleth not the spirite of Christe'.⁸⁹ Foxe was asking his readers to judge for themselves and he also reminded them that there had been similar contentions in the more recent reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Thus, Gervase formed a link in a chain that was intended to demonstrate the increasingly Antichristian activities in the English church caused by the plots and strategies of the Papal Antichrist.

3. The 1570 Edition: Satan's Empire

When Foxe came to writing the history of the early Plantagenet kings of England, he did so under the conviction that he was now telling the story of the Papal Antichrist, firmly entrenched in Christian affairs. Alongside that account and parallel to it, was evidence, in Foxe's eyes, of an increased rejection of papal authority. The increase of 'heresy', the heightened rivalry between Pope and Emperor, the questioning, by scholars of papal policy, and the increase in prophecies of the Antichrist, were all signs, for Foxe, that the faithful had survived and were rising up against the powers of evil. Foxe was fortunate to have access, largely through Matthew Parker's collection, to several prominently anti-papal chronicles for this period. Foxe too had access to the accumulated anticlerical and anti-papal scholarship of Lollards and evangelical reformers. Together these sources enabled Foxe to not only re-locate his narrative from a world where corruption and superstitions were creeping into the church to a world almost entirely enthralled by the Antichrist, but also to assess that period from a

⁸⁹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 309.

different corpus of evidence. Most significant amongst that corpus was the *Chronica Majora* compiled by Matthew Paris in the thirteenth century.⁹⁰

i. Matthew Paris

Foxe followed Matthew Paris with few exceptions for his account of the reign of Henry III. From the young king's coronation in 1207 to the year 1260, where the *Chronica Majora* ended, Foxe painted a picture of an emerging 'papal yoke' over England. The story of England's servitude to Papal authority had begun in earnest through the account on King John, which had been written for the 1563 edition and reinserted with few changes in 1570. The reformist rehabilitation of John's character had begun when Henrician policies drove the need for evidence in support of independence for the English church from Rome, then later as a means to legitimising the actual break from Rome. For instance, William Tyndale had published his *The Obedience of a Christen Man*, challenging the traditional depiction of John as a wicked tyrant.⁹¹ Tyndale sought instead to assert papal abuse and intolerance as the root-cause of the baronial conflicts and church disputes. A year later, Simon Fish expanded upon this in his anticlerical tract *A suplyacyon for the Beggars*, which was further elaborated upon in 1534 by Richard Barnes in his *A supplicacyon onto the most gracious prynce H. the VIII.*⁹² The final Henrician attempt at redefining King John was produced by John Bale sometime around 1538. Bale took the revisionist stance a stage further by refashioning John as a proto-martyr for the reformist cause. Unlike the polemics of Tyndale, Fish and Barnes,

⁹⁰ For details of this chronicle and its tendency to attack the authority of the papacy and secular governments see Richard Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge, 1958).

⁹¹ William Tyndale, *The obedience of a Christen man* (Antwerp, 1528).

⁹² Simon Fish, *A supplicacyon for the beggars* (Antwerp, 1529) and Robert Barnes, *A supplicacion unto the most gracious prynce H. the VIII* (London, 1534).

Bale adapted John as the hero for a polemical history play in support on the newly reformed Church in England.⁹³

These revisions largely centred on the theme of supremacy, which was a fundamental aspect of the 1530s political struggles.⁹⁴ It was no longer useful to depict King John as a tyrant who had deserved the rebellion of his subjects, the interdiction of the realm and the excommunication of his person. Instead Henrician polemicists reinterpreted the evidence and drew a parallel with Henry VIII. Where Henry had succeeded in brushing off the papal yoke, John had failed, and that failure had resulted in the servitude and imprisonment of England under the Papal Antichrist. The characterisation for the subsequent reign of Henry III was therefore indebted to this revisionist account of King John. England, Foxe claimed, had been 'made tributary to the pope and the Romishe church'. If John was to be a parallel to Henry VIII, then Henry III could act also as a parallel to Mary Tudor. What would happen if another Mary came to the throne? Foxe did not ask this question directly, but the allusion could not have been far from his mind. 'It is incredible' Foxe mused 'how the insatiable auarice and greediness of the Romaines did oppresse and wring the commons and all estates and degrees of the realm, especially beneficed me(n) & such as had any thing of the church'.⁹⁵

⁹³ The play has now been printed in Peter Happé, *The Complete Plays of John Bale* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1985). Frontain, 'David in his most hevynes', pp. 1-10 emphasises the importance of Bale making a comparison of John's character to the Biblical David, versus the 'papal' Goliath. This association drew on medieval tradition in which David was seen as the Biblical model of the divinely anointed king. Bale used this characterisation to reveal papal oppression and injustice. Bale again returned to his play of *King Johan* in the early 1560s making various revisions based on his increased knowledge of history. For details see Carole Levin, 'A Good Prince: King John and Early Tudor Propaganda', *SCJ*, 11:4 (1980), pp. 23-32.

⁹⁴ For further information of Henry VIII and the Supremacy see the summary in Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation; Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (London, 2003), pp. 198-204

⁹⁵ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 113 and 1570, bk. 4, p. 339.

The highly colourful depiction of the papacy in the *Chronica Majora* provided Foxe with powerful ammunition with which to demonstrate the brutal treatment of England under papal rule. Foxe inserted this material around his account from 1563 and, in particular, sought to demonstrate papal avarice and greed in the aforementioned short excursus entitled 'The intolerable oppression of the Realme of England by the Popes exactions'.⁹⁶ The account from 1563 (derived from Matthew Paris), opened with the unsuccessful complaints of the English clergy and the papal demand for two prebendships from every cathedral church. Foxe then introduced his main protagonist; the papal legate Otto. Dorothy M. Williamson has stated that Legate Otto came to England in a period of high political stress and that his task was made all the more difficult as the pope required him to see through a levy to be used against England's former ally, Frederick II.⁹⁷ Otto was tactless in his approach to the clergy and English chroniclers, especially Matthew Paris, recorded their anger. Foxe used this to his advantage. Amongst many accounts contained in the chronicles of Matthew Paris, the story of Otto setting up a council at St Paul's Cathedral, provided Foxe with an opportunity to combine the joint themes of worldly greed and unfounded authority, which, he claimed, were a sign of the papacy in this period. Legate Otto put the bishops 'in feare and in hope' so that he could 'hunte for mony' and satisfy his lust for power. When a disagreement broke out between the Archbishops of Canterbury and York over seating arrangements, Foxe extracted very closely from Matthew Paris how the legate was 'more to be commended' for how he dealt with the dispute, but that afterward he revealed his contempt for them both by standing 'aloft' with an archbishop obediently at either side. Otto had used the image of the cross with St Peter on the right and St Paul

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 360-372. For clarification on where these accounts occur see appendix 2.D. These sections are entitled 'The oppression of the Pope in England' and 'Papal Extractions in England'.

⁹⁷ Dorothy M. Williamson, 'Some Aspects of the legation of Cardinal Otto in England 1237-41', *The English Historical Review*, 64:251 (1949), pp. 145-173.

on the left and stated that both were of equal glory. In the margin Foxe clarified his meaning: 'Note the theme of the cardinal applied to God how he applieth it to himselfe'.⁹⁸ Again, Foxe added an accusation that Otto was there to 'fil the popes pouche' and that when the king 'willed him to repaire home to Rome againe', the Pope sent out instructions for him to stay and apply his harvest taking 'whatsoever he might scrape'.⁹⁹

Foxe also cited an example where the 'Romishe rakehels' pilfered money and obtained oaths for a 'fight against the Turkes'. The crusade, however, never happened and 'whe(n) they haue once bound with a vowe, and signed them with the crosse: then sent they their Bulls to release them both of their labour, and their vowe for money'.¹⁰⁰ There followed another example, where the Pope commanded that 'prouision should be made for iij. Hundred Romanes in the chiefest and best benefices in al Englande, at (th)e next voydance'.¹⁰¹ Then came another, in which Peter Rubeus travelled from bishopric to bishopric quietly pilfering money on the false claim that other bishops had already paid him.¹⁰² The exactions were to finance the Pope's war on Emperor Fréderick II and no amount of complaint could cease the constant drain of money. Foxe estimated that more than 60 million florins were handed over in one year.

Foxe found all of these stories through only a limited reading of the *Chronica Majora*, possibly without having ever seen an actual copy of it (as discussed earlier). The account evoked a strong and negative picture of papal policy in England, and there can be little doubt that Foxe was desperate to enquire further. The evidence provided by

⁹⁸ *A&M*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 115 and 1570, bk. 4, p. 340.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 115 and 1570, bk. 4, pp. 340-1.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 1563, bk. 1, p. 116 and 1570, bk. 4, p. 341.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

Matthew Paris said exactly what Foxe believed it should say. From the manuscript copies of the *Chronica Majora*, Foxe followed this account of papal avarice, lifted from the 1563 edition and added an entirely new section on the Cathars and the Albigenian crusade. Foxe hinted that he thought that the Cathars held 'true' beliefs but that 'it can not be wel gathered by the old popishe histories'.¹⁰³ Foxe appears to have spent some time trying to understand whether the Cathars were proto-protestants or indeed heretics. Yet, he found that the available sources – the 'popishe histories' – failed to provide him with any indication of what the Cathars actually believed. Instead, Foxe focused his account on the pressure placed on the French to persecute the Cathars, and upon the subsequent plot by papal legates to trick the Cathars into surrendering. Both stories were taken from the *Chronica Majora*, which itself provided a detailed narrative of the crusade.¹⁰⁴ Foxe then added a series of disputes over the election of a new Archbishop of Canterbury and the rise and fall of Chief Justice Hubert de Burgh, who had stood up to Papal demands only to be defeated by Peter de Roches, Bishop of Winchester (d. 1238). Foxe reiterated the division between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church. All of these stories were lifted from the *Chronica Majora* and all expanded upon the themes of worldly greed and unfounded authority much to the detriment of others.

This material was a rich basis from which to describe the picture of Roman avarice, which Foxe had already claimed for this period. The combination of his narrative from the 1563 edition, joined with new evidence from the manuscript copies of the *Chronica Majora*, reveals just how vital Parker's provision of the materials was to Foxe's history.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 345.

¹⁰⁴ For details on how Matthew Paris and other chroniclers wrote of the Cathars see Nicholas Vincent, 'England and the Albigensian Crusade', in Björn K. U. Weiler and Ifor W. Rowlands (eds), *England and Europe in the Reign of Henry III (1216-1272)* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 67-85.

This is nowhere more evident than in Foxe's second excursus into papal taxation. This section opened with an exclamation that 'duryng all this kynges tyme [Henry III], the Realme was neuer lightly without some of the Popes liegers withal violence exacting and extorting continuall prouisions contributions, and summes of money....to the miserable empouerishing both of the Clergie, & temporaltie'.¹⁰⁵ The statement paved the way for Foxe to repeat and add to the story of Legate Otto in England, as well as various other agents of the papacy.

The Scottish affair during negotiations for the Treaty of York in 1237 provided a clear example from Matthew Paris, with which Foxe could document papal greed. In the *Chronica Majora*, Matthew described how Otto had made a request to the King of Scotland, Alexander III to examine ecclesiastical affairs in his country. Alexander refused and warned that 'ungovernable, wild men dwell there, who thirst after human blood, and whom I myself cannot tame, and if they were to attack you, I should be unable to restrain them'.¹⁰⁶ Foxe reproduced this entire account with few changes until he came to the point where Otto retracted his request out of fear. Foxe elaborated that 'after the Cardinal heard the king speak these words, he pluckt in his hornes, and durst proceed no further'.¹⁰⁷ Foxe's gloss here (with its implicit reference to the devil) deliberately adds spice to the original story.

The *Chronica Majora* was a rich source for examples of papal oppression. The story of Peter Rubeus extorting money by underhand means was repeated, as was the 'craftely'

¹⁰⁵ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 365-6.

¹⁰⁶ *CM* III, pp. 413-4 translated from J. A. Giles, *Matthew Paris' English History from the year 1235 to 1273* (3 vols, London, 1889), I, pp. 69-70.

¹⁰⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 356.

plotted plan to gain money through the promise of a crusade.¹⁰⁸ Additionally, Foxe told the story of how a papal agent named Martin came to England with blank papers signed by the Pope's seal so that he could write to whoever and for whatever purpose he liked.¹⁰⁹ Martin took away 10,000 marks and suspended all prelates from granting benefices. Foxe recited how the king and barons attempted to persuade the Pope that the exactions were impoverishing the realm, but even when the Pope seemed to relent, more money was soon afterwards demanded.¹¹⁰

The duplication of stories previously reported in the text, alongside a select gathering of dispersed references to papal exactions over a period of some fifty years, gave the illusion that more money was taken from England during these years than the evidence actually provided. Without significant access to the *Chronica Majora*, Foxe would not have been able to make his argument as potent. If Foxe was successfully to convince his readership of the validity of the protestant claim to have reverted to the original sanctity of the early church, then he needed extensive evidence that the later medieval church had been corrupted. Matthew Paris provided ample evidence in a language coloured by bitter resentment of papal authority. However, another of Foxe's sources – one which had initially received significant attention from Matthew Parker and other reformers – faded into the background because the *Chronica Majora* could carry out the same role but more effectively. That chronicle was named the *Flores Historiarum*.

Foxe had used the *Flores Historiarum* for a few choice references in his Anglo-Saxon history, but its role had been basically insignificant. For Book Four, it became more important to the central discussions and even carried events between the years 1250-

¹⁰⁸ Both occur in *Ibid.*, p. 367 and were extracted from *CM IV*, pp. 6-7, 35, 55.

¹⁰⁹ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 367-8 with *CM IV*, pp. 284-379.

¹¹⁰ See in particular *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 371-2 compared to *CM IV*, p. 595.

1260.¹¹¹ However, it was generally sidelined in preference to the *Chronica Majora*, the *Historia Brevis* and other texts such as those compiled by Walter of Guisborough and, to a lesser extent, Nicholas Trivet. Its problem lay not in its contents but in the realisation that much of what Matthew of Westminster (in reality Matthew Paris) and the continuator of the chronicle, William Rishanger had to say was borrowed from other texts, predominately from the *Chronica Majora*.¹¹² The *Flores Historiarum*, which had previously been held in high regard, became just a variant of superior chronicles.¹¹³ Yet, in this role, Foxe found the *Flores Historiarum* extremely useful. It became his primary text to confirm accounts in the *Chronica Majora* and one of several texts to perform that role when Foxe came to recount the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.¹¹⁴ Foxe's strategy was to accumulate chronicle references to strengthen his truth-claims, which would result in the presentation of his case with a stronger emphasis on source verification, than he could have done with just the one manuscript. The *Flores Historiarum*, therefore, provided additional authority to the *Chronica Majora*, strengthening Foxe's claim to truth through the agreement of variant sources. The use

¹¹¹ See Block 4.29-30 in appendix four.

¹¹² See *Flores* I, pp. x-xii.

¹¹³ This is not to say that the worth of the *Flores Historiarum* had been dismissed. As summarised by Frederic Madden (ed.), *Matthew Paris, Historia Anglorum* (3 vols., RS, London, 1866-9), p. xliv-xlv it was used for various publications including what appears to have been a plan for a republication of the chronicle itself by Twysden in 1648.

¹¹⁴ A reference to both Matthew of Westminster and Matthew Paris occurs numerous times between *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 344-412. The *Flores Historiarum* was also used in this way when Foxe referenced the arrival of the Minorities (Grey Friars) into England to Matthew of Westminster and Nicholas Trivet. Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 343-4 with *Flores* II, pp. 187-8 and Trivet, p. 211. On another occasion where Foxe recounted that the Viscount of Melun had confessed the French invasion plans to a rebellious English baronage, Foxe cited both Walter of Guisborough and 'Florilego' (*Flores Historiarum*). Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 337 with *Flores* II, p. 163 and WG, pp. 158-9. Foxe again referenced the *Flores Historiarum* with Walter of Guisborough for other aspects of the baronial wars to plague the last years of Henry III as well as the reign of his son Edward I. Compare the list of the Barons against the agreement of Oxford in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 420 with *Flores* II, p. 475 and WG, pp. 187-8; compare also the story of a peace negotiation in France between the king and Simon Montfort in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 421 with *Flores* II, pp. 488-9 and WG, pp. 188-191; and compare the story of Prince Edward on crusade in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 428-430 with *Flores* III, pp. 19-21 and WG, pp. 204-212. In this last instance Foxe also consulted Arundel MS 5, a manuscript containing a chronicle, which he described as 'Scala Mundi'. For the most part, however, Foxe strengthened the authority of the *Chronica Majora* by also referring to the *Flores Historiarum*.

of this method to authenticate evidence would become even more important when Foxe came to write of events after the death of Matthew Paris.

ii. Thomas Walsingham and related texts

When John Foxe came to the later thirteenth century he was unable to rely upon any one particular source that could act as Robert Fabyan, William of Malmesbury and Matthew Paris had done before. For this period there was no one chronicle that stood out from the rest and therefore Foxe turned instead to an abundance of complementary manuscripts. The most vital were the *Historia Anglicana (Historia Brevis)* by Thomas Walsingham, the anonymous *Chronicon Angliæ*, the *De gestis mirabilibus regis Edwardi tertii* by Robert of Avesbury, an untitled chronicle by Walter of Guisborough, and the *Annales sex regum Angliæ* by Nicholas Trivet. Together these chronicles helped Foxe to describe the true and false churches as Bale had taught him to see them. However, Foxe's use of these texts is further complicated by the fact that most of these histories were heavily borrowed or copied from one another, to a greater degree than Foxe had found previously. The *Historia Anglicana*, *Chronicon Angliæ*, and *De Gestis mirabilibus* were all very similar chronicles, with at least the majority of the narrative having originally been composed by Thomas Walsingham. We can observe that between the 1570 and 1576 editions, Foxe corrected various references he had made to 'Avesbury' to their correct reference; 'Walsingham'.¹¹⁵ This reveals that Foxe himself was easily confused between his manuscript copies for this portion of his account. One was much like another. Where Foxe does provide references in his text to his sources – and these are not often in this portion of the text – we must be even more suspicious of

¹¹⁵ See Freeman and Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England* (forthcoming).

their accuracy than usual. Most of Foxe's borrowing for this period is not only confused by what references he provided, but also by the fact that, for the most part, he furnished none at all.

One version of the *Historia Anglicana* was in Foxe's hands in the 1550s and we can see that he consulted it for the *Commentarii*. This manuscript is a fifteenth-century copy now named Arundel MS 7 and entitled *Chronicon Angliæ*.¹¹⁶ It was once in the possession of Lord William Howard of Naworth, and as suggested by Freeman and Evenden, was obtained by Foxe independently of Bale.¹¹⁷ Matthew Parker provided the second manuscript, BL Harley MS 3634, for use in the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.¹¹⁸ Foxe generally referred to this edition as 'Historia Monachi D. Albani' and noted that he had borrowed it from the archbishop. In other instances he would refer to it as a manuscript obtained from William Carye.¹¹⁹ The third manuscript, Douce MS 128 is a copy of Robert of Avesbury's chronicle borrowed again from Matthew Parker having previously belonged to John Stephenson.¹²⁰ In Book Four, Foxe mentioned that the 'story of Robertus Avesbur. remaining in the library of J.

¹¹⁶ The attribution to Foxe's ownership of Arundel MS 7 is put forward in the Freeman and Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England* (forthcoming), ch. 2. From Foxe the manuscript appears to have been handed to Matthew Parker. Henry T. Riley (ed.), *Thomae Walsingham, Quidam Monachi S. Albani, Historia Anglicana* (London, 1863), p. xi-xii was the first to suggest that Matthew Parker's published edition perpetuated errors which can only be found in Arundel MS 7. This manuscript is now published as *Chronicon Angliæ, ab Anno Domini 1328 usque ad Annum 1388: Auctore Monacho Quodam Sancti Albani*, edited by Edward M. Thompson (London, 1874).

¹¹⁷ Freeman and Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England* (forthcoming), ch. 2.

¹¹⁸ Thompson (ed.), *Chronicon Angliæ*, p. xviii believed that Foxe had used Cotton MS Otho CII, although he admitted that Foxe could have borrowed Harley MS 3634. However, in the forthcoming book by Freeman and Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England* (forthcoming), ch. 5, evidence to the contrary has convincingly suggested that Foxe had borrowed Harley MS 3634. Foxe, Parker and Stow have all annotated the manuscript.

¹¹⁹ Foxe references this manuscript mainly in Book Five of the *A&M*, but it was almost certainly a source for the latter part of book four as well. This is signified when Foxe compared it to an account in Polydore Vergil's history and noted that 'One I am sure came to his perusing [Polydore Vergil], an olde auncient Latine history fayre written in parchment (but without name) belonging to the library of Willia(m) Cary citizen of Lond.'. Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 469-471 with Polydore Vergil, lib. 18 cap. 9 and Walsingham I, pp. 171-180.

¹²⁰ See Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1. This manuscript appears to have belonged to John Stephenson, then to Foxe, then Parker, who lent the manuscript to William Lambarde. It is now printed in *Robertus de Avesbury de gestis mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Tertii*, edited by Edward M. Thompson (London, 1889).

Stevenson of London' was the source of a letter between Edward III and Pope Benedict XII, that he did not have room to print.¹²¹ John Stephenson might be identified as a canon of Lichfield c. 1557-1562, but this is uncertain.¹²² Foxe's use of this manuscript is again linked to Matthew Parker, who passed the manuscript to William Lambarde sometime after 1573.¹²³

These three manuscripts formed the basis for Foxe's account of Edward I, and his war with Scotland, the quarrel between Philip IV of France and Pope Boniface VIII, Edward II and Piers Gaveston, and the reign of Edward III (including the one hundred years war). Inserted into these stories were other sources, which provided pivotal evidence to add to the wider narrative. Some materials came from Bale and Flacius' catalogues. Foxe also presented certain documents obtained from the French archives intended to strengthen and add to the continual theme of papal usurpation of secular power. Freeman has suggested that Flacius himself might have supplied Foxe with these documents.¹²⁴ For the disagreement between Philip IV of France and Pope Boniface VIII, Foxe cited a series of documents that were later published in the seventeenth century by Pierre Dupuy.¹²⁵ We can be almost certain that Foxe never had access to the French Royal archives. Freeman has also noted that Foxe published the material out of chronological order, which might suggest that he was working from a series of copies. Flacius is the likely contender for providing this material, as he had already printed an example from the original letters in his *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*.¹²⁶ If this is correct,

¹²¹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 477. This letter can be found in Walsingham I, pp. 201-208.

¹²² *Clergy of the Church of England Database* (CCED), www.theclergydatabase.org.uk [Accessed January 2009]. Thompson (ed.), *Robertus de Avesbury*, p. xxv; only notes that the name 'John Stephynson' in the manuscript (Douce MS. 128) is in a fifteenth or sixteenth-century hand.

¹²³ Thompson, *Robertus de Avesbury*, p. xxv.

¹²⁴ Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1, fn. 79-80.

¹²⁵ Pierre Dupuy, *Histoire du différend d'entre le pape Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel...* (Paris, 1655), pp. 56-9, 101-113.

¹²⁶ *CTV* (1562), p. 476.

and it is currently only an assumption, then this is further evidence of Foxe's connection to Flacius and his reliance upon his work.

iii. Walter of Guisborough and the Baronial Wars

When Foxe came to recount the latter part of the reign of Henry III characterised by the baronial rebellions under Simon de Montfort, sixth Earl of Leicester (1208-1265) he claimed to set aside his ecclesiastical mandate for a while so that he could use these secular calamities for a polemical purpose. The fear of rebellion involving Mary Queen of Scots was active after 1567 and Foxe, noting many lessons to be learned from Henry III's baronial conflict, and perhaps prompted by Matthew Parker's concern to use history as a defence against rebellious incitement, decided to describe in some detail the secular events as a means of providing 'much fruitful example, both for princes and subiectes to behold and looke upo(n), to see what mischiefe and inconuenience groweth in co(m)mon weales, where studye of mutuall concorde lacketh'.¹²⁷ However, the account was not entirely devoid of ecclesiastical content. Foxe used the conflict to provide yet another illustration of how papal interference was the root cause of England's troubles. Henry III's marriage with Eleanor, daughter of the count of Provence is blamed for 'opening the doors' to foreigners, especially papal legates whilst the pope is accused of abusing his power of absolution by making the Oxford agreement null and void.¹²⁸

¹²⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 418. Part of Matthew Parker's propaganda campaign was concerned with the danger of rebellion see Vivienne Sanders, 'The Household of Archbishop Parker and the Influencing of Public Opinion', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 34 (1983), pp. 534-547.

¹²⁸ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 418 and *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 414 respectively.

The baronial conflict covers about ten folio pages in Book Four and contains summarised details of its various battles, councils and failed agreements.¹²⁹ Most of this material came from a handful of sources; Nicholas Trivet's *Annales sex regum Angliæ*, the *Flores Historiarum* attributed to Matthew of Westminster, and the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough. Foxe referenced the last of these items as both 'Hemingford' and 'Gisburn', with both names occasionally rehearsed for the same reference.¹³⁰ Foxe did own a continuation of Walter of Guisborough compiled by John Bale from a mixture of old manuscript leaves and sixteenth-century transcripts, but this manuscript began in 1327 and focused on the reign of Edward III.¹³¹ As far as it is known, Foxe only had access to one copy of the actual chronicle, which was provided by Matthew Parker.¹³²

Walter of Guisborough is clearly the main source for Foxe's account of the Battles of Lewes, Evesham and Kenilworth Castle as well as providing the occasional additional material on the thirteenth-century papacy.¹³³ Interestingly it is also Foxe's primary

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, bk. 4, pp. 418-427.

¹³⁰ This occurs on two occasions. First when describing the death of King Richard I in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 317 where Hemingford and Guisborough are named alongside an unidentified manuscript belonging to William Carye, the chronicle attributed to John Brompton and 'Historia Regis Richardi 2' which is probably a reference to Walter of Coventry. Second, Foxe references both Hemingford and Guisborough in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 419 when describing Simon de Montfort's petition to Henry III against his favouring of foreigners. In Harry Rothewell (ed.), *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough* (Camden Society, 3rd series, 89, London, 1957), p. xxiv suggests that the attribution to Walter of Hemingford was an invention of John Bale, which held 'no more authority than that'.

¹³¹ This manuscript is Magdalen College MS Latin 53.

¹³² Matthew Parker's copy is CCC MS 250. This is a sixteenth-century transcript. Another possibility is Cambridge University Library MS. Dd. 2.5, a fourteenth-century copy, which had come to Parker in a mutilated form, and had therefore undergone a 'completion' process in which ff. 253-4 were reinserted in a counterfeited hand. Both were in Parker's collection.

¹³³ Compare the account of the battle of Lewes in *A&M*, 1570, pp. 423-4 with WG, pp. 191-4, the battle of Evesham in *A&M*, 1570, p. 425 with WG, pp. 198-202 and the siege of Kenilworth Castle in *A&M*, 1570, pp. 426-7 with WG, pp. 202-4. For incidences of papal history in the *Acts and Monuments* compare the account of Innocent II in *A&M*, 1570, p. 257 with WG, p. 34 and the correction of a date in *CTV* (1562), pp. 504-5 on the oppression of the Waldensians with WG, pp. 56-7 in *A&M*, 1570, p. 260. For more details on Foxe's use of Walter of Guisborough for the papacy see Freeman, 'Papal History', pt. 1.

source for Magna Carta.¹³⁴ There are basically two points in the narrative where Foxe deals with the English charters. The first – during the account of King John - could almost be missed, as very little is made of it, and it is not mentioned by name until the subsequent discussion during the account of papal abuses during the reign of Henry III.¹³⁵ In this instance, also, Magna Carta is little more than a by-product of a discussion into papal extortion and interference in England. These references were derived directly out of the *Chronica Majora*.¹³⁶ The second account appeared for the year 1224 in Foxe's narrative on Henry III, when Magna Carta and the Carta Foresta were reconfirmed. This time, the charters were the central focus for the discussion. The early years of Henry III's reign were almost entirely derived from Matthew Paris with a few interpolations from the *Flores Historiarum* and Nicholas Trivet, but when Foxe came to the reconfirmation of Magna Carta and Carta Foresta he migrated to an alternative text; Walter of Guisborough.

That same chronicle was also consulted for the charters recounted during the subsequent reign of Edward I, this time linked to a papal Bull issued by Pope Boniface IX that decreed that no church or ecclesiastical person should yield tributes to a secular prince.

According to Foxe that Bull went against 'the commaunded ordinance of God and the

¹³⁴ J.C. Holt, 'The St Albans Chroniclers and Magna Carta', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 14 (1964), pp. 67-88 discusses the relationship and similarities between Matthew Paris and Walter of Guisborough's skewed understanding of Magna Carta and its history.

¹³⁵ In the account of King John (*A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 325) Magna Carta is more alluded to than providing an outright statement of its origin in John's reign whilst Foxe clearly states in the reign of Henry III that it was conceived at this time (*A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 418). It would seem likely that the author of King John in the 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* was not aware that he was talking about Magna Carta. This is not too surprising as Ralph V. Turner, *Magna Carta Through the Ages* (Edinburgh, 2003), p. 140 confirms that it was largely unknown as late as the 1560s that the charter was the result of the baronial wars of king John's reign and not that of Henry III. Although Foxe is clearly aware that it began in King John's reign by the 1570 edition, he does not update the account in King John. There is no obvious reason for this other than the possibility put forward by Freeman, 'John Bale's "Book of Martyrs?"', pp. 175-223 that Foxe was preserving one of the final pieces of work by his old friend and mentor, John Bale, who had died in November 1563.

¹³⁶ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 325 with *CM* II, pp. 615-20, 627-30 and 633-34 and compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 365 with *CM* III, pp. 75-6.

Apostolicall canon of S. Peter, and all other examples of holye scripture'.¹³⁷ Although, Matthew Paris' account had ended before the reign of Edward, it seems unlikely that Foxe missed the narrative for 1224 in the *Chronica Majora*.¹³⁸ It would appear that this use of sources is a result of Foxe categorising their specific purpose. Matthew Paris was generally to be used as a source for attacking the papacy whilst Walter of Guisborough was a source generally interrogated for the baronial wars and thus, by its relation to these battles, the Magna Carta.

Beyond all this, it is possible that a third manuscript of Walter of Guisborough may also have been used in the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. Thomas Freeman has identified an independent extract from Walter of Guisborough's chronicle in the last-minute addition of a section entitled 'the Image of Antichrist', at the end of Book Six.¹³⁹

It appears that Parker's household, rather than Foxe himself, compiled this entry for the *Acts and Monuments* to strengthen Foxe's argument against Roman Catholic critics; most especially Thomas Stapleton, who had successfully attacked Foxe's account of

¹³⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 444. The Bull is printed in full in Walter of Guisborough (Hemingford II, pp. 66-7), whilst the reconfirmation of Magna Carta was contained in WG, pp. 309-313.

¹³⁸ Compare *A&M*, 1570, p. 345 to WG, pp. 162-173. A similar account appears in CM III, pp. 91-2. This short section in the text has all the appearances of being an interpolation into a section in which Foxe is relying on Matthew Paris as his primary source. He has also used evidence from Nicholas Trivet, Arundel MS 5 (*Scala Mundi*), and the *Flores Historiarum* largely in conjunction with the *Chronica Majora*. It would seem likely that Foxe composed this section whilst researching the later baronial conflict and inserted this short section into the relevant chronological location. It would certainly seem that this short account is the result of Foxe attempting to gain some understanding of the chronological history of the Cartas as he also mentions that the Magna Carta was again reaffirmed in 1236.

¹³⁹ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 6, pp. 929-930. The manuscript is Cambridge University Library MS. Dd. 2.5 and according to Freeman, 'John Bale's "Book of Martyrs?"', pp. 209-210, its use here (*A&M*, 1570, bk. 6, pp. 929-930) mirrors the previous account at the end of the account of King John (*A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 335-6), and yet makes no illusion to the former. The other sources that were used to strengthen Foxe's original account of the poisoning were such that Foxe himself could not have been the compiler. Three anonymous chronicles, including one in French, are unidentified, Foxe could not read the French language, so this makes his use of at least one of these chronicles unlikely. Another chronicle he mentions which began 'Adam pater generis humani, etc' belonged to Parker (Trinity College Cambridge MS R. 7.13 ff. 1r-50v) as did the remaining seven sources that were listed: another French chronicle entitled the *Scalachronicon* (CCCC MS 133), the *Poychronicon* (of which both Foxe and Parker had copies), Thomas Rudbourne's *Epitome Historis Majoris* or his *Historia Minor* (CCCC MS 110), 'Richard Rede in novo Chronico ad tempora Henry 6' which matches CCCC MS 311, and a copy of the *Brut* (CCCC MS 182).

John's poisoning in his *A Counterblast to M. Hornes vayne blaste*. It is significant that the compiler of the account in the *Acts and Monuments* had left out a detail on why John was poisoned. Walter of Guisborough's account that John had been poisoned related that it was in order to prevent him from seducing a nun who was also the sister of the Abbot of Swineshead.¹⁴⁰ This omission is obviously polemical and again reflects the ideological and methodological assumptions with which the reformers interrogated their sources.

iv. Nicholas Trivet

Other than the chronicle belonging to Walter of Guisborough and the texts related to Matthew Paris the account of the baronial wars occasionally borrowed from the *Annales sex regum Angliæ* by Nicholas Trivet, as did various other sections of Book Four. The *Annals* of Nicholas Trivet have been described by John Taylor as the first attempt in fourteenth-century England to write a universal history, thus beating Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* by some years.¹⁴¹ Although it never attained the same level of popularity as Higden's text in England, it fared better in France.¹⁴² As far as Foxe was concerned this was a useful history to use for comparison, corroboration and dismissal of facts in other chronicles. The arrival date of the Grey friars (Minorites) in England was taken from the *Flores Historiarum* and then corroborated with Trivet's *Annals*.¹⁴³ Similarly the death of Pope Innocent IV in 1254, who had nightmares and visions over the death of Robert Grosseteste was taken initially from Bale's *Catalogus*, which cited the *Polychronicon* as its source and then further corroborated with Matthew Paris'

¹⁴⁰ Freeman, 'Bale's "Book of Martyrs?"', p. 209. The account is in WG, pp. 154-156.

¹⁴¹ John Taylor, *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1987), ch. 5.

¹⁴² Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, p. 97.

¹⁴³ Compare A&M, 1570, pp. 343-4 with *Flores* II, p. 187-8 and Trivet, p. 211.

Chronica Majora, the *Flores Historiarum* and Nicholas Trivet's *Annals*.¹⁴⁴ Foxe referenced all of these texts including the *Polychronicon*, which he may or may not have looked at himself. Trivet was also used for individual accounts of Jewish history and summarized accounts of events placed at the end of each king's reign. The *Annals* were Foxe's source for the life and death of Stephen Langton, the scholarship of Robert Grosseteste, and the marriage of Henry III to Eleanor of Provence.¹⁴⁵ Foxe also used Trivet as a counterweight to Thomas Walsingham's chronicle for the account of Edward I. Foxe had relied almost entirely on Thomas Walsingham, occasionally adding in material from William Rashanger's continuation of the *Flores Historiarum* (published as one chronicle by Matthew Parker) and a few other sources such as Bale's *Catalogus*, and the chronicles belonging to Platina and Walter of Guisborough. Trivet's role was to provide alternative authority for selected information such as events concerning Pope Boniface IX, the tale of Cardinal William Testa, and a council at Carlyle in 1307.¹⁴⁶

Trivet's *Annals* was used in this way in order to mitigate its 'monkish' agenda. Trivet had claimed to be producing 'patriotic histories', deeply entrenched in his Benedictine order.¹⁴⁷ His *Annals* reflected his deep-rooted belief in the religious orders, his support of the papacy and his reverence for King Edward I. Trivet's training at Oxford and

¹⁴⁴ Compare *A&M*, 1570, p. 416 with *Catalogus*, p. 288, *CM V*, pp. 471-2, *Flores II*, p. 404 and Trivet, pp. 243-4.

¹⁴⁵ For example in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 259, Trivet, pp. 11, 18 is used to list names and details of various scholars in the time of King Stephen whilst in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 298, Trivet, pp. 81-2, 88 is used to discuss various events at the end of Henry II's reign including the burning of Jews. Trivet, p. 316 is again used for Jewish history in Henry III's reign (*A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 416). The life of Stephen Langton is copied almost word-for-word in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 349 from Trivet, p. 216, the scholarship of Robert Grosseteste in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 410-411 from Trivet, pp. 242-3, and Henry III's marriage in *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 418-9 from Trivet, p. 220. The history of the Jews in the *Acts and Monuments* is another interesting element of Foxe's compilation of the past, explained by the apocalyptic framework. Although this topic is beyond the scope of this thesis there is a useful study on the subject which reflects the examination of Foxe's history depicted here. See Sharon Achinstein, 'John Foxe and the Jews', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54:1 (2002), pp. 86-120.

¹⁴⁶ For Boniface compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 432-3 with Trivet, pp. 379-94 and *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 435 with Trivet, pp. 378-9. For William Testa and the council at Carlyle compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 447 with Trivet, pp. 407-411.

¹⁴⁷ Trivet himself declared that he was writing a patriotic history in his preface. See Trivet, pp. 2-3.

Paris also meant that his *Annals* was strongly scholastic although, as John Taylor comments, this does not mean that he rigidly applied that technique but only that it influenced the form and content of his writing.¹⁴⁸ These factors made it a less useful source for argument in the *Acts and Monuments* than the less cautious St Albans chroniclers, who were more willing to give a negative review of popes and princes. However, as a source of factual corroboration, Trivet was in a league of his own. His *Annals* were clearly organised not only by the year (*anno domini*) but also by the regnal years of popes, emperors, kings of France and kings of England.¹⁴⁹ The manuscript had been given an index by John Bale and had been glossed by Bale's marginalia, which highlighted important points and events, the beginning of new topics, and provided a guide as to how the material could be put to useful protestant scholarship.¹⁵⁰

v. *The Anti-Fraternal Tradition*

Briefly moving on from the chronicles composed by medieval monks we find that Foxe also used sources in opposition to the papacy. In particular Foxe engaged with late-medieval anti-fraternal literary writings, to show that a variety of learned men had written against the papacy and in criticism of monastic orders.¹⁵¹ This tradition began around the mid-thirteenth century and included, most particularly the writings of Geoffrey Chaucer. It is significant, however, that Foxe never used any of Chaucer's own writings but rather lesser known tracts. This included a Lollard anti-fraternal story entitled *Jack Upland*. *Jack Upland* had been published under the pseudonym of

¹⁴⁸ Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, p. 39.

¹⁴⁹ See CCC MS 152 or the printed edition by Thomas Hog. This is also briefly emphasised by John Taylor, *Chronicles*, p. 124.

¹⁵⁰ For more details on John Bale's impositions on CCC MS 152 see chapter six of this thesis.

¹⁵¹ For more details on the anti-fraternal traditions see Penn R. Szittyá, *The Anti-fraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature* (Princeton, 1986).

Chaucer in the 1540s, as a means of avoiding the censorship of Lollard texts by the Henrician *Act of Six Articles*.¹⁵² It had been published twice, first by John Gough (d. 1543/4) and then by John Day, who, of course, would later work with John Foxe on the *Acts and Monuments*.¹⁵³ Here, then, we have an interesting opportunity to comment on the Foxe-Day relationship, and on how Foxe was able to resort to his printer's own publication history, as a means of adding spice to his narrative. The provision of a ready-to-print edition of *Jack Upland* provided Foxe with an opportunity to trace, through an association of Chaucer to Wyclif as 'faithful witnesses', the continued existence of an apostolic congregation in the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries.¹⁵⁴

To further substantiate such a claim, Foxe also printed the thirty-nine arguments of William of St Amour against friars and monastic 'sects'.¹⁵⁵ In this instance, Foxe framed the material with evidence of preachers and writers in the thirteenth century whose works had attacked the papacy. Foxe tells us of preachers in Sweden accusing the Pope of heresy, of a Spaniard named Arnold who claimed the Pope's church had been seduced by Satan, and of a German named John Semeca, who had at first written decrees on behalf of the pope, only to fall from favour for resisting Clement IV's extortionate gathering of taxes from Germany. Foxe extracted all of this information from Flacius' *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*.¹⁵⁶ Then, from the same source and perhaps

¹⁵² See P.L. Heyworth, 'The Earliest Black-letter editions of "Jack Upland"', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 30:4 (1967), pp. 307-314. For the context of the sixteenth-century English suppression of Lollard and reformist tracts see David Loades, 'Books and the English Reformation prior to 1558', in Karin Maag and Jean-François Gilmont (eds & trans.), *The Reformation and the Book* (2nd ed., Aldershot, 1998), pp. 264-291. Another tract that was similarly used in this way is the *Piers Plowman*, which was assigned to Chaucer in Robert Crowley's 1550 edition. See John N. King, 'Robert Crowley's editions of "Piers Plowman": A Tudor Apocalypse', *Modern Philology*, 73:4 (1976), pp. 342-352.

¹⁵³ For details on John Gough and John Day's editions see Erea Kempton Maxfield, 'Chaucer and Religious Reform', *PMLA*, 39:1 (1924), pp. 64-74.

¹⁵⁴ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 335-9.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 398-409. William of St-Amour is widely acclaimed as inaugurating the anti-fraternal tradition and is therefore described in detail in Szittyá, *The Anti-fraternal Tradition*.

¹⁵⁶ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 403. These accounts were all taken from *CTV* (1556), pp. 799-801, 856-7.

also from a reading of Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora*, Foxe provided a biography on William of St Amour and noted that this 'worthie and valiant champion of Christ and aduersary of Antichrist' was 'condemned for an heretique, exiled, and hys bookes brente'.¹⁵⁷ The thirty-nine articles, which Foxe prints in full, derive from William's *De Periculis novissimorum Temporum* (1256). We do not know from which source Foxe derived that material. It had not been printed and Flacius did not include it in his catalogue. One possibility is a manuscript in Parker's collection largely containing the works written by Arnold of Bonneval, and which also includes William's articles.¹⁵⁸ As evidence, the articles gave Foxe the opportunity to let his source do the work for him. He added little additional commentary to the document but simply told his readers to listen to what William had to say. After this in-depth narrative on William, Foxe then returned to Flacius' catalogue (and possibly Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora*) to produce other examples of books burnt at this time by the Pope.¹⁵⁹

Foxe provided a similar context for *Jack Upland*, placing the tract in a discursive discussion on the Cathars, the monastic orders, and the prophecies of Hildegard of Bingen.¹⁶⁰ Foxe had first inserted the list of 101 monastic orders and his narrative on Hildegard in 1563, but now he added *Jack Upland* and the Cathars into the mix. Foxe linked Hildegard's prophecies as written down in her *Scivias*, *Liber vitae meritorum* and *Liber divionorum operum*, to the Cathar persecution and in turn to the Lollards. Then in parallel, Foxe linked the prophecies to the corruption of the monastic orders (as

¹⁵⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 403-4. This information was derived from *CTV* (1556), pp. 801-5. It is possible that Foxe also consulted *CM V*, pp. 598-600 as Matthew Paris is referred to by Flacius, and also copied by Foxe.

¹⁵⁸ This manuscript is CCC MS 103. The articles of William of St Amour can be found in section 8 (see James Catalogue for details).

¹⁵⁹ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp 409-10 with *CTV* (1556), pp. 803-6, 840-3, 872-3 and *CM V*, pp. 599-600.

¹⁶⁰ For background details on Hildegard of Bingen see Sabina Flanagan, *Hildegard of Bingen 1098-1179: A visionary Life* (London, 1989). For the prophecies contained in the *Scivias* see Flanagan's fourth chapter entitled 'The Ways of God', pp. 57-79.

outlined largely from material gathered from John Bale), before inserting *Jack Upland* to further establish the point against friars.¹⁶¹ The anti-fraternal tradition had enabled Foxe to link up divergent themes in his account to show how one was related to the other through the corrosive power of the Antichrist.

vi. Summary

These were, then, Foxe's sources for compiling Book Four for the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. As we have seen Foxe used monastic chronicles in combination with fifteenth and sixteenth-century accounts to compile most of his narrative. In addition, Foxe emphasised evidence derived from anti-papal or anti-clerical authors as further evidence that the Antichrist had not entirely defeated the Church of Christ. As Foxe claimed in his prefaces, this was a history of two churches 'especially of the poore oppressed and persecuted Church of Christ'.¹⁶²

For Foxe, late medieval history was a story of two parts. First there was the rising up of Antichrist in the role of the pope and the Turk. This period in history culminated in the enthrallment of Christian countries around the beginning of the thirteenth century. Then, Foxe found that when the Antichrist had become dominant, signs of the true church became more apparent in the form of 'heretical' movements and in the writings of learned men. From the diversity of his sources, Foxe attempted to write the history of these two parts and to emphasise both churches in comparison to the other and as preparation for what was to come next: protestant Reformation.

¹⁶¹ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 332 with *Catalogus*, pp. 234-5.

¹⁶² *A&M*, 1570, *A Protestation to the whole Church of England* [Prefaces], p. 3.

Foxe used a corpus of medieval chronicles and annals, which had been compiled by monks largely hostile to his own opinion of history and in particular in opposition to his protestant beliefs. Yet, Foxe believed that these texts could hold truth – some more than others. How, though, did he use them? Well, Foxe took a selective approach; borrowing what was useful and ignoring what was not. As discussed in chapter three, there was more to this methodology than the prejudice that this implies. Foxe chose what material he felt reflected ‘God’s truth’, and ignored the rest as the corrupted fabrications or ignorant fallacies of an ousted institution. Foxe also added his own glosses and instructions to the reader on how to read material which was in opposition to his own beliefs. However, he could not always do this as such a course might have left him open to the accusation of undue authorial imposition upon his sources. He therefore used other methods such as producing material in a new order so that he could put across his points and arguments with the original points skewed to his own interpretations. Foxe’s printing of documentation in opposition to his own views was therefore placed within a carefully prepared framework, which would make them say what Foxe wanted them to say. This, then, was how Foxe constructed his argument for the post-Conquest material in Book Four. As he had done for his pre-Gregorian history, Foxe selected certain texts over others to act as his main authority, with which other texts were then compared. First he tested the text against contemporary protestant literature, then against other medieval chronicles and annals. Occasionally, Foxe would also insert a tract or portion of material verbatim, such as *Jack Upland*. Each of these sources was tied into his pre-established text from the 1563 edition and into his conception of the past, as interpreted through Scripture. As we discussed, Foxe’s opinion on the role of Antichrist and the bound Satan during this period of history, did not directly impact his actual text that often. However, in interpreting his materials

these concepts were nevertheless part of his language and understanding. Foxe could not read the medieval chronicles without seeing the work of Antichrist everywhere. Through such means Foxe wrote one of the first accounts of the middle ages as a distinct period of time. Foxe did not call it the middle age as such, nor would he have quite conceived of it in those terms. However, Foxe did see a break or rupture, where Satan was once again loosened, and history took a turn for the worse. With these thoughts in mind we shall now move onto which manuscripts Foxe actually used to compile that account and from where he retrieved them.

4. Paper Trails

The sources used to compile Book Four derive from various parts of Foxe's contact network. For the corpus of medieval sources, Foxe had gathered some himself; others were borrowed from John Bale and other scholars, many of which were provided from the household of Matthew Parker. For instance the manuscript copies of Gervase of Canterbury (CCCC MS 438) and Matthew Paris (CCCC MS 26/16) were both obtained through Parker. For Anselm's letters, Foxe provided numbers for each document, linking it to CCCC MS 135, which contains the same numbering and is again to be found with Parker. Foxe's extracts from the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough were probably obtained either through a sixteenth-century version (CCCC MS 250) or a fourteenth century version (Cambridge University Library MS Dd. 2.5). Again, both owned by Parker. The continuation of Walter of Guisborough, obtained through John Bale, could only have been used from 1327 (Magdalen College, Oxford, Latin MS 53). The *Annals* of Nicholas Trivet as found in CCCC MS 152, came either via Bale or

directly from Parker. Although we cannot be certain where Foxe inserted material from Walter of Coventry we do know that he consulted two manuscript copies. One derived directly from Bale. This is Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 36, which contains annotations by both Foxe and Bale.¹⁶³ The other is CCCC MS 175, which belonged to Parker.¹⁶⁴ The *Chronicon Angliæ* was borrowed from Parker and also lent to John Stow (BL Harley MS 3634). The text attributed to Robert of Avesbury (Douce MS 128) was derived through Parker from John Stephenson. The *Historia Anglicana (Historia Brevis)* compiled by Thomas Walsingham derived from a copy that Foxe owned (Arundel MS 7).

Foxe's copy of the *Flores Historiarum* is more difficult to identify. However, a link to Matthew Parker is almost certain. Parker had collected various copies, especially in the later 1560s when he realised that his first published edition was incomplete and inadequate.¹⁶⁵ Therefore various manuscripts as well as Parker's first published edition are potential candidates.¹⁶⁶ The question is, which one? This would be difficult to answer if it were not for internal evidence in the *Acts and Monuments* themselves that reveals the textual origins of Foxe's consultation with the *Flores Historiarum*. This points to one particular probability, from the evidence on William Longsparta's wife. Foxe wrote that 'William de longa spata, which was the bastard sonne of kyng Henry 2. & Earle of Salisbury: was first founded the hosue of the Carthusia(n) monks at Heytrope.an. 1222. After whose death, his wife Ela was tra(n)slated to (th)e house of

¹⁶³ Foxe on Magdalen College Oxford Latin MS 36 f. 8v-25v and Bale throughout that manuscript.

¹⁶⁴ Foxe has noted that Walter of Coventry had borrowed part of his account from Roger Hoveden on CCCC MS 175, f. 43v.

¹⁶⁵ As listed in *Flores* I, pp. xliii-xliv the first edition was taken entirely from MS E. Eton Collage. The second edition was a conflation of the former copy with MS Bibl. Bodleian Laud 572, BL MS Cotton Claudus E.8, and BL MS Cotton Nero D.2.

¹⁶⁶ The second edition of the *Flores Historiarum* was published in the same year that the 1570 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* and is therefore too late for Foxe to have used.

Hentone in Barkshyre. An. 1227'.¹⁶⁷ For this information Foxe referenced the *Flores Historiarum*.

In the nineteenth-century edition of the *Flores Historiarum* the editor, Henry Richard Luard, noted that this material was only found in one manuscript copy from Norwich that had been produced for its bishop, Henry Spencer in the late fourteenth century.¹⁶⁸ Furthermore, this manuscript copy uniquely contained additional information on the children of various kings of England and on at least one occasion, when describing the children of William I, the *Flores Historiarum* is a likely, albeit not the only, candidate.¹⁶⁹ Neither the 1567 edition of Parker's *Flores Historiarum* nor John Bale's *Catalogus* contained these particular details and it is unlikely that Foxe was able to get them elsewhere. The manuscript itself has at least two hands providing annotations, one of which bears a resemblance to Foxe's own hand, and which on at least one occasion compares the text to 'Matt Paris fol. 263', which agrees with Parker's copy of Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora*, which Foxe had also borrowed. This strongly suggests which copy of the *Flores Historiarum* Foxe used and, interestingly, gives us further evidence, although uncertain, for co-operation with the antiquarian John Stow.¹⁷⁰ Stow appears as a frequent link between Parker and Foxe and the possibility that they shared the *Flores Historiarum* as well only adds to this interesting element of collaboration and the sharing of materials.

¹⁶⁷ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 344.

¹⁶⁸ This is BL MS Cotton Claudus E 8. See *Flores I*, p. 188.

¹⁶⁹ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 237 with *Flores II*, p. 15. Other possibilities include Brompton, col. 978; Huntingdon, lib 6 cap. 40; and *Eulogium III*, pp. 41-2.

¹⁷⁰ This was suggested by Thomas D. Hardy, *Descriptive catalogue of Materials relating to the history of Great Britain and Irenad, to the end of the reign of Henry VII*, vol. 3 (London, 1871), p. 313 and partially agreed upon by Luard in *Flores I*, pp. xxiv-xxvi. However Luard in *Flores I*, pp. xxi-xxii has also noted that Frederic Madden in *HA*, p. xx believed that it was BL MS Cotton Otho C 2 which belonged to John Stow, so this assertion must remain just that for the moment.

The authority and frequency with which Foxe alluded to his sources confirms that Parker's contributions were significant for the re-appropriation of post-Gregorian history. The chronicles of Gervase of Canterbury, Matthew Paris, and Thomas Walsingham all derived from Parker's collection and were given significant authority in the text. Again, the *Flores Historiarum* was borrowed from Parker and given a prominent role in supporting Foxe's arguments. However, the basic argument remained an earlier construction at least as far as the account of Henry III. Foxe added and expanded upon his 1563 text, but rarely altered what he had previously written. Admittedly, from the second half of Henry III's reign the account was largely new, and it is here where there was more scope for Parker's manuscripts to provide the basic argument. To a large extent Parker's manuscripts enabled him to do this, but almost only in relation to English events. For continental stories Foxe continued to expand upon his reliance on John Bale and Matthias Flacius Illyricus.

Beyond the connection to Parker we also find that Foxe borrowed other sources. Foxe inserted almost verbatim parts of Pierre Bertrand's tract about the French Parliament in 1329, which touched upon the jurisdiction of temporal princes and the church.¹⁷¹ Pierre Bertrand and the Pope's chief official at the Parlement, recorded King Philip VI's position as read by Pierre de Cugnières, including a list of sixty-four articles, which complained about the corruption of the clergy. Foxe used this account as evidence that papal avarice was inflicted on France as well as England in the early fourteenth century. To do so, Foxe added his own commentary, which attacked every point Bertrand had raised against Cugnières, as a means of revealing how misguided his position had been.

¹⁷¹ Compare *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, pp. 448-463 with Petrus Bertrandus, *Libellus de iurisdictione ecclesiastica contra Petrum de Cugneriis* (Paris, 1495).

Foxe had also obtained a manuscript copy of the second portion of Fabyan's fifteenth-century *New Chronicles*, which he could compare to the printed editions. Examination of MS Cotton Nero C XI, by C. L. Kingsford, has shown that this chronicle is an entirely different London chronicle and not the same as Fabyan's. In this regard the sixteenth-century printed editions should be viewed as an amalgam of Fabyan's *New Chronicles* and an anonymous text now named the *Great Chronicle*.¹⁷² This manuscript begins with the reign of Richard I (the point where Fabyan ends his account) but is more annalistic and focused on the civic history of London; Fabyan's chronicle, had been more detailed, with a strong narrative and focused essentially on Anglo-Saxon history. At the point where Fabyan's chronicle ends, so too does Foxe's reliance upon it for pre-Lollard history. However, there is the occasional reference to London charters and liberties, which could have been taken either from the printed or manuscript copies. In Book Five, Foxe does again use Fabyan as a witness to his own times.¹⁷³ In one instance he refers to both the printed and manuscript versions confirming that he did indeed use both.¹⁷⁴ From evidence in the manuscript and in print, we can also link Foxe's use of this manuscript to the antiquarian John Stow, who would later use it for several of his histories including his *Survey of London* (1598). These examples bear witness to the diversity of sources which Foxe was prepared to engage with and the methods with which he analysed them.

Foxe concluded his post-Gregorian history by proudly proclaiming that 'this fourth booke, wherin, sufficiently hath been described the excessiue pride and po(m)pe of

¹⁷² See C.L. Kingsford, *English historical literature in the fifteenth century* (Oxford, 1913); and A.H. Thomas & I.D. Thornley, *The Great Chronicle of London* (London, 1938).

¹⁷³ See *A&M*, 1570, bk. 5, pp. 612, 677, 686, 830-1 for the use of Fabyan in the fifteenth-century account.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 1563, bk. 6, p. 866. See Thomas and Thornley, *The Great Chronicle of London*, p. xvi.

Antichrist, florishyng in his ruffe and securitie'.¹⁷⁵ In the 1563 edition, Foxe had admitted that his post-Gregorian history only highlighted the most essential and pivotal moments that depicted the rise of the Antichrist and the corruption of the Roman Catholic Church. The provision of a greater manuscript base meant that Foxe was able and willing to transform this brief account into a fully-fledged history. Foxe adapted his apocalyptic vision of the past and strengthened pre-existing themes with further proof in other times. The controversy concerning Thomas Becket was enhanced by numerous other stories of contentions in other times. The provocative words of Matthew Paris illuminated the depiction of an enthralled realm. The recognition through their own writings, that many scholars had in the past confronted the corruption of the church, elevated Foxe's argument to another level. It is to a study of these manuscripts - now identified as having been used by Foxe - that we now turn.

¹⁷⁵ *A&M*, 1570, bk. 4, p. 498.